

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TALK HONORING THE HONORABLE  
OTIS LIVINGSTON

## HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on Tuesday, June 22, 1971, Mr. James M. Windham gave a talk at an appreciation dinner in Columbia, S.C., to honor the Honorable Otis Livingston.

The outstanding career of this fine South Carolinian is worthy of attention. Mr. Livingston established himself in the vital field of securing the necessary revenue to run our government.

Mr. President, the ability of this man is especially noticeable in view of his re-appointment as chairman of the tax commission through change after change of State Governors. The earlier custom had been to rotate the chairmanship among the different members of the tax commission.

In 1922, Mr. Livingston began his career with the South Carolina State Tax Commission. On July 1, 1947, he became the director of the income tax division as its second director. On October 3, 1949, I appointed him as a member of the South Carolina State Tax Commission when I was Governor of South Carolina. He served from February 1952 until June 23, 1967, as chairman of the South Carolina Tax Commission.

Mr. Otis Livingston is known throughout the Nation as a knowledgeable tax expert. He was granted the honor of being a member of the National Association of Tax Administrators. Mr. Livingston was elected president of this national association, which shows the high esteem in which he is held by other men in this field throughout the Nation. The career of Mr. Otis Livingston deserves the consideration of the Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the talk given by Mr. James M. Windham on Tuesday, June 22, 1971, honoring the Honorable Otis Livingston be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

APPRECIATION DINNER TO HONOR THE HONORABLE OTIS LIVINGSTON IN COLUMBIA, S.C.

Mister Toastmaster, distinguished guests, and friends and admirers of the one we are here to honor: I will not further classify those in attendance, because each of you is distinguished else you would not be here, and I am sure all are friends of our honoree.

When I was asked to make a talk paying honor to Otis Livingston, I suggested someone else more apt with words than I, realizing that my background is not that of a speaker, but rather that of an attorney whose talks are those before our courts. Any practitioner knows the odds there. However, when it was insisted that I should do the honors and I had agreed to do them, I came to realize several things: The first is that I

feel to be chosen to say a few words in honor of Otis, I, myself, am necessarily honored thereby. Second, and far more important, I realized that with regard to the gentleman we honor tonight, truth can be said and need only be said. When said, it can only come out most complimentary of him. Therefore, I cherish the opportunity not because I intend to make a spell-binding speech, but rather because of what I can freely say with complete honesty and sincerity about this most remarkable man in governmental circles.

However, bearing in mind these words by Nancy W. Olson, I set out to discuss the career of Otis:

"The human brain's the greatest thing  
That ever man could seek,  
It functions from the time he's born  
Till he gets up to speak."

In considering the career of Otis, we should not overlook the difficulty of establishing an enviable career in taxation. It certainly is not one designed to win friends and influence people, but to the contrary. In fact, it has been aptly said that there are two classes of people who dislike taxes, namely, men and women.

In honoring Otis, I draw a parallel between him and J. Edgar Hoover. To me, Otis is to the government of South Carolina in his particular field of public service what J. Edgar Hoover is to the government of the United States in his particular field of public service. Both have directed their respective government departments with such ability and skill until each has become a veritable institution. Each is a legend in his time.

There is valid reason for this. Each has served in extremely important roles where *knowledge* and *expertise* have been applied so advantageously in the operation of government—Mr. Hoover in law enforcement and Otis in the vital field of securing the revenues to run the government.

As a general rule, the tenure of appointees to direct and head commissions and departments end with the inauguration of a new head of State. It is not so in the case of either Mr. Hoover or Otis. Each has served through change after change in heads of State. Mr. Hoover has served continuously through the tenures of many Presidents, and Otis served without interruption through the tenures of many Governors. In the case of Otis, tradition was broken in another way in that when initially appointed as *Chairman* of the Tax Commission, he continued in that role through re-appointment by successive Governors. Custom and tradition theretofore had been that the *Chairmanship* rotate among the *membership* of the *Tax Commission*.

Let me trace for you some of the things that all of us know and appreciate in the career of the one we honor tonight. And I shall take the liberty since I have the floor, I say to those of you from the legislative halls, to insert certain remarks that I originate since I have personal knowledge thereof.

Otis had long been a recognized authority in the field of taxes when I commenced a tenure of over a decade with the South Carolina Tax Commission in 1953 as its General Counsel. I had known of his unusual administrative ability well in advance of that time, and, believe me, it was not easy to come to work for one so knowledgeable as that without some trembling on my part. I trembled indeed when I thought of my role of advising him about taxes. However, as

it turned out, he made my job easier by reason of his vast knowledge. When I resigned to enter private practice, I can say candidly that it took a great deal of talking to myself to take me away from the pleasure of working with Otis. As a matter of fact, when I wrestled with the matter of leaving, I almost decided against it primarily because of my great respect and admiration of Otis.

Otis is a native of Columbia. He attended Columbia Schools and Presbyterian College. After World War I, in which he served in the Infantry, he worked for a C.P.A., gaining experience in an essential to being a tax expert, namely, accounting.

In 1922, he began a career with the South Carolina Tax Commission right after (11 days, in fact) the passage of South Carolina's Income Tax Law. On July 1, 1947, he became the Director of the Income Tax Division, its second Director, where he continued until October 3, 1949.

On October 3, 1949, Governor Thurmond appointed him a member of the South Carolina Tax Commission.

From February 1952 until June 23, 1967 through the administration of numbers of Governors, he served as Chairman of the South Carolina Tax Commission.

On June 23, 1967, Otis became Chairman of the South Carolina Alcoholic Beverage Control Commission, that Commission being carved out, as it were, of the South Carolina Tax Commission. He served as Chairman of the said Alcoholic Beverage Commission for two years, and since then until now he has been a member of that three-member Commission.

It is with regard to the service with the Tax Commission that I know the value of Otis to his State. In a word, he was "Mr. Taxation" in South Carolina. When a tax expert from a large corporation had a tax problem in South Carolina, he knew full well that in Otis was a man at the top level who could understand the problem, follow and participate in the technical discussion, and present his side of the picture first hand. Additionally, I can say without any doubt that many corporations were influenced to establish plants in this State because of Otis' ability to give them solid and straightforward answers to the tax implications of doing business here.

Otis was respected as a knowledgeable tax expert not only throughout South Carolina, but also throughout the United States. His advice and counsel were sought by tax people over the United States.

There are two major tax associations in the United States. One is the National Association of Tax Administrators, whose membership is made up of people in government tax work. Otis was honored in being elected to serve as President of that National organization for the years 1957-58.

The second National tax organization is the National Tax Association, whose membership is made up of the academic sector, that is, economists, college professors teaching taxation; the private sector, that is, the representatives of taxpaying businesses and corporations; and finally, the government sector, that is, people in government who are directly involved in the administering of tax laws. Otis was chosen President of this organization, and served as its head in 1962. He is also honored by being listed in "Who's Who in America."

Recognizing the great contribution Otis had made to South Carolina and the nation in his role as Chairman of the South Carolina Tax Commission, Clemson University, a

school he dearly loves, conferred upon him the Degree of Doctor of Laws in 1965.

How did he come to achieve the success that he has enjoyed? Of course, if we knew the precise answer to that question, others could rise to those heights. However, I know some of the characteristics, traits and habits of this man. I touch upon them, and in so doing, like to believe that perhaps each had an important role in the place Otis has carved for himself in the pages of history.

*First*, there is Alma, his dear wife. Of course, we also know what a truly vibrant personality she is and how she can bring her vivaciousness to rub off on others. She has been Otis No. 1 helper, and should share this honor with him. I suggest that she does so. It has been said many times that "behind every successful man is a wonderful woman." Tonight I want to rephrase that and say by Otis' side has stood a wonderful woman.

*Second*, there is application and devotion to duty. In that regard, Otis established the reputation of being the first person on the job each morning and the last to leave each evening. Beyond that, when Saturdays became "a day off," Otis was there on the job.

*Third*, there is integrity. Otis possesses integrity to the extent that he refused to sacrifice principles. He earnestly searched for an answer to a problem, and when he arrived at what he believed to be right, he stuck to his position irrespective of any pressures.

*Finally*, and by no means do these four cover all of them, there is his determination to respect all with whom he deals so that he is always ready to listen to any individual, to respect his views and to suffer him to make known his views up to a point where it becomes obvious that such person is not to be believed. Only then would Otis fail to listen.

Otis' love is in his fine family. His wife, Alma, and his two sons, John F. Livingston, who lives in Graniteville where he is Assistant General Superintendent of the Graniteville Company, and Otis, Jr., who is a Lieutenant Colonel of Infantry, U.S. Army, and naturally, his grandchildren.

We salute you, Otis, upon your retirement, and we call you a "gentleman."

"A gentleman is a man who is clean inside and out,  
Who neither looks up to the rich nor down to the poor,  
Who can lose without squealing,  
And who can win without bragging,  
Who is considerate of women, children and old people,  
Who is too brave to lie, too gentle to cheat,  
And who takes his share of the world,  
And lets other people have theirs."

**H.R. 9092, PREVAILING RATE PAY SYSTEM FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES**

**HON. J. J. PICKLE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is time that we bestow some of the increases that have been going to other civil service workers to our wage board employees. Many of the jobs that make the daily wheels of government grind are done by wage board employees and this group should be justly rewarded. This bill is substantially the same legislation which passed Congress late in 1970

only to be vetoed by the President on January 1, 1971. To my way of thinking this was no way for the President to start off the new year.

H.R. 9092 accomplishes 2 major purposes:

First, it enacts into law the long established principles and policies for setting the pay of prevailing rate employees.

Second, it makes the following changes in the current operating changes and procedures:

a. It establishes a Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee to guide the wage board system.

b. It provides for a five step wage schedule instead of the present three prevailing steps. The fifth step would be 112 percent of the prevailing wage.

c. It provides automatic step advancements after 26 weeks work in step 1; 78 weeks in step 2, and 104 weeks in each of steps 3 and 4.

d. It provides a 7½ percent pay differential nationwide for scheduled non-overtime work during the second shift—3 p.m. until midnight—and 10 percent for the third shift—11 p.m. until 8 a.m.

e. It provides "saved pay" for two years for prevailing rate employees who are reduced in grade. General Schedule employees now have this protection.

f. It brings the employees of non-appropriated fund activities of the Armed Forces and employees of the Veteran's Canteen Service under the provisions of the prevailing rate pay system.

Mr. Speaker, I think these provisions of H.R. 9092 are long overdue and I urge that this bill be strongly supported by the House.

**MASS LAYOFFS OF STEELWORKERS**

**HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a recent news article published in the Daily News of McKeesport, Pa., which explains a most unusual situation now occurring in the domestic steel industry.

The article concerns the sudden and unprecedented mass layoffs of thousands of steelworkers in my 20th Congressional District and elsewhere. United States Steel Corp., for example, is the principal employer in the Mon-Yough Valley of Pennsylvania, which I represent. In recent weeks it has furloughed more than 5,000 steelworkers with the promise of more to come. Other steel firms in the nearby areas have laid off another 5,000 and there, too, the situation is expected to worsen.

What is so unusual about this? What is the reason for these unprecedented layoffs? It is not, as some of my colleagues might feel, because of troubled conditions within the industry today. It is not because of the threat of a work stoppage when the current contract expires at the end of this month.

Mr. Speaker, the villain behind these

layoffs is the same one which has been openly, arrogantly, and ruthless strangling the American steel industry and its workers. It is foreign steel imports, unrestricted foreign steel imports, which is choking and killing the American steelmaking industry.

For the benefit of my colleagues who may not be familiar with steelmaking and the procedures of the steel industry during contract negotiations, I would like to explain why the contract talks of 1971 are so vastly different from those of past years.

They must understand that in previous negotiations, where there has been the possibility of a work stoppage, the industry and the steelworker continued to make steel until the last possible minute. They attempted to fill as many orders as possible before banking their furnaces and shutting down their rolling mills. It meant money for the company; it meant money for the worker who might be off for long periods of time without a pay check.

Steelmakers again this year were anticipating a boom in production. Additional facilities were cranked up in anticipation of buyers stocking their inventories in event of a work stoppage. But the boom never materialized. It fizzled. Orders for steel which normally would have kept the plant and the workers busy until the last minute were, instead, filled weeks in advance. There was no need for the plant to operate. There was no demand for the worker.

Why? Because foreign manufacturers, nursed back to robust health after the ravages of World War II by American taxdollars and American technology, now found themselves in a position to fatten their pocketbooks at the expense of the American steel industry, the American steelworker, and the American taxpayer.

The reason domestic steel plants are shutting down and laying off workers weeks ahead of the usual time is not because there was not a demand for orders. No. There was a demand, but much of that demand was filled by foreign steel producers. There was no need then to employ Americans or maintain American production facilities.

In the first 5 months of this year the United States has been subjected to a mammoth onslaught of foreign steel. Overseas producers are shipping their products here at a record rate. In just 5 months nearly 7 million tons of steel has come into the country. That is nearly 60 percent greater than what was shipped in the same period last year.

It was hoped the voluntary restraint arrangement, negotiated by our State Department in 1968, would curb and control the influx of foreign steel. It has not. Not one iota. Parties to the arrangement have not hesitated to violate its provisions and their promises, when and if it was to their advantage. They struck where the iron was hottest. Last year the specialty steel segment of the domestic industry took it in the gut. This year, with the expiration of the voluntary arrangement looming on the horizon and the threat of a work stoppage in the do-

mestic steel industry as a whole, the foreign producers expanded their attack. They not only maintained the concentration of specialty steels, which bring a much higher dollar value per ton, but increased the tonnage of basic steel, thereby reaping an even greater financial harvest on the higher volume.

We also know overseas manufacturers are tempting American steel buyers with a lucrative carrot. They are constantly cajoling our producers to have their products made abroad, taking advantage of low labor costs, and then returned to the United States and sold under the well-known American brand name. In the process, of course, the American buyer is committed to long-term contracts which would prevent him from buying American-made products while labor conditions are stabilized.

Mr. Speaker, I am including the news article mentioned early in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues. I also would like to inform them I am planning to ask for special orders in the near future to further discuss the threat of foreign imports, not just in steel but in any industry threatened by producers abroad who enjoy low labor costs and governmental subsidies which allow them to undersell American manufacturers and make them noncompetitive.

The article follows:

**STEEL FIRMS FORCED INTO NEW LAYOFFS;  
PRODUCERS BLAMING SHRINKING DEMAND  
FOR WORKER CUTS**

PITTSBURGH.—A shrinking demand has forced layoffs and production cutbacks in the domestic steel industry and producers say the situation is getting worse.

All but two major producers report either layoffs, "personnel adjustments" or declining production.

Hardest hit are the country's two largest steelmakers, U.S. Steel and Bethlehem.

U.S. Steel, the nation's top producer, has idled more than 5,000 workers in recent weeks, including 2,700 at its Youngstown, Ohio, works. Bethlehem laid off about 2,500.

The cutbacks and layoffs—without pay—began last month when an anticipated production boom fizzled.

Steelmakers had expected buyers to stock up in anticipation of a possible strike when contracts with the United Steelworkers union expire Aug. 1.

**MARKET FLOODED**

But foreign producers flooded the American market with record-level imports, much of it lower-priced products. Imports totaled about 1.8 million tons in May and 5.15 million tons the first quarter of the year.

"Our people had no choice then, than to tear down, starting with the additional facilities that had been put into production to meet the boom that never really came," one industry spokesman said.

"Let's face it," said a spokesman for one company, "we couldn't just keep people on the payroll at plants that were not producing."

Both company and union spokesmen scoff at a report that the layoffs an attempt by the companies to scare the United Steelworkers into reducing their contract demands during the negotiations under way in Washington.

A spokesman at union headquarters called

the report "ridiculous," citing the extensive costs involved in shutting down and reopening plants.

In addition to its Youngstown plant, U.S. Steel has announced layoffs of 2,000 at Braddock near Pittsburgh; 500 in Gary, Ind.; 400 at its National-Duquesne works in Duquesne, Pa., and 250 at its South Works in Chicago.

This week's cutbacks, plans for which were announced 10 days ago by U.S. Steel, affected the submerged arc pipe mill at National Plant. Earlier, the electric furnace shop at Duquesne Plant was taken out of service.

Initial company estimates put the number of workers to be affected at some 250.

Today, a U.S. Steel spokesman discounted reports that the late-week furloughs amounted to 700 here, and cited the earlier estimate.

Bethlehem has laid off 1,000 at its Lackawanna, N.Y., plant; 725 at Sparrows Point, Md.; 400 at Johnstown, Pa.; and 300 at Bethlehem, Pa.

Also, according to a Bethlehem spokesman, hundreds of men at various other plants have not been scheduled to work. He said they technically are not laid off, but just weren't working this week.

These include 900 men at Lackawanna and another 200 at Burns Harbor, Ind., the spokesman said.

Republic Steel gave between 3,000 and 4,000 workers at plants at Canton, Ohio; and Buffalo, N.Y., what it called "an extended July 4th holiday" because of a lack of orders. But a spokesman said Friday those men may be recalled early next week.

Tenth-ranked Wheeling-Pittsburgh Steel Corp. announced cutbacks last month at its plants at Monessen and Allenport in southwestern Pennsylvania, a move that affected about 250 workers.

Two major producers who say they have not had to lay off workers are Armco and National Steel.

A spokesman for National, the fourth largest steelmaker in the nation, said however:

"I suppose we'll come to the point of slowing down our finishing mills soon and an alternative probably would be a shorter work week. At this time, we do not anticipate any layoffs."

**AID TO ISRAEL**

**HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is a common error within Government circles to speak of U.S. aid to Israel without noting the crucial difference between aid in the form of loans and aid in the form of grants. In fact, economic aid to Israel has only rarely taken the form of outright grants, and of the loans we have distributed to her, more than half have already been repaid. Military assistance, moreover, has never been granted outright to Israel; while we have extended her credits over the years, we have never just given away U.S. arms.

A thorough study of these distinctions as they apply to Israel has been brought to my attention by Mr. Louis Panush, a resident of my district. I include the study, an article from the June 30 Mid-

dle East Report in the RECORD at this point:

**THE MALICIOUS ATTACK ON AID TO ISRAEL**

Over the years, critics of U.S. aid to Israel have exaggerated the amount in order to bolster their claim that we have favored Israel over the Arab states.

We refer to recent speeches by Senators Mark O. Hatfield (R-Oreg.) and J. W. Fulbright (D-Ark.) and to an article by David G. Nes, ex-U.S. diplomat, which has been published in *The New York Times* and Arab propaganda sheets.

Hatfield addressed the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on June 14, opening a campaign to knock out the Jackson amendment which authorizes arms credits for Israel.

"Our policy towards the Middle East over the last 23 years has been unbalanced in terms of economic and military aid," he said. "Between 1948 and 1968, U.S. economic aid to Israel equalled \$1.1 billion."

Here Hatfield used the word *aid* to include loans as well as grants.

But the accompanying table shows that U.S. economic grants to Israel totaled only \$369.3 million, a tiny fraction—1/262nd—of our world total of \$96.8 billion.

**GRANTS ENDED A DECADE AGO**

Grants to Israel ended about ten years ago.

That money helped to resettle more than 1 1/4 million refugees and immigrants—the survivors of Hitler's death camps, the escapees from behind the Iron Curtain, the Jews who fled discrimination in Arab and other Moslem countries.

The same table shows that U.S. economic loans to Israel totaled \$907 million.

But more than half—\$459 million—has already been repaid. Example: These loans included \$333 million from the Export-Import Bank; this had been reduced to \$72.3 million by the end of 1970.

Israel has met her debts; her repayments exceed repayments by all the Arab states put together, as the table shows.

Egypt, for her part, was in default before the six-day war and has made no repayments since; her delinquency to the United States now totals \$140 million.

American aid to Israel never leaves this country; Israel buys far more from the United States than she sells to us.

The United States had a favorable trade surplus with Israel of \$2.6 billion between 1949 and 1970—exclusive of Israel's military procurement.

In 1964 Israel spent \$191 million in the United States. By 1970, Israel purchases had soared to \$594 million. During the same period, Arab purchases declined from \$796 million to \$758 million.

**NO MILITARY GRANTS**

The table also reveals that Israel never received grant military aid, while nine Arab countries were granted \$230 million in this period.

Figures on arms sales and credits are classified.

Israel has received loans for arms purchases totaling about \$250 million through 1969, of which \$65 million was paid back by June 30 of that year. Subsequent credits have not been disclosed. These include \$500 million voted by Congress last fall under the open-ended Jackson amendment which Hatfield now seeks to eliminate.

Five Arab countries—Jordan, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, Sudan and Tunisia—have received undisclosed military credits in this period.

[In millions of dollars]

Arab States	U.S. aid to Israel and Arab States 1 1946, 1970					U.S. trade with Israel and Arab States 2					
	Economic aid		Repay- ments and interest	Total loans out- standing	Military grants	U.S. exports			U.S. imports		
	Grants	Loans				1964	1970	Total 1964, 1970	1964	1970	Total 1964, 1970
Algeria.....	168.8	11.6	4.3	7.3	0	54	62	354	5	10	36
Iraq.....	28.3	26.9	11.5	15.4	46.7	60	22	236	8	3	56
Jordan.....	569.9	31.3	4.5	26.8	53.2	34	63	295	(1)	(1)	(1)
Kuwait.....	0	50.0	20.5	29.5	0	56	62	568	52	25	244
Lebanon.....	73.0	18.1	7.9	10.2	9.0	58	64	508	8	13	64
Libya.....	205.6	7.0	8.4	-1.4	17.4	61	104	624	29	39	392
Morocco.....	296.8	424.4	96.7	327.7	37.2	41	89	423	6	10	65
Saudi Arabia.....	27.5	31.1	23.9	7.2	35.1	95	141	1,035	86	20	465
Sudan.....	67.5	35.0	13.0	22.0	.7	16	7	81	.6	12	54.6
Syria.....	36.4	24.0	4.0	20.0	.1	13	11	86	5	2	24
Tunisia.....	374.7	288.1	32.4	255.7	30.3	33	49	322	1	3	19
United Arab Republic.....	293.0	619.1	152.3	466.8	0	270	81	879	16	23	158
Yemen.....	42.9	0	0	0	(2)	5	3	27	.4	.1	5.3
<b>Total:</b>											
Arab states.....	2,184.4	1,566.6	379.4	1,187.2	230	796	758	5,438	217	160.1	1,519.9
Israel.....	369.3	907.0	458.7	448.3	0	191	594	2,150	56	150	678

1 Source: U.S. Overseas Loans and Grants, a special report prepared for the House Foreign Affairs Committee, printed May 14, 1971.

2 Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Overseas Business Reports: United States Foreign Annual 1964-70, printed February 1971.

(1) Loans not available.

(2) Less than \$500,000.

(3) Less than \$50,000.

#### MIXING GRANTS AND LOANS

Hatfield has combined our aid figures with non-government loans, like Israel bonds, and private philanthropy. Here, too, he neglects to mention that by the end of 1970 Israel had redeemed more than half of the \$1.6 billion in bond sales.

It is obviously unfair to include private financing in U.S. aid figures. Many Americans invest abroad. Many American dollars have gone to develop Arab oil. Many countries float bonds in the United States. Thus, Canadians would be shocked and resentful if anyone described their widespread sale of provincial bonds here—a net increase of about \$3.5 billion in the last six years—as “U.S. aid.”

What about the perennial complaint that UJA funds contributed to Israel are deductible from income tax? The fact is that all charitable and missionary funds to all other parts of the world are tax-deductible. Israel is not the only country to benefit by our tax laws.

Moreover, those who complain about tax-deductible UJA contributions might do some research on how the Arab countries have prospered as a result of our laws favoring oil investments abroad.

The depletion allowance and laws permitting the giant oil corporations to treat royalties and taxes paid to Arab governments as tax offsets have not only benefited American oil companies but have enhanced the profitability of their ventures for the Arab countries. American taxpayers have helped Arab sheikhs get rich.

Furthermore, Arab oil revenues are subsidizing the Egyptian and Jordanian economies.

In 1967, three oil-rich Arab states—Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and Libya—promised an annual subsidy of \$378 million—\$266 million for Egypt and \$112 million for Jordan. Saudi Arabia gave \$140 million; Kuwait, \$134 million; Libya, \$84 million.

During Jordan's war with the Arab terrorists late in 1970, Kuwait and Libya halted contributions to Jordan. As a result, the United States proposes to increase aid to Jordan this year.

The amounts going to Israel from bonds and UJA are always vastly exaggerated.

Thus, Fulbright said last Apr. 4:

“Since 1948, private American citizens have provided another \$3 billion in tax-deductible contributions, and regularly purchase between \$300 million and \$400 million a year in Israel bonds.”

The facts: UJA collections between 1948 and 1970 came to \$2.047 billion. Part of this

money was spent outside Israel by the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee and other UJA beneficiaries, although this sum is probably offset by contributions to other institutions, such as universities and hospitals.

Fulbright's figures on Israel Bond sales are also inflated. World-wide sales have totaled \$1.6 billion and have averaged about \$80 million a year between 1951 and 1970—85% in the United States.

Hatfield said that in 1971 dollar transfers to Israel would approximate \$1.6 billion.

That estimate is actually double the dollar transfers for 1970. This inflated figure seems to have been pulled out of the air.

#### FALSE COMPARISONS

Hatfield and Nes complain that U.S. aid to Israel on a per capita basis greatly exceeds “the \$35 per capita to the people of the 13 countries neighboring Israel.”

Which 13 countries?

Perhaps Hatfield means the 13 Arab countries. But we do not think per capita comparisons are realistic or equitable because U.S. aid has never been distributed or measured with that kind of simplistic yardstick. Our aid program recognizes the need of the recipient country and its ability to absorb and make effective use of our aid.

In this area, Israel has always been regarded as a showcase of U.S. aid. Israel, it should be emphasized, resettled the host of refugees who came to her land. The Arab states, despite their huge resources, have always refused to resettle the Arab refugees. The United States has contributed \$478 million to UNRWA to keep Arab refugees alive. In the April 4, 1964, issue of *Foreign Affairs*, Professor J. Kenneth Galbraith wrote that Israel had shown “great capacity to make effective use of aid” and had made rapid progress because of four elements in Israel: “high literacy and a highly educated elite, the sense and reality of social justice, an effective government and a strong sense of purpose.”

Parenthetically, we should note that our per capita grant aid to Jordan—\$271—exceeds our per capita grant aid to Israel—\$127.

But there is no proper justification for comparing our aid to Israel with that given to her enemies. There is no rule which holds that aid to Israel should be curtailed because of the enmity or the inertia of her neighbors.

Some Arab countries, like Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and Libya, are rich in oil and do not need our aid. Some, like Syria, rejected it. Some have accepted it and repaid us by burning down U.S. buildings and nationalizing

U.S. companies. And some, like Egypt, Syria, Iraq, Yemen and Algeria, receive huge assistance from the Soviet Union.

[There are no precise data for Soviet military and economic grants and loans to the Arab states. It has been estimated that the Soviet Union has provided them with more than \$6 billion in armaments—more than half of it since 1967. This is exclusive of Soviet economic grants and loans, which are estimated at \$2.6 billion up to 1967.]

Since we do not know to which 13 countries Hatfield and Nes refer, we might compare our aid to Israel with our aid to Israel's 13 neighbors which share with her the coastline of the Mediterranean Sea.

Our grant aid to these 13 nations totals \$25.299 billion—about 68 times the amount of our grant aid to Israel.

If Hatfield insists on per capita calculations, he will find that there is no truth in his claim that our per capita assistance to Israel “exceeds our assistance to any ally.” Our per capita grant aid to France was \$146, to Greece \$399, to Israel \$127.

#### COMPARING ISRAEL AND VIET NAM

The most invidious Hatfield utterance compares transfers to Israel with our aid to Viet Nam. He told the committee:

“Israel received \$1,400 per capita, which exceeds our assistance to any ally, including Viet Nam, which received \$556 per capita between its founding and 1966.”

Hatfield's calculations would multiply U.S. aid to Israel to the astounding figure of \$4.06 billion which apparently includes grants, loans, credits, transfers—plus an additional unaccounted for one billion thrown in, perhaps, for tips.

On the other hand, Hatfield's arithmetic would fix our Viet Nam aid at only \$10 billion.

We do know how Hatfield arrives at that figure. He stops his calculations with 1966, because the aid program to Viet Nam was then transferred to the U.S. defense budget. We do not know whether he includes the billions which went to Viet Nam via the French in the early post-war years.

#### \$10 BILLION OR \$100 BILLION

He knows better.

As a foe of the Viet Nam war, Hatfield denounced its high cost and used different figures in his Senate speech on June 10. He called it a war “that kills only 30 Americans every week, that wounds only about 300 other Americans every week, that costs only \$10-12 billion a year, that requires only 100,000 or 50,000 or 40,000 American troops . . . and never stops.”

We cannot understand how Hatfield can juxtapose an exaggerated figure for money "transfers" to Israel with a partial figure for Viet Nam which does not include the huge costs of Viet Nam in terms of American lives and military equipment.

How can Hatfield possibly speak of our aid to Israel and our aid to Viet Nam in the same breath? He distorts the figures to fabricate an analogy between Viet Nam and Israel which is designed to prejudice Israel's cause in the eyes of the American people.

#### HEW AND ITS MISAPPROPRIATIONS OF TAXPAYERS' DOLLARS

### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the announcement that the Washington, D.C., school system has been charged by Federal investigators with misspending much of the \$5.2 million in Federal funds earmarked last year for the citizens' poorest children does not come as a surprise to anyone.

Every HEW activity which has resulted from grants of taxpayers' money should be rigidly and thoroughly investigated, and those found guilty of exploiting the poor, the needy, and the youth of our country should be promptly removed and those involved should be prosecuted.

Certainly graft, extortion, and misappropriation must not be allowed to become the law of our land by common practice. The most despicable public servants are those administrators and department heads who not only go out of their way to cover up the stealing of taxpayers' money, but also try to justify their criminal complicity by the use of threats to their employees and so-called appeals to humanity.

If there is anything worse than thieves, it is wealthy or intelligent people who use the poor for their own self-gain.

I insert a newsclipping at this point:  
U.S. CHARGES CITY'S SCHOOLS MISSPENT MUCH OF \$5.2 MILLION IN AID TO POOR  
(By Lawrence Feinberg)

Federal investigators have charged the Washington school system with misspending much of the \$5.2 million in federal aid earmarked last year for the city's poorest children.

In a highly critical report, investigators for the U.S. Office of Education said some of the money was spent on low-priority extras, including a course in aviation at one high school where most students have severe difficulties in reading.

The investigators added that the school system also used the money to buy expensive equipment, including television sets and record players, with "no evidence" that it was needed to overcome problems in reading and math.

At one elementary school, which has only 12 teachers, the investigators said they found 10 television sets, 10 filmstrip projectors, 10 record players, four calculators and three overhead projectors. All were bought with money from Title One of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, but the investigators said they found no indication of what they were needed for or even if they were being used.

The report added that the 29 public

schools and five Catholic schools in which the money is spent were not selected carefully to make sure that they serve the city's highest concentration of poor children.

Within these schools, it said, the extra programs paid for by Title One, including counseling, trips, and tutoring, often were provided for all children enrolled instead of only to those with the most severe educational problems.

The federal regulations require that Title One money be concentrated in schools with the most children from low-income families, and that within these schools it be spent on students with the most serious problems, and not on general "enrichment."

The report, which did not charge any criminal wrongdoing, was sent last week to D.C. School Supt. Hugh J. Scott, who passed it on to school board members. Yesterday afternoon Scott was out of town, and could not be reached for comment.

Anita F. Allen, the school board president, said the Title One program had been "out of control of the board" under several school superintendents for the past four years.

She said she and other board members have pressed for a clear definition of the program's goals and for limiting it to children with the greatest need in order to make an impact.

"I have complained about Title One," Mrs. Allen said, "since the day I got on the board (in July, 1967) . . . I knew that somewhere down the road we had to get clobbered about what we were doing."

Since 1966, the federal government has spent over \$31 million in Title One aid in Washington schools.

According to annual evaluations prepared separately from the federal investigation, there is no evidence of significant academic improvement among students in the schools receiving money from the program.

The Title One funds originally went to 77 schools in all parts of the city, and in the program's second year, 18 more schools were added. After the federal government complained that the money was spread too thin to have any effect on student achievement the school board reduced the number of aided schools to 36.

On the advice of a report prepared by former Supt. William Manning in 1968, all of the 36 schools were in the Cardozo area or near Dunbar High School, about 10 blocks away, just above the city's old downtown area.

The federal report said these schools were designated to receive the extra aid without ranking all schools in the city according to their concentration of low-income students. It suggested that schools elsewhere may actually have a greater need, a complaint often made by residents of far Northeast Washington and of Anacostia.

The report ordered Scott to cancel the Learning Through Aviation program at Cardozo High School and another program at the school in data processing. The two programs cost over \$60,000 last year.

It added that the school system must follow federal regulations in selecting aided schools and projects, and "recommended" that it seek "technical assistance" in drawing up a plan to manage the program.

#### RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE—THIRD CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

### HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I recently conducted a questionnaire in the Third

Congressional District of Florida, which comprises Jacksonville, Fla. Over 16,000 residents of Jacksonville responded to the poll, the results of which are included below:

1. Which of the following would you favor for the U.S. position in Southeast Asia:

	Percent	
a. withdraw all U.S. forces by December 31, 1971.....	41.3	
b. continue as at present.....	25.3	
c. increase U.S. military effort to win, then withdraw.....	34.1	

Do you favor:

[In percent]

	Yes	No
2. Federal revenue-sharing with the states if it requires increased federal deficit spending? .....	24.6	66.3
3. Raising the minimum wage to \$2.00 per hour?.....	55.1	43.6
4. A national health insurance program financed by higher social security and other federal taxes .....	33.6	62.2
5. Restricting Presidents to one six-year term?.....	29.7	66.4
6. Admitting Red China into the United Nations?.....	48.4	46.1
7. Additional Manned Space Shots? .....	56.7	45.2

#### FARM SUBSIDIES—AND THE RICH GET RICHER

### HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, it should not be necessary to remind my colleagues of the desperate need that exists for the funding of social problems and the difficulty in finding available money. States and cities are hard pressed for funds to meet their needs. The average citizen is heavily taxed, and the burden is on those who can least bear it. Yet, the rich get richer.

The farm subsidy program is one way by which the Government is abetting this process of aiding the "fat cats." Last year's ceiling of \$55,000 had been reputed to be saving the Government \$69 million, yet now that the year has run its course none of that money can be found. The fat cat farmers have found a way to continue receiving subsidy payments by reorganizing their businesses. The large corporate farmers have suffered little while the smaller farmer has, if he is ever able to collect subsidy payment, been adversely affected.

The House has passed an amendment to lower subsidy payments of \$20,000 for the third time. The projected savings for this policy are \$200 million which could be used in areas such as housing, education, and health. Of course, this will not be a panacea for these ills, but it will be a start in the right direction.

Tom Wicker's column in the New York Times of July 15 and the Washington Post editorial of July 15 give a good commentary on the farm subsidy program. I commend these articles to the attention of my colleagues:

## DOWN ON THE FARM

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON.—The new welfare reform bill, if passed, will provide the munificent total of \$2,400 a year for a family of four, providing the family meets the park rules and survives the other red tape in which the program will be wrapped.

On Capitol Hill, any number of social programs are in trouble because of inadequate funding. In huge cities like New York, tax payers are on the verge of revolt, but the budgets they are supporting are still woefully inadequate to minimum public needs.

Universities and school systems everywhere are in trouble for lack of funds; hospital fees have gone out of sight; and this lugubrious listing of financial deficiencies could go on for the length of this article. That wouldn't be so bad if the country were really hard up for money and everyone suffered alike.

But that isn't the case. This is a country where the rich get richer, and not just because they are smarter or have more capital; the system tends to be rigged in their favor. The oil depletion allowance is a well-known example; so is the fact that persons wealthy enough to buy blocs of municipal bonds can live virtually tax-free. Some incredibly wealthy men can find the means to escape taxes altogether.

Gov. Ronald Reagan of California recently conceded that, due to "business reverses," he had paid no state income tax last year. The worst thing about that is that undoubtedly he was truthful in protesting that he had done nothing illegal; the painful fact is that it is perfectly possible for a man being paid \$40,000 a year in America, if he has outside business interests, to pay no state income tax, although that would be virtually impossible for someone earning \$8,000 or \$9,000 a year with no other income.

The latest Government gimmick for those who are already rich turns out to be last year's decision to put a \$55,000 limit per crop on the amount any farmer could be paid in agricultural subsidies. As cynics expected all along, the big farming interests and the Department of Agriculture administrators collaborated to turn this limitation into a farce.

Senator James O. Eastland of Mississippi and his family, for one example, received about \$160,000 in cotton subsidies in 1970. This year—according to an authoritative report by Nick Kotz in *The Washington Post*—the Eastlands met the \$55,000 limitation by creating eight new business entities to farm their 5,200-acre farm. The result is an estimated Federal subsidy of \$159,925 for this year. No doubt the Eastland legal costs for these arrangements were substantial, but that is still pretty good footwork and a pretty fat take.

It need scarcely be pointed out that Mr. Eastland and his Mississippi constituency are among the leaders in decrying the supposed sloth and lack of moral fiber of poor people receiving welfare assistance from the Government. In fact, not a few of those needing welfare were displaced by machines from just such farms as the Senator's; and they have no way to divide themselves into eight parts in order to outpace their "handout."

There is a case to be made for agricultural subsidies, of course, and it should not be thought that farmers generally are profiting as blatantly as Senator Eastland and other big growers. In fact, only 1,353 farmers received more than \$55,000 per crop in 1970, taking down about \$142 million in Government subsidies.

But millions of smaller farmers were paid the rest of a total of about \$3-billion in Federal farm subsidies, and Senator Birch Bayh of Indiana says that about 40 per cent of the total, or more than \$1.5 billion, went to only five per cent of the nation's farmers.

No wonder the House of Representatives already has voted to reduce the \$55,000 ceiling to \$20,000 in future years, and Mr. Bayh has announced that he and three other Senators will propose the same reduction in the Senate.

This reduction would affect only 2 per cent of farmers—those who now receive more than \$20,000 per crop—but Mr. Bayh says it would save \$200-million for the Government and the taxpayers. That is not a lot of money, the way they hand it out around here, but there are surely better ways to spend it than to line the pockets of fat-cat corporate farmers.

## THE NONLIMITS ON FARM SUBSIDIES

Loopholes are tricky. You can block up passage through one but a practiced craftsman can find another. What's more, where one person of dim vision sees no hole at all, another sees space enough to march a small army through.

The latter is exactly what appears to be happening in the federal farm subsidy program. In the last session of Congress, a \$55,000 limit per crop was set on the payments the Department of Agriculture could make to farmers in return for their pledge to divert some land from production, and thus support farm prices. Those who backed the payment ceiling thought and hoped the new law would save the government money, in this case at least \$60 million a year. A report by *Washington Post* writer Nick Kotz last week details how far short these expectations fall. The total of \$3 billion paid out last year for not growing cotton, wheat and feed grains will not be lowered as a result of payment limitations, although the figure may be less this year because of other changes in the farm program. Quietly, effectively, and legally, hundreds of the country's richest farmers have reshuffled their businesses in ways that avoid the on-paper toughness of the 1970 law. The well-known gentleman farmer and senator, James Eastland of Mississippi, for example, made a business reorganization of his Sunflower County plantation and will receive from the government \$160,000, only a small reduction from last year.

Such legal deftness does not escape the attention of Rep. Paul Findley (R-Ill.) who last year fought for a \$20,000 limit and doubted the Department of Agriculture would strictly interpret the new law. "I believe," said Rep. Findley, "that most members of Congress thought they were getting a payment limit in which less money would be spent on the (farm subsidy) program. I'm disappointed in the whole thing, but I expected to be because the law and regulations were written by people who don't believe in any payment limitation." That so many farmers are able to avoid the effect of the law, said Rep. Findley, is "a subterfuge and clear evasion of the intent of Congress."

With evidence that they have been outfoxed, the Congress should go back and seal off the loopholes used so cleverly by these farmers of wealth. The latter cannot be faulted for taking advantage of technicalities, nor is much to be gained by questioning motives; if farmers choose to "reorganize" their businesses so soon after the new regulation took hold, an observer may have questions about the odd coincidence in timing, but he cannot question the legality. He should, however, wonder about the competence—or the sincerity—of those who passed the law in the first place, and insist that it be rewritten—tightly. What would be the reaction of Congress if it passed a law to save \$60 million on a poverty program and discovered a year later a group of poor people using clever legalities to pocket the \$60 million anyway?

## PHOENIX IN FLIGHT: ALL SYSTEMS GO

## HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, on June 22, 1971, Dr. Hiram Curry of the Medical University of South Carolina gave a splendid speech to the section on general practice at the American Medical Association meeting in Atlantic City, N.J. Dr. Curry, a charter member of the American Board of Family Practice, set up the Department of Family Practice at the Medical University of South Carolina. This outstanding program has been a model for similar departments throughout the country.

In his splendid speech Dr. Curry addresses himself to some of the most pressing problems which we as a nation face in our attempts to provide the best possible medical care for every citizen. He not only clearly delineates the problems, but he offers cogent and dynamic suggestions for appropriate solutions. This speech shows the potential for the field of family practice which can lead to important and beneficial changes in the health field. I commend Dr. Curry's excellent speech to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives and to the people of this country:

## PHOENIX IN FLIGHT: ALL SYSTEMS GO!

The occasion of this lectureship offers a yearly opportunity to review a major issue facing our profession. In the 1970s the unavoidable issue is the problem of change. The challenge is not just to describe changes as they occur, but to search for ways of controlling change—of building on what has gone before, rather than permitting older institutions to be torn down; of achieving orderly evolution, rather than submitting to revolution.

In the insignia of the American Board of Family Practice we find a symbol of change. It is the phoenix, the mythical bird of ancient Egypt, said to be as large as an eagle, with plumage of brilliant scarlet and gold. As you may recall, this legendary bird, as it grew old, would fashion a nest of aromatic boughs and spices. Then, by flapping its wings, the phoenix would set itself ablaze. To be consumed in its own flames. But invariably a new phoenix would rise from the ashes. There is no suggestion that the phoenix resisted its fate. Perhaps its faith in the future was based on knowledge of the past. There had always been a phoenix.

In the legend of the phoenix we find a pertinent theme of change, of renewal and of continuity. The history of human society is a record of vast changes, but each society has had a medicine man or healer living in its midst—the shaman of primitive tribes, the scholar physician of ancient Egypt and Greece, the granny woman of the American frontier. In 20th Century western society the general medical practitioner has been the healer from whom our people have sought relief from their illness or distress. Through the centuries one form of healer has evolved into another, each new form finding the role most appropriate for its time. The history books do not record the turbulence that undoubtedly accompanied some of these changes.

The era of general practice has a proud history that is well known. Those of us who are or have been general practitioners are all too familiar with the trends and difficulties of

practice that in recent years have reduced our ranks. In 1970, only one of every six physicians in this country was a generalist, and of these one half were over 55 years old. When we view this deficit in frontline manpower in the context of rapidly expanding medical knowledge, of increasing public expectation, of long hours that leave little time for continuing education or modernization of practice—then we can see the dilemma of general practice in its full and overwhelming dimensions.

The dilemma is equally overwhelming from the viewpoint of the individual or the family. Saint Thomas Aquinas once said, "The tragedy of man in his search for happiness is not that he cannot find happiness but that he looks for it in the wrong place". Similarly, an individual in need of medical care may often seek it in the wrong place—a crowded emergency room or the office of a highly-trained specialist.

The impact of this dilemma and the need for corrective changes have been the subject of widespread discussion and study. The successes of medical science and technology have created an imbalance which first became apparent in medical schools and residency training programs; then, inevitably in patterns of medical practice. Medical students have emulated the physician whose milieu is the research laboratory or the metabolic ward, rather than the community physician whose task is to meet the lifelong needs of families and individuals.

Academic medicine in the past has given short shrift to those skills that enable an experienced physician to appraise the needs of a patient whose complaints are vague and undifferentiated, needs which are often emotional, even in patients who have overt chronic or acute illnesses. In the case of an ulcer patient, for example, a specialist may show more concern about the remote possibility of an underlying pancreatic adenoma than about the patient's obvious occupational frustrations or family stress. (In 1971, the sixtieth anniversary of the Flexner report, a compensatory response, a negative feedback or a homeostatic reaction is long overdue.) Dr. Edmund Pellegrino has epitomized the problem as follows: "While specialization is an unquestioned benefit in every phase of clinical medicine, it greatly sharpens the need for a parallel development of the synthesizing and integrative functions required to understand and treat humans and their diseases. Concentration on an organ system or technique too often produces an insensitivity to distress signals elsewhere in the body or in the person."<sup>1</sup> There is great need for a physician who can look at the whole patient as a person, identify his problems, address himself to those problems he can and should correct or manage, and seek consultation for other problems.

We postulate, then, that the specialized, technologic emphasis of medical school curricula and medical practice fails to meet major needs of individuals and families, who seek accessibility of care, maintenance of health and preventive care, and above all, care based on a trusting doctor-patient relationship.

The public media regularly broadcast the miracles of modern medicine, but a father seeking reasonably continuous and personal care for his family may search in vain. Many people realize that their tax money has directly supported the education of physicians and advances in medical research. The level of public frustration is understandably high. It finds expression in congressional debate and in such extreme presentations as the recent television series entitled "Don't Get Sick in America". Is there a suggestion here of the paradox that foreshadowed the French Revolution—"If they can't have bread, let them eat cake"?

Footnotes at end of article.

Imbalance and frustration have set the stage for change. A new phoenix has hatched in the ashes of the old phoenix. My thesis at this point is brief: I believe that Family Practice as a specialty offers our best vehicle for change, our best opportunity to resolve current imbalance in medical care, to meet the needs of families and individuals, to preserve the great tradition of our profession, which in every society has had its foundation in a trusting personal relationship between patient and physician.

To support this thesis, we must examine the nature of the new specialty, this new phoenix emerging from the hot ashes of our dilemma.

The founders of the American Board of Family Practice many of them leaders in the American Academy of General Practice, had before them a clear task: to bring together a philosophy, a manner of practice, and a body of knowledge that would best meet the needs of families and individuals in our changing times. Their initial model was near at hand, the best general practitioners. These physicians have met the needs of their patients with dedication, ingenuity, and courage, often in spite of major obstacles. Their service has been very rarely heralded in the public media. (The weekly ABC television show *Marcus Welby* now dramatizes what the family doctor has been doing quietly for a long, long time.)

Family doctors have been physicians of first contact, available when needed. Their level of technical knowledge is high. They can provide definitive care for a high percentage of patients who come to them. The demands upon them are diverse, ranging from advice on the rearing of children to guidance in occupational rehabilitation after severe illness. They are alert to medical problems that require consultation with specialists or to life-adjustment problems that can be referred profitably to community agencies. They are willing to accept the responsibility for continuity of care and for prevention of disease. The skills, the knowledge, the personal and professional philosophy that we find in these general practitioners of medicine are the foundation of the new specialty of Family Practice.

An affluent society is not an easy one to satisfy. The more it has, the more it wants. People want what they want when they want it—immediately. They insist that their wishes be carried out, failing to differentiate these from their true needs. The population must accept some responsibility to separate wish from need, the trivial from the important, if medical manpower is to be utilized where it is needed. To have minor symptoms for a brief period and demand that a highly specialized physician analyze the problem is costly and unreasonable. If this type of medical care is desired for the entire nation then the cost will be astronomical. At a time when medical manpower is limited it is doubly unwise for individuals to monopolize the physician's time with trivia while others with significant problems must wait or not be seen. If medical care is to be a right of every citizen then each must take some responsibility to monitor his own health needs and use the physician's time wisely. With a right there goes the responsibility for using the right wisely.

Inefficiency is perhaps our greatest immediate impediment to providing excellent health care in this country and a leading cause of inefficiency is the imbalance in the ratio of primary to secondary and tertiary physicians.

At the end of 1970 there were 334,028 physicians in the United States. There were 57,948 engaged in general practice, 77,214 in medical specialties, 86,042 in surgical specialties, and 89,641 in other specialties. Even when we consider that some of the 41,872 internists and some of the 17,941 pediatricians provide primary care, we see the

tremendous imbalance in primary and secondary medical care. These figures reveal why care for rare ailments is easier to arrange than for common ones.<sup>2</sup>

Society is challenging the medical profession to organize its services so as to render comprehensive care to persons, to coordinate generalist and specialist, and to utilize efficiently bed and ambulatory, acute and chronic, diagnostic, curative, preventive, and rehabilitative facilities.

Several factors have contributed to this unworkable ratio of primary physician to consultant. Graduates have gone into the specialties and into research where the drama of the biomedical knowledge explosion has been occurring. The discovery of the antibiotics, the steroids, and advances in immunology, to mention only a few, have attracted them. General practice has not been a part of the advances in medical technology and the changes in society, making it less attractive to young doctors planning their future. Members of our affluent society bypass local primary opinion to seek expert opinion because they want the best and they can afford it. They do this because they believe the family doctor can not provide best care. To have medical care by a distant expert has become a status symbol for some.

The military services have furnished an excellent model for screening complaints to utilize efficiently the physician's time. Many common complaints can be evaluated and treated in a prescribed manner by an assistant working directly under the physician's supervision. It is understandable that a layman may overinterpret the significance of a complaint. Such a screen is very useful in such cases and especially in managing psychosomatic symptoms.

If any health care system is to work efficiently there must be a workable balance between the problem and the solution. The complexity of the problem must be matched with the training of the medical personnel attending the patient. To have a highly educated and skillful physician evaluate a patient with a sore throat is wasteful. It is like having a Ph.D. mechanical engineer change the tires on your car. No society can wisely afford such a care system. Some will argue that a sore throat can be serious. They are correct but checks can be built into a protocol that will safeguard the patient, the physician assistant, and the physician and still ensure excellent care. By having the assistant manage many minor problems the physician can give his time to more serious complaints, adding another dimension of efficiency.

Similarly a physician having years of training and experience in internal medicine is not required to diagnose and treat pneumonia. The family physician can manage the problem expertly, and frequently as an ambulatory patient, I might add. Should the pneumonia not respond promptly to therapy, then the internist should be consulted.

When a lung abscess develops the internist or the chest physician should manage the disease. There is still a place for the family physician to care for the patient as the chest physician treats the disease. Should a brain abscess develop the neurologist or neurosurgeon assumes responsibility for managing that complication. The family practitioner should continue to care for the many other needs of his patient.

In such a system there is efficiency. When the specialist is patient-selected errors occur and precious time is wasted without benefit to anyone. To pay for the time of a highly trained specialist of the wrong variety causes patient unhappiness, but it is of his own making. If the patient demands the right to choose direct access to specialists, insists on by-passing the primary physician, then he must be willing to pay for the privilege of his errors. But for society

the loss is greater. The physician's time and effort could have met another patient's real need.

Efficiency demands that every doctor do what he has been trained to do. Here is how we get both quantity and quality. False pride often leads a doctor to dabble in areas where he is uninformed. This is done in the name of accommodating the patient but more often he is fulfilling his own needs. It is time we shed our false pride for the sake of good medical care.

Efficiency also demands that doctors be selective. All of us should observe two limitations: problems too simple and problems too complex. There is more work to do than can be done. Let us divide it in the way that it is done best and most economically.

The last serious problem I shall mention is continuing education. With the doubling of medical information occurring every seven years one can keep abreast in only a tiny area or read summary articles. It is difficult to imagine the quantity of published scientific research—the equivalent of 190 Encyclopaedia Britannica volumes per day! A good medical library will subscribe to more than 5000 periodicals. The National Library of Medicine receives more than 19,000 different journals. The Index Medicus records over 180,000 entries per year.<sup>3</sup>

The physician has a heavy responsibility to translate new knowledge into service for patients. This is especially difficult for the family practitioner since he covers the entire field of medicine. He must share this responsibility with the consultants to whom he refers his difficult problems.

Advances in scientific medicine have not diminished the importance of the physician as a person or the value of the doctor-patient relationship as a diagnostic and therapeutic tool. Scientific advances do permit us to devote more time and attention to problems of living rather than to the relief of pain and the preservation of life.

As scientific treatment of disease has progressed there has been less attention to the humanistic aspects of medicine. George Engel points out that most curricula in medical schools emphasize only the study of disease and technical competence. They are inadequate in preparing students to understand their patients and what illness means to them. We must have science and humanity too. Science is not all.

Pellegrino states that professional competency comes first but there is no reason it cannot be accompanied by compassion. "We must consciously reinfuse kindness into medical care. This is largely a matter of the emotional maturity of the physician, the behavior of his teachers and the patient care models he is exposed to in medical school. It is far less a function of courses in the social science or humanities."<sup>4</sup>

There is something wrong with our value system in medicine and in society if the consultant who solves a complex problem in ninety minutes is regarded higher than the family physician who may have seen six of his patients for less complicated complaints in the same period. There should be no greater reward for any service in medicine than for care of the sick, direct or indirect, immediate or delayed, of general or a highly specialized nature. The status of scientist has its glories; but medicine's ultimate responsibility is people.

Our government policy is that health care is now a right of every citizen. The government has a responsibility to make laws and create programs which can make this right, good health care, available to every person. The government has transformed medical needs into public demands by instituting new medical services and financing programs for which there is inadequate medical man-

power and organization. Today the medical profession cannot meet the demands of the government or the public. Yet we must meet this challenge, and very soon, if we are to avert serious political decisions which will result in poorer medical care for our patients and penalties for the medical profession. Clearly it is the people's wish that good health care shall be available to all. We must make those changes which will permit us to meet this challenge.

As government attempts to meet its responsibilities by passing laws and creating programs it becomes a larger and larger financial investor in health care. It quite properly develops concerns for how the system operates, the efficiency, the quality, and the distribution of health services. Government is involved and will continue to be involved, probably even more so. We must discover ways to continue to render good quality and comprehensive care within the system that society demands. There are displeasing aspects to be sure. Our failure to meet adequately our responsibilities in the past is at least a part of the reason for governmental intervention. We stumbled! But let us fall forward! Let us prove we are a great profession by reorganizing our services so we can meet the public needs and their demands.

Common ailments are common; rare diseases are rare. Primary physicians practice in a manner to evaluate common complaints quickly, efficiently and at a low cost. Consultants are trained differently and practice in a different style. Since their patients presumably have been screened, they emphasize thoroughness to diagnose the rare disease, to uncover the unusual feature which has prompted the referral. Such an evaluation takes more time and study and therefore warrants a higher fee. Such thoroughness on a first visit for a common complaint is unreasonable and wasteful. We must reintroduce good judgment in medicine regarding such matters. There is more to life than just enjoying good health and having an up-to-date medical record with complete laboratory studies. I realize the value of good health and good health care, but there is a happy middle ground where possibilities are balanced with probabilities. If the symptom persists, or if other symptoms develop, or if there is no improvement with treatment, then additional studies are warranted. When consultants see a patient they are trained to be thorough and consider the exotic diagnostic possibilities from the beginning. Since the family doctor provides continuing care, it is proper for him to proceed in steps. In this way the patient gets the greatest benefit for his investment and the best medical care as well.

Medical schools recognize that all is not well. They are reviewing their educational programs, their research activities, and their community service obligations, scrutinizing them quantitatively and qualitatively to determine the ratio of attention each receives. Many medical schools have adopted new curricula which include new courses in behavioral sciences to teach students more about what makes people people. In a few medical schools courses in the humanities provide a vicarious experience through literature, history and the arts, to develop maturity of judgment, dedication of purpose and increased sensitivity. In general there is a definite trend for medical schools to be more sensitive and more responsive to society's needs.

A medical school needs to have better input about medical needs in the community it serves to enable it to adjust its program and curriculum to that need and to urge its graduates to fill that need in the community. The faculty members by their interest and activities influence the future and career choice of many students. The absence of family physicians in medical colleges not only has failed to provide a pattern for stu-

dents to copy but has said forcefully that medical schools do not approve of this medical vocation. At a time when there is great need for primary physicians it is regrettable medical schools did not anticipate this need and respond earlier.

By being sensitive to the needs of its community the medical school has the opportunity to become the example for the student to copy. If societal needs are not presented to him he may not consider them as he makes his career choice. His wishes may be tempered and changed if he knows the needs of society.

A survey carried out at the Medical University of South Carolina confirmed that many students want the curriculum of the medical school to change so that they will be trained to appraise the total health needs of patients and families and learn to be effective in planning for health and managing the diseases of patients. They want to be involved with their patients and their communities.

A huge educational system cannot change overnight. The existing system is programmed for research and the production of specialists and subspecialists. If medical schools are to produce the doctors which society needs they must shift their emphasis and urge students and young doctors to become broad-based primary physicians and provide excellent opportunities for such training. The administration and faculty of medical schools will offer resistance to such a change. The old shoe is so comfortable to the foot—even though there is a hole in it and it has gone out of style.

Those who would remove effective researchers from their laboratories to do patient-care work are myopic. Research is delayed service to the sick. Research is needed. Our present crisis would be a catastrophe were it not for the research miracles of the last three decades.

The purpose of the medical profession is to serve the sick and keep the healthy well. The attainment of a degree in medicine is not a worthy goal in itself. It must be translated into service. The giving of a learned lecture is praiseworthy only when it is later translated into service at the bedside. Effort at the research bench often appears to be self-serving but this is usually not true. Isolated and seemingly unrelated bits of research information are put together to solve complex clinical problems. To teach, to do research and to care for the sick are all responsibilities of the medical profession to this nation. They are the legs of a stool. But these legs must be of equal length if the stool is not to wobble. They must be strong enough to support the health needs of this nation. As society changes the imperfections of our health care system become more apparent all the while. Fortunate for society and for our profession we become uncomfortable enough to make us want to change, want to improve.

Great leadership and profound wisdom will be required to persuade educational and research institutions to balance their efforts in teaching, research and patient care according to the needs of society.

There must be some mechanism established whereby a correct ratio of primary, secondary, and tertiary physicians are produced. Excellent health care is expensive even when organized for maximal efficiency. I doubt our society can afford to pay about 90% of the cost of medical education and continue to permit absolute freedom of choice in medical careers. Needs must be met if health care is a right of every citizen. Urging that societal needs be met may be sufficient. Careful selection of people-oriented students to fill anticipated future needs may be worthwhile. It may become necessary to establish a limited number of postgraduate training positions supported by public funds and to regulate these carefully to reflect future needs.

<sup>3</sup>Footnotes at end of article.

Hopefully the needs of our society will weigh heavy as students choose their careers. They say they want personal involvement with people's problems. They want their lives to be relevant. They have the opportunity to decrease emphasis on personal choice and personal stature and dedicate their professional lives to serve others—how, when and where needed.

To summarize our problems: there is a need to balance education, research and service; to balance the teaching of esoterica and practicalia; to balance the number of primary, secondary and tertiary physicians; to train a workable ratio of clinicians, teachers and researchers; and lastly, to discover a method to sensitize each student and young doctor to temper his personal wishes with societal needs.

South Carolina is 47th in the nation in physician/population ratio. The Medical University of South Carolina has looked at the medical needs of our state and the wishes of our medical students and has reviewed its responsibility to both. Out of this study came a commitment to match the yearnings of our students with South Carolina's need for primary physicians. The commitment was to establish a Department of Family Practice of equal status and with equal responsibilities to other major clinical departments. Several of the finest family doctors in the state have joined our faculty, to teach what they have learned by themselves through long years of experience as family doctors. The emphasis on ability to see the big picture, to see the patient as a member of his family, to see the medical problem in relationship to his other problems, to select important information from trivia, to make reasonable value judgements, provides a new dimension to medical education.

Students who want a very close personal relationship with patients and see themselves as future family physicians can relate to this new physician on campus. In contrast to the implied disapproval suggested by their absence in the past, the presence of these new faculty members expresses the Medical University's endorsement of Family Practice.

Large numbers of medical students participate in the program of the Department of Family Practice by enrolling their families in it for care, by electing to follow families and participate in their care and by attending Family Practice conferences. Students see there is need for the different personalities and intellectual approaches in medicine. They see that primary physicians and specialists in narrow fields are essential for an efficient, workable and economical health care system. They see that a workable ratio of these physicians is essential.

Graduates see the plight of our nation. They see the need. They see the high standards set for the new specialist in Family Practice, a discipline with defined goals. They see a place in this new specialty they wish to fill, a place that they know is important, a place that will be respected. They know they will be proud to be a specialist in Family Practice. The growing number of residencies and the large number of applicants affirm that new graduates see the relevance of Family Practice to the health care problem of our nation.

At our Medical University of South Carolina there is already a lively interest at every level and our program is less than one year old. Nine of our 76 graduates of the class of '71 are beginning residency training with us next month, increasing our total to 17 residents. An additional eight of our graduates are training elsewhere to become family physicians.

Family Practice programs in medical schools and medical centers are doing much to correct the imbalances I have discussed. The creation of the American Board of

Family Practice with its high standard and stated goals has brought about new respectability and with it an invitation to join in the teaching of medical students. Family physicians as faculty members are explaining the satisfactions to be gained from the practice of family medicine. Medical students and residents are adjusting upward their estimation of the care he can provide. They respect his efficiency in caring for large numbers of patients and his expertise for separating out the more serious illnesses as he provides continuing care. They are seeing that a clever family physician teaches his families to separate wish from need, at least to a degree.

Students and residents are seeing that patients are better satisfied when their symptoms and problems are explained to them by one they know and trust. They see him continue to care for a patient even while another physician directs his efforts more directly at an organ or at a disease. They are learning it is a pleasure to be a consultant working with a well trained family physician, a pleasure to work with him as a team-mate. Students and residents respect his judgment as he demonstrates his ability to balance possibility with probability and care for a patient through an illness or solve a problem at a reasonable cost.

The American Board of Family Practice was recognized and approved as a specialty in February 1969, only 27 months ago. In this brief period almost 4000 physicians have taken a rigorous examination in order to be identified with this new specialty. The number of Family Practice Residency Programs has increased from 21 to 64 in the same period. On July 1st more than 514 young doctors will be training in these programs.<sup>6</sup> There are now 16 departments and 21 divisions of Family Practice in the medical schools of this country. An additional 38 departments and divisions are being planned. Thus concepts of Family Practice are being taught in many medical schools and medical centers throughout the country.

Our phoenix is healthy and vigorous. As he stands in the ashes of the pyre and surveys the terrain he sees more widespread concern for everyone having his needs met than any previous phoenix has seen. And especially there is a demand that the health needs of this society be met.

Teachers in grammar and high school are teaching basic health rules and the value of good health. Economists are searching for the best mode of financing adequate health care which is fair to all.

The government is seeking to implement policies and health programs which the majority of our citizens want. Lawyers and legal experts are interpreting the laws to ascertain the rights of citizens.

The humanists challenge us to rise above intellectualism and serve the noble purpose of medicine.

The Church is involved. It is reviewing the great commission—to preach, teach and heal the sick. The Church is reviewing its responsibility to health and pondering how it can best use its resources.

President Nixon has said "America has long been the wealthiest nation in the world. Now is the time that we become the healthiest nation in the world". We should be the activists in this endeavor. It is the doctors which can make this come true.

There is a common chord beating in cadence in all these areas of our society to make life fuller, and especially to make it healthier. To reach this great goal we must rise above intellectualism. We must share the concern of a worried friend or patient, we must become more involved with his problems, we must become our brother's keeper. Another enlightenment awaits us. Life can be fuller and healthier than we have yet dreamed.

The stage is set for a happening and I predict it will occur soon. All we need is a catalyst. The new specialty of Family Practice may get the reaction going. It is destined to be a part, and I believe a large part, of the solution to our health care problems.

In closing let me remind you that the first act of the phoenix was to gather up the ashes of his father and place them in a ball of myrrh. He then flew with the ball to Heliopolis to deposit it on the altar of the sun god. Let us be as respectful for the father of Family Practice. It was in General Practice that the concepts of Family Practice were first conceived and tested. Time moves on. Family Practice as a formal specialty has arrived on the scene at a crucial time. The new phoenix is healthy and strong. It flies into the future with confidence and with all systems go.

#### FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> Pellegrino, Edmund D.: The Generalist Function in Medicine, JAMA 198:541-545, 1966.

<sup>2</sup> Source: Center for Health Services Research and Development.

<sup>3</sup> Saunders, J. B. DeC.M.: Medicine Is For Man, Keynote Address at Kern Postgraduate Conference, October 1969.

<sup>4</sup> Engel, George: Care and Feeding of the Medical Student, JAMA 215:1135-1141, 1971.

<sup>5</sup> Pellegrino, Edmund D.: The Non-Renaissance Man, the Pharos 32:16-17, 1969.

<sup>6</sup> Carmichael, Lynn: Personal Communication.

### CHILDHOOD LEAD POISONING: HALF STEP FORWARD

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, we are faced with a national plague—childhood lead poisoning.

This disease—more disastrous to children than polio before the advent of the Salk vaccine—is completely preventable. Yet it continues. It continues because adequate funds to combat this crippler and killer of young children have not been forthcoming. Despite the fact that Congress authorized \$30 million to fight lead poisoning, the Nixon administration has only now requested a belated and insufficient \$2 million to fund the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act, Public Law 91-695.

The results of this failure can only be measured in terms of children's lives. Lead poisoning afflicts some 250,000 to 400,000 young children each year. It is estimated that 16,000 of these children require treatment, 3,200 incur moderate to severe brain damage, and 800 are so severely brain damaged that they require care for the remainder of their lives. And another 200 children will have no future for they will die.

If this is regarded only in terms of dollars and cents—and I do not hold that we can regard children's lives in such callous terms—the conclusion remains inescapable: funding for the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act must be forthcoming.

Each moderate case of brain damage requires approximately 10 years of special instruction and care, averaging \$1,750 per child annually. So, each year,

the 3,200 children who suffer moderate to severe damage produce costs for care alone of \$5.6 million. The 800 youngsters who annually experience severe brain damage require lifetime institutionalization at a cost of \$4,000 per year each, or \$3.2 million annually. Thus, the current annual cost for the damage to these small children totals \$8.8 million. Add to that the medical and other expenses for the 200 who die annually. Add to that the incalculable millions for loss of productive lives. Add to that the incalculable amounts for grief and suffering.

The figures are devastatingly damning. So long as we fail to spend the money to end the blight of childhood lead poisoning, we will continue to expend far more money patching up the sins which have been committed against our children by allowing them to fall victim to this man-made, yet preventable, disease.

At this point I include in the RECORD a most compelling article by Daniel T. Magidson entitled "Half Step Forward" which appeared in the June 1971 edition of *Environment* magazine. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

#### HALF STEP FORWARD

(By Daniel T. Magidson)

Kelly Jones is one of the children in St. Louis who has lead poisoning; she is nineteen months old and was recently taken to St. Louis Children's Hospital. She had previously been treated by a pediatrician for influenza, but, because her condition had grown steadily worse, her mother took her to the hospital rather than back to the pediatrician. On admission to the hospital the baby was unresponsive and almost unconscious. A spinal tap revealed a high spinal fluid pressure and elevated protein content. X-rays showed characteristic signs of lead in the long bones, and specks in the gastro-intestinal tract that appeared to be undigested lead paint. The level of lead in her blood was greater than 100 micrograms per 100 milliliters (the high "normal" level is below 40 micrograms per 100 milliliters). She was immediately given intravenous calcium disodium versinate which was alternated with Bal (British Anti-Lewisite) over a five-day period, the customary treatment for acute lead poisoning. By the second day she was more alert and responsive. Her life had been saved, but it is still too early to determine whether damage was done to her brain.

How did Kelly get poisoned? Her apartment house, seen from the outside, was obviously once a stately edifice and is still presentable. Looking at the inside of the Jones apartment, however, one has little doubt where Kelly got the paint she ate. Plaster is chipped off the walls and ceilings, and wallpaper is peeling. Every windowsill in the Jones apartment is a tetracycline of cracked and flaking white, lead-based paint.

Kelly seems to be a typical toddler, and toddlers often put things into their mouths, no matter how much they are watched or told not to.

Unfortunately, many young children eat old paint, plaster, and putty that contain lead. About 3,600 children in St. Louis have lead poisoning, according to a St. Louis Division of Health official.

James Schoonover, director of the St. Louis Development Program of the St. Louis City Planning Commission, says that about 75 percent of the houses in the city were built before 1930. Presently there are 238,500 housing units in St. Louis. Of these, according to Schoonover, 23,800 are considered by the city to be in "poor or dilapidated condition." It is safe to assume that at least this

10 percent of the houses, freely acknowledged to be substandard, contain deteriorated, easily accessible, lead-based compounds in their interiors.

Ivory Perry, consultant to the St. Louis Metropolitan Tenants Organization (MTO), is among those concerned about the situation. As a civil-rights activist and housing developer for the Human Development Corporation in St. Louis, Perry became intimately involved in attempts to ameliorate poor housing conditions in the city; in time this brought him to consider lead poisoning in children and its major cause.

"I got interested in chipping plaster and paint in 1968. I was worried that children from one to six years would eat it. Most houses built before 1950 had lead paint in them. Most poor people don't have air conditioning, and they raise the windows in the summertime, and most of the little kids put their mouths on the windowsills." They soon discover that the paint chips they lick have a sweet-sour taste like lemon drops (Perry has tasted paint chips himself to confirm this), and soon they are busily chipping and eating the paint.

According to Perry, the use of lead paint in housing interiors was outlawed in the state of Missouri in 1950. In 1970 he started testing houses for lead, using a sodium sulfide solution which causes paint containing lead to turn black on contact. He said, "I tested about 50 houses and found out it was a waste of time because they all had lead paint."

As a member of a Danforth Foundation-sponsored task force on housing code enforcement in St. Louis, Perry attended an aldermanic meeting on the subject in 1969. He spoke in favor of new legislation to enforce the housing code and pointed out that "chipping plaster and peeling paint are a hazard and a danger to the kids, because most little children will pick up anything and put it into their mouths—anything."

The Metropolitan Tenants Organization, with several other community groups, has been conducting free blood-screening tests which account for 50 percent of the St. Louis screening program, the rest of the screening being done by four well-baby clinics operated by the Health Division and its central municipal laboratory (to which all samples are sent for free evaluation); the Community Medicine Department of the St. Louis University School of Medicine is involved, and individual medical students from St. Louis and Washington University Medical schools and a number of hospital technicians have volunteered their services.

Mounting public concern over lead poisoning is now making itself felt in city government. In April 1970, the St. Louis Board of Aldermen passed an ordinance "to detect, treat and prevent lead poisoning resulting from the ingestion of lead-bearing substances, which ingestion is hereby declared to constitute a serious public hazard." Instrumental in framing the ordinance were the MTO, the St. Louis Division of Health, and the Legal Aid Society. The ordinance made lead poisoning a reportable disease and gave the city health and building commissioners new inspection and enforcement authority; unfortunately, there have been only limited inspection and enforcement because the city has not been able to appropriate enough money. Inspectors have confirmed the presence of lead in at least 100 housing units, including the Jones apartment, and fines have been assessed in a few cases.

In 1970 the city's Health Division gained permission to use unexpended funds from other programs to begin a full-scale attack on lead poisoning. Community pressure was a significant factor influencing the Board of Aldermen to release the funds for the Health Division's program. St. Louis, like other

major cities, is in poor financial condition. Dr. Valgard Jonsson, deputy health commissioner, had been asking for years for increased funds to detect and treat lead poisoning. It took the city three years to buy the modern testing equipment requested by Jonsson, and then it could not be put into use for a time because the city could not spare \$200 to send a technician to Chicago to learn to operate it. To the city's rescue came the MTO, which raised the necessary money. Now the Division of Health has eight people working in the Lead Poisoning Control Service under Acting Administrative Chief Sharon Love.

According to Mrs. Love, between June 28, 1970 and April 4, 1971, 2,784 St. Louis children were given blood tests for lead. Of this number, 1,168 had levels greater than 40 micrograms per 100 milliliters; 248 of these were given a diagnosis of lead poisoning by physicians, and 118 have been hospitalized to date. Even for those children who are successfully treated, however, the long-term effects of the poisoning are not known, nor does the city have funds for follow-up studies of the children. In many cases, they are returned to the same environment in which they were poisoned.

The future of even this modest lead poisoning control program now appears doubtful. The special funds will be running out soon, and if the St. Louis Board of Aldermen does not appropriate specific funds for its continuation, it will stop. When asked what he would do if the aldermen do not appropriate the funds, Commissioner of Health William C. Banton, who has said "We have robbed Peter to pay Paul to get the program going," refused to speculate; he said that he could not imagine that the city would not find some way to continue the Health Division's program to halt lead poisoning in children.

Ivory Perry and many other interested citizens will not be surprised if the appropriation is not made, however. He has said, "One reason the city is not trying to prevent the disease is because it is not catching." He also has charged that the city government is not very interested in the victims "because 60 percent are black, 40 percent are white, and all are poor." Ten deaths were officially attributed to lead poisoning in St. Louis from 1960 to 1969; all were in children from one to four years of age; six were nonwhite, and four were white. Dr. Banton states that lead poisoning is not solely a "black" problem; he estimates that almost as many poor white children become poisoned as black.

It is likely that far more than the reported ten children have died of lead poisoning in St. Louis from 1960 to 1969. There is probably no way to make a meaningful estimate, however, Larry Evert, deputy assistant health commissioner, told *Environment*, "The exact incidence and prevalence of lead poisoning in the city of St. Louis is unknown." Physicians, as in the case of Kelly Jones, often fail to recognize the symptoms of lead poisoning. Dr. Banton, who graduated from medical school in 1946, commented that, at least in his school, not a great deal of time was spent in making medical students aware that it could be a serious public health problem. Other physicians have had similar experiences. Dr. Banton said also that lead poisoning could be compared to other diseases that have been, or are in the process of becoming, more widely detected; one must be aware of something before he can suspect it. And although the constellation of signs and symptoms that indicate classical lead poisoning are almost unmistakable when all are seen in one particular child, it is extremely rare for them all to be present at once. Also, they resemble the manifestations of other conditions and diseases, such as malnutrition and influenza, to name only two of many.

In short, people in general, and doctors and

parents in particular, must become more aware of the lead poisoning problem, especially if they work or live in the areas where lead poisoning must have been endemic, though largely unrecognized, for many years. When the index of suspicion becomes higher, and when all susceptible children have their blood tested for lead, the real incidence of the disease may become known.

Obviously, better detection and treatment are vital measures, but prevention is the only avenue to eradicate the disease. It is here where there is the greatest controversy and consequently the least action. St. Louis Public Health sources give the cost of removing or covering lead paint in interior surfaces of houses at \$50 per room, while real estate people feel it could be \$250 per room. It has been estimated that it would cost \$100,000,000 to eliminate lead poisoning as a public health menace in St. Louis. The new city ordinance orders the owner or owners of record to remove or cover all lead-bearing surfaces in a house within 14 days of notification by the health or building commissioner. If this is not done the owner is held in violation of the ordinance and the dwelling may be condemned for human habitation until the lead is removed or adequately covered.

Even if no kind of affirmative action is taken, eventually the incidence of lead poisoning in children will go down, if only because of gradual abandonment and razing of older houses. As of May 4, 1971, of the 23,800 houses in very poor or dilapidated condition in St. Louis, 15,000 are vacant and vandalized, just waiting for the headache ball. But this is a painfully slow process.

At a public meeting on May 2, 1971 at the Watch Church of God in Christ in St. Louis, Arthur Jackson, vice-chairman of the Metropolitan Tenants Organization, said, "Improvement in housing is the answer, but children who may be subjected to lead poisoning don't have time for long-term projects." Long-term projects must still be initiated; but in the meantime massive nationwide screening and treatment programs must be initiated and continued to prevent the grave and irreversible damage that lead poisoning can cause innocent children.

#### MAYNARD CENTENNIAL

### HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to inform the House of Representatives of the 100th anniversary of Maynard, a town lying within the Assabet River Valley in central Massachusetts. Bounded on the north by Acton, on the west and southwest by Stow, on the northeast by Concord, and on the east and southeast by Sudbury, this historical, industrial town is located 27 miles northwest of Boston.

The town was incorporated April 19, 1871, and named in honor of Amory Maynard, Esquire, a carpet maker from Marlborough, through whose untiring energy and sagacity the industries of the town were developed.

One early industry in the town was a textile mill to make yarn. The mill was later used in the manufacture of car-

peting. It was bought by the American Woolen Mills Co. around the turn of the century and expanded into the Assabet Mills of the American Woolen Co. Other early industries included papermills, built by William May about 1820 and later used in the manufacture of wall-paper, saw and grist mills, cider and vinegar factories, mills for the manufacture of spindles and other factory machinery, and mills for the making of blankets and flannels. The Assabet River proved immensely important for early industrial development, as the woolen mills were dependent upon water for their operation.

In 1907, a group of mill workers organized the United Cooperative Society, one of the most successful consumer enterprises in the United States.

Following World War II, Maynard was dealt a disastrous economic blow when the American Woolen Mill ceased operations. Two thousand jobs were directly affected in the period between 1951 and 1953. Hundreds of secondary service jobs also disappeared.

Today, however, Maynard boasts of many manufacturers including electronic components and accessories, radio and television receiving sets, converted paper and paperboard products, digital computers and integrated circuits, stereo components, consoles, industrial sound instruments, and gift wrapping.

Because Maynard has such a small land area and a limited industrial base, the townspeople must be constantly vigilant and mindful of the importance of sound development practices.

In short, Maynard has learned what most other American communities are just beginning to realize—that land is not a limitless commodity and a resource to be squandered.

Maynard is an outstanding example of grassroots democracy at its best. Through good times and bad the people have stayed together—working at their own problems.

The people of Maynard, who now number almost 10,000, have always been proud of the heritage and the spirit which has brought them together and kept them together despite many adversities over the past 100 years.

For more than a century the town of Maynard has been characterized by all of the New England virtues of industry, frugality, hospitality, and good government.

One of the excellent features of the 100th birthday program conducted by Maynard on Independence Day, April 19, 1971, and on July 4, 1971, was a splendid presentation by the Maynard Community Band—an organization which has existed for well over 50 years and which performs regularly for the people of Maynard and surrounding towns.

It is an extraordinary privilege to have been able to participate in the ceremonies of a community which rightfully has pride in its ancestry and great hope for its future. One of the most remarkable features of the centennial celebration was the production of a truly fascinating book of 234 pages which details all of the remarkable history of the migration

of peoples to this lovely town in Massachusetts where the ingenuity and resourcefulness of so many people over so many decades have created a community which has a very unique sense of purpose and determination. With these qualities Maynard can look optimistically to the next 100 years.

#### WE NEED A MANHATTAN PROJECT FOR DRUG CONTROL

### HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the United States is suffering from a scourge which is corrupting our children, turning our streets, homes, and parks into battlegrounds, and clogging our jails—narcotics addiction.

For much too long now, we have largely concentrated our energies on the punitive aspects of the problem, jailing the unfortunate victims of this disease like hardened criminals. Little has been done to take the steam out of drug traffic at its source—by eliminating its profitability.

Recent U.S. initiatives in prompting Turkey to end its opium industry, and proposals by the President and in the Congress to create an executive antidrug office are steps in the right direction, but we must do much more to begin a true national crusade to conquer drug abuse. Surely a country which can set and meet a date to land men on the moon should try to save its young people from the drug blight.

I include in the RECORD two excellent recent editorials dealing with the drug problem:

[From the New York Law Journal,  
July 6, 1971]

NEEDED: ANOTHER "MANHATTAN" PROJECT TO SOLVE NATION'S DRUG PROBLEM

(By Jerry Finkelstein)

Attention: President Nixon, All Leaders of Government and the Bar.

During World War II a secret project whose code name was "Manhattan" tackled every conceivable angle so that the United States could produce the atom bomb. After the war, Congress established the Atomic Energy Commission whose sole function is to study and develop new uses for the atom—and these studies have been conducted on an all-encompassing basis by all academic disciplines.

Similarly, when the United States embarked upon its space program, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration was set up to oversee the program. It was charged with every aspect of the nation's program, using not only engineers, but astronomers and historians, manufacturers and others who could contribute to every minute area of study.

Drug abuse has long since become a scourge that threatens the national character and fabric. No segment of our society is immune from the impact of this deadly plague. Our children at all levels of school have been infected. It is the major cause of soaring crime rates that undermine security in our homes and streets and parks. It has corroded the morale and discipline of our armed forces in Vietnam. It takes a

huge toll out of the business activity in terms of absenteeism and poor employee performance. It clogs our court calendars.

It is tragic that a crisis of such magnitude has not stimulated a national response on the level of the "Manhattan Project" or NASA. If we had recognized the need for this approach three years ago, or five years ago, or ten years ago, perhaps there might not be a drug problem today. If the best brains of the nation were used to study the drug abuse problem—not only chemists, but educators, physicians, psychologists and psychiatrists, sociologists, clergy, attorneys and judges, legal enforcement agents and any other conceivable group that could shed light on the subject, perhaps today we might know whether marijuana is safe to use or not, or if it leads to the "hard stuff." If the nation had undertaken the massive response to the drug problem as it did to the atom and space, perhaps today there would not be a debate as to whether or not marijuana should be legalized. Nothing less, in our judgment, but this massive undertaking will put an end to drug addiction.

This same observation can be applied to methadone and other aspects of the drug abuse problem. Programs for treatment and rehabilitation of addicts and education programs to prevent addiction are inadequately financed and uncoordinated. But more important, we are full of half-truths and ignorance in our nimble approaches to solving the problem.

What is urgently needed is a strongly financed, well-coordinated mobilization of the nation's resources to develop a comprehensive program to put an end to this national disaster and disgrace. Such a program should accelerate our research, to telescope the work which has not been done in the past five or ten years, so we may save our people and our nation.

The United States has attacked so many difficult problems—from polio to the atom—and found solutions through massive injections of money and talent. Drug abuse is more of a problem and should be approached in the same manner—not through some piecemeal program with minuscule funding. It requires a broad scope—from legislation to treaties with other nations—so no stone is left unturned.

The drug problem is a challenge which must be faced by the members of the American Bar Association. Drug and drug-related cases jam the courts and impede the legal profession's work. As civic and community leaders, members of the Bar can play a decisive role in prodding into action the White House, Congress, Governors and Legislatures to provide the initiative and financing needed to put an end to this major threat to our nation.

It is true that the White House has recognized the problem, and called the nation's attention to the dimensions of the national tragedy, but it has not attacked drug abuse in depth.

It is equally surprising that no "Mr. Anti-Narcotics" has emerged like a Nader in the consumer protection field.

The time is long since past for us to talk about drugs, and hope it will blow away. It won't! It could eventually lead to the destruction of the civilization we have built and come to know.

Leadership taken by the Bar in mobilizing our national resources in this effort would be in the noblest traditions of the profession.

[From the Wall Street Journal]

#### NEW PRIORITIES ON DRUGS

One of the self-defeating features of U.S. efforts at control of drug abuse has been an emphasis on police methods aimed at controlling the supply and use of dangerous drugs.

CXVII—1613—Part 19

There need hardly be any greater evidence submitted to show the failure of this approach than merely to cite the dimensions of the drug problem that has developed in this country. Drugs have become the leading cause of death for people between the ages of 15 and 35 in New York City, for example.

Our doubts about the effectiveness of attempts to control supply makes us skeptical of the importance of the just-announced U.S. agreement with Turkey, in which Turkey has agreed to ban production of the poppies which provide the raw material for illegal heroin. We find it hard to believe that the crooks who make heroin won't find some other source of their raw material.

We are, however, encouraged by signs that government thinking on this subject has been changing since the negotiations with Turkey began. President Nixon's recent message to Congress asking an expansion of federal spending on the drug abuse problem suggests that the U.S. may be swinging towards a sounder approach, very belatedly. It may be swinging towards treating the use of dangerous "hard" drugs, principally heroin, as a medical rather than a police problem.

The President said he will give a new priority to the rehabilitation of drug addicts through such programs as methadone maintenance. He said the government must "act to destroy the market for drugs, and this means the prevention of new addicts and the rehabilitation of those who are addicted."

Federal recognition of the market aspect of the drug problem is welcome. Studies of the epidemiology of drug abuse long ago discovered the syndrome that has led to much of our present trouble, but U.S. officials have not responded to it.

The syndrome is simply this: Addicts place their need for heroin above all else and many have progressively larger needs, so drug demand has a solid underpinning. As government succeeds through enforcement efforts in limiting the supply, the effect is to push the price of the illicit drugs steadily upward. As the price rises, the traffic in the drug becomes more attractive to criminals and criminal organizations willing to take high risks and well organized to avoid detection.

The rising price also forces the addict into a life of crime, including the recruiting of new drug users, who soon become addicts themselves. Thus there is an epidemic of rapidly spreading hard-drug use, rampant crime, and corruption of enforcement officers.

The British government long ago foresaw the futility of an approach to the problem that depends so heavily on "prohibition." It has traditionally permitted heroin addicts to register with the authorities and obtain enough drugs to maintain their habits from doctors or hospitals at a very low cost.

There have been some problems with doctors abusing their responsibilities under this system, but they have been relatively minor. Hard drugs and the associated crime problem are relatively small worries in Britain. The only conclusion can be that Britain has never allowed itself to become a highly profitable market for hard drugs, unlike the U.S.

It will no doubt take some time to change the thinking of agencies that have attempted to deal with the drug problem, and failed so miserably. Experiments by private clinics with substitution of legal methadone for illegal heroin in New York and Washington—thereby enabling some addicts to withdraw from the crime syndrome—have sometimes gotten cavalier treatment, or worse, from officialdom.

The President's proposals to take the profitability out of the drug traffic can hardly have an immediate effect. But at least the country now seems to be moving in the right

direction. The sad thing is that the whole problem most likely would not have gotten out of hand if more intelligence and the lessons of the past colossal failure of alcohol prohibition had been applied long ago to hard drugs.

BILDERBERG CASE; REPLY FROM  
U.S. ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in my speech of May 24, 1971, page 16698, entitled "Secret Bilderberg Meeting and the Logan Act," I raised the question of the applicability of the Logan Act being violated by a secret meeting between citizens of the United States and citizens as well as officials of foreign governments carrying on discussions which very likely were designed to influence measures or conduct of one or more foreign governments or officers or agents thereof in relation to disputes or controversies with the United States or an intent to defeat measures of the Government of the United States.

I, subsequently, on June 1, inquired of the Department of Justice as to their opinion of the Bilderberg meeting and whether it constituted a possible violation of the Logan Act. I specifically asked what action was contemplated by the U.S. Attorney General.

The reply, which I received 6 weeks later, confirmed my charges of the Logan Act being violated, but denied any contemplated criminal action for the protection of our country or its people because—

Details of discussions, conclusions, and recommendations reached have been suppressed from the public, and one can only speculate as to what transpired. The Department had no coverage of this meeting and we have no information which would justify requesting the Federal Bureau of Investigation to conduct a criminal investigation of the activities of presumably innocent citizens

Many Americans who have grown apathetic by thinking that their country is protecting them and itself through the expenditures of mass amounts of money and employment of trained intelligence people may rightfully be shocked to learn that if they expect any action to be taken by the Justice Department it is incumbent upon the citizens to infiltrate the secret meetings and supply the data providing specific allegations or specific information indicating a violation of the Logan Act.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point a copy of my letter to the Attorney General of the United States and the reply from his office followed by my original remarks of May 24:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., June 1, 1971.

HON. JOHN N. MITCHELL,  
The Attorney General,  
Department of Justice,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: In remarks to the House of Representatives on May 24,

1971. I pointed out what appeared to me as a possible violation of the Logan Act.

I am referring to the recent secret Bilderberger meeting held at Woodstock, Vermont, April 23-24.

I enclose a copy of the text of my remarks entitled, "Secret Bilderberger Meeting and the Logan Act", as well as the texts of other statements of mine about the Bilderbergers.

It seems to me that a scrutiny of the entire proceedings of the three day meeting would be necessary in order to determine if there was "an intent to influence the measures or conduct of any foreign government or any officer or agent thereof in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States," or if there was "an intent to defeat the measures of the government of the United States."

I would appreciate hearing your opinion of my analysis of this matter and of any action you may contemplate taking.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. RARICK,  
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,  
Washington, D.C., July 13, 1971.

HON. JOHN R. RARICK,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RARICK: I have your letter to the Attorney General dated June 1, 1971, concerning the possible applicability of the Logan Act to the activities of American citizens who participated in the Bilderberg meeting at Woodstock, Vermont in April, 1971.

In your remarks in the Congressional Record of May 24, 1971, you correctly noted the elements of a violation of the Logan Act. You further noted that there were citizens of the United States as well as officials of foreign governments in attendance. You concluded that it is logical to assume that one or more of those citizens in attendance did carry on correspondence or intercourse with one or more officers of foreign governments and that it was very likely that there was an intent to influence measures or conduct of one or more foreign governments or officers or agents thereof in relation to disputes or controversies with the United States or an intent to defeat measures of the Government of the United States.

However, you also pointed out that all the details of the discussions, conclusions, and recommendations reached have been suppressed from the public, and one can only speculate as to what transpired. The Department had no coverage of this meeting and we have no information which would justify requesting the Federal Bureau of Investigation to conduct a criminal investigation of the activities of presumably innocent citizens.

Of course, we would consider requesting an appropriate investigation in any case in which we might receive a specific allegation or specific information indicating a violation of the Logan Act.

Sincerely,

ROBERT C. MARDIAN,  
Assistant Attorney General,  
Internal Security Division.

SECRET BILDERBERG MEETING AND THE  
LOGAN ACT

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in recent remarks—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 13688-13691 of May 5, 1971, entitled "Bilderberg's Woodstock Meeting"; and 14189-14195 of May 10, 1971, entitled "U.S. Dollar Crisis—A Dividend of Internationalism"—I raised several questions about the secrecy of the Bilderberg meetings and the possible consequences of such secrecy.

Since all the details of the discussions, conclusions, and recommendations reached have been suppressed from the public, one can

only speculate as to what transpired. Following their meeting, the Bilderbergers returned to their respective countries with the ordinary citizens uninformed as to their goals and plans.

Secret discussions are not in keeping with Western political tradition of "open covenants openly arrived at." Ordinary citizens are alarmed when influential men meet privately to solve world problems, especially when the membership lists are overwhelmingly composed of international Socialists, businessmen, and financiers.

The cause and effect method can be used to arrive at the latest intentions of the Bilderbergers. Following the first Bilderberg meeting held in the United States in 1967 came the announcement that French gold and silver reserves had dropped more than 50 percent in the previous year and of the partial withdrawal of French gold balances in the United States. Within a few days following the recent Bilderberg meeting of April 23-25 in Woodstock, Vt., came the recent U.S. dollar crisis in Europe. The Bilderbergers' decisions are highly suspect of manipulating gold and international currencies.

Could the secrecy of the Bilderberg meetings be because of the Logan Act which prohibits unauthorized contacts between a citizen of the United States and an officer or agent of a foreign government?

As amended and enacted into positive law on June 25, 1948, as 18 U.S.C. 953, the Logan Act provides:

"§ 953. *Private correspondence with foreign governments*

"Any citizen of the United States, wherever he may be, who, without authority of the United States, directly or indirectly commences or carries on any correspondence or intercourse with any foreign government or any officer or agent thereof, with intent to influence the measures or conduct of any foreign government or of any officer or agent thereof, in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States, or to defeat the measures of the United States, shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than three years or both.

"This section shall not abridge the right of a citizen to apply, himself or his agent, to any foreign government or the agents thereof for redress of any injury which he may have sustained from such government or any of its agents or subjects, June 25, 1948, c. 645, 62 Stat. 744."

The elements of a crime under the Logan Act appear to be as follows:

"(1) The actions forbidden to U.S. citizens are:

"(a) Without the permission or authority of the Government;

"(b) Directly or indirectly;

"(c) To commence or carry on any verbal or written correspondence or intercourse with any foreign Government or any officer or agent thereof.

"Or—

"(d) To counsel, advise or assist in any 'such correspondence,' i.e., in any verbal or written correspondence by a U.S. citizen with any foreign Government or officer or agent thereof;

"(e) With an intent to influence the measures or conduct of any foreign Government or any officer or agent thereof in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States.

"Or—

"(f) With an intent to defeat the measures of the Government of the United States."

As can be seen from the membership list of the recently held Bilderberg meeting there were citizens of the United States as well as officials of foreign governments in attendance. Since no official announcement was made of this meeting by the U.S. Government, we can only assume that the meeting

was not authorized by the U.S. Government. Since the meeting at the Laurance Rockefeller Woodstock Inn lasted 3 days, it is logical to assume that one or more of those citizens of the United States in attendance did carry on "correspondence or intercourse" with one or more officers of foreign governments present. Since the two points discussed as announced by Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands were, first, "the contribution of business in dealing with current problems of social instability," and, second, "the possibility of a change of the American role in the world and its consequence," it is very likely that there was an intent to influence measures or conduct of one or more foreign governments or officers or agents thereof in relation to disputes or controversies with the United States or an intent to defeat measures of the Government of the United States—especially when shortly following the close of the Bilderberg meeting there occurred a rejection of U.S. dollars by four of the governments whose officers were in attendance at the Bilderberg meeting. Additionally the Socialist Prime Minister of Canada whose defense minister was present, now is in Moscow carrying on defense agreements with the Soviets against the United States.

So, it seems plausible that one or more of the U.S. citizens present at the recent secret Bilderberg meeting could very well have committed a criminal offense under the Logan Act. Could this be the reason for the veiled secrecy?

BIG BUS BILL

HON. FRED SCHWENDEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. SCHWENDEL. Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated earlier, the big bus bill, H.R. 4354, has now been officially reported to the House. Upon reading the report, I was surprised at the extreme efforts made by the majority in the report to disassociate the big bus bill from the big truck bill. The majority states:

It (the bus bill) in no way is related to the question of length or weight nor is it in any way related to the question of trucks.

At one other point in the report, they state:

Last year, the big bus bill was heard concurrently with legislation involving the size (length and width) and weights of trucks. The two should not be confused or related in consideration of H.R. 4354 as reported.

I would be the first to concede that the big bus bill "simply" permits buses 6 inches wider to travel on our interstate system. My colleagues in the majority must be somewhat naive if they see no relationship between bigger buses, and bigger and heavier trucks.

If a bus 6 inches wider is sufficiently safe to be operated on our highways, how can you say that trucks 6 inches wider are any less safe? And, what is the point in making trucks 6 inches wider unless you permit them to carry a heavier load? It seems quite clear to me that a big truck bill is following behind this bill as certainly as night follows day.

With respect to the effect of those bigger and heavier trucks on our highways, the following clipping from the Chicago

Sun-Times for July 12, 1971, gives some idea of the scope of the problem:

**EXPRESSWAY REPAIRS GOT YOU DOWN? BLAME TRUCKS**

(By Fletcher Wilson)

If reconstruction work on the Kennedy and Dan Ryan expressways is giving you headaches, blame the 30,000 trucks that use these highways daily, the state's chief highway engineer said Sunday.

Richard H. Golterman said the righthand local lanes which the trucks are required to use wore out on the Ryan while the express lanes remained in good shape. The Ryan reconstruction is on the local lanes.

"Trucks appeared in greater volume and with heavier weights on the Ryan than was anticipated by the designers," Golterman said. "This was instrumental in breaking up the local lanes in advance of their time."

State highway engineers believe trucks also were largely responsible for damaging the Kennedy pavement to the extent that it needs resurfacing. But they base their case against trucks on the more conspicuous evidence in the Ryan local lanes.

The Kennedy was fully opened in November, 1960. The Ryan was completed in December, 1962.

When plans for the Ryan were put on paper in 1957, designers predicted that less than 150,000 vehicles would be using the highway daily in 1971 and less than 200,000 daily in 1975.

The volume passed 180,000 in 1963 and has gone to 220,000 now.

Golterman said trucks appeared in greater volume than designers foresaw. Designs were based on the expectation that 75 per cent of the traffic would be passenger vehicles and 25 per cent trucks. The 1971 ratio has been 55 per cent passenger vehicles to 45 per cent trucks.

Still more significant, Golterman said, is that planners estimated that 55 per cent of the trucks would be light single-axle vehicles and 45 per cent would be multiple-axle pavement crushers.

The actual ratio is 45 per cent single-axes to 55 per cent multiple.

"These continuous heavy truck loadings," Golterman said, "made necessary the replacement of the old concrete pavement with stronger and thicker concrete."

**HOT WEATHER VICTIM**

The old pavement being broken up is eight inches thick. It will be replaced with 10 inches.

Golterman conceded another engineering goof. The continuous pavement laid in the Ryan was supposed to resist hot weather blowups. It did not.

Another type of construction used on the Eisenhower Expressway was free of summer troubles. That type will be used in the Ryan construction. It places expansion devices the engineers call dams at frequent intervals.

The \$15,743,472 job of rebuilding the Ryan and resurfacing the Kennedy with three inches of asphalt is the largest single expressway rehabilitation project the state has had so far.

**20-25 year lifespan?**

The Ryan work is being done by the Brighton-Krug Construction Corp. on a bid of \$5,473,744 and the Kennedy by the Arcole-Midwest Corp. on a bid of \$9,482,003. In addition J. L. Manta Inc. was given a \$787,724 painting contract.

Highway experience over the nation has led to a rule of thumb that properly laid pavement can be expected to last 10 to 15 years when subjected to the conditions for which it was designed.

Golterman said the new pavement on the Ryan should last 20 to 25 years. He said this estimate should be sound if present truck

weight limitations are retained. He said traffic volume cannot go higher because no more vehicles can be squeezed on the highway.

Some surface disintegration will come, he conceded, from the winter freeze-thaw cycle and from salting.

Golterman said the decision was made to tie up both the Kennedy and the Ryan at the same time because this would minimize the length of time motorists are discomfited. Splitting the jobs, he explained, would bring two summers of tieups instead of one.

This way it is all supposed to be over by Oct. 22. Contractors will be given bonuses for finishing early but must pay penalties for going beyond the deadline unless the delay can be attributed to an act of God, such as bad weather.

**THE WALTER COLLINS CASE**

**HON. BELLA S. ABZUG**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the attention of this body a case which clearly illustrates the dual evils of military conscription and pervasive racism in this country. The Walter Collins case shows us how these evils interact to bring compounded injustice to our citizens.

Walter Collins is a young black man now serving a sentence in prison for refusing induction into the Armed Forces. While he is ardently and conscientiously opposed to the war and the draft generally, he protested his own induction specifically because he was classified and ordered for induction by an all-white local board which did not represent his community.

As I have said here many times, the draft is by its nature unfair but it is especially unfair to blacks who are sometimes unsophisticated in the ways of draft resistance, who lack the funds for long court battles, and who are excluded from jobs and education which would give them deferments.

Even if a black man can surmount these obstacles, he may then be subject to the whims of a local board made up exclusively of his bigoted white neighbors.

I urge my colleagues to examine this case and to join me in protesting in Walter Collins' behalf:

**PROTEST THE JAILING OF WALTER COLLINS AND THE SITUATION OF BLACK DRAFT RESISTERS**

Walter Collins, 26-year-old activist in the black liberation movement, was arrested November 27, 1970, to start serving a five-year sentence for refusing to be drafted.

The arrest came just 11 days after the U.S. Supreme Court had refused to hear an appeal of his sentence—even though his lawyers were preparing a petition for reconsideration by the high court, which they had 25 days to file. Federal marshals came to Collins' home in New Orleans, handcuffed him, and refused to allow him even time to get a coat or a toothbrush. His mother, Mrs. Virginia Collins, a nationally prominent leader in peace and liberation movements, correctly called it "gestapo tactics." The normal procedure of arrest when an appeal is denied, especially in the case of white defendants, is to allow the person time to take care of personal affairs and surrender.

The issue in Collins' case is whether all-white draft boards, made up of people who live outside the areas where black people live, have a right to draft black men to die on foreign battlefields for a system that has continually oppressed them at home.

Collins' situation is similar to that of thousands of young black men across the country—for draft boards like his are operating everywhere. The only unusual thing about his case is that Collins had been organizing throughout the South and the country against racism, war, and the draft. At the time he was arrested, he was scheduled to speak in the following two weeks at colleges and high schools throughout Louisiana and to lead a national conference of black draft counselors in Chicago in early December. The government wanted him shut up quickly.

We ask you to join us in protesting Collins' imprisonment—and through this protest the oppression of all black men under the draft laws. The Supreme Court must face this issue—and so must all of white America.

A petition for reconsideration of the Collins case was filed in the Supreme Court on December 10. On January 11, 1971, the Court gave its final refusal to consider the appeal. Collins is now in federal prison in Texarkana, Tex. Details on this case and the issue—and what you can do about it—are outlined below.

**WHO COLLINS IS**

Collins has been active in civil-rights movements since he was in high school and took part in the sit-ins of the early 1960's. He worked on voter-registration drives in the Deep South, and in 1966 he started organizing opposition to the Vietnam War in the New Orleans black community.

For the last two years, he has worked on the staff of SCEF, a Southwide organization that is building coalitions between black people and poor and working-class white Southerners. Along with young white organizers, he has been working to build such coalitions in Laurel, Miss., and elsewhere in the Deep South.

He is also Southern regional director for the National Association of Black Students (NABS) and has been setting up a Southern regional office for the Central Committee for Conscientious Objectors and organizing a network of black draft counselors throughout the South.

**THE COLLINS DRAFT CASE**

Collins lost his student deferment in 1966, soon after he began organizing against the Vietnam War. He was classified 1-A by an all-white draft board—although two-thirds of the people in the area it served were black. Only one of the board members lived in that area. The chairman of the board lived in a different county. All this was in direct violation of the draft law.

He was given the wrong information when he tried to apply for conscientious-objector status. Twice, when he reported for induction and passed out anti-war literature, he was sent home. Collins was finally indicted on six counts of refusing induction—and convicted of five. He was sentenced to five years on each charge, to be served concurrently—and fined \$2,000.

Collins' appeal is based on the illegal make-up of his draft board. His lawyers contend that if he was not represented on the board, he should not have to obey its orders. The government says it doesn't matter if the board failed to comply with the draft law—it is a "de facto" board. Now, government spokesmen are also claiming that "a quorum" of the board members were legally eligible to serve on the board, and therefore it was not a lawless board.

"There should be only one law for the governors and the governed," says Robert Sedler.

one of Collins's lawyers. "A draft board not constituted in accordance with the statute and regulations is a 'lawless board' without the power to classify at all, or to issue valid orders to report for induction."

Sedler also noted that the federal courts in New Orleans were inconsistent in their rulings. Last April 24, the U.S. District Court in that city freed Oscar E. Clinton, a white man, on a draft charge because only two members of his draft board were residents of the area it served. Three days later, the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in New Orleans upheld Collins's five-year sentence—although only one member of his board lived in the area it served.

Sedler also asked the high court why black people should be expected to serve in the armed forces when they are not allowed to serve on draft boards—why they are expected to "accept decisions affecting their very lives that are made by whites," but whites are not expected to accept decisions affecting their lives made by blacks.

The attorney suggests that this may explain why 22 per cent of the Americans killed and wounded in Indochina are black, although black people are only 10 per cent of the U.S. population. "These questions," Sedler said in a brief to the Supreme Court, "relate to the very legitimacy of a system by which young Negro men are asked to give up their lives for their country. . . . They call into issue the prejudice and racism that are part of American society today."

#### THE SPECIAL OPPRESSION OF BLACK RESISTERS

Collins is only one of thousands of young black men who have been victimized by unfair and illegal administration of the draft law. He is only one of many who have been refused a hearing in the higher courts. Nowhere is the double standard of justice in this country—one standard for whites and one for blacks—more evident than in the application of the draft law.

In the last few years, the rights of draft resisters under the law have been widening—because of pressure from the peace movement. A number of important cases have been won and prison sentences set aside. But these were almost entirely in the cases of white men. Since 1965, the U.S. Supreme Court has decided 28 cases involving the rights of draft resisters. Twenty-four of these were won and four were lost by the young men involved. But only three of those whose cases were accepted for review were black. Two of these were among the four cases that were lost.

Meantime, other black draft resisters have had their appeals rejected or have been unable to appeal to the higher courts. They are now in prison or on the way, or in exile in other parts of the world, convinced that they can get no justice in the U.S.A.

Among those refused a Supreme Court review are Fred Brooks, a leader of the black student movement in Nashville, and Mike Simmons, SNCC leader who not only refused induction but took part in one of the first induction-center demonstrations—in Atlanta in 1966; and thus far the Court has avoided hearing the central issues in the case of Cleve Sellers, a founder and leader of SNCC.

Especially singled out for long sentences under the draft law are young black men who are active in protest movements—in other words, those who are actively trying to change the system that oppresses them. Meantime, thousands of other black men who might have refused the draft have been convinced from the beginning that it is useless or they lack the resources to make a major fight. So they have simply gone into the army—or disappeared.

As we protest the imprisonment of Walter Collins, we are fighting for the rights of all these men. As we call the attention of government officials and the public to the way

the draft system operated in Collins' case, it becomes clear what this system is doing to all black men. If we can win Collins' case, it can crack open the entire draft system as it relates to blacks. And as it cracks open for blacks, it will crack open for more whites, too—for the same kind of discrimination also operates against poor white men, who are also usually drafted by boards whose members live outside their areas.

The draft system, like everything else in this country, is blatantly racist. Ultimately racism always means murder—and nowhere is this more evident than in the draft, where the results are that young men are sent to their deaths. White America must tear the blinders off its eyes and look at this situation—and do what is necessary to change it.

#### THE PROTEST MOUNTS

On December 10, representatives of black liberation, human rights, and peace organizations met in Washington to present the issue of the Collins case to government officials. Included were leaders of the National Committee of Black Churchmen, the National Association of Black Students, Southern Christian Leadership Conference, SCEF, Republic of New Africa, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, and several other groups.

They visited the Justice Department, Selective Service headquarters, and the White House, where they presented amnesty petitions signed by 12,000 people across the country. Three white draft resisters who recently won their cases in landmark decisions of the Supreme Court submitted an amicus brief to that court, urging that the Collins case be reviewed. The three—David Gutknecht, Joseph Mulloy, and Elliott Welsh—told the Court: "Our victories in the face of black defeats contradict everything we are trying to make our lives stand for."

On the same day, in Collins's home town of New Orleans, a delegation presented the U.S. district attorney with amnesty petitions signed by 5,200 persons in that city. Other concerned citizens visited their local U.S. district attorneys in other parts of the country; some called on their congressmen for an investigation of the racist nature of the draft system. Amnesty International, based in England, began circulating petitions for amnesty for Collins all over the world.

In the wake of these protests, the Supreme Court announced that it would hear the draft appeal of heavyweight champion Muhammad Ali—after previously rejecting it. In a letter from prison, Collins remarked: "I'm sure that quite a few people will see the court's action as a concession to black draft resisters. Far from that, it is an attempt to evade the charge of racism and the onus of genocide in the court's abetting of the discriminatory and illegal drafting of black men by racist, incompetent draft boards."

#### CROWDED JAILS IMPERIL JUSTICE

#### HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, the Chief Judge of the District of Columbia Superior Court has recently reminded us that our attempts at strengthening the criminal justice system are a long way from showing results we can be proud of.

As Judge Greene warned in testimony before a Senate subcommittee, we have increased rather than decreased the pressure on the system by reforming only

half of it. Our efforts have been so lopsided in favor of the police and the prosecutor that the courts and the jails are unable to keep up with the number of arrests and convictions being obtained.

It is admirable to catch and convict criminals, but not if the result is self-defeating. At present our jails and prisons are so overcrowded and underfinanced that they cannot hope to rehabilitate the people who are sent there. Since more than 90 percent of the people who are sent to jail are at some later point released back into society, it is suicidal for us not to do something while they are in custody to try to insure that they will not commit further crime after being released. Yet at present, we spend 85 percent of each corrections dollar on mere custody, and only 15 percent on correcting criminals.

Conditions have become so desperately degrading at some institutions that judges are refusing to send convicted criminals to them. In two recent cases, conditions in State prisons have been held to constitute cruel and unusual punishment in contravention of the eighth amendment to the Constitution.

Yet still we neglect our correctional institutions at every budgetary turn. The District of Columbia crime bill passed last session provided generous assistance to the courts and the police and the prosecutors, but precious little for the institutions which must deal with the people who are caught and convicted. More recently, the House voted to shortchange the jails and prisons once again when it cut funds from the Justice Department appropriation earmarked for this purpose, and rejected an amendment which proposed to reinstate the requested funds.

We are creating an explosive situation by our uneven treatment of the criminal justice system. We would do well to heed Judge Greene's warning, as reporting in the following article in the Washington Evening Star:

[From the Washington Evening Star, June 17, 1971]

#### CROWDED JAILS IMPERIL JUSTICE, GREENE WARNS

(By Martha Angle)

Chief Judge Harold Greene of the D.C. Superior Court warned today that the District's entire criminal justice system may face "a crisis of the greatest magnitude" due to inadequate correctional facilities.

The warning came at a Senate District Committee hearing focusing upon the impact that last year's landmark D.C. Court Reform and Criminal Procedures Act has had on the correctional systems here.

Moments earlier, Asst. U.S. Atty. Luke Moore told the senators that felony indictments in the District will be double last year's figure as a result of the new law, and that conviction rates are up to about 92 percent.

#### SEES "GRAVE CRISIS"

Greene said that if facilities are not available to receive all those being convicted as a result of court reform and stiffer criminal laws, "we are going to have a grave crisis."

Sen. Adlai E. Stevenson III, D-Ill., conducting the two-day hearings, was clearly disturbed by the testimony.

"If one thing has been made evident by these hearings," he said, "it is that there simply are not enough facilities within the Department of Corrections for the incar-

ceration of all those who are being convicted."

## ALTERNATIVES SOUGHT

Stevenson said that "we must find alternatives to incarceration" if the system is not to break down. He suggested that judges could place more convicted offenders on probation with proper supervision.

But Greene replied that more use of probation was "not the purpose" of last year's tough anti-crime legislation, "which lays heavy emphasis on incarceration."

Blair Ewing, director of the mayor's office of criminal justice plans and analysis, told the committee the Corrections Department was neglected in last year's crime bill.

## FOCUS OF ATTENTION

"The police, the prosecutors, the public defenders and the courts all received the attention they so urgently needed.

"Corrections did not," Ewing testified. The new law went into effect on Feb. 1. Moore said that by Feb. 1, 1972, the U.S. Attorney's office expects to have obtained a total of 4,000 felony indictments, "a 100 percent increase in one year."

## "SIGNIFICANT IMPACT"

"This will obviously have a significant impact on other components of the criminal justice system, particularly corrections," Moore said.

Defendants are being given speedier trials and longer sentences as a result of the new law, he said.

In addition, Moore said the conviction rate in felony cases—including guilty pleas—of about 92 percent, compares with 85 percent when all such cases were prosecuted in U.S. District Court. The Superior Court now handles about half the felony indictments in the District, he said.

## REASONS UNCLEAR

Moore said he is "not sure at this time" why the conviction rate is higher in the wake of the Court Reform Act.

"We don't know whether it's the increase in the quality of staff (in the U.S. Attorney's office) or the views of the jury," he said.

D.C. Corrections Department officials yesterday testified that the Lorton Reformatory complex and the D.C. Jail are already seriously overcrowded.

## THE TIME HAS COME

## HON. FRED SCHWENDEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. SCHWENDEL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, July 5, the Davenport Times-Democrat editorialized on the war in Vietnam.

Reflecting on the mail I am receiving from constituents and the results of my questionnaire this spring, it is apparent to me that this editorial represents the feeling of a large number, if not an overwhelming majority of the people I serve.

The editorial is well-reasoned. It deserves the attention of the House.

I include the article as follows:

## THE TIME HAS COME

The Viet Cong offer to free American prisoners of war simultaneously with the withdrawal of all U.S. forces before the end of the year puts President Nixon, Secretary of State William Rogers and Ambassador David Bruce, negotiator at the Paris peace conference, squarely on a red-hot griddle they have sought desperately to avoid.

Nixon must now decide whether the U.S. has any "war aims" left except the recovery of the POWs.

This could well be the temper of the country. June 22 the Senate gave 57 votes to pass the Mansfield Amendment to provide withdrawal of all troops from Vietnam within 90 days if the POWs are freed.

Actually, the Mansfield Amendment has no force or effect. The Senate has only an advisory role in foreign policy but it put the fat in the fire.

Hanoi, judging that the senators were reflecting the mood of the American public, saw the green light. Two days after the passage of the amendment Le Duc Tho, Hanoi's senior negotiator, showed up in Paris for the first time since April 1970.

Earlier in June, the New York Times, followed by other major newspapers, had begun publishing secret Pentagon papers on how the U.S. got involved in Vietnam in the first place. The stories raised considerable doubt among the people on what our aims really were—and are.

These developments, step by step, have put heavy strain on the President's announced plans of trying to withdraw from Vietnam "in a way" that will leave a stable government able to cope with the North Vietnamese troops which, of course, will stay in South Vietnam.

Nor does the President have any assurance that all POWs will be returned. The administration believes that POWs and men missing in action number as high as 1,600 men. North Vietnam acknowledges holding only 339 prisoners. There is a strong possibility that some POWs would be left behind as slaves or hostages.

Dr. Dang Tan, a physician and former official in the North Vietnamese Communist party who recently defected to the south, recently reported that all prisoners of the French Indochina war have not been released "even to the present day."

Also to be considered is the effect of any kind of withdrawal date on the preparations for South Vietnamese elections scheduled late in August and early October.

A date will embolden the Viet Cong. Even in pacified hamlets, VC sympathizers would surface with threats of violence to be meted out after the withdrawal date.

Nevertheless, President Nixon is now in a spot where more support for his present Vietnam policies will have to be forthcoming if he is to continue them.

The revelations of the secret papers have convinced us that there is no reason ever to suspect Saigon will have a government we view as "stable," that we erred in trying to bring this about through military force, and that we wish the South Vietnamese well but that we're through with the mess if our men are freed.

In effect, that does leave the return of the POWs as our last "war aim" and if we can make sure we'll get them all back, let's start serious negotiations and accept the inevitable.

## PRESIDENT NIXON IS KEEPING HIS WORD

## HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, last week the President of the United States withdrew an additional 3,100 soldiers from Vietnam.

On January 20, 1969, there were 532,500 Americans enduring the perils of

an Asian war. Today, there are 236,400 Americans in Vietnam who are planning to come home.

Mr. Speaker, President Nixon is keeping his word.

## THE THREE HOMES OF THE PILGRIMS

## HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, last year, the 350th anniversary of the landing of the Pilgrims at Plymouth Rock, Mass., in December 1620, was duly celebrated, and the dramatic story of its successful establishment and maintenance of the Plymouth Colony on Cape Cod Bay dramatized anew by pageant and portrayal.

The devoted and dedicated Pilgrims in establishing and maintaining a new home in America, with the establishment firmly based on the principles of civil and religious liberty, was an event of world significance. Occasionally, through the years, reference to these events have appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under the authorship of Maurice H. Thatcher, himself a descendant of the patriarch of the Pilgrims, Elder William Brewster, and a five-term Congressman from Kentucky.

In 1970, under the leadership of Col. Frederick I. Ordway, Jr., of this city, then Governor of the Society of Mayflower Descendants in the District of Columbia, there was prepared and published an ambitious volume entitled, "Register of the Society of Mayflower Descendants in the District of Columbia, 1970."

In addition to a certain number of carefully prepared historical articles, the book carries a roster of the several hundred members of the District of Columbia society, setting forth the respective genealogical record of each member.

The prepared articles are splendidly informative and possess important historical matter. One of these articles was prepared by Mr. Thatcher under the title of "The Three Homes of the Pilgrims," and sets forth in concise detail a most interesting and dramatic story of "The Three Homes," Scrooby, England, Holland, and Plymouth, Mass. This article is distinctive and I believe it to be of sufficient merit to appear in the RECORD. Therefore, under leave accorded, I include it as part of these remarks:

## THE THREE HOMES OF THE PILGRIMS

It is believed necessary to mention something of the conditions prevailing in some parts of England—especially in the Scrooby region—prior to 1607-8, when the dissenters or separatists left their native land for Holland.

The Established Church (English) had become so narrow and despotic in prescribing and enforcing restraints for all who did not completely conform, that persecution and the most intolerable punishments were imposed by the church hierarchy. For infractions thus prescribed, the most extreme and unreasonable punishments were enforced, and it became plain to those thus affected

that they could not have the slightest independence in their religious thinking if they remained in their native land.

Therefore, those thus minded cast about for another country, as a home where they might fully enjoy the blessings of civil and religious liberty. They became ready to abandon all that was near and dear in England and migrate to a more favored country.

A considerable number of these dissenters were in the Scrooby section where William Brewster had organized a dissenting church in the old Manor House, in Scrooby, occupied by himself and family. He had suffered imprisonment for petty violations of Established Church rules; and others of his community had likewise suffered.

Thus these dissenters, including affected families, chose and sought and found in progressive and tolerant Holland a haven of comfort and refuge; and under the most tragic conditions, they finally landed in that adjacent country.

*New Light on the Pilgrim Story* (Mason & Nightengale) is the authority for the quotation now given of the punishment and persecutions of those found guilty of disobeying the penal laws in regards to dissidents like Brewster and others. I quote:

The principal London prisons were County Poultry, Counter Wood Street, Bridewell, Newgate, Clink, Fleet, Gatehouse, and Tower. The site of the old Fleet is now occupied by the Memorial Hall, the headquarters in England today of the spiritual successors of the men who died for religious liberty long ago. How trivial some of their offences were! George Cotton, for hearing a portion of Scripture read by Greenwood in a friend's house, was thrown into prison, without trial, for twenty-seven months. Quentyn Smith was put in irons in a dungeon at Newgate for a similar offence. Nor was the lot of those who escaped imprisonment much more enviable. For reasons dealt with at length by Dr. Dale, it seems not too much to say that England was in danger of becoming one great civil prison. The Separatists at the time did not see all that was involved in what they claimed; but it was upon them that the whole brunt of the situation fell and right manfully did they endure it.

What transpired in London area was typical of what took place in other parts of England where dissidents flourished; and particularly in the Scrooby region where Brewster and others were thrust into prison at Boston, and other places, for dissenting practices. For years Brewster was an especially object of persecution with a price on his head and this continued in England and Holland until he made his way to the New World on the *Mayflower* in 1620, accompanied by his wife and children. His case was one of the most outstanding, and was typical of what was taking place in London and the eastern portion of England, including Scrooby district. All of these persecutions were instigated by the hierarchy of the Established Church (English), and illustrates the absolute pettiness and despotism involved. It may add something of interest to this story to refer to William Bradford, the protege of Brewster, and the historian and Governor of Plymouth Plantation, whose home was at Austerfield.

In some way certain published records gave his home as Ansterfield, instead of Austerfield; and for a century English scholars, in vain, tried to find Ansterfield in England, when finally some more enterprising researcher discovered the fact that the letter "n" had been misused to replace the letter "u" in Austerfield. It seems strange that it took so long to discover a mistake so patent; but thus it was.

#### HOME IN ENGLAND

It seems appropriate that at this point an account of the visit by the writer and his wife, July 1927, while they were closing

their European trip touring England, Scotland and Ireland, included a visit to the Scrooby area. The following is verbatim copy of the notes made at the time of the visit.

From Travel Book of Maurice H. Thatcher  
Friday—July 8, 1927

Left London at 10 o'clock this morning by London-North Eastern Railroad for Edinburgh via Scrooby. Arrived at Scrooby at 2 PM after changing cars at Grantham.

At Scrooby saw the Manor House where William Brewster lived from 1588 to 1608, and his father before him, both Keepers of the King's Post.

The old house is in very good condition except as to some of the floors. We had pointed out to us (Mrs. Thatcher and myself)—the particular room said to have been Elder Brewster's bedroom. The house is brick with tile roof and is two stories in height. It stands on the shore of an idyllic little stream known as the River Righton.

The Manor House is now owned by the Ecclesiastical Commission, whatever that may be, and is under 20 years lease to Major Peake of Bawtry Hall. The actual occupant of the Manor is C. H. Durdy. We found at home Mrs. Durdy and her sister Laura Hough.

I secured several snapshots of the Manor and other features of interest in the gracious little village of Scrooby.

Tablets have been placed at the side of the entrance door of the Manor as follows:

On the three hundredth anniversary of the sailing of the *Mayflower* with the Pilgrim fathers to New England, this tablet was unveiled by the representatives of the Anglo-American Society, in commemoration of the heroic virtues of the little band of lovers of truth and freedom which first met in this place.

September 1920:

This tablet is erected by the Pilgrim Society of Plymouth, Massachusetts, United States of America, to mark the site of the ancient manor house, where lived William Brewster, from 1588 to 1608, and where he organized the Pilgrim Church of which he became ruling elder and with which, in 1608, he removed to Amsterdam, in 1609 to Leyden, and in 1620 to Plymouth where he died.

APRIL 16, 1644

At Scrooby we saw a picturesque and pleasing countryside surrounding the town with several churches in the landscape. We met the pastor of the local Methodist Church and had with him an interesting conversation. He lived very much in the past and gave evidence of the fact in what he had to say. All in all, the Scrooby area seemed to be a typical English scene now generally under cultivation and pasturage, although in ancient times much of this general section of England was in swamps and morasses.

Scrooby was indeed the home of the principal founders of dissent who escaped to Holland in 1607-8, and Brewster was the strong leader of the movement. He lived at the Manor House, and had charge of the post. He organized the dissenting church at Scrooby—made up of high class, middle class Englishmen. And the Manor House was utilized as a place for regular meetings of the church group. Brewster, who was not an ordained minister, became the Ruling Elder of this movement, and thus continued in Holland and the Plymouth Colony until his death there in April 1644. In this connection I would quote from *The Pilgrims in Their Three Homes*, (Wm. Elliot Griffis):

The leaders of the movement in Gainsborough and Scrooby were 4 men, Brewster, Robinson, Clifton, and Smyth, each of whom had been trained in Cambridge University. The 1st and greatest of them was Brewster, and next was Robinson. . . . The man who emerges as the beginner of the Pilgrim movement was William Brewster, whose father had charge of the relay station or post at

Scrooby, and who was born before 1567. He grew up in the village, seeing whatever came into the place from the great world outside. When the king's messengers changed horses, drank their ale, or took their supper and breakfast at his father's inn, he was apt to hear news. Occasionally some gay or even royal lady would pass that way. Margaret, Queen of Scotland, daughter of King Henry VII, slept at Scrooby on the 12th of June 1503, on her way northward. . . . After he had been to school somewhere in the neighborhood, probably at Bawtry, he went to Cambridge. It is not at all improbable that he walked the whole way thither. Brewster entered Peterhouse, the oldest college of all, founded in 1284, and made his first record December 3rd, 1580. An English college in those days was much like some of our smaller universities—little more than a grammar school. Though it is quite probable that Brewster did not graduate or take a degree, yet he was long enough at Cambridge to become decidedly earnest in his Christian character. . . . Brewster was called away from his studies to help William Davison, who had long been Elizabeth's envoy at Antwerp.

Conditions became so intolerable to the dissenters in Scrooby community that they undertook to go clandestinely to Holland as a place of refuge for residence, until ultimately they might go to the New World where they could form themselves into a new colony. In brief, after great trial and tribulation, the Scrooby group of dissenters made their escape to Holland, which for the period of 1607-8 to 1620 became their second home.

#### HOME IN HOLLAND

During the period involved, Holland constituted the most advanced country, not only in Europe, but in the entire world. It had progressed far along the road of tolerance and free institutions, and was outstanding in its education, commerce, and shipping. The temporary dominance of Spain came to an end in a few years, and the country found its complete freedom. Its great progress and civilization, tolerance of all religions, and its educational facilities, made of it a shining example to neighboring countries, and especially to Eastern England. Indeed, the English nation, following the influence by Holland, was transformed from an agricultural country into one of complete industrialization with factories everywhere abounding. No more fortunate decision could have been made by the Pilgrims than that of Holland as a second home. In this connection, let us again quote from the volume last cited relative to what Brewster found in his earlier visits to the Low Countries during diplomatic missions with Davison:

It must have been a wonderful experience for this bright young Englishman to travel in a state so highly civilized as Holland, which then was in many respects, especially in social refinement and the comforts of life, far superior to Brewster's native country. He saw gayly dressed and well-fed people in many walled cities, excellent farms, well-made and well-kept roads, noble church edifices, superb city halls, dwellings built of bricks, and striking cleanliness everywhere, while carillons of bells in the spires doubtless pleased his ear. . . . We may be sure that so observing and keen-minded a man as Brewster afterwards showed himself to be could not fail to notice especially those things which were very different from what one could find in the England of his time, such as the federal union of seven states, self-government of cities, judges independent of the executive, the democratic spirit of the churches, public schools and free instruction for poor children, the freedom of the press, and the liberty of printing and publishing. He could not but note the toleration granted to Roman Catholics, Jews, Anabaptists, and other people without the state church. These 'dissenters' though not allowed public processions or parades, or crosses or symbols on the outside

of their places of worship, were perfectly free indoors and suffered no molestation. The great number of people able to read and write, of cheap books and pictures of schools, hospitals, orphan asylums, and benevolent institutions, must have impressed Brewster; while the number and variety of manufacturers, the gaiety of the markets, the vast fisheries and tremendous commerce—opened his eyes to the wonderful world beyond his native land. Above all, this idea of liberty of conscience, the devoutness and earnestness of the Dutch Puritans, and the determination of all, Protestants and Catholics alike, to fight Spain until their freedom was acknowledged, must have kindled new thoughts in the mind of William Brewster.

Also, the following quote is from *The Pilgrims in Their Three Homes*:

The episode of William Brewster's presence in Holland at a critical period in Dutch history, and during the movement of the Calvinistic democratic and unionist elements in the federal republic, which Davison could not but favor, is of great significance to the philosophic student of Pilgrim history. Brewster must have, then and there, seen clearly the difference between the forces making for the uplifting of the common people and the consideration of a strong and united nation, and those which nourished aristocracy, privilege, and wealth, and even secession. Evidently he went back to his old home mightily reinforced in heart and intellect. His whole afterlife shows what principles he followed—even those which have made the better life of England, Holland and the United States of America.

Undoubtedly, Brewster's earlier experiences in Holland impressed him tremendously. He thus saw in a country other than his native England, a land where progress and tolerance had advanced in such marked degree. It was but natural that later, after he returned to live in Scrooby, and had taken over the post there, his advice of choosing Holland as a haven of refuge, though temporary in character, would have powerful influence with his fellow dissenters in Scrooby and north-east England. Such was the case. And the first contingent of Pilgrims in 1607, followed by larger groups of the dissenters, chose Amsterdam as their first place of Holland residence. Conditions in this city were not favorable to the Pilgrims in matters of employment and shortly afterwards, upon due study, they made the happy choice of Leyden as their residence.

Leyden was certainly adapted to the wants and needs of the Pilgrims, and their residence there, until the migration of most of them to the New World, wholly justified the selection. In that fine metropolis of commerce, manufacturing, shipping and other industrial pursuits they found a desired haven. Leyden was then the most advanced and cultured city in Holland. It was near the mouth of the River Rhine, and by that stream encircled. It had beautiful churches, a splendid university (in which university Elder Brewster taught English, besides publishing tracts and books on religious subjects), and many factories engaged in the weaving and dyeing of woolen and other fabrics. In factories the bulk of the Pilgrims found employment. They also educated their children in public schools, and the renowned university provided facilities for advanced studies. Spanish dominance—more or less nominal—was coming to an end, and the country was soon to become wholly free. The Pilgrims were welcomed there with open arms by the Dutch, and on the whole the Pilgrims found what they desired. Their contacts with all the advantages involved in Leyden, and its policies of education and religious tolerance, and public and private cleanliness, equally impressed them; and the lessons thus learned greatly influenced their lives thenceforth. There persisted the deep desire on the part of these sojourners that, as

Englishmen, they should find a new and permanent home in the New World, under the English flag, where they could enjoy civil and religious liberty. Finally, in 1620 the decision was made for a large portion of the Pilgrims and their church population in Leyden to leave Holland for the New World, and the beckoning New World awaited them. The remaining portion, with Pastor Robinson in charge, was expected to follow and join the first group in North America. Some did follow afterwards, but Pastor Robinson remained in Holland and died there. The story of the *Mayflower* voyage that ended November 1620 at Provincetown in Cape Cod Bay need not here be retold.

#### HOME IN AMERICA

The third and final home of the Pilgrims who came to the New World on the *Mayflower* in 1620 was at "Plymouth Plantation," on the present site of Plymouth Massachusetts. The Pilgrim group had hoped to end their voyage at the mouth of the Hudson River, where there was a Dutch settlement; but because of a stormy passage the *Mayflower* ended its voyage at Provincetown, and later settled on December 21, 1620, at the present day Plymouth site. This was north of the Virginia territory, mentioned in their charter, and made it necessary for them to act independently in the establishment of the Colony at Plymouth. This resulted in the adoption of the Mayflower Compact on November 21, 1620.

At last, in the dead of winter, they began building their homes on the bleak shores of Cape Cod Bay, and the severe weather conditions prevailing caused the deaths during the winter of more than half the Pilgrim group. Houses had to be built and this required time and effort; but so much sickness and death occurred that during this particular period it came to pass that Elder Brewster and Myles Standish, both retaining health, notwithstanding the arduous labor involved, were about the only persons left with strength to administer to the remaining sick and dying colonists. Yet, later in April 1621 when the *Mayflower* was ready to return to England, the invitation of Captain Christopher Jones of the *Mayflower* to take back to England any or all of the remaining colonists was not availed of by a single one. For these remaining Pilgrims the Rubicon had been crossed and, live or die, the choice of their third home was fixed and irrevocable. Their faith in Divine Providence was supreme, and their hope for a final home where they could be wholly free in civil and religious matters, prevailed. In the course of time, under conditions of great peril and hardship, they succeeded in their endeavor, and became the oldest English colony of the New World in North America that continued without change of location.

In the Plymouth area the colonists engaged in farming, fishing and shipping, and in timely fashion paid all their obligations. In general they lived at peace with the Indians.

These Pilgrims brought to their new home their consciences, and fully profited from the experiences of their English persecutions and their contact with the broad tolerance and beneficent qualities of the Dutch people and government. They were thus peculiarly fitted to found a new colony in North America and unlike other English colonies, elected their own governors and other officials. They were thus governed for about seventy years, after which their colony became a part of the Massachusetts Bay Colony. They discarded the practice of English primogeniture, but followed the English system in regard to wills, deeds and estates. They also instituted public schools, never tolerated the idea of witchcraft doctrines, and granted religious freedom to all. They continued their independent church

which may be said to have been the first congregational group in the western world. Other religions, in the course of time, were established in their midst.

On the whole, it may be truly said that their faith and their way of life constituted an example of unprecedented benefit to other colonies that soon dotted our eastern seaboard. The Pilgrim Colony was indeed one of conscience and character, and a hostile English King, under whom the colony was founded, permitted these colonists to exist without interference or abridgment of their civil and religious policies. The Mayflower Compact contained the essential features of free and representative government which were, in large measure, written into our federal constitution.

These are some of the contributions made by the Pilgrims who brought to the New World the Christian home upon which our nation was founded. Never in all history has a small number of dedicated persons done so much for the cause of free institutions as that achieved by this Pilgrim group. Their work will endure so long as men may cherish the principles and practices of liberty.

#### PLYMOUTH ROCK

Over the seas the valiant Pilgrims came,  
Nought thinking of honor, glory, or name;  
They worthily wrought for Liberty's cause,  
And earned for themselves a wide and  
deathless fame.

#### THE CASE OF CAPTAIN CULVER

#### HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, we have seen today in the Thomas Culver case yet another in a long series of blatant attempts by the U.S. military establishment to stifle our citizens' expressions of their opinions on this Government's intolerable war policy in Indochina.

Capt. Thomas Culver is an American citizen who happens to be serving his country in the U.S. Air Force in England. When he entered the service he swore to defend and uphold the Constitution, and he apparently took this oath quite seriously. On May 31, 1971, he and 200 other servicemen, out of uniform and on their own free time, exercised their constitutional right to petition this Congress to protest an unconstitutional war.

Mr. Speaker, in Captain Culver, we have a highly courageous and conscientious American who should be held up as a fine example and an inspiration to every freedom-loving citizen and every American serviceman. But instead, what has happened to Captain Culver? He was summarily arrested, confined without charges for a week, and then subjected to and convicted by a court-martial, on the grounds that he violated a military regulation which itself is patently repressive of the very freedoms which Culver swore to defend. I, for one, find this to be an outrageous paradox, which perfectly illustrates the famous words of the philosopher Camus:

When crime dons the apparel of innocence in a curious transposition peculiar to our times, it is innocence that is called upon to justify itself.

We know that activities of U.S. servicemen are protected by the Bill of Rights, exception being made only in cases where such activities present a threat to the national security. Yet the petitioning of Culver and his cohorts was thoroughly peaceful and scrupulously consistent with both U.S. law applying to civilians and with the laws of England, the host country. To say, as the Government did at the Culver court-martial, that Culver's activities threatened our security or endangered our harmonious relations with England is to make a very bad joke.

Mr. Speaker, the President, as Commander in Chief, has it in his power to dismiss the charges and vindicate this fine man. Clearly, it is now time to hold Mr. Nixon to account for his statement at the Air Force Academy in 1969:

Everyone in uniform is a citizen first and a serviceman second, and we must resist any attempt to isolate or separate the defender from the defendant.

The military's continuing abuse of authority by applying a separate standard of rights to dissident servicemen flies in the face of that pledge by the President.

I here insert into the RECORD, and commend to your attention the report of the Culver case from a recent edition of the Washington Post.

[From the Washington Post, July 14, 1971]

A.F. CAPTAIN CONVICTED FOR PROTEST  
IN LONDON

(By Dan Yergin)

LAKENHEATH, ENGLAND, July 13.—Capt. Thomas L. Culver, a 32-year-old legal officer, was found guilty today of violating an Air Force regulation forbidding demonstrations by airmen outside the United States.

The court-martial was the first test of the right of U.S. airmen abroad to petition and demonstrate.

Culver was charged with participating in an antiwar demonstration in London on May 31 and also with soliciting others to participate, both in violation of an Air Force regulation which bars such activity. The regulation does not apply within the United States.

The jury of eight officers returned to the small courtroom here this afternoon after almost four hours of deliberation. More than two-thirds voted for conviction. Sentencing will be Wednesday.

Outside the courtroom shortly after the verdict, Culver, visibly shaken but still calm of voice, said, "I'm upset, but not surprised. The judge gave such a broad definition of demonstrations that the jury had to find me guilty. This will be a big hunk out of my life, but I hope that the appellate court will decide on the constitutionality and rule that I am not guilty and that servicemen do have rights. Somebody had to stick their neck out. This is the way you make law."

Culver can move his case through the military appeal court system up to the Court of Military Appeals which sits in Washington. That board is made up of three civilians. The case could also be taken by the U.S. Supreme Court if it agrees with the defense contention that a constitutional issue is involved.

Similarly higher commands up the line, up to and including the President, the commander in chief, will be reviewing the case with the option of lessening the charge or the sentence.

Early in the trial the defense challenged the constitutionality of the regulation barring participation in demonstrations outside the United States. The trial judge, Carl R. Abrams, ruled against it.

Both sides generally agreed to the facts of the May 31 incident—that 200 off-duty airmen assembled in civilian dress at Speakers Corner in Hyde Park, that they walked in groups of six to the embassy to deliver their antiwar petition addressed to the President and Congress, and that they then attended a concert in Victoria Park.

The five-day trial focused on the question of whether this was a demonstration.

Abrams, stating that he had consulted five dictionaries, defined a demonstration as "a public showing or display by a large group of assembled persons, of feelings such as sympathy or antagonism, especially towards a person, a cause, or action of public interest—for a large crowd to intentionally assemble to protest against or dictate favor for some official action or attitude against—a public exhibition of welcome, approval or condemnation, a public manifestation of feeling."

Edward F. Sherman, civilian defense counsel and professor of law at Indiana University, described the definition as "wholly inadequate."

Prosecutor Franklin A. Luna argued that "there was planning and organization arm-bands, attempts to get attention, statements read out, and political satire. What happened down there was a demonstration."

The defense concentrated on trying to prove that no demonstration had occurred, that it was only the presentation of a petition—a right guaranteed by the first amendment to the Constitution, as well as by section 4 of Air Force regulation 35-15, which guarantees airmen the right to petition Congress.

Replying to prosecution's suggestions that the incidents had threatened "harmonious relations" with Britain, the defense called several British citizens. Commander Harold Hodgson of Scotland Yard said the airmen were "anxious not to break any law and to stay within U.S. military regulations."

Summing up for the defense, Capt. Frank Wessen stated, "These young men—and we have to remember that the servicemen today are a lot different from those of 25 years ago, they are better educated and more aware of the world around them—came in a relaxed and peaceful manner, guided by a rather vague regulation, attempting to stay within the law, to present a petition to the members of Congress and to the President.

Wessen concluded by quoting President Nixon who declared in 1969 that "everyone in uniform is a citizen first and a serviceman second, and we must resist any attempt to isolate or separate the defender from the defendant."

ANGELA DAVIS

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it is well known that the cause of Angela Davis has become a major propaganda program organized by the Communist Party of the United States. Angela Davis is an admitted Communist and has been accused of having furnished some or all of the guns used in the court shootout and kidnaping which resulted in the death of four persons in California.

Since that time the Davis case has become the center for radical agitation and organization for the advancement of causes which have nothing to do with

the justice involved in the case. If we look back over the past few decades whenever a Communist or a Communist sympathizer has been arrested for some crime, an immediate cry goes up that the accused is ipso facto innocent. No matter how cowardly or how terrible the crime, it appears that no Communist will ever be suffered to have justice done according to the merits of his or her case. Instead the cases are made a rallying point for Communists, for sympathizers, and dupes who hope to attack the "system."

It is particularly disturbing that many church leaders have allowed themselves to become involved in these nefarious operations. These church leaders have a completely muddled concept of Christian charity. They seem to feel that a person such as Angela Davis is particularly deserving of sympathy and support. They place no trust in the efficacy of our judicial system and they join in with a Communist cause even though Communists remain militant opponents of Christianity.

These confused ministers of Christian gospel have mixed up the concern which any human being ought to have for the rights of another human being with sympathy for a personality and the cause which that personality espouses. In other words, as Christians their concern should be to see that Miss Davis receives the proper and ordinary course of our judicial system. The State of California has taken every precaution to see that justice will be done. It is highly mistaken to believe that we must go beyond this basic concern and espouse the cause which the accused represents.

In this case the accused represents a particularly heinous cause, a cause which is opposed to our Nation and to our rights as a Christian people. Any informed Christian minister who supports the work that Angela Davis is doing is supporting the subversion of our Nation. They are guilty by participation in the attack upon our national survival.

Mr. President, Mr. Anthony Harrigan, executive vice president of the Southern States Industrial Council, a noted writer and analyst who lives in Charleston, S.C., has recently written a column in which he calls the involvement of many national church leaders in these radical causes "one of the truly tragic developments in our time." Mr. Harrigan is a keen student of both military and psychological warfare and his analysis of church support for the Angela Davis case again demonstrates his firm grasp of the situation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the column "Sensing the News" by Anthony Harrigan, entitled "Church Aid for Angela Davis" be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

SENSING THE NEWS: CHURCH AID FOR ANGELA DAVIS

(By Anthony Harrigan)

One of the truly tragic developments of our time is the involvement of many national church leaders in radical causes destructive of peace, order and progress. These church leaders often manage to channel

church funds to extremists despite the objections of the man in the pew.

Especially shocking is the disclosure that the Council on Church and Race of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. has contributed \$10,000 to the defense of Angela Davis, an admitted communist.

Angela Davis is accused of having furnished some or all of the guns used in a court shoot-out and kidnapping which resulted in the death of four persons in California. She fled the state to avoid prosecution and was apprehended in New York City. She is charged with murder, kidnapping and conspiracy.

According to the *Philadelphia Inquirer*, the \$10,000 was obtained from a \$100,000 fund used to pay for bail or legal fees for people from minority groups. The newspaper said that allocation of the \$10,000 to the Angela Davis defense fund, which is being promoted by the Communist Party, "angered many Presbyterians during its recent General Assembly meeting in Rochester, N.Y."

Despite these protests, Dr. William Thompson, stated clerk of the Presbyterian Church in the USA, defended the contribution. In a recent "sermon," he said that "We should have concern for the woman because of the Christian gospel." That's hardly justification for giving \$10,000 to aid an admitted communist charged with murder and kidnapping. Churchmen have concern for the souls of the members of the Mafia, but that doesn't mean denominational groups should give \$10,000 to every accused killer and drug pusher. Moreover, the \$10,000 devoted to Angela Davis could be spent on good works—help to the orphaned or in establishment of church missions. Church hand-outs to avowed enemies of the United States are something new and sick.

Support for the contribution to the Angela Davis legal fund isn't Mr. Thompson's only interest of this kind, however. On June 13, the Associated Press quoted Mr. Thompson in connection with a plan to convene an "ecumenical assembly" to oppose U.S. involvement in the Vietnam War. The announcement of the assembly came at a meeting of the general board of the National Council of Churches, an organization that plays a major role in promoting and funding radical, anti-American groups and movements. Mr. Thompson was quoted as saying: "A tide of public opinion is running against this war. If this tide swells into a wave, the administration may hear it."

Many concerned churchmen hold, however, that denominational groups and leaders have no warrant to use church facilities and funds to stage protests designed to produce a specific political reaction. These concerned churchmen believe that as the churches involve themselves in politics, they depart from their authentic mission.

Church support for Angela Davis is particularly offensive in view of her well-known dedication to Communist Party doctrines. Months ago, Episcopalians in Pennsylvania protested strongly when a rally to mobilize financial support for Angela Davis was held at the Episcopal Church of the Advocate in Philadelphia. The protests didn't deter diocesan officials, however. The public relations director of the diocese said "the Committee in Defense of Angela Davis seems a very legitimate enterprise to many black people, particularly the young; and Dr. Paul Washington (rector of the Advocate) believes he would be irresponsible if he did not permit the Advocate facilities to be used by this committee. He has indicated his intention to continue to permit this committee to use Advocate facilities. The bishop concurs in this judgment."

This type of thinking is producing a marked reaction on the part of individual churchmen who resent use of their contributions and of church property to aid revolutionary groups and movements.

Actually, the issue extends beyond the denominations to the general public. Inasmuch as churches enjoy tax exemptions, the public has the right to be concerned if these tax exemptions are used to assist subversive organizations or individuals engaged in urban terrorism. Viewed from any angle, church support for Angela Davis is an extremely disturbing development.

#### FEDERAL DRUG ABUSE EFFORTS SERIOUSLY FRAGMENTED

### HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, on March 24, over 60 colleagues and I introduced a bill to create an Office of Drug Abuse Control in the White House. This bill was the result of an investigation of Federal drug abuse programs which convinced us of the need for a comprehensive multi-disciplinary, multi-faceted plan of attack which would coordinate the now seriously fragmented Federal approach to the problem.

In order to document our belief that current programs are uncoordinated and disjointed in origin, largely unevaluated and of doubtful efficacy, poorly designed and just as poorly led, I have attempted to compile a comprehensive list of all Federal agencies which operate such programs. At the same time, administration officials have attempted to compile their own list.

Neither list is thus far entirely comprehensive. The administration list at this time, for example, does not include programs operated by the Veteran's Administration, HUD or the Department of State. My list also contains omissions.

The very fact that each list describes programs that the other omits dramatically illustrates how difficult it is to even determine the scope of the Federal effort in this area. Therefore, I wish to include both lists in my remarks at this point:

#### LIST OF FEDERAL DRUG ABUSE CONTROL PROGRAMS COMPILED BY REP. JAMES H. SCHEUER

##### LAW ENFORCEMENT

#### Department of Justice, Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs

Program: Law Enforcement Assistance—State Legislation

Objective: To assist States in drafting enforcement and regulatory legislation relating to controlled substances, and to effect uniform drug laws among the States and the Federal Government.

Program: Law Enforcement Assistance—Training

Objective: To acquaint appropriate professional and enforcement personnel with: 1) techniques in the conduct of drug abuse investigations; 2) aspects of physical security in legitimate drug distribution; 3) techniques in the analysis of drugs for evidential purposes; 4) pharmacology, socio-psychological aspects of drug abuse education, and investigatory techniques.

#### Law Enforcement Assistance Administration

Program: Criminal Justice Improvement Program—Block Action Grants to States

Objective: A program of grants to States for the purpose of improving and strengthening law enforcement. Components of a State

plan, which must be approved by LEAA may include programs for the treatment, education, and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts.

Program: Criminal Justice Improvement Program—Discretionary Grants to State and Local Governments

Objective: To make discretionary grants designed to assist States and local governments in implementing "special emphasis" law enforcement activities. Each city may select its programs from seven categories of projects, one of which is drug abuse education.

Program: Narcotic Detection

Objective: Detect the presence of narcotics by remote means. Based on the findings of these projects, the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice will develop additional narcotics detection systems and procedures.

#### Department of State, Agency for International Development

Program: Public Safety Program

Objective: Extensive assistance to local and narcotic police to discover illicit usage and traffic of narcotics in East Asia. In coordination with the Bureau of Customs, AID provides advisors to custom officials. Vietnam receives the most extensive assistance. Programs are presently being expanded in Laos and Thailand.

Program: Agricultural Development and Control

Objective: Loan of three million dollars to provide equipment for law enforcement agencies and administrations of agriculture in Turkey for its crop substitution program.

#### Department of the Treasury, Bureau of Customs

Program: Narcotic Identification Program

Objective: Training of special customs agents in advanced and basic schools for the purpose of identifying narcotics.

#### Department of Agriculture

Program: Marijuana Control Program

Objective: Help farmers identify and eradicate marijuana.

#### Department of Defense

Program: Prevention of Drug Traffic, Navy

Objective: Elimination of drug abuse by individuals aboard naval ships and installations. Intensification of enforcement measures directed at individual navy men trafficking in drugs. Primary attention is focused upon the pusher.

Program: Detection of Marijuana

Objective: Both the Army and Navy are involved in pilot programs using trained dogs to detect marijuana.

#### RESEARCH AND OTHER SUPPORT

#### Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Institute of Mental Health

Program: Addiction Research Center

Objective: Plans and conducts direct research on the causes, diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of drug addiction, on the nature of the addictive process and on the addiction liability of new drugs.

#### Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration

Program: Effects of Methadone Treatment on Criminality

Objective: The program is assessing the value of methadone treatment in reducing the incidence of crime in area with a heavy concentration of heroin addiction and evaluating the change in individual behavior resulting from protracted administration of methadone to addicted persons.

Program: Chronic Effects of Marijuana

Objective: Two marijuana studies are currently underway. The first is assessing the effects of its chronic use on brain and on behavior. The second study is examining the social and cultural basis of youthful drug use.

**Program: Heroin Detection**

Objective: The objective of this project is to find a means to detect minute traces of heroin in the air. A device to detect the presence of traces of heroin in the atmosphere to indicate the location of hidden quantities of heroin could be a major breakthrough in the apprehension of traffickers.

**Program: Termination of Drug Abuse**

Objective: An analysis of the careers of drug addicts in order to identify those factors which distinguish continuing users from those persons who terminate their drug abuse.

*Department of State, Agency for International Development***Program: Income Substitution**

Objective: Aid to study the possibility of income substitution for the production of opium in East Asia.

*Department of Justice, Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs***Program: Laboratory Analysis**

Objective: To provide drug evidence analysis, expert testimony in court, and technical assistance to law enforcement agencies concerning narcotics, other abused drugs, and their analysis.

*Department of Defense***Program: Selectivity in Recruitment—Screening Program, Navy**

Objective: Research and improve screening at recruiting level for drug addicts and drug abusers.

## EDUCATION AND TRAINING

*Office of Education***Program: Teacher Training**

Objective: Under the authority of the Education Professions Development Act to grant funds for the specific purpose of training school personnel in the fundamentals of drug abuse education. The program is aimed at educators working with the 5-17 year old age group. Although States may use their grants as they see fit, they are encouraged to use the Government training centers operating in key locations around the country. These centers are responsible for training teams of teachers, counselors, school administrators, students and community leaders from the local school districts.

*Department of Housing and Urban Development***Program: Drug Abuse Projects, Model Cities Administration**

Objective: Make funds available for drug abuse projects in prevention, education, treatment, rehabilitation, and evaluation related to or incorporated in model cities programs.

*Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Institute of Mental Health***Program: National Clearinghouse for Drug Abuse Information**

Objective: Give the public one central office to contact for help. The Clearinghouse collects and disseminates material and data from Federal and appropriate private State and local projects. It also maintains a computer data bank on a wide variety of drug abuse control programs to enable the Government to give detailed answers to queries.

**Program: Center for Studies of Narcotic and Drug Abuse**

Objective: Development of new treatment techniques for addicts—improved methods of measuring the social readjustment of addicts under treatment, the increase of knowledge concerning the abuse of drugs of various types, and the training of workers in the special problems of drug abuse. Various types of grants and contracts, as well as consultation services, are made available to investigators and State and local agencies.

*Department of Justice, Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs***Program: Public Education on Drug Abuse: Technical Assistance**

Objective: To provide advisory services to groups desiring to establish an educational program of drug abuse.

**Program: Law Enforcement Assistance—Technical Laboratory Publications**

Objective: To disseminate scientific information on the detection and analysis of narcotics and dangerous drugs.

**Program: Training of Foreign Narcotic Officers**

Objective: Two week training program to teach foreign narcotic officers American techniques of law enforcement.

*Department of Agriculture***Program: 4-H Educational Programs**

Objective: The Department of Agriculture has been involved in drug abuse education efforts through its 4-H educational programs. These programs are underway in at least twelve states.

*Department of Labor***Program: Regional Workshops—Drug Seminars**

Objective: Education of personnel and enrollees in Job Corps Centers and other manpower training programs.

**Program: Drug Survey of Adolescents**

Objective: To collect a random sample of Job Corps employees to discover their knowledge of drugs and utilization patterns.

*Department of Defense***Program: Drug Abuse Awareness, Navy**

Objective: Promote drug abuse awareness at flag officer and commander level. Use of written and visual media to provide information about the effects of drugs and treatment available.

**Program: Drug Abuse Education Specialists**

Objective: Provide specialists at each major command to advise all servicemen about drug abuse. These specialists will educate and counsel active duty naval personnel, navy reserve personnel, and dependents of naval personnel.

**Program: "Dope Stop Teen" Program, Navy**

Objective: Utilizes volunteer high school teen counsellors to provide effective drug abuse information to children of all naval personnel in the elementary and junior high school grades.

**Program: Drug Abuse Education, Air Force**

Objective: The Military Airlift Command has contracted with a local drug rehabilitation agency to obtain the services of several ex-addicts in conducting seminars at each of its installations. A pilot traveling drug abuse indoctrination team project incorporating the use of an ex-addict as a team member has also been completed in the Air Force and the results are presently being evaluated.

## TREATMENT AND REHABILITATION

*Office of Economic Opportunity***Program: Community Action Programs: Economic Opportunity Act of 1964**

Objective: Funding of community action programs for the prevention of narcotic addiction and the rehabilitation of narcotic addicts. Funds may also be granted to projects concerned with treatment and rehabilitation of abusers of depressant and stimulant drugs, as well as of narcotics. They encourage the use of neighborhood facilities and the services of recovered drug addicts and drug abusers as counselors.

**Program: Drug Rehabilitation**

Objective: Provide grants for community-based programs to 1) discover the causes of drug abuse and addiction and 2) treat the drug abuser and drug addict, emphasizing their re-entry into society rather than institutionalization. Utilize the services of recovered drug abusers and addicts as counselors.

*Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Institute of Mental Health***Program: Narcotic Addict Treatment (Narcotic Addiction Rehabilitation Act)**

Objective: To provide for civil commitment

of narcotic addicts for examination and treatment, and for rehabilitation and after-care services for addicts.

**Program: Community Mental Health Centers (General Mental Health Centers)**

Objective: Provide for grants to States and communities for the construction and staffing of public and other nonprofit mental health centers. The General Mental Health Centers may be used (but not exclusively) for the treatment and care of narcotic drug addicts.

**Program: Community Mental Health Centers (Specialized Facilities for Narcotic Addicts)**

Objective: Grants to States for the construction and staffing of facilities specifically concerned with the treatment of narcotic addicts. Funding of training and development activities and of surveys to evaluate the addiction treatment and prevention programs receiving assistance.

**Program: Clinical Research Centers.**

Objective: To serve currently as hospital facilities for the inpatient phase of treatment of persons participating in the Federal program for the treatment and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts. Under NARA the Centers are designated to examine, evaluate, and treat addicts who voluntarily commit themselves (Title III) and those given a choice by the Federal court to accept commitment rather than trial for certain charges (Title I).

*Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social and Rehabilitation Service***Program: Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control**

Objective: Grants to assist communities in furnishing diagnosis, treatment, rehabilitative and preventive services to youths who are delinquents or in danger of becoming delinquent.

It encourages States to utilize resources under programs in the areas of general and vocational education, job training, prevention and detection of crime, and health and welfare.

**Program: New Career Opportunities for the Handicapped**

Objective: To enable state vocational rehabilitation agencies and other public and private non-profit agencies to develop new programs to recruit and train handicapped individuals for new career opportunities in the fields of rehabilitation, health, welfare, public safety, law enforcement, and other appropriate public service employment. The Social and Rehabilitation Service Administration conducts a program which includes activities specifically aimed at the drug abuser group. These activities include grants to States for research and demonstration projects, grants to State agencies, innovation grants, and training grants.

*Department of Justice, Bureau of Prisons***Program: Treatment Program for Drug Abuse**

Objective: Development of treatment programs for offenders under Title II of the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act. It is a self-help program within a Federal prison similar to the therapeutic community programs of Synanon and Daytop.

*Veterans' Administration***Program: Drug Dependence Treatment for Veterans**

Objective: To provide two to eight weeks of hospitalization followed by long periods of out-patient care. The five centers are located at VA hospitals which will provide methadone maintenance, psychiatric care, and counseling.

*Department of Labor***Program: Screening Program**

Objective: Individuals who are addicts are screened out from enrolling in manpower training programs. These individuals are provided with assistance and counseling.

*Department of Housing and Urban Development*

Program: Drug Abuse Projects, Model Cities Administration

Objective: Make funds available for drug abuse projects in prevention, education, treatment, rehabilitation, and evaluation related to or incorporated in model cities programs.

*Department of Defense*

Program: Treatment and Rehabilitation Programs, Navy

Objective: Provide every naval man with the assistance—counseling, treatment, and rehabilitation—to overcome drug problems. Rehabilitation of the hard drug user is the priority.

Program: Drug Abuse Exemption Program, Navy

Objective: Provide counseling and assistance to any individual with drug abuse problems. The heroin addict, by applying to a representative at his command will receive exemption from punishment and undesirable discharge.

Program: Voluntary Treatment Program, Army

Objective: This is the first voluntary treatment program to be initiated in the military services. Any individual may now seek treatment without fear of punitive measures.

Program: Urinalysis Test

Objective: The purpose of this test is to identify military members who are dependent on drugs prior to their return home. Military members who are identified as drug addicts are insured further treatment.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

*Prevention*

The Department of Agriculture has been involved in drug abuse prevention efforts through its 4-H educational programs. These programs are underway in at least a dozen States. For a brief description of several of these programs, see attached letters. Other informational efforts are directed toward farmers and aimed at the identification and eradication of marijuana.

*Treatment*

No programs.

*Research*

No programs reported which are directly related to non-enforcement aspects of the drug abuse problem.

*Training*

No information available beyond what is contained in the attached prevention program descriptions.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

*Prevention*

Information and preventive campaign involving American Forces Radio and Television Service and wide dissemination of information including posters, handbooks for commanders, programs currently in operation for military dependents in Pacific, Atlantic, and European areas. More than nine dependents' high schools have established pilot programs involving the use of

high school age students to communicate about drugs to younger students. These programs are modeled after DOPE STOP in Phoenix, Arizona. Implementation of drug abuse prevention education in Overseas Dependents Schools cost \$85,472 in school year 1970-71. The Domestic Action Program of DOD can also be seen as being preventive in nature providing alternatives to youth involvement with drugs (see attached article).

*Treatment*

DOD reports that information to reply to this section is not available at this time. New reporting procedures will furnish this information for future reports.

*Research*

See DOD report for description of types of research being conducted and surveys to determine (1) percentage of hard drug users in the separated population, and (2) prevalence of drug abuse and demographic factors related to the problem.

*Training*

The Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps have all had personnel attend DHEW-sponsored drug abuse training programs. (Only figure reported indicating the numbers of personnel involved was 94—that many spaces were provided to the Air Force at one of the DHEW Training Centers.)

The Navy has been operating a Drug Abuse Education Specialist School since early this year. The school has a current capacity of graduating 20 students a month. Plans are underway to increase this capacity to 30 per month. An East Coast school is also contemplated. Current training capacity would then be 240 students per year. As plans are implemented, training capacity could increase to 360 or double that amount if an East Coast school with identical capacity is opened.

Fifty dependents' school teachers will receive training in drug abuse educational procedures during the period June 21-July 17, 1971 in Wiesbaden, Germany. Hq. U.S. Army (Europe) has received funds from the Educational Professional Development Act for this purpose.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

*Prevention*

The Office of Economic Opportunity is authorized to conduct a "Drug Rehabilitation Program" under Section 222(a)(9) of the 1969 Amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. The authority relates to discovering the causes of and providing treatment and rehabilitation for drug dependency and narcotic addiction. The major emphasis is on treatment and rehabilitation services, developing community support, and utilizing neighborhood resources and ex-addicts as staff. Community education and prevention activities take place in the context of comprehensive treatment and rehabilitation programs rather than separately, and our programs are by and large funded in such a way that they relate closely to existing OEO-funded Neighborhood Service Center and Neighborhood Health Center de-

livery systems. Research activities are service program oriented. Funding levels are as follows.

Fiscal year 1970.....	\$4,500,000
Fiscal year 1971.....	12,800,000
Fiscal year 1972.....	18,000,000

(Requested budget, about \$15,000,000 would be available for new programs.)

*Treatment*

See Table 1, Treatment Programs for Heroin Addiction and Other Drug Dependencies.

Also, in the area of treatment and rehabilitation there are two contracts for operational Integrated Addict Rehabilitation-Manpower Training Programs: one in Baltimore, Maryland, and one in New Orleans, Louisiana. Each contract will run for a 24-month period, will cost about \$1,000,000, and will serve 650 addicts. (That is, the total for the two contracts will be \$2,000,000 with 1,300 clients served.) The projects will utilize methadone maintenance, counseling, residential services, and supportive modalities. In addition, Department of Labor funding (about \$1,500,000 for each project) will be obtained to provide job-training and employment services. This will be a major effort to develop a coordinated system of services and to open up the private employment sector to ex-addicts. Followup, evaluation, and cost effectiveness systems will be a major part of the effort. The RFP is out and proposals will be due about July 15, 1971.

*Research*

A national evaluation contract which will provide a base for comparative drug treatment program evaluation is scheduled for completion June 30, 1971. This project is to evaluate OEO-aided Drug Rehabilitation Program, providing comprehensive analysis of relative program effectiveness including descriptions of various program components, their relationships to each other, and patterns of client-flow through various services.

*Training*

A grant is being made for the period 6/1/71-6/31/72 in the amount of \$430,000 to the Center for Human Services to operate a National Training Institute in Washington, D.C. This will provide an intensive 6-month training program for ex-addict staff from various local projects with followup back at the local program. It will also provide shorter courses for professional staff and program administrators, especially focused on the peculiarities of an OEO-funded program in terms of its orientation toward the community and its goals of assisting clients out of poverty in addition to providing drug treatment services. There will also be a technical assistance capability to help local programs utilize ex-addict staff more effectively and to develop career ladders and certification procedures. The training project is based on a previously funded research grant which looked at present patterns of utilization of ex-addict staff, effectiveness of ex-addict staff, and current training practices. No capacity for this training endeavor was given.

TABLE 1.—TREATMENT PROGRAMS FOR HEROIN ADDICTION AND OTHER DRUG DEPENDENCIES

Locale	Period	Modality	Approximate number serviced	Total expenditures
Detroit, Mich.....	July 1, 1970 to July 31, 1972.....	Outpatient methadone maintenance (Therapeutic community serving 50 clients to be developed).	1,200	\$1,200,000
L.A., Calif. <sup>2</sup> .....	July 1, 1970 to Aug. 31, 1971.....	Drug-free outpatient with hospital detoxification, counseling, crisis intervention, job placement.	800	<sup>2</sup> (1,000,000) 630,000
Washington, D.C.....	July 1, 1970 to July 31, 1972.....	Youth program (under age 17) utilizing drug-free residential treatment, outpatient counseling and family service.	300	<sup>2</sup> (340,000) 480,000
Chicago, Ill.....	Aug. 1, 1970 to Dec. 31, 1971.....	Hospital detoxification, residential (halfway house), outpatient counseling and vocational services. Drug-free.	300	330,000 <sup>2</sup> (110,000) <sup>2</sup> (120,000)
Boston, Mass.....	July 1, 1970 to Sept. 30, 1972.....	Outpatient and residential services for youth (under age 16) experimenting with drugs.....	500	550,000 <sup>2</sup> (150,000)
New Jersey (Hudson, Essex, and Monmouth Counties) <sup>3</sup> .....	Aug. 1, 1970 to Aug. 31, 1971.....	Drug-free therapeutic community. Outpatient counseling and supportive services. Small methadone maintenance (about 50 clients) being developed.	<sup>4</sup> 200 <sup>3</sup> 500	1,000,000 <sup>2</sup> (500,000)

Locale	Period	Modality	Approximate number serviced	Total expenditures
New York City	July 1, 1971, to Sept. 30, 1972	Part of comprehensive system involving primarily drug-free inpatient and outpatient modalities.	\$ 1,500	\$4,000,000
Philadelphia, Pa.	July 1, 1970, to Dec. 31, 1971	Methadone maintenance (outpatient) with supportive services.	4,000	(2,500,000)
Atlanta, Ga.	July 1, 1971, to June 30, 1973	Methadone withdrawal, methadone maintenance (about 100 clients), drug-free outpatient and inpatient services, group therapy, counseling, crisis intervention and supportive services.	200	250,000
El Paso, Tex.	July 1, 1971 to June 30, 1973	Community outreach, followup and counseling services. Development of contacts with existing methadone maintenance and drug-free modalities for low-income Mexican-American heroin addicts.	500	(110,000)
Tucson, Ariz.	do	Similar to El Paso project.	500	900,000
Southern Alameda County, Calif.	do	Outpatient and residential drug-free modalities for low-income youthful drug abusers.	400	580,000
Vermont (Statewide)	July 1, 1970 to Dec. 31, 1972	Drug-free inpatient and outpatient services primarily to drug abusers (non-opiate). Therapeutic community being developed.	300	(250,000)
Richmond, Va.	July 1, 1970 to July 31, 1972	Therapeutic community and outpatient counseling, supportive and rehabilitative services. Drug-free modalities for heroin addicts. Also provides supportive services for methadone maintenance program.	300	(150,000)
Los Angeles, Calif.	July 1, 1971 to June 30, 1973	Drug-free residential, supportive and job-placement services for incarcerate and heroin addicts.	500	730,000
South Carolina (Statewide)	do	Counseling and group therapy services for addicts and drug-dependent persons in correctional facilities coupled with supportive services in community prerelease centers.	300	(220,000)
Chattanooga, Tenn.	do	Methadone maintenance and therapeutic community (drug-free) services for heroin addicts.	500	590,000
Cincinnati, Ohio	do	Residential, outpatient, group therapy, counseling, and supportive services. Part of ex-offender halfway house system.	500	(300,000)

<sup>1</sup> All figures given represent annual estimates.  
<sup>2</sup> Non-Federal funds.  
<sup>3</sup> Funding to be assumed by NIMH.

<sup>4</sup> Inpatients.  
<sup>5</sup> Outpatients.  
<sup>6</sup> Adults.  
<sup>7</sup> Youth.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education  
Prevention

OE has funded a wide variety of preventive efforts in FY 71. \$6 million was appropriated for programs to be conducted in FY 72.

\$2 million will go in grants to 55 State Education agencies to support continuing programs to train educational personnel.

Twenty-six comprehensive community projects will be supported for a total of \$2,100,000. These projects are intended to involve a variety of community agencies and groups in a cooperative effort to deal with local drug abuse problems.

Twenty college-based projects have been funded for a total of \$700,000. These are intended to serve as pilot projects. They are initiated, designed, and directed by students.

Eleven drug education projects have been initiated by local school districts using \$1.3 million in ESEA Title III funds. These programs call for heavy community involvement.

Seventeen programs are being supported by the Office of Nutrition and Health Services of OE. The programs for the most part are being funded under Title I of the Higher Education Act. ESEA Title III funds are also being used as well as funds under Title IV Regional Research Program. These programs are primarily educational and informational in character, intended to involve and educate a variety of target groups including students, teachers, law enforcement personnel, hospital and nursing home staffs, and the general public regarding drug use.

For a list of 13 projects supported by the Bureau of Higher Education under Title I, HEA, see attached chart. According to the information given, these projects with two exceptions are due to be completed on or before June 1971. An estimated 11,460 persons have been or will be involved as participants in these programs which are primarily, but not exclusively, educational in character. (For other projects specifically concerned with training, see section on Training below.)

Treatment

While no OE funds have supported treatment programs per se, \$197,847 from the Bureau of Adult Vocational Technical Training has been awarded to the Blackman's Development Center in Washington, D.C. for a multi-occupational training program designed to

offer occupational alternatives to drug users and addicts. (According to Department of Labor figures approximately 200 drug addicts are serviced by the Blackman's Development Center.)

Research

The National Center for Education Research and Development of OE is supporting a project which is designed to study and evaluate current trends in drug abuse education. This project is being conducted by the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development in Berkeley, California and is scheduled for completion late this year. It has received \$44,712 in Federal funds.

Training

A total of \$2 million will be expended to provide formula grants to State Departments of Education. In 1970 over one million educators and students were trained through the National Drug Education Program.

The Awareness House project will be expanded to serve as a training center for community personnel who will be trained to develop community drug abuse prevention projects. It will be funded at a level of approximately \$200,000. No information on the capacity of this project is given in the OE report.

A project to train 50 teachers in schools for Department of Defense dependents in drug abuse educational procedures has been funded at a cost of approximately \$100,000.

Of particular interest is a program being funded in FY 72 by the Division of College Support, under EPDA, Part E, entitled "Institute of Drug Education for Personnel of Eight Black Colleges," Alabama A & M, Huntsville, Alabama (\$68,000). No estimates as to the number of participants is given.

Several of the projects being funded by the Bureau of Higher Education involve training programs. An estimated 100 persons participated in a training program entitled "The Development of Resource Personnel for Community Drug Abuse Programs" (University of Georgia). Another BHE project for FY 71 was entitled "Seminars for School Personnel on Personal Problems of Teenagers with Special Emphasis on Drug Abuse." An estimated 2,000 school personnel and youth counselors participated (Medical College of Virginia—Virginia Commonwealth University).

BHE has also funded a project entitled "Students in Community Service" involving some 500 students as participants. These students have worked under faculty direction

with a community of young people at Odyssey House in Newark, New Jersey. The purpose of this project is to provide social support for the patients at Odyssey House.

Food and Drug Administration

Prevention

FDA efforts in this area are minimal.

Treatment

No programs.

Research

The Bureau of Drugs of FDA reports that its efforts in research related to narcotics and dangerous drugs are concerned with drug testing methodology and with the screening of new analgesics—defining their propensity for causing habit formation and physical dependence.

Training

No programs.

National Institute of Mental Health

Prevention

NIMH prevention activities take the form of promoting the development and dissemination of education materials. These materials and their distribution are described in the attached Fiscal Year 1971 Summary and "A Guide to Drug Abuse Education and Information Materials."

Treatment

The National Institute of Mental Health funds treatment and rehabilitation programs for narcotic addicts and drug abusers under both grant and contract mechanisms. The grant program includes staffing grants to comprehensive drug treatment centers under Part D of the Community Mental Health Centers Act and special project grants for single or separate services under P.L. 91-513, the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970. The contract program is limited to the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966 (NARA).

The grant program. Currently there are twenty-three community-based grant funded programs for the treatment of narcotic addicts and drug abusers. Eighteen of these funded programs are now operational and the additional five are in the process of commencing operations (New Orleans, D.C., Pittsburgh, Miami, Philadelphia). The number of individuals treatment approaches and location for these grants are shown in the accompanying Table T. At the present time, it is not possible to separate funds used for treating narcotic addicts from those used for other drug abusers. The Institute is cur-

rently reviewing grant applications pursuant to section 256 of P.L. 91-513 (detoxification, institutional, aftercare services). It is anticipated that up to fifteen new programs will be funded in Fiscal Year 1971 with the \$5 million appropriated under this authority.

**The contract program.** The contract program under NARA includes examination and evaluation services, inpatient treatment services, and aftercare services carried out in facilities other than Fort Worth and Lexington Hospitals. The majority of examination and evaluation and inpatient treatment services, however, is carried out at these two hospitals. On March 31, 1971 there were 2,074 individuals in the NARA program distributed as in Table T.

2. Los Angeles Center for Group Psychotherapy Grant #T15 MH12319-01 \$81,443.

To train 90 school counselors, probation officers and mental health professionals in group techniques appropriate for treating adolescent and young adult drug abusers.

3. Roosevelt Hospital (New York) Grant #T15 MH12320-01 \$3,222.

To train physicians in the scope of the drug abuse problem and prevention and treatment techniques.

4. University of California (Berkeley) Grant #T01 MH12564-01 \$150,378.

To establish a specialized drug abuse training unit in the Post-Master's Community Mental Health Program of the Department of Social Welfare.

#### Social and Rehabilitation Service

##### Prevention

SRS has supported a number of projects in the prevention area.

Examples include the Community Services Administration's support of family life education efforts in various locales and other educational programs which include a focus

on drug abuse prevention among children and youth.

The Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration of SRS has supported or is supporting a variety of projects in the area of drug abuse prevention. These include the recently funded project of Boston Model Cities Administration. This project focuses on an informational approach to prevention as well as providing counseling and referral services. Other projects in this area supported by YDDPA include the "Drug Use, Misuse and Abuse Education Program" conducted by the State Planning Bureau in Atlanta, Georgia; the Youth Drug Abuse Prevention Project conducted by Flight, Inc., in Rochester, N.Y.; and the "Store-Front Drug Program" conducted by the Berkshire Farm Institute for Training and Research, Inc., Canaan, N.Y.

##### Treatment

See Table 1, Treatment Programs for Heroin Addiction and Other Drug Dependencies.

Also in the area of treatment and rehabilitation, the Rehabilitation Services Administration is planning to stimulate and implement 15 to 20 Expansion Grant projects aimed at increasing substantially the number of drug abusers rehabilitated into gainful employment.

##### Research

The major emphasis of the demonstration project of the Oregon State Mental Health Division is to evaluate the effectiveness of two methods of treatment on the vocational rehabilitation of young adult drug abusers. Pre- and post-data on performance variables and psychological and social functioning will be collected and compared. This project is being supported by Division of Research and Demonstration Grants, SRS, monies.

The Division of Disability Services, Rehabilitation Services Administration, SRS, is

planning to develop and initiate four to five Research and Demonstration projects designed to find new and improved methods for rehabilitating the drug abuser.

The Community Services Administration of SRS is soliciting information on whether adult public assistance recipients are known by the public welfare agency to be suffering from drug addiction.

##### Training

The Rehabilitation Services Administration of SRS plans to support five bi-regional training conferences for State rehabilitation agency staff in rehabilitation of the drug abuser.

The Rehabilitation Services Administration also supports a training grant program authorized under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act. This program is aimed at increasing the supply of personnel in the rehabilitation fields by helping training programs to expand and by offering aid to students. The objectives of this grant program also include working with professional groups to improve the quality of preparation; facilitating communication and working relationships among the professional rehabilitation fields; and to give workers in the rehabilitation field opportunities to improve their skills. No figures were given as to the capacity of these training efforts.

The Community Services Administration of SRS has supported a variety of training programs sponsored by State public welfare departments. The purpose of these training programs included the development of the skills and capacities of a variety of social service staff. Community Services Administration does not maintain data on the capacity of these training programs for prevention, community organization, and treatment personnel in specific problem areas such as drug abuse.

TABLE 1.—TREATMENT PROGRAMS FOR HEROIN ADDICTION AND OTHER DRUG DEPENDENCIES

Locale	Period	Modality	Approximate number serviced	Total expenditures
Washington, D.C.	Fiscal year 1971	VR services to methadone maintained	240	\$112,000
Minneapolis, Minn.	do	VR services to hospital inpatient narcotic addicts	75	27,778
Nassau County, N.Y.	do	Evaluation and VR services to disadvantaged addicts	250	25,810
Hartford-Waterbury, Conn.	do	VR services and counseling	75	38,330
Tulsa, Okla.	do	Counseling and psychiatric	25	12,500
Portland, Oreg. <sup>1</sup>	do	Individual or group psychotherapy, detoxification and medical, vocational, social, occupational, recreational, and educational services in addition to family casework services and religion	100 clients annually	\$194,095
Brooklyn, N.Y. <sup>2</sup>	July 1, 1970-June 30, 1971	Detoxification as often as necessary under medical supervision, group treatment (Guided Group interaction model)	25 girls, ages 12 to 16	168,866
Anchorage, Alaska <sup>3</sup>	Not given (recently funded)	Halfway house to aid drug users in kicking their habit and reentering society	150 to 250 youths, 16 to 22	55,414

<sup>1</sup> This program is in the Psycho-Social Study Section, Drug Abuse Research and Demonstration Project, SRS.

<sup>2</sup> 2d year, \$209,000; 3d year, \$207,000.

<sup>3</sup> These programs are funded by the Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration, SRS.

Note: The first five programs are in the Division of Disability Services of SRS. There is no data available on drug dependence or addiction treatment per se from the Office of Service Delivery, SRS.

#### DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

HUD was unable to comply with the deadline set for receipt of information because this information is available only through its regional offices. The regional offices of the Department have been contacted and should be responding to the request for program information within a week or two. HUD will then send this information to NIMH to be collated and forwarded to the White House at the earliest possible date.

#### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

##### Law Enforcement Assistance Administration Prevention

The Prevention/Public Education program has been attended to largely in Large City/County Special Grants Program. Likewise, the Narcotics and Dangerous Drug Control Program (K-1 and K-2) have also provided a vehicle by which this area can be addressed. The major focus of prevention has been directed at the nation's youth through the development and implementation of pre-

ventive education programs in all grades of the public school system; e.g., grammar, junior high, and senior high. State and local medical, educational, and law enforcement personnel have worked jointly in the preparation and presentation of these programs. The National Institute of Mental Health and BNDD have likewise assisted in the development of informational materials for this purpose.

Public Education response to the narcotics/dangerous drug abuse problem is seen in programs developed for presentation to parents, civic groups, church organizations, and other interested citizen bodies. The intent here is perhaps three-fold: (1) to inform the adult community of the nature and extent of the problem; (2) to inform adults of what is being done; and (3) to prepare them for a possible personal confrontation with drugs as it may affect their own children.

##### Treatment

See Table 1, Drug Abuse Programs (Discretionary Grants Only—Action Grants Not Available) FY/71 Available Data.

##### Research

Information regarding only two discretionary grants involving research/data collection is available for FY 70-71. These are the Police/Community Information Program in Anchorage, Alaska funded for \$40,000 and the Commission on Drug Abuse-Treatment Program and Facility, Memphis, Tennessee, funded for \$75,000. The Anchorage, Alaska project involves establishing a data and information bank. The Memphis, Tennessee project involves studying and researching the causes of alcoholism and drug abuse related problems.

##### Training

Intensive training for the members of these special enforcement units have been emphasized throughout LEAA programs, the establishment of close liaison between local and state agencies and BNDD have been insisted upon regarding development of training programs, utilization of existing programs, and further continuous unit training. No figures representing the number of persons trained or to be trained were given.

TABLE 1.—DRUG ABUSE PROGRAMS (DISCRETIONARY GRANTS ONLY—ACTION GRANTS NOT AVAILABLE) FISCAL YEAR 1971 AVAILABLE DATA

Locale	Period	Modality	Approximate number serviced	Total expenditures
Broward County, Fla.	Aug. 1, 1970-July 31, 1971	Detoxification, physical and psychiatric evaluation, rehabilitation through psychiatric treatment and counseling, guided group interaction therapy.	500 (30 to 40 in residential care program).	\$200,000
Chicago, Ill. (drug abuse rehabilitation program—addict offenders).	Aug. 24, 1970-Aug. 23, 1971	Group and individual counseling.	200 to 300 addict offenders.	200,000
Boston, Mass. (Norfolk County comprehensive interconventional drug addict treatment program).	Apr. 15, 1971-Apr. 14, 1972	Includes methadone maintenance and a self-help-type halfway house, therapy, and counseling.	No estimate given.	154,318
Whitmore Lake, Mich. (serving adolescents from Detroit, Flint, Grand Rapids, and Highland Park) adolescent drug use limitation and treatment.	Aug. 15, 1970-Aug. 14, 1971	do.	360 adolescents.	92,475
Royal Oak, Mich. (alcohol and drug abuse treatment center).	Fiscal year 1971	No information given.	No information given.	101,046
St. Louis, Mo. (community-based treatment and supervision of selected offenders—narcotics).	December 1, 1970-December 30, 1971	Prewithdrawal counseling, withdrawal under medical supervision, short-term residential accommodations, crisis intervention, varied counseling and guidance.	Estimated 200 can be handled on a post-release basis.	79,285
Trenton, N.J. (drug addiction treatment, rehabilitation; and prevention).	July 1, 1970-June 30, 1971	Includes residential treatment center (modeled after Dayton Village, N.Y. City with total utilization of ex-addicts as staff).	Residential center designed to serve 70.	139,600
Columbus, Ohio (preventive program for metro narcotics and drug abuse enforcement).	September 7, 1970-September 6, 1971.	Includes medically supervised withdrawal program.	No information given.	75,000
Memphis, Tenn. (commission on drug abuse-treatment program and facility).	August 15, 1970-August 14, 1971.	Psychological and sociological counseling included in voluntary treatment program.	22-bed facility.	75,000
Travis, Texas (comprehensive treatment program for young drug users).	September 7, 1970-September 6, 1971.	Inpatient and outpatient therapy, including voluntary "walk-in" referral and crisis services.	No information given.	52,470

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs  
Prevention

BNDD's efforts in the area of prevention include a public inquiry program which responds to requests for information on the problem of drug abuse, drugs being used, and various aspects of the drug problem as related to preventive enforcement and the problem of illegal drug use in the community. In addition, a community organizational program involving 13 pilot projects is being conducted. The emphasis of this is to promote a total community effort to prevent drug abuse, which includes law enforcement and other elements in the criminal justice system.

BNDD's preventive efforts also include a dissemination of information on drug laws and regulations to the registrants under the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970.

Other preventive efforts include stimulating program activities among the pharmaceutical manufacturers and associations. Other developmental activities in which the Bureau has been involved have recently included a conference for artists to explore

means of utilizing the artistic community at the local level in providing alternatives to drug abuse. Other activities have involved the clergy, educators, law enforcement, and media people.

## Treatment

BNDD has no treatment programs.

## Research

See BNDD report (attachment 1).

## Training

No estimate of numbers of persons who can be or have been trained through BNDD was contained in its report.

Major training efforts are conducted for professionals in the enforcement field and related areas to orient them to the need and the advantages of preventing drug abuse as opposed to concentrating only upon the enforcement aspects of the drug problem.

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

## Bureau of Prisons

## Prevention

No programs reported on.

## Treatment

Two categories of treatment programs: one functioning under the Narcotic Addict Re-

habilitation Act (NARA); the other—Drug Abuse Program—treating offenders currently in the Federal prison population who have drugs as a contributing cause to their criminal behavior and who do not qualify under NARA. See Table 1, Treatment Programs for Heroin Addiction and Other Drug Dependencies.

## Research

No research findings as yet to report. Collection of data in progress to help determine significant variables affecting treatment outcomes.

## Training

Since NARA provides for an aftercare phase, a series of conference workshops with community agencies and probation agents have been held. (No figure is given as to the numbers of persons who have participated in these programs.)

Of some interest is the fact that several of the releasees from the NARA programs have been hired by community organizations who are concerned with the "drug problem." The releasees are functioning as counselors and lecturers to various groups in the community. The Bureau of Prisons has contracted with some of these releasees to help in the continuing development of an effective treatment program.

TABLE 1.—TREATMENT PROGRAMS FOR HEROIN ADDICTION AND OTHER DRUG DEPENDENCIES

## A. NARA (NARCOTIC ADDICT REHABILITATION ACT)

Locale	Period	Modality	Approximate number serviced (capacity)	Total expenditures
Danbury, Conn.	Fiscal year 1971	Primarily therapeutic community approach.	200	See below.
Milan, Mich.	do.	do.	50	Do.
Alderson, W. Va.	do.	do.	100 women	Do.
La Tuna, Tex.	do.	do.	100—50 women	Do.
Terminal Island, Calif.	do.	do.	100 men, 50 women	Do.
Five programs funded for.....				\$560,400

<sup>1</sup> Salaries, \$436,200; operating costs, \$124,200. Also, \$525,000 in aftercare contracts have been let with community agencies, fiscal year 1971.

## B. DRUG ABUSE PROGRAM (FOR THOSE NOT QUALIFIED TO RECEIVE TREATMENT UNDER NARA)

Facilities at Lewisburg, Pa.; Petersburg, Va.; Terre Haute, Ind.; El Reno, Okla.; and Lompoc, Calif.; will be providing treatment in fiscal year 1972 for drug abusers who do not qualify under NARA. To date, \$80,000 has been allocated for fiscal year 1971 to cover the costs of construction.

The major emphasis of the information program on drug smuggling and abuse by the United States Bureau of Customs is to stress law enforcement activities. This serves several purposes: one, it reinforces that there is a drug abuse crisis and tells the public what is being done to combat the problem; two, it asks the public to cooperate with local, state and federal authorities so that more can be done to solve the problem; and, three, it acts to deter amateur smuggling of illegal drugs into the United States.

This information program by Customs is

implemented: from the speaker's platform; through news releases that generate editorials, news and feature articles; and, by use of posters, flyers, and radio and television public service announcements to inform the public of certain inconveniences they may experience because of the search for illegal drugs.

The Bureau cooperates with the travel industry and other government agencies in programs to slow drug smuggling and abuse in the United States. It has also participated in presentations by the White House for the

television and radio industries on ways to curb drug abuse in America.

Additional information may be obtained from the Bureau of Customs, Office of Information and Publications, Treasury Department, Washington, D.C. 20226. Telephone 202-964-2475.

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

## Prevention

A special film and other educational materials are being developed specifically for lower class and inner city populations be-

cause of the paucity of suitable material for Job Corps training programs. Guidelines for conducting drug education and counseling have been prepared for use in Job Corps training programs.

**Treatment**

See Table 1, Treatment Programs for Heroin Addiction and Other Drug Dependencies.

Other efforts supported by DOL in the treatment and rehabilitation area include the VERA Institute of Justice of New York City which takes people arrested for less serious crimes and, prior to trial, gives these people (many of whom are drug addicts) an opportunity for rehabilitation and training.

Another similar program—not specifically geared to drug abusers but involving many—is Project Crossroads in Washington, D.C. This project is sponsored by the National

Committee for Children and Youth and funded by the Department of Labor. It is a pretrial diversion program for youthful offenders. The program stresses career development, using employment, training, and other supportive services. Project Crossroads, like the VERA Institute of Justice program, relies heavily upon non-professional staff.

**Research**

DOL has contracted with the New York State Narcotic Addiction Control Commission to make some special tabulations from an ongoing survey of drug use among the general population of New York State in August 1970 which would show the extent of drug use among different occupational groups in the labor force. See the attached report for further specifics regarding the survey findings.

**Training**

A most extensive training effort has been undertaken by the Job Corps in DOL. The Job Corps organized a series of nine technical assistance seminars which could aid in the recognition of symptoms and in dealing with drug users. The first seminar was held in mid-January 1971 in Washington, D.C. Other seminars are scheduled for June 21-23 in Philadelphia. The six remaining seminars will be conducted July through September 1971. No specific information is given as to the number of persons who can participate or who have participated in each technical assistance seminar. The DOL report states that approximately 70 people in each Manpower Administration region were found to need background information and training in the drug area. This would bring the intended number of participants to no less than 630 persons.

TABLE 1.—TREATMENT PROGRAMS FOR HEROIN ADDICTION AND OTHER DRUG DEPENDENCIES

Locale	Period	Modality	Approximate number serviced	Total expenditures
Washington, D.C., <sup>1</sup> Residential Manpower Center	Mar. 15, 1971	Methadone treatment (program for detoxified addicts who are physically and psychologically capable of undertaking job training).	No information given	No information given.
Baltimore, Md., Westinghouse Learning Corp.	Fiscal year 1971	Job training and placement of ex-addicts	3 treatment programs but no information re numbers serviced.	Do. <sup>2</sup>
New Orleans, La., New Orleans Association of General Contractors.	do.	Job training and placement of ex-addicts	No information given	Do. <sup>2</sup>
Washington, D.C., Blackman's Development Center.	February 26, 1971	Institutional training program for rehabilitated drug addicts (training courses 26 weeks in length).	200	\$325,000 (plus \$198,000 from HEW).

<sup>1</sup> Two other similar demonstration projects are scheduled to begin prior to the end of fiscal year 1971 at 2 other Job Corps yet to be announced.

<sup>2</sup> On both of these projects DOL is working in conjunction with OEO. OEO plans to award operating contracts for 8 more cities in fiscal year 1972.

**PITTSBURGH DISTRICT OF THE U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS**

**HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend the Pittsburgh district of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, which has accomplished many notable objectives in my 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, celebrated its 107th anniversary.

The occasion was highlighted with a dinner where Col. E. C. West, the district engineer, cited certain employees for meritorious service which spanned 30 and 40 years. Guest speaker at this anniversary observance was Maj. Gen. W. L. Starnes, division engineer.

The Pittsburgh district of the corps has functioned as a civil works arm of the corps since 1864 and it has been active in water resource development, navigational improvement, and flood control measures in the area in and around the city of Pittsburgh. Just a few weeks ago I had the pleasure of meeting with Colonel West and members of his staff to explore the possibilities for greater utilization of waterways in the Mon-Yough Valley.

We discussed flood control measures along the length of the Monongahela River. Periodically, that river leaves its banks and inundates industrial plants, causing extensive damages and lost production time. Colonel West and I also held a preliminary hearing on the opening of industrial-recreational facilities along the Youghiogheny River, which will give a considerable boost to the

economy of the Mon-Yough River Valley.

Mr. Speaker, I was most impressed with Colonel West and found him to be most cooperative, interested, and courteous. It is a pleasure, therefore, to add my personal commendations for the illustrious record achieved by the Pittsburgh district of the corps and to extend my best wishes for continued success in the years to come.

**GOLD MEDALLION GIVEN TO GOVERNOR THATCHER FOR PUBLIC SERVICE**

**HON. STROM THURMOND**

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on September 9, 1970, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 116, part 23, page 30960, the story of a splendid program at the Cosmos Club on August 15, 1970, honoring Gov. Maurice H. Thatcher in celebration of his centenary date. The program, truly outstanding in every respect, was carried out by the Panama Canal Society in Washington, D.C., with its then president, Prof. Edwin J. Lewis presiding. What I now say should be read in connection with what I said on September 9 last.

The gold medallion awarded by the Canal Zone authorities and the Panama Canal Co.—which award was made on July 31, 1970—to Governor Thatcher for exceptional public service was not minted at the time the indicated celebration occurred. It took considerable time to

prepare the design and inscriptions of the medallion; then further time was needed for minting the medallion in the United States, before the actual delivery could follow. Finally, all of the required work was done and the medallion delivered to the awardee.

The medallion, like other works of art and skill is a "thing of beauty" which should last forever. The front face of the medallion depicts in relief two Panama Canal builders with shovels in hand and a steam shovel, with suspended bucket, behind the workers. Above the depiction appear the words, "Panama Canal," and on the lower rim appear the words "Honorary Public Service Award." On the other face, appear the words, "For Exceptional Public Service, Presented to Maurice H. Thatcher, July 31, 1970." As generally known, Governor Thatcher is the only surviving member of the Isthmian Canal Commission which supervised the construction of the Panama Canal.

The medallion is 3 inches in diameter, and the whole constitutes the finest example of art and textualization, and Governor Thatcher, very naturally, is deeply grateful and appreciative of this tangible token of honor.

It may be appropriate, in this connection, to speak of another honor accorded to Governor Thatcher: That in the form of a resolution adopted October 17, 1970, by the Board of Assistants of the General Society of Mayflower Descendants at Plymouth, Mass., at the board's annual meeting.

Governor Thatcher is of Pilgrim stock, being a lineal descendant of Elder William Brewster, who, throughout the Pilgrim era is considered as the Patriarch of the Pilgrims, and an outstanding leader

of the Pilgrim effort in behalf of the establishment of civil and religious liberty in the new world. In this effort, it was wholly successful and its action was inspirational to the other colonies. Indeed the other American colonies, including South Carolina, were as one in establishing the great principles thus involved.

The Pilgrim Colony, unlike the other colonies, never had a Crown Governor, but elected its own Governor each year, and for the ensuing 72 years of its life was governed under the famous Mayflower Compact.

In a recent issue of the *Mayflower Quarterly*, the official organ of the General Society of Mayflower Descendants, there was published the next of resolutions adopted by the society's General Board of Assistants, highly commendatory of Governor Thatcher's services in keeping vital the story of the Pilgrims.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the *Extensions of Remarks*.

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

#### RESOLUTION

Adopted by the Board of Assistants of the General Society of Mayflower Descendants at its Annual Meeting held at Plymouth, Massachusetts on 17 October 1970.

Whereas, the Board of Assistants of the General Society of Mayflower Descendants records with a great deal of pleasure the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of The Honorable Maurice Hudson Thatcher, who was born in Chicago, Illinois on August 15, 1870; and

Whereas, Mr. Thatcher became a member of the District of Columbia Society of Mayflower Descendants in 1924 by reason of his descent from Elder William Brewster and served as Governor of our District of Columbia Society from 1939 to 1946, and, in September 1948 at the 18th General Congress of our Society, was elected Assistant General from our District of Columbia Society and was reelected to this office in 1951 at the 19th General Congress when he was also appointed Chairman of the Committee to consider amending our Constitution regarding subversives and Chairman of the Resolutions Committee, and, in September 1952, was elected Deputy Governor General from our District of Columbia Society, and, at the 20th General Congress, in September 1954, was elected Counsellor General, serving as such until 1957, during which time he was also Chairman of a special committee on our Constitution and By-Laws, and, at the 21st, 22nd and 23rd General Congresses, and at all the intervening Annual Meetings of the General Board of Assistants, he served as Parliamentarian, and, at the 21st General Congress, in September 1957, was elected Honorary Counsellor General for life; and

Whereas, in addition to his service to our Society, Mr. Thatcher has a distinguished record of public service, becoming, in 1901, Assistant United States Attorney for Kentucky's Western District and, in 1910, was appointed by President Taft a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission which supervised the construction of the Panama Canal and served as Civil Governor of the Canal Zone for more than three years presently being the last surviving member of the Canal Commission, and, in 1961, the United States Congress having unanimously named the new twenty million dollar bridge across the Canal at the Pacific entrance, "The Thatcher Ferry Bridge", and

Whereas, Mr. Thatcher served in Congress

from the Louisville, Kentucky District from 1923 to 1933 and was a member of a number of important Congressional committees and sponsored many beneficial Acts, and was largely responsible for the creation of the United States air mail service; and

Whereas, since leaving Congress, he has been an effective sponsor of beneficial legislation for the civilian builders and operators of the Panama Canal, and has been active in many civic and conservationist committees and organizations; and

Whereas, among his other accomplishments, Mr. Thatcher is a well-known and published poet, whose quatrains have often been reproduced in our "Mayflower Quarterlies"; now therefore

Be It Resolved, that the Board of Assistants of the General Society of Mayflower Descendants at this, its first Annual Meeting since Mr. Thatcher's one hundredth birthday, wish him many happy returns of the day, and express its deep appreciation to The Honorable Maurice Hudson Thatcher for all he has done for the Society of Mayflower Descendants and for the people of the United States and acclaim him as an outstanding statesman, conservationist and benefactor; and

Be It Further Resolved, that a copy of this Resolution be placed on file with the permanent records of the General Society of Mayflower Descendants, and that a copy of this Resolution be sent to Mr. Thatcher.

#### CBS CONTEMPT CITATION

### HON. MORGAN F. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1971

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, one of the situations we, as Members of the U.S. Congress, are called upon daily to face is that of reporting our activities to those whom we represent. We must tell our constituents why we vote the way we do on certain measures and explain to them the reasons for our actions.

Recently this august body was faced with the task of judging whether the Columbia Broadcasting System and its president should be held in contempt of Congress for not producing filmed outtakes and certain documents which concerned the CBS documentary film "The Selling of the Pentagon."

I do not think it is necessary at this time to go into the details of the matter since we are all familiar with them, but I would like to take this opportunity to explain, for the record, my position and the reason I voted not to recommit the contempt measure back to the Commerce Committee.

The situation is quite perplexing, in my judgment, for where does freedom of the press end with regard to the right of the masses to be accurately informed? And yet, by what authority does the Congress take upon itself the role of watchdog, to judge what is fair and honest reporting and to demand that members of the news media present evidence that what they have reported is accurate and note intentionally misleading or deceiving?

We have all had occasion to disagree with stories and the way they have been

reported so it should not be surprising that the Defense Department took exception to the way the "Selling of the Pentagon" was presented. The program was aimed at telling the American people exactly where their tax dollar is going in terms of national defense. It has already been agreed that some of the program was inaccurate and the evidence of this was presented by CBS in documents it supplied to the Commerce Committee, as well as texts already inserted into the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD*.

But it has been recently revealed that the Pentagon itself gave false information to CBS insofar as the amount spent to conduct special tours for businessmen. They told CBS the amount was in the neighborhood of \$14,000 while the actual amount was more like \$80,000.

I feel that this case, similar in nature to the case of the New York Times and the Pentagon papers, should be referred to the courts if the Defense Department feels it has a justifiable complaint against the facts as reported by CBS. Thus far this has not been done.

There are times, gentlemen, when we face decisions which we would rather not face. It has happened to all of us at some time or another and it will always be that way. The decision to cite CBS for contempt was one which I faced with much reluctance.

We all heard the arguments from both CBS and the chairman of the Commerce Committee. Yet I, for one, must admit I was swallowed up in the pros and cons of the situation to the point where the facts became unclear and the distortions in statements exaggerated.

CBS contends that any attempt to review the requested materials would be an infringement on the Constitutional authority of freedom of the press. The esteemed chairman of the Commerce Committee said he was afraid if CBS got away with certain distortion in the film shown to the American public, that sooner or later, television would take over and rule through its power of bringing information to the public.

The Commerce Committee did an admirable job examining certain allegations that distortions were present in the documentary. The distortions were revealed and printed in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD*.

But if the issues were to be pursued, I would the proper place for adjudication is in the courts. They are the ones who can decide what, if anything, was illegal.

The Congress, by failing to vote on the issue, by burying the matter in the Commerce Committee, has ignored its responsibility to stand up and be counted.

The late President John F. Kennedy in his book "Profiles in Courage" gives numerous examples of men who were willing to take a stand on issues. I think the Congress should have dealt with this matter the only way reasonable—by voting to cite CBS in contempt and let the courts settle the matter in the American method of justice. After all, this country was founded in the interest of justice to all, and the minute we skirt that responsibility, we have lost something that makes this country great.

## FEDERAL DISCRIMINATION

## HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, problems will always arise in any group when the leaders attempt to put themselves above their own laws—when the people in power try to stop the members of the group from doing something while they themselves continue to act in this supposedly prohibited manner.

We are told by psychologists, psychiatrists, and even by well-informed parents that one of the primary causes of dissonance and revolt among the youth of this country is that the older generation is hypocritical, that it is trying to tell the youth that they cannot do something, while all the while doing it themselves. You cannot convince a kid that smoking is bad with a cigarette in your mouth.

Even the laborers of this country will testify to this fact. Any foreman will tell you that he dare not try to tell his crew to do something that he cannot or will not do or has not done. In fact, any leader of any caliber will tell you that you have to be in the forefront—you have to be willing to set an example.

This simple lesson in leadership has somehow failed to be impressed on this Congress or on our Nation's leaders. The problems that presently confront this country can be traced to the fact that we have no leadership that will lead—we have no one willing to pay the price and set an example for our people to follow.

On February 18, 1971, I introduced a bill, House Concurrent Resolution 172, to make it "the sense of Congress that each officer or employee of the Federal Government who is residing and working in the District of Columbia and who has a child qualified to attend an elementary or secondary school should send such child to an elementary or secondary school in the public school system of the District of Columbia." My objective was simple—to ask the people in positions of leadership, who make the laws to come forward and set an example for the Nation by sending their children to the public schools in the District. Opposition was encountered when I testified before the District Committee—our leaders, they call themselves that, are not willing to pay the price.

Just like the permissive parent who refuses to punish his child, our leaders refuse to move up front and set the example for our people. Either it is too much trouble for them, or, and I prefer to believe this, they realize that the laws are themselves bad.

The fact that this Government is in the hands of people who feel that they are themselves above the law has been made evident again in an article that appeared in the Washington Evening Star of July 13, 1971. In this article, Secretary Richardson of HEW admits, in colorful language that, though there are Federal laws prohibiting certain State actions that are discriminatory in nature,

especially in certain States, the Federal Government can, in fact, discriminate itself against the States and there is no law that would prohibit them.

The analogy is evident. We cannot expect this country to return to anything resembling a normal state until the Federal Government starts practicing what it preaches—until it stops discriminating against one section of the country and using it as a whipping boy for all so-called evils in this Nation.

I include the news article from the Washington Evening Star of July 13, 1971, and my resolution on education in the District at this point:

## RICHARDSON CITES BIAS LAW LIMITS

(By John Mathews)

Health, Education and Welfare Secretary Elliot L. Richardson said today existing laws and court decisions severely limit the power of the government to force desegregation of schools in the North.

He added that the administration is doing everything it can under current standards to produce more desegregation in the North, including the assignment of about 80 of its civil rights personnel to Northern cases, compared with 52 to concentrate on the South.

The secretary also criticized Northern liberals for failing to acknowledge the "real change in human attitudes and relationship" that has taken place in the South.

## ANGERED AT REPORTER

Richardson said he has seen a degree of candor in black-white exchanges on biracial advisory desegregation committees that does not exist in the North. He also cited recent HEW figures showing that 39 percent of black school children in the South attend integrated schools, while 28 percent in the North do so.

Secretary Richardson bristled when a reporter suggested the administration was taking the position that little can be done to desegregate Northern schools.

"Damn it," he said, "I have to answer this at every single press conference." He added, "I don't see any constitutional theory where we could, if we wanted to, require desegregation in the North without the presence of official state action."

## LIMITS TO BUSING

Richardson explained that in the North, the government must prove that deliberate discriminatory actions by state and local authorities results in a segregation pattern, such as zoning or locating schools to insure that they are segregated. Current laws and court decisions do not allow the government to move against de facto segregation resulting from neighborhood housing patterns. In the South, the secretary said, court decisions have found since 1954 that laws providing for segregated schools are unconstitutional and de jure segregated patterns must be reversed.

The secretary said proving a long-range pattern of government action in the North resulting in racial discrimination in the schools is a laborious process. It takes some 2,500 man hours on a Northern discrimination case for every one hour required to prove a Southern case.

Speaking with reporters at a breakfast meeting today, Richardson said that even if the Supreme Court were to rule eventually that the North must desegregate its schools on the same basis as the South, the "problem of fashioning effective remedies would still remain."

Cities in the North as well as the South are much more complicated to desegregate than smaller communities, he said. There are limits to how far a child can be bused, for example, Richardson said.

The secretary offered no new approaches to desegregation in the North, other than to

say that courts could more narrowly define what constitutes "official state action," which would make it easier for HEW to move against Northern school districts. In the South, he added, the job of desegregation is "largely finished," although some problems remain of segregatory practices within schools and classrooms.

## H. CON. RES. 172

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that each officer or employee of the Federal Government who is residing and working in the District of Columbia and who has a child qualified to attend an elementary or secondary school should send such child to an elementary or secondary school in the public school system of the District of Columbia.

## DOING BUSINESS WITH YAHYA

## HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD at this point an article from the New York Times of July 12, 1971, entitled "Doing Business With Yahya":

## DOING BUSINESS WITH YAHYA

(By Anthony Lewis)

LONDON, July 11.—After Hitler, there were many—and not only Germans by any means—who said they had had no idea of the extent of the horror. They knew terrible things were happening, but six million Jews in the gas chambers.

Similarly with Stalin's terror in the Soviet Union, it took years for people even in the West to appreciate the level of brutality and murder that obtained. And in Vietnam: most of us failed for too long to understand the inevitable consequences of American tactics in terms of human misery, death and destruction.

Right now another immense human disaster is taking place for political reasons. This time there can be no excuse for any informed person failing to understand what is happening; contemporary accounts leave little of the horror to the imagination. And yet, somehow, some responsible men do not see.

The disaster is in East Pakistan. Since West Pakistani troops moved in last spring to suppress the Eastern political movement, six million people have fled to India. Tens, probably hundreds of thousands have been killed. And the feeble Pakistani propaganda claim to be dealing only with "miscreants" does not conceal the fact that the army is killing and terrorizing on grounds of race and politics.

A first-hand account of the savagery appeared on June 13 in The Sunday Times of London. It was by Anthony Mascarenhas, a West Pakistani journalist who went to the East with a group at the army's invitation but was so sickened by what he saw that he came to Britain to tell the truth.

Mascarenhas saw the troops kill men because they were not circumcised—and were therefore presumptively Hindus. He saw Bengali Moslem villages burnt. West Pakistan officers told him they were ready to prevent the East's secession, if necessary, by killing two million people and running the country as a colony for thirty years. He concluded that they meant it, that they were determined to push through their "final solution" of the East Bengal problem.

Within the last few days that picture of life under the army in East Pakistan has had authoritative and independent confirmation

from two weighty sources. Both make clear, moreover, that the terror did not stop soon after the army takeover but has continued.

One of these sources is the report by a joint team of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, just distributed to the Bank's directors. It found a continuing reign of military terror in East Pakistan. Much of the urban population has been killed or has fled, the report said; guerrilla activity is growing.

The other persuasive confirmation comes from four members of the British Parliament who have just toured the area. Two were Conservative and two Labor M.P.'s; they went at the invitation of the Pakistan Government and were hardly prejudiced against it. But they came back saying they were sickened by what one called the army's "continuing repression, using the most brutal methods."

Now General Yahya Khan is not Hitler, and it is doubtless true that his Government did not set out deliberately to commit mass murder and destruction in its Eastern territory. But those are the results.

That is why the silence in some quarters is so puzzling. President Nixon has said nothing. That great moralist, U Thant, who regularly criticizes American action in Vietnam, has not had much to say about racial killing by Pakistani soldiers. And there are many others.

The answer must be that they are all practical men. Yahya is in charge, and so it is necessary to do business with him. That is the import of recent testimony by a State Department official who said that a cut-off of American aid would "undermine the productive political relations with the Government of Pakistan."

Even in practical terms that is a doubtful argument. The World Bank mission reported that chaos in East Pakistan precluded effective use of aid now. The British Government among others has said there must first be a political settlement—necessarily meaning some form of autonomy for the East.

Reginald Prentice, who was Minister for Overseas Development in the Labor Government, wrote after visiting Pakistan that outside economic pressure on the Pakistani generals was the "only hope." His experience in the aid field, he said, made him think it was "wrong in 99 cases out of 100 to attach political conditions—but this is the 100th."

There are now reports in London that the Communist Chinese Government is reassessing its commitment to Yahya Khan; it may have come to feel that a split between East and West Pakistan is inevitable. Hopefully, Henry Kissinger will bring back from his visit to Pakistan a realistic appraisal of the political future.

But the American interest goes beyond realism. We can no longer have any illusions about our ability to make unpleasant governments around the world behave well, but there does come a point at which self-respect requires us to stop helping them. That is why an American official, one who is certainly a realist, said the other day:

"There is not much we can do about East Pakistan, but I dislike—pardon the phrase—our moral posture."

#### CIVIL DEFENSE PLANNING

### HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, it took a Berlin crisis to stir our Nation into thinking about civil defense on a grand scale. But in recent years, civil defense has begun to drift into the shadows of public view and even congressional re-

view. I submit that what civil defense needs today is a good old-fashioned revival.

One of the best articles I have seen on civil defense planning appeared July 4 in the San Diego Union and was written by the very distinguished and able Frank Macomber who spent 15 years covering the Washington scene, including the Pentagon. In his analysis, the reporter mentions that Chairman HÉBERT of the House Armed Services Committee has promised that our Civil Defense Subcommittee, of which I am ranking minority member, intends to make a complete review of our civil defense program which may be fighting for its own survival. So that our colleagues can have the benefit of Mr. Macomber's report, I insert it in the RECORD following these remarks:

#### CIVIL DEFENSE PLANNING IS STILL ACTIVE IN SPITE OF NEGLECTED BOMB SHELTERS

(By Frank Macomber)

Ten years ago the citizens of this country spent about half a billion dollars of their own money to dig bomb or fallout shelters. They did so on the advice of the late President John F. Kennedy, at a time when the United States was having one of its periodic confrontations with East Berlin and the Communists.

Today many of those shelters and the ones built before them either have been abandoned or serve as storage space for the cast-off family furniture, old photograph albums or shelves of home-canned fruit and vegetables.

Yet the Office of Civil Defense does not consider itself an anachronism and is fighting for its life. One of the agency's chief arguments is that a competent civil defense program across the nation will save lives during and after natural disasters even if the United States never comes under enemy attack.

Supporters of a revived and vigorous civil defense program are encouraged by indications that Congress this year will approve a \$77.7 million CD budget for the next fiscal year beginning July 1, \$5.7 million or 7.9 per cent above the present one.

But some complain this scarcely is enough to keep a nationwide program alive. Others note that President Nixon has yet to act on recommendations in a civil defense study he ordered more than two years ago.

Some responsible Americans, however, claim the program diminishes chances to solve international problems by creating an atmosphere of distrust, while others are convinced Americans could not survive a nuclear holocaust with or without civil defense.

The Office of Civil Defense disagrees and comes up with some arithmetic to back its arguments in favor of a revitalized protection of the nation's citizens from The Bomb. It goes like this:

A nuclear assault on the United States today would wipe out nearly half the nation's 200 million inhabitants. And another 33 million also would die needlessly. There is a way to save them, but so far it hasn't been used.

A full-scale shelter program could save 48 million American lives. But present shelter programs at the federal, state and local levels could save only 15 million of these.

Hence, the CD's grim mathematics: 33 million needless deaths if the United States should become an H-bomb target.

John E. Davis, the national boss of civil defense, says the American public has little protection today from atomic attack or major natural disasters. In some areas, local civil defense is virtually a state of the past, he concedes.

His grim assessment is borne out by recent surveys which show that public shelters are stocked to protect only about 61 million Americans. The rest of the 200 million would

be virtually defenseless against an atomic assault or the violence of nature.

The studies also reflect that what shelters do exist are located mostly in cities which would be leveled first by a cataclysmic bomb blast. In rural areas, where fallout but not blast could be expected, little has been done to protect population from nuclear radiation and the illnesses which follow.

Most people, a survey claims, are so uninformed about civil defense that they wouldn't know where to find a shelter if an attack came. (Do you know where to go if there should be one?)

This especially is true of the younger generation which wasn't even born when Allied A-bombs leveled Hiroshima and Nagasaki in August, 1945.

Some state and local civil defense officials blame the federal CD chiefs for the stumbling program and predict there would be pandemonium, looting and panic on a wide scale if the United States should come under attack.

But federal CD officials claim much more could be done under the present budget—about 35 cents a year per person—if state and local civil defense leaders would organize properly. They point to a shortage of trained shelter managers and radiological monitors, leaving those in shelters to survive on their own. They say water barrels aren't even kept filled in many shelters and that most shelters fall short of federal standards in one or more ways.

But Davis and his aides believe there is a path leading out of this obvious civil defense dead end. These are some possible roads to a revitalized CD program:

Boost civil defense spending to 70 cents per person annually. (Switzerland spends \$5.69 per person on civil defense and Sweden about \$3.40.)

Spend proportionately in the big cities and less in areas less likely to be A-bomb targets.

Give state and local CD directors more powers to act and less time to use their posts for political purposes.

Show again the old movies portraying the death and destruction wrought by nuclear weapons, to revive in the minds of older Americans the terror of the bomb and possibly even reach the younger generation.

Inaugurate full-scale, community-wide civil defense tests sending people to shelters so they will be ready if an atomic assault or major natural disaster should occur. (In Russia, civil defense training is compulsory, directed by a Red army marshal with military men in commanding positions.)

Chairman F. Edward Hebert of the House Armed Services Committee has called the U.S. civil defense program "our great unheeded sentry." He has promised his committee this year will review the program, its shortcomings and its possibilities for revival and survival. Hebert also has pledged his opposition to moves toward merging the Office of Civil Defense with some other government agency.

Hebert's committee, with all its authority, is powerless by itself to move the civil defense program off dead center. But its review could give Americans an insight into what has happened to civil defense over the years.

If enough people listen, America once again might look to its presently unheeded sentry.

#### THE SPECK DECISION

### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the legal chaos inherent in the Supreme Court decision which stayed death sen-

tences throughout the country was thoughtfully discussed in a WGN—Chicago—Radio-Television editorial from July 10 through July 13. The editorial properly points out that the citizens of Illinois, in a statewide referendum, sustained capital punishment as a sentence. This directly applies to the infamous Speck murder rampage in which an Illinois jury recommended the sentence.

The editorial follows:

#### THE SPECK DECISION

The Supreme Court, in over-turning the death sentence of Richard Speck, has reopened only a part of the case. It must be made clear that the decision raised no questions as to Speck's guilt in the slaying, five years ago, of eight young women. What the court questioned, and found contrary to the constitutional protections afforded to everyone in this country, was the method in which the jury was selected for the Speck trial.

Announcement of the Supreme Court's decision brought emotional reaction. All of us were horrified at the crime. The instinct for revenge, an eye for an eye, strong five years ago, resurfaced. The court's opinion was not clear and direct. There is much doubt about the future of Richard Speck. Under Illinois law, which will handle the case from here on, judges are free under certain circumstances to reduce a jury's recommended sentence. In capital cases, a death sentence cannot be imposed unless recommended by the jury.

There are differences of opinion in the local legal community as to whether Judge Herbert Paschen, who presided over the Speck trial could once more sentence Speck to death. This will have to be decided by the State Supreme Court.

Illinois citizens had an opportunity to declare their feelings on capital punishment recently. When they approved the new state constitution, they had the option of abolishing capital punishment in this state. They voted to retain the death penalty as part of our legal system. If Judge Paschen can legally sentence Speck to death, we feel he should follow the guidelines of that referendum.

#### CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

### HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, this week, commencing on July 11, is the anniversary of Captive Nations Week. President Nixon, in proclamation 4065 has again renewed the commitment that President Eisenhower made in 1959—namely that the people of the United States would not forget the millions who are enslaved behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

I wish to commend all those who are taking this opportunity to observe Captive Nations Week. This week we should all rededicate ourselves to our American commitment to the ultimate liberation and self-determination of the hundreds of millions of people who are still living as victims of Communist imperialism.

We must never simply accept the fate of these lands and people, for their only hope for liberty now lies with those of us who still enjoy the blessings of freedom. To forget these fellow humans

would be to condemn them to a life of perpetual oppression and to further expose ourselves to the source of this oppression.

To fulfill this important commitment we must assemble and utilize all the truths and facts pertaining to the enslaved conditions of these peoples. I have always supported our commitment to these nations, and since I first came to Congress in 1963 I have advocated the establishment of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. Such a committee would provide the American people with a continuing source of information concerning Communist rule.

In the past year the Soviets have tried to lull the opponents of Communist tyranny into a sense of security by displaying a degree of moderation in international affairs. However, since World War II we have learned that Communists relax in their overt aggressions only when it suits their basic policy of world conquest.

The importance of these observations have recently been underscored by the action of the Soviet Union in brutally crushing Czechoslovakian dreams of limited freedom within a Communist regime.

If we fail the people of these captive nations, we fail ourselves, for freedom is safe only as long as those who enjoy it continue to fight for it. We should take this occasion of Captive Nations Week to rededicate ourselves to the cause of liberty and individual freedom for all. I promise to continue to work to fulfill our commitment to the victims of Communist tyranny.

#### MISLEADING REPORTING BY SEGMENTS OF THE NEWS MEDIA

### HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on May 21, 1971, station WRAL-TV in Raleigh, N.C., broadcast an editorial on recent attacks aimed at Gov. Ronald Reagan by the ultra-liberal portion of the news media. This editorial was re-broadcast by several stations, one of which was station WTYC in Rock Hill, S.C.

Mr. Jesse Helms, the executive vice president of WRAL-TV, points out underhanded methods used by part of the media in an effort to create a story. Because of these methods, much of the American public has lost trust in our news media.

The author points out the absurdity of the media criticizing Governor Reagan not paying State tax where he did not owe any. In creating this issue the press completely ignored previous State and Federal taxes paid by Governor Reagan. These comments deserve the consideration of the Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial by Mr. Jesse Helms from station WRAL-TV in Raleigh, N.C.,

be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

#### MISLEADING REPORTING BY SEGMENTS OF THE NEWS MEDIA

Inasmuch as spokesmen for the major ultra-liberal news media are pleading for public respect, it may be instructive to examine the case history of an episode illustrating why millions of Americans no longer trust the major news media.

A couple of weeks back, there was a news story out of California which was given prominent display on every network newscast and in every newspaper. In retrospect, it is obvious that the story was published and broadcast in a contrived manner carefully calculated to mislead the public.

Governor Ronald Reagan of California, whom the leftwing news media despise, paid no California state income taxes last year—for the simple reason that he was not due to pay any. He did pay federal income taxes.

Prior to being elected Governor of California, Mr. Reagan was a successful movie actor. He was paid well for his work, and he saved his money. He invested it in various businesses. His investments, in general, have been productive ones—but 1970 was not a good year for a great many businesses around the country, and some of those in which Ronald Reagan had invested suffered along with all the rest. Simply said, Mr. Reagan's net income dropped sharply in 1970, and no citizen—be he a Governor or anybody else—should be expected to pay income taxes when he had no taxable income.

So Governor Reagan filed his income tax returns, and he filed them honestly, lawfully and accurately. There is no dispute about that. Moreover, his tax returns—and those of all other citizens—are supposed to be confidential. But the leftwingers, who make so much noise about snooping, delightedly gained unlawful access to the confidential information contained in Mr. Reagan's tax returns, and broadcast it throughout the nation, carefully implying that he had evaded payment of taxes.

He had done no such thing. Because of business losses in 1970, he had no taxable income—even including his salary as Governor—so under California law he was not subject to payment of state income taxes. However—and this is something that the leftwing news media carefully ignored—Ronald Reagan paid a total of \$91,128.22 in state income taxes during the first four years that he was Governor of California. On top of that, he paid huge federal income taxes.

Ronald Reagan didn't owe any state income taxes in 1970, so he paid none. He abided by the tax laws, just as every other citizen is entitled and obliged to do. But in one of the nastier little vendettas to be waged by the leftwingers, they are suggesting that he ought to have paid state income taxes whether he owed them or not.

The point is that Ronald Reagan is a conservative political figure. He is an effective one, a man whose integrity and courage are admired by millions of citizens across the country. He is a handsome man with an attractive personality, and leftwingers privately acknowledge that he would be a formidable candidate for President of the United States. In short, they fear him.

So they have set out to destroy him by false innuendo and contrived implications. And they do this in the full knowledge that what they are doing is dishonest and unfair. They cannot defeat Ronald Reagan with truth, so they grasp for falsehoods. Surely the American public will reject this sort of tactics.

Yet this is the sort of thing that the leftwing news media pounce upon. They will participate with enthusiasm in the destruction, if they can manage it, of an honest

man—simply because they disagree with him.

Ronald Reagan will survive it, because he is a bigger man than the political pygmies who hurl their poisoned darts at him. But can the leftwing news media survive their own degrading conduct?

That is the question. Public confidence in the news media has been falling rapidly. A few more episodes like this one, and the media will hit rock bottom. Which, unless they change, is precisely where they belong.

**PRESIDENT PARK FORESEES  
GOLDEN ERA FOR SOUTH KOREA  
IN THIRD INAUGURAL ADDRESS**

**HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA**

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

**Mr. MATSUNAGA.** Mr. Speaker, highlighting the start of his third term of office with a strong peace-and-prosperity theme, President Chung Hee Park of the Republic of Korea offered much in his inaugural address to hearten the people of the United States and the rest of the world, as well as his own countrymen.

The inaugural ceremonies were held in Seoul, Korea, on July 1, 1971. In attendance were many distinguished guests from abroad, including Vice President SPIRO T. AGNEW of the United States and Prime Minister Eisaku Sato of Japan.

Sounding a note of reassurance, President Park said:

We stand today on the threshold of a new era that seems to promise peace and prosperity—the goals of all mankind.

I believe this ought to be a new era for all mankind to live and prosper together, and to build together a new, peaceful world order based on respect for the moral imperative of mutual dialogue and cooperation.

Getting down to specifics, President Park noted:

A great change is taking place around us, as indicated by the rise of a so-called mood of thaw between East and West, and the initiation of efforts for rapprochement between the United States and Communist China.

Hopefully, these changes may dispel the dark clouds of aggression that hang over Asia.

Tracing the rapid rise of his country in the 1960's, the Chief of State of South Korea said that:

There is now a solid foundation upon which to erect a new Korea, revitalized and self-sustaining.

Calling the decade just past "a period of inner growth and maturing" for South Korea, President Park exhorted his countrymen "actively to participate in the channeling of the new international currents of the will to peace. He said that it is within such currents that the people of South Korea must seek ways to achieve their national goals, including "a new era of national unity for the Korean Nation," and the end of what he termed "the tragedy of national territorial division."

Mr. Speaker, I believe that Members of Congress and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would find President Park's inaugural address of considerable interest, and I therefore submit

the full text for inclusion in the RECORD at this point.

**PRESIDENT PARK'S INAUGURAL SPEECH**

My fellow countrymen here and abroad, Distinguished visitors and guests:

A quarter of a century has passed since the guns of the Second World War fell silent.

We stand today on the threshold of a new era that seems to promise peace and prosperity—the goals of all mankind.

I believe this ought to be a new era for all mankind to live and prosper together, and to build together a new, peaceful world order based on respect for the moral imperative of mutual dialogue and cooperation:

A new era of mutual exchange and cooperation for the peoples of Asia, so that they may achieve regional harmony founded upon the diversity of Asia's unique traditions; and

A new era of national unity for the Korean Nation, to consolidate the work of modernizing our Fatherland, and to put an end to the tragedy of national territorial division.

Conscious of the grave and heavy responsibilities incumbent upon me to serve my country and the community of men as this historic new era unfolds, I pledge before history and the Nation that I shall do my utmost to vindicate the trust which the people have placed in me, always putting courage before vacillation, duty before comfort. My beloved fellow countrymen!

For the world, the 1960's were a decade of development and of struggle for growth. For us, the Revolution of May 16, 1961 provided the initial thrust to strike off the shackles of past dependence upon others, arousing the country from stagnation. We have now built a solid foundation upon which to erect a new Korea, revitalized and self-sustaining.

Through the experience of this decade, we have proved to ourselves, and to others, that democracy can flourish only upon an economically fertile soil.

And we have recorded a victory for the liberal ideology by demonstrating that a democratic system is far more effective than, and superior to, a Communist one in the arena of development and growth.

We can take pride in the fact that the decade just past was a period of inner growth and maturing for our country.

With this foundation, the time has come for us actively to participate in the channeling of the new international currents of the will to peace. It is within these currents that we must seek ways to achieve our national goals.

A great change is taking place around us, as indicated by the rise of a so-called mood of thaw between East and West, and the initiation of efforts for rapprochement between the United States and Communist China.

Hopefully, these changes may dispel the dark clouds of aggression that hang over Asia. And let us take this opportunity to reiterate to the entire world our firm determination to reunify our divided Fatherland through peaceful means at the earliest possible time.

But my fellow countrymen!

A cold fact which we cannot evade is that tension still exists in the Korean peninsula; and that, so far, as our prayers for peace and our magnanimity of attitude have not been reciprocated.

The Communists in the northern zone of Korea are not only ignoring our peace proposals, but have gone so far as to take it upon themselves to export the so-called "People's War" to countries in other regions of the world. They have not abandoned their anarchistic and fanatic revolutionary dogmatism.

It is because of this that we are forced to withhold our decisions and actions that could be based upon greater optimism and more positive hope for peace.

We must therefore remain firm in our untiring pursuit of international peace, while strengthening the ideals and practices of freedom and democracy at home. Our endeavors for security and national unification must be courageous but prudent, positive but flexible. We will advance ever forward step by step.

My fellow countrymen!

Times of great historic change are almost always times of great challenge. It was because our country at the turn of the century had not cultivated sufficient national capabilities to face up to the challenges of that time that we lost our nationhood.

We face such challenges today. We must learn anew from history the stern lesson that fundamentally our own destiny depends on our own capability.

Should we of this generation fall once more to cultivate our national potential, I can predict with certainty that not only this generation but also our posterity will be doomed forever to stray from the ranks of progressive nations of the world.

We must surmount our national trials. In our progress toward the freedom and prosperity of our Fatherland, there can be no delay: we cannot afford to stop even for a moment.

I am convinced that the unification and re-birth of our Nation can be achieved in our time, and I emphasize that the key to success lies in the cultivation of our national capabilities, that is to say, with our own hands.

I believe that by the mid-1970's we should have become strong enough to achieve unification, and no effort will be spared to increase our capabilities in all fields to achieve this goal.

The success of the Third Five-Year Economic Development Plan is vital to the development of our democracy, and the creation of a democratic society is in turn vital to the eventual achievement of unification.

In the years ahead, I shall usher in the age of heavy and chemical industries in Korea, re-enact the "Miracle of the River Han" on our four other great rivers, send waves of Korean exports across the five oceans, and place Korea in the upper ranks of the intermediate advanced countries by modernizing the Nation's agricultural and fishing communities.

Through balanced growth of urban and rural areas, the relative income gap between them will be reduced gradually but steadily. I shall see to it that our farmers, fishermen and industrial workers are adequately compensated for their strenuous toil in construction and production.

And, confident as I am of the further growth of the potential of our national human resources, and always keeping in mind the heritage of civilization which we have received from our forefathers, I shall encourage the development of our national culture, the arts and the sciences. I shall give special attention and support to the cultural aspects of the great work of revitalizing Korea.

Thus, with the passage of time, our national life will certainly become richer and more dignified. In this more fertile national soil, democracy will take firmer root, and the positive traits of self-discipline and cooperation will emerge even more strongly as manifest virtues of an open society. We shall have then built a society that guarantees happiness and welfare of all the people.

In the meantime, I here clearly state my intention to correct the unsoundness still existing in parts of our society. These unhealthy phenomena have been observed before in societies in the earlier stages of democratic and industrial development, and I shall deal with these social ills not with

stop-gap measures, or merely to achieve a demonstration effect. Nor will this problem be handled for the sake of expediency. The dominant objective of my measures will be to prevent and cure these social ills through a succession of broad and systematic improvements in rules and practices.

Before we point an accusing finger at others, we should rectify our own faults. We should attack waste and excess luxury just as vigorously as we accuse falsehood and injustice.

The virtues of diligence, frugality, honesty and sincerity must be made to permeate our society, and in order to bring about this social reform, those in the leading positions must initiate a quiet spiritual revolution, setting examples by deeds, not by words.

These ideals in the life of a modern citizen must become the guiding principle in our homes, in our places of work, and in our society. I give my pledge to stand at the forefront of this campaign against social ills, and I appeal to all of my countrymen for their support and participation.

My fellow countrymen!

Now is the time for us to formulate new ideas for the next stage of national development. We are called upon to forge a national consensus to set the direction of our future.

Let us not be idle bystanders. Let us actively share in the life and growth of our nation. Let us think together and share our responsibilities and duties as a sovereign people.

It is because of your overwhelming support that I have been able to devote myself wholeheartedly to the difficult task of managing the affairs of this state. I cannot reflect upon those past years without renewing my fervent hopes for my beloved country.

Born into a poor farming family and living through the tragic days of the fratricidal war, I have constantly yearned to see poverty driven out of my country, and to see the sundered families of north and south share the joy of reunion.

My most fervent hope is for our Nation to be united in this land of ours in freedom, prosperity and peace. This goal is far more than merely my personal wish. No matter where they live—north or south, or far away in foreign lands—it should be the burning desire of all Koreans who love their people and their Fatherland.

Let us unite and march on!

When this desire, this aspiration is transformed into the toil and sweat of our confident endeavors, I believe with all my heart that there will come a day of national celebration, when the torch of a great Korea will be raised on high to shed light throughout the world.

Thank you.

## SOVIET MILITARY POWER

### HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in my judgment, much of the public remains uninformed and apathetic about the rapid shift of the balance of strategic military power to the Soviets against the United States. Since the American press is very anxious to live up to its obligation and responsibility to the American people to the extent of publishing classified information which may endanger our national security, then I call upon

this tremendous media, including television, to present a continuous flow of facts about the Soviet Union's ever-increasing strategic military power.

A few years ago, a great deal of this strategic information would have been classified. In an effort to inform the American people of the Soviet threat, the present administration has declassified much of this strategic information. I believe the American press can do a better job in presenting this information to the people.

Mr. President, the blue ribbon defense panel, appointed by the President and Secretary of Defense in July 1969, submitted its report on July 1, 1970. Members of the panel reserved the right to submit supplemental statements on areas not addressed by the panel's report. Consequently, seven expert members of the panel submitted a supplemental report to the President and the Secretary of Defense on September 30, 1970, entitled "The Shifting Balance of Military Power".

This report, which consists of 35 pages, clearly presents the ominous danger of being a second-rate power in the nuclear age. It presents facts and figures on the Soviets' growing superiority across the board in strategic power.

Mr. President, a concise summary of this supplemental statement was published by the American Security Council in its "Washington Report," dated June 28, 1971. It is stamped "top secret," but it is not classified. Highlighting the report is an introductory comment which states:

The best kept secret in the United States seems to be the news that the period of U.S. superiority of military power has ended and that "in the 70's neither the vital interests of the U.S. nor the lives and freedom of its citizens will be secure."

I urge the American press to use its resources to keep the American people better informed of the real threat to their security.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the June 28, 1971, issue of the "Washington Report," entitled, "Analysis of Developments Affecting the Nation's Security" be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

[From the Washington Report, June 28, 1971]  
"ANALYSIS OF DEVELOPMENTS AFFECTING THE NATION'S SECURITY"

The best kept secret in the United States seems to be the news that the period of U.S. superiority of military power has ended and that "in the 70's neither the vital interests of the U.S. nor the lives and freedom of its citizens will be secure . . ."

#### THE BLUE RIBBON DEFENSE PANEL

Shortly after his inauguration in 1969, President Nixon appointed a select group of distinguished citizens, to examine the organization setup and contracting procedures of the U.S. Department of Defense, and to make recommendations for improvements therein. On July 1, 1970, the Panel submitted to the President and the Secretary of Defense its report on those specific matters, including a number of recommended changes which the Defense Secretary has since announced have been or are in process of being introduced in that Department.

Subsequently, seven members of the Panel submitted a supplemental statement on related matters which they deemed to be of vital concern to the Nation at large, as well as to themselves as American citizens. It should be read by every American.

The principal points made may be clearly appreciated from the opening paragraphs and key phrases of the Summary of the Supplemental Statement:

"The Converging Trends. The convergence of a number of trends indicates a significant shifting of the strategic military balance against the United States and in favor of the Soviet Union. These trends include: (i) the growing Soviet superiority in ICBM's; (ii) the Soviet commitment of greater resources than the U.S. to strategic offensive and defensive weapons, with the continued deployment thereof; (iii) the possibility that present U.S. technological superiority will be lost to the Soviet Union; (iv) the convincing evidence that the Soviet Union seeks a pre-emptive first-strike capability; (v) the rapidly expanding Soviet naval capability; and (vi) the mounting hostility of segments of the public towards the military, the defense establishment and "the military-industrial complex," without due recognition that sustained irresponsible criticism could undermine and weaken the only forces which provide security for the U.S."

"Since World War II a degree of world order has been maintained by the dominance of U.S. strategic military strength. This American-preserved world order is now disintegrating, as doubts arise as to our will and strength to preserve it.

"U.S. strategic superiority has ended. The Soviet Union has moved significantly ahead of the United States in ICBM's, the principal weapons system of the nuclear age.

"The End of U.S. Superiority. . . . The Soviet SS-9 ICBM force alone is capable of delivering a megatonnage of nuclear warheads several times greater than that of the entire U.S. force of ICBM's and SLBM's. . . .

"The situation which our country faces is without precedent. . . .

"It is not too much to say that in the 70's neither the vital interests of the U.S. nor the lives and freedom of its citizens will be secure. . . .

"Yet, many of our most influential citizens respond to this unprecedented national peril, not by a renewed determination to assure an adequate national defense, but rather by demands for further curtailment of defense measures which can only increase the peril.

"In short, the mood of the people and much of the Congress is almost one of precipitous retreat from the challenge. This paradox in response to possible national peril is without precedent in the history of this country."

#### A WELL KEPT SECRET

This solemn statement, throwing into question, for the first time, the survival of American life and liberty, had been in the hands of our governmental leaders since September 30, 1970. When it was released by the Pentagon on March 12, 1971, neither Government nor the media (with the single exception of *U.S. News & World Report* for April 5, 1971) deemed it a matter to be explicitly made known to the American people.

Whereas previous warnings of a dangerous shift in the balance of military power were often discounted on the grounds that those raising the alarm were "military-oriented", this cannot be said of the authors of the special "Blue Ribbon" report. Although several of them had wartime service in one or another of our Armed Services, they are all primarily noted for distinguished accomplishments in civilian pursuits. The seven signers of the Supplemental Statement are:

William Blackie—Peoria, Illinois; Chairman of the Board, Caterpillar Tractor Company.

George Champion—New York, New York;

President, Economic Development Board of New York.

William P. Clements, Jr.—Dallas, Texas; President, Southeastern Drilling, Inc.

John M. Fluke—Seattle, Washington; President, John Fluke Manufacturing Company, Inc.

Hobart D. Lewis—Pleasantville, New York; President, Reader's Digest Association, Inc.

Wilfred J. McNeill—New York, New York; Director and Advisor, Fairchild-Hiller Corp.

Lewis F. Powell, Jr.—Richmond, Virginia; Lawyer, Past President, American Bar Association (1964-65).

#### 1971 POSTURE STATEMENT

The *Statement of Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird before the House Armed Services Committee on the FY 1972-1976 Defense Program and the 1972 Defense Budget*, dated March 9, 1971, comprising 191 pages, devotes 39 pages in Section II *Toward Better Management of Human, Material and Economic Resources in the Department of Defense*, growing, in part, out of the work of the Blue Ribbon Defense Panel.

It gets down to such subjects as "drug abuse in the armed forces" and to such details as following the Blue Ribbon Panel's recommendations in telecommunications. But, curiously, no mention is made of the Blue Ribbon Panel's Supplemental Statement on the Nation's peril and the chilling portent to the Free World, of our now overshadowed defense posture which no longer provides a realistic deterrence. Yet the term "Strategy of Realistic Deterrence" is used repeatedly as a statement of national policy, as if realistic deterrence could be achieved by mere use of the words!

How is it that recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Panel can be adopted as to "major changes in the organization of the Department [of Defense]" and other recommendation affecting the survival of our national life be swept under the carpet?

Further, the Laird Report states: "The threats to U.S. and Free World security obviously were a central factor in planning forces and programs to implement the new strategy." If this is true, how is the balance of strategic power being restored? The American people have a right and a "need" to know.

On page 12 of the Laird Report as a part of the Secretary's Summary it is said: "In the past two decades we achieved first place in nuclear capability, became pre-eminent in space, and substantially strengthened our conventional capabilities." In direct contrast, the Blue Ribbon statement said "Within a span of less than two decades we have moved from complete security to perilous insecurity."

On page 14—*The Changing Environment—Prelude to the 1970's*, one of the existing military realities listed as: "different from the situation just five years ago is: . . . A growing Soviet military capability and technological momentum." No mention is made of the existence of a massively overwhelming preponderance factor [about 8 times] of Soviet nuclear ICBM capability, expressed in megatonnage. The report continues: "Confronted with this changing environment, we conclude after careful analysis in the National Security Council that we must, whatever else, assume the following criteria in national security planning for the decades of the 1970's: 1. Preservation by the United States of a sufficient strategic nuclear capability as the cornerstone of the Free World's nuclear deterrent . . ."

One has a right—and indeed a duty—to ask what that means. How can we preserve what we do not have? Who decides what the subjective but key word "sufficient" means? And finally how decipher the meaning of the words "the cornerstone of the Free World's nuclear deterrent," when it is clear that our

foreign policy as well as the "security of the lives and freedom of U.S. citizens" requires simply that we move to match if not exceed the present awesome balance of nuclear power now arrayed against the United States.

#### U.S. NEEDS "SUPERIOR STRATEGIC CAPABILITY"

The first duty of our responsible officials to "safeguard the security of the Republic," cannot be mixed up with other nations of the Free World's nuclear deterrent. The U.S. alone must look to its own security—as does the U.S.S.R.

The Blue Ribbon Panel's conclusion regarding the shifting balance was that ". . . the only viable national strategy is to regain and retain a clearly superior strategic capability."

As the Panel pointed out, "The road to peace has never been through appeasement, unilateral disarmament or negotiation from weakness. The entire recorded history of mankind is precisely the contrary. Among the great nations, only the strong survive. Weakness of the U.S.—of its military capability and its will—could be the gravest threat to the peace of the world."

Thus this is no time for circumlocution or the obscuration of life and death box-scores with statements of purpose which admit of any and all interpretations under the sun. Our clear course, as expressed by the special Blue Ribbon statement is to move at once to offset "The Soviet Union's advantage in numbers and megatonnage of missiles . . . that could result in a force more than double that of the U.S. by the Mid-70's . . . (when) . . . the Soviet Union would have the capability of effectively destroying both U.S. ICBM and bomber forces as well as our cities." Otherwise we must accept the consequences of becoming a second-rate power, ". . . incapable of assuring the future security and freedom of its people."

#### WHY NOT LET THE AMERICAN PEOPLE KNOW?

The Special Blue Ribbon report states: "Neither the facts concerning these trends nor the ultimate danger is generally understood by the public, which for the most part remains uninformed and hence apathetic." Why?

In this day of electronic and communications pollution, every form of trivia can be and is elevated to the level of national interest. The media leave no electronic gap in the air and no tree standing that can be pressed in to the service of engaging every ear and eye. Even the President of the United States must strain to fill two hours of chat over a nationwide network. Then how come the vital message of the Blue Ribbon Panel Statement, sufficient to alarm a group of distinguished citizens which had spent a year studying the Pentagon, was not deemed important enough to be expressly made known to the American people.

How come the President's 180 page *Foreign Policy Report for the 1970's* dated February 25, 1971 (five months after he received the Blue Ribbon Supplemental Statement) is silent on the consequences to our foreign policy while mentioning that we are out-gunned as to numbers of ICBM's by some 40%. No megatonnage figures are given, but interestingly enough the meaning of the words "strategic sufficiency," as contrasted with "strategic superiority," is defined without clarifying very much the life and death aspects of the present shifting balance of power. However, the President's Foreign Policy Report does state: "The United States and the Soviet Union have now reached a point where small numerical advantages in strategic forces have little military relevance. The attempt to obtain large advantages would spark an arms race which would, in the end, prove pointless. For, both sides would almost surely commit the necessary resources to maintain a balance."

If the 35 pages of the Blue Ribbon Panel's

Supplemental Statement say anything, it is that the maintenance of that balance has long since gone by the boards. If that statement—in an official document—is untrue, it should be refuted—officially. If it is not untrue, then the President's Foreign Policy Report dated five months later needs re-evaluation.

#### THE PRIMARY STRATEGIC THREAT

Secretary Laird's Report, dated March 9, 1971, under Section III entitled, *The Threats to U.S. and Free World Security* states: "The threats to U.S. and Free World security obviously were a central factor in planning forces and programs to implement the new strategy. Before discussing specific force planning under the strategy, let me review briefly the current and projected security threats. Admiral Moorer, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff will provide a more detailed analysis of the threat [emphasis added] in his statement to the Committee." (We shall turn to Admiral Moorer's report later.)

The Laird report states: "The primary strategic threat to the U.S.—the capability of the Soviet Union to deliver long range, nuclear weapons against targets in the United States—has been a matter of grave concern to us. Shown on Table 9 are our estimates of Soviet strategic offensive and defensive weapon systems in the near term. U.S. strategic forces are shown for comparison on Table 3."

In the report, Table 9 applies to U.S. forces while Table 3 applies to the forces of the Soviet Union—a small matter, but a slip to which Freud would have attached great significance!

The "specific force planning" of the Laird report still leaves the relative ICBM balance, U.S. versus U.S.S.R., unchanged: "at the end of FY 1972 (it) will consist of 1,000 Minuteman missiles, 54 Titan missiles" [ed. note: old and obsolescent] as against about 1,200 SS-11 and SS-13 missiles of around 1 megaton each and corresponding roughly to the U.S. Minuteman, and about 300 SS-9 missiles [ed. note: new] of 25 megatons each.

If all this is bewildering as a policy of "strategic sufficiency" for an announced "Strategy of Realistic Deterrence" the point has been made.

#### ADMIRAL MOORER'S REPORT

And now let us turn to the report entitled: *United States Military Posture for FY 1972* by Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Thomas H. Moorer, USN, before the House Armed Services Committee, dated March 9, 1971. Here, surely, one seeking assurance against the spectre raised by the Blue Ribbon Supplemental Statement, must find it. Our problem, after all, is purely military and as promised in Secretary Laird's Report one may expect "a more detailed analysis of the threat". Perhaps this is where we should have looked in the first place to see the danger to the U.S. broadly delineated, and the few steps needed to parry this threat clearly stated.

Admiral Moorer starts out with a nicely balanced plea for objectivity, and that we neither underestimate nor overestimate the strength of an opponent. Neither, he says, should our enemies, our free world partners nor we ourselves, underestimate the military strength of the United States. But . . . "We dare not underestimate the military capability of those who seek to expand their influence and hegemony over peoples whose interests now coincide with ours." That about covers the subject.

Admiral Moorer reported that as of the end of 1970, the U.S. had "fallen distinctly behind the Soviets in total numbers of operational ICBM launchers" (1054 to 1440) and that "the Soviets are already far superior to us in total strategic offensive megatons." While the Soviet SS-9 ICBM is discussed at some length, no mention is made that the megatonnage of the 300 SS-9's alone, which

the Soviets are expected to have by the end of 1971, "... each capable of delivering 25 megatons" (Blue Ribbon Panel assessment) exceeds by many times that of our total ICBM launchers and moreover are "designed as counter-force weapons capable of destroying U.S. hardened missile silos" (Blue Ribbon Panel Statement).

Admiral Moorer also said: "While I do not believe the United States today is in a position of inferior military strength vis-a-vis the Soviet Union, the balance is tenuous in certain areas and, therefore, we cannot help but be concerned. The United States no longer has clear superiority in strategic nuclear weapons."

#### THE PROBLEM IS NOW!

But then the Admiral went on to make what must be the most incomprehensible statement in modern military history by saying: "Due to long lead time in acquisition of modern weapons systems, the problem we see is in the future"

A "long lead time", far from putting the problem in the future stresses the present imperative.

But in line with the concept of the problem being in the future, Admiral Moorer recommends the adoption of the Administration's proposed military budget for Fiscal Year 1972. This budget does not in any way call for a reversal of the shift in strategic military power balance. In fact, since the Nixon Administration took office deep cuts have been made in the defense budget. Most of the dollar cuts have been made by the Administration, itself; though some have been made by the Senate. An even larger reduction in the effective level of spending for defense has been caused by inflation and pay raises for military personnel without additional appropriations to cover the cost of those pay raises.

The combination of these several factors has reduced our effective defense spending by about 25% under the Nixon Administration—a sharper rate of decline than that under the preceding two administrations.

In all fairness, one must hasten to point out that the Laird and Moorer reports cited were prepared by dedicated, patriotic Americans striving to advance the interests of the U.S., to the best of their abilities, within the framework of Administration policy.

#### HOW TO REVERSE THE TREND

Also, reversing a trend such as this is a problem of great complexity; a multiplicity of facts and factors must be taken into consideration. To forewarn without frightening is a necessary prerequisite to action in a democracy. Yet *The Wall Street Journal* for April 28, 1971, says, in part: "Defense Secretary Melvin Laird's increasingly grim assessment of Soviet strength may be a prelude to another escalation of the arms race and a possible request for a boost in the Pentagon budget."

"... Mr. Laird's new threat assessment is likely to produce some skepticism and anger on Capitol Hill. There, lawmakers critical of defense spending are likely to view the Secretary's remarks as part of the 'annual rites of spring'—when military men come forward with evidence of new and menacing Soviet developments to justify their budget submissions."

Other newspapers have made similar statements.

Small wonder that loyal Americans of good will, seeking to discharge their Constitutional responsibility "to provide for the common defense" may wonder in a political context how far to go in alerting a nation to its peril. On the other hand, because we are a democracy, the shifting balance of power which imperils our Nation, our freedom, and the rest of the Free World, cannot be offset by our taking appropriate action, unless and until the people—all of the people—are in-

formed by our governmental leaders who have the duty to assign the highest priority and sense of urgency to preparing Americans for a recital of some unpleasant realities and proposing a program for changing these facts.

The American people—we believe are capable of taking the harsh truth of our present danger—and capable of marshalling the spiritual, human, and material resources needed to assure the survival of our way of life.

It is this which must be done.

#### PUBLIC EDUCATION A VICTIM OF LIBERAL REVOLUTION

### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, it becomes increasingly more obvious from the many letters I receive from concerned parents not only among my constituents but from various parts of the country as well as from the mushrooming number of news reports that the public schools are being exploited as a vehicle for degenerating the morals of our youth, destroying the family unit, accelerating the establishment of a totally planned society, and for establishing control over the masses once the planners have achieved their goal.

According to one news report, the following courses were offered in nearby Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School: Draft counseling, drug offenders' rights, Black Panther seminar, revolution: why and how people revolt, student dissent, and gay liberation and the rights of homosexuals.

We read in another news report that students—boys and girls, white and black—in Wakefield High School in Arlington, Virginia fondled each other, looking searchingly for understanding and communication into the eyes of each other and exploring other parts of the anatomy of one another. This was supposed to allow them to communicate honestly with each other and overcome any prejudice which their parents may have instilled in them.

An account of happenings at Gaithersburg, Md. High School reveals that last year students cheered a defendant of the Chicago Seven national conspiracy trial with cheers of "right on" when he exhorted them to overturn the system.

We are alarmed to learn that in Omaha, Nebr., and Little Rock, Ark., that drugs were administered to normal as well as abnormal children apparently without parental consent.

A letter, typical of many I receive, arrived today from a concerned parent in Oxnard, Calif., and points out the absolute absurdity of HEW edicts and U.S. Supreme Court decisions on busing simply to satisfy some bureaucrat's idea of achieving racial balance. I insert the letter at this point:

PARKER-WEIGEL, INC.,  
Oxnard, Calif., July 12, 1971.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RARICK: As you can see by the enclosed, we have become one of

the average American towns where busing is about to be forced on us. Also that the decision was made in a very one-sided manner. Segregation has never been enforced in Oxnard, a child can attend any school in his neighborhood.

The school our children attend is one-half block from our home. This school, by the way, was one called "border line", as it was less than 1% from the national average. Our school board paired schools to satisfy the racial mixture, which resulted in six schools being bused. The remainder of the schools, including ours, were paired with a school within the 2 mile limit required to bus a child. Therefore our children (one in kindergarten, another in 4th grade) will have to walk past the school near our home and go 1.5 miles to another. It means crossing a major street that is heavily traveled, past a high school and through some other risky neighborhoods. Can we in good faith send these children on this walk twice a day?

Over 2800 parents have signed a protest but they refuse to listen to us. We are told if our children aren't in school (either by bus or walking) we will be jailed and our children made wards of the court.

Our legal council (for the school board) says there is nothing that can be done. That the "Law of the Land" the judge's decision must be executed. We question his decision. What can we do? Can you help us with advice? Will you alert our California Congressmen, as all we seem to be able to get is a nice letter saying that they don't like busing either.

We love our children and want to stop this busing order before it even starts in the Fall.

Yours truly,

Mrs. E. M. WIEGEL.

The result of forced racial balance and busing children away from their neighborhood school can only be to cause chaos and disruptions needed as an excuse for the imposition of more centralized controls necessary for a fully planned society. Education as a purpose for schools has now become secondary.

From throughout the Nation we hear reports of teachers beaten, schools vandalized, police required to keep order in schools, and even cases of teachers being raped in the classroom.

Systems of locally controlled schools assisted by private and parochial schools locally operated have played a significant role in making America a strong and free nation. The schools were an agent for teaching the American heritage of individual freedom and for preserving that heritage.

Only since the centralized planners in the Federal executive department assisted by their cohorts in the Federal judicial department were allowed to usurp unconstitutional control of the public schools have the schools degenerated to the low ebb at which they are today.

The prime purpose of any educational system should be to preserve the culture of the people so that the oncoming generation has the benefit of past achievements and the civilization perpetuates itself.

The woes of public education today must be laid at the feet of Federal intervention in forbidden territory. We in the United States must be the first civilization ever to finance the training of an oncoming generation to destroy its heritage and its birthright.

If America is to survive as the "Land of the Free and the Home of the Brave,"

we must restore order and discipline to public education so that it can again be the vehicle for preserving a free society instead of serving as the "change agent" it has become for achieving Big Brother's 1984 Society.

I insert at this point the text of a new filmstrip entitled "New Education—Order or Chaos" by Granger Graphics, Post Office Box 71, Yorba Linda, Calif., and related newscippings.

#### NEW EDUCATION: ORDER OR CHAOS

Education: Two schools of thought—order and chaos.

There are no sights equal to that first day of school with the little tykes dressed up, their names neatly printed and pinned on their shirts, mothers standing by with a smile, reassuring them, "Don't be afraid, everything will be all right."

But will it be? The doctrine and practice of virtually total permissiveness has brought about an almost complete collapse of discipline, which obviously can result in physical danger even on the school grounds. But what about the mental and emotional dangers that have increased with the introduction of new doctrines into the schools?

To test yourself, what do these terms mean to you?: change agent, bussing, Ritalin, schools without failure, psycho-drama, sensitivity training, third force, free dress, child advocacy. These are terms used in modern education for bringing about change. They represent sharp departures from traditional educational, social, economic and political philosophies.

The concern of modern education is apparently not to impart knowledge, but to change "attitudes" or "concepts," so that children can willingly accept a controlled society. One of the methods to accomplish this is a system called "taxonomy," which uses periodic psychological testing of children. The results of these tests are then fed into a computer for evaluation, so that at any given time, social planners can punch a button and find out how your child will think, feel and react on any subject. Now, if the child's concepts are contrary to what is desired, he is recycled through the same unit of instruction until his computer readout shows that he has accepted, without reservation, the desired change. We are told that this will create a utopia where a handful of elite social planners will be able to control our lives for our ultimate happiness.

There is nothing new about this utopian dream of a controlled society. The only difference between today and 3,000 years ago is the computer. Throughout the ages, there have been men who have tried to control society, only to fail and throw society into chaos. So, for a clearer understanding of what is happening today, we must review parts of history.

#### THE HISTORY OF MODERN EDUCATION

For an understanding of our modern education, interestingly, we must go back 2400 years to the teachings of Socrates, who said that education should teach the young the constant, unchanging fundamentals developed by intellectual discipline.

#### PLATO FIRST SCIENTIFIC SOCIALIST<sup>1</sup>

On the other hand Plato, a student of Socrates, believed men needed to be ruled . . . that he was not capable of self government. So he created his Republic as a state ruled by philosophers, protected by warriors, and supported by a class of poorly educated laborers and artisans. His chief interest was in teaching a ruling class—a small but dominant group. They were to be philosopher kings whose supreme virtue was wisdom and whose purpose was to attain truth and good for all.

Footnotes at end of article.

Aristotle—shown here—was a student of Plato. He knew that no one would willingly submit to a dictatorship that will destroy families, nor become willing slaves for philosopher kings. He warned the only way this could be brought about was by fraud and force. He warned against the danger of his teacher Plato's writings. At the same time, he realized how attractive that thinking could be to a self-appointed elite. Thus he wrote, "Those that are eminent in virtue do not usually stir up insurrections." And he taught that revolutions are brought about by fraud and by force.

Aristotle went on to warn: Insurrections are brought about by the fraud of demagogues, and they will continue until the only way to maintain order is through intervention by the State. He said this is so obvious and dangerous that if children are not educated in the Constitution and its laws, they are certain to fall under a Police State ruled by tyrants.

So we see the roots of our problems in education today extending back to that conflict between two opposing philosophies of old—in the battle for men's minds.

"Order," as represented in the blue area, is the concept of a free society based on the individual. "Chaos" is represented in the red area. It is a concept of totalitarian order, based on the centralization of power in a collectivist society.

#### THE TEACHINGS OF CHRIST

The next person we find on our chart on the side of Order is Jesus Christ. Historians are quite unanimous in considering Jesus Christ the greatest of all teachers. After nineteen centuries, He is still the central figure of the human race. Jean Jacques Rousseau, French philosopher whose ideas helped bring about the French Revolution, resorted to fraud to bring about change.

Rousseau knew adults would not be susceptible to change, so he concentrated at his efforts on changing children. His book, *Emile*, revolutionized education in that day. It was a fictional story of a boy raised without discipline. He was to follow his own judgment or impulses—our "learn by doing" concept in its original form. The boy Emile was denied books. Rousseau said, "Reading is the scourge of childhood. I teach the art of being ignorant."<sup>2</sup> No books, no verbal lessons. Rousseau's *Emile* was to grow up like a little savage, or as the original "Lord of the Flies."

Permissive education today has changed the attitudes of many of our youth. *Life* magazine shows how they are giving up our traditional American way of life and returning to nature, adopting communal living and group marriage, rejecting private property. Rousseau's teaching brought about the same changes over 200 years ago. These were the same ideals held by Plato over 2000 years ago. The emphasis on change today is far from new. But it has never quite brought about the disastrous results its perpetrators sought . . . until now.

#### DESTROYING HISTORY

Men like Rousseau who use fraud to destroy the minds of children must destroy history, because if children know history they will never fall for the propaganda of the elite philosopher kings. History is destroyed in two ways. First, they minimize history; second, they distort history for their own purposes. So Rousseau joined with Voltaire, Diderot, and d'Alembert to re-write the history of the world. They called themselves "The Encyclopedists."<sup>3</sup>

#### THE ILLUMINATI AND EDUCATION

To add another link to the chain: at this time in Germany, another educator working for change was Adam Weishaupt.

Adam Weishaupt merged Rousseau's "encyclopedists" with men of finance, to form an organization called the Illuminati. So powerful was the influence of this secret

movement that today, in all Communist countries throughout the world, the most important holiday is May Day—which commemorates the founding of the Illuminati on May 1, 1776.

There have been secret conspiracies all through the ages. The writings of Voltaire throw some light on the mentality of one such organization, the Illuminati. To quote Voltaire: "The mass is destined to remain stupid and barbaric. Therefore, unlike the intelligentsia, they need a God or king to keep them under control."

#### ROUSSEAU AND THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

Rousseau manipulated the French masses in just this fashion with his book *Social Contract*. He propagandized the socialistic term "General Will." In other words, "for the common good" we must share the wealth. He capitalized on class hatred by pitting the ignorant mass against the land owners, and his slogan "Liberty, Fraternity and Equality" became the rallying cry of the French Revolution.

We all remember the French Revolution. It turned into a blood bath, and the guillotine was the immediate answer to any opposition, throwing France into terror and chaos.

#### EDUCATORS' ROLE IN CREATING REVOLUTION

Some extremely important facts can be learned from this revolution. The conspiracy that brought it about was predicated on three factors: the men who financed it, the educators who changed the masses through permissive education, and the political philosophy of share-the-wealth (or socialism).

You notice we have finance on top of the triangle because the continuing chaos brought on by the French Revolution created family banking dynasties which, after every European war, suddenly became richer and more powerful. Today these same families represent the greatest concentration of wealth in the world.

The French Revolution proved that the combination for changing the thinking of the masses to accept a dictatorship is: permissive education, and the political propaganda of socialism. This combination has been used over and over again by educators and philosophers in Europe, the most significant of whom are Hegel, Fichte, Pestalozzi, Darwin, Bakunin and Nietzsche. We'll look at them next. From their teachings came not only the philosophy of Hitler's National Socialism and Marxist Communism, but our progressive education.

#### GEORGE HEGEL

First—it should be known that the arch enemy of all socialist propaganda is God—God and the simple truths of religious teachings. That's why George Hegel is famous for his statement, "The State is God."<sup>4</sup> He emphasized the value of war for maintaining a strong centralized government. He pointed to his teacher Rousseau's statement, "It is by public education that minds are given a national form."

The dialectics of Hegel laid the groundwork for Hitler's Nazism . . . Marx's socialism . . . and Kierkegaard's existentialism.

#### JOHANN FICHTE

Next on our list of educators-for-chaos is Johann Fichte who believed, like Rousseau, that reading should be postponed, and who like Plato considered educators as the real parents. Also, like Plato, he would put the guidance of the state in the hands of teachers. He taught this proposed elite ruling class of teachers to select their successors from their students.<sup>5</sup> This thinking also revered him to socialists like Bertrand Russell, who said in his book *The Impact of Science on Society*, "Fichte laid it down that education should aim at destroying free will so that after pupils are thus schooled they will be incapable throughout the rest of their lives of thinking or acting otherwise than

as their school masters would have wished."

The chaos required for mass movements like the French Revolution, World Wars I and II, Nazism and Communism, would not have been possible without the insistence for change by Fichte, Hegel, and Kant who were university professors influenced by Rousseau. (Hopefully you appreciate their effect on you today. The East German communists do, because they just honored Fichte on a coin commemorating his 150th anniversary!)

#### CHARLES DARWIN

On our list for chaos is Charles Darwin whose writings were welcomed by the elite Humanists for emphasizing the animalistic nature of man.

Darwin's theory is just that—a theory. If it were true, species could be crossed to create entirely new species. Some species have been crossed but the creatures thus produced are incapable of further reproduction. The donkey is the classic example. Darwin's theory has always been plagued by the "missing link," supposedly between man and monkey. There is also a missing link between amoeba and fish, dogs, cats, etc. There is of course no fossil evidence of any of these important missing links. However, I defy you to pick up one book on science in this country today that doesn't teach that evolution is the most logical answer for man's origin.

#### PESTALOZZI SCHOOLS IN EUROPE

Next on our list of past educators affecting us today is Johann Pestalozzi, who was a failure as a minister, lawyer, and farmer, but an overwhelming success as a permissive educator. He was so impressed by Rousseau's *Emile* that he raised his son following Rousseau's return-to-nature concept. He recorded his progress in a book called *Father's Journal*, and the success of his writings brought about the Pestalozzi schools in Europe.

Like Rousseau, Pestalozzi taught that reading and writing were unimportant. He emphasized the return-to-nature concept of Weishaupt. He stressed learning-by-doing. He did away with grammar. He collaborated with Fichte, who helped create the environment necessary for Adolph Hitler and Karl Marx. But most important to us is his influence on Horace Mann, the father of our public school system.

#### HORACE MANN FATHER OF AMERICAN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

John Dewey was not the originator of permissive education, Horace Mann was the originator. He introduced the 2-year normal schools for teachers in the United States, predicated on the Pestalozzi school system in Europe.

There is probably no better example of how modern history has been distorted than the way the career of Horace Mann has been recorded—and distorted. Our current encyclopedias and your children's history books tell us of the problems Mann had in promoting public education in this country. They lead you to believe the debate was centered around religion. This was a factor, but not the main issue.

The main issue is to be found in this book of the 1800's called *Poison Drops*. It reveals what the controversy was really about. The chart you see shows that Mann's public schools in Massachusetts had produced one criminal to every 649 persons, compared to Virginia's private school system with one criminal to every 6,566 people—almost 10 to 1. These statistics included native-born only, not even immigrants.

The book compares other social ills created by public education, such as suicide: one out of every 13,828 in state-controlled schools, as compared to one to every 56,584 in private schools. The book provides an excellent and authentic example of the con-

flict among the citizens over the introduction of public education. Unfortunately this book is available only at your local patriotic book store. It should be mandatory reading for every American high school student (or should at least replace *Catcher in the Rye*).

Horace Mann, the humanist who promoted our public education system, wanted universal education free of sectarian religious influences. Public education has never since deviated from this goal.

#### ANARCHY ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES

Today anarchy on our college campuses has caused a great deal of concern among American taxpayers. To trace the originals of its concept, again we must go to Europe. There, Mikhail Bakunin spent a year studying the writings of Fichte; he was overwhelmed by the teachings of Hegel; he carried Rousseau's hedonistic return-to-nature to the ultimate. In the end, he introduced the philosophy of terroristic anarchism.

You can find the anarchistic teachings of Bakunin only by visiting your local college bookstore, where his writings are extremely popular. He is the father of Nihilism; current Nihilists of course, are called Weathermen. They are doing exactly what their counterparts did in France during the French Revolution, and in Russia during the Bolshevik Revolution—attempts to create anarchy by bombing, kidnap, murder, and insurrection, in order to bring about the ultimate police state, a police state ruled of course by philosopher kings like the Utopia of Plato.

Perhaps you're still thinking this is old history, with no significance today. Have you ever read the Black Panther's *Catechism of the Revolutionary*? It's written by Mikhail Bakunin. Perhaps you see why history is so important, when you read the number of policemen assassinated, a major specialty of Bakunin.

#### FABIAN SOCIALISTS AND OUR MODERN EDUCATION

None of these men—Nietzsche, Bakunin, Pestalozzi, Darwin, Fichte, Hegel, Weishaupt, or Rousseau—would be of as great importance to us today if it were not for the group in England called Fabian Socialists.

The Fabian Society of England was a collection of racists, super rich, degenerate homosexuals whose depraved minds conjured up a plan of change to create a world government predicated on gradualistic socialism.<sup>10</sup>

Bertrand Russell's book *The Impact of Science on Society*, available only in England, should be of interest to all American parents who are concerned about the changes in today's education. Let me quote just a few paragraphs from the book.

Russell, (who by the way modernized and made popular the Peace Symbol) said, "I think the subject of most importance politically is mass psychology. Its importance has been increased enormously by the growth of modern methods of propaganda. It may be hoped that in time anybody will be able to persuade anybody of anything."

"Various results will soon be arrived at," said Russell, "First, that influences of the home are obstructive. Second, that not much can be done unless indoctrination begins before the age of ten."

#### WE CAN TEACH CHILDREN SNOW IS BLACK

"Third," said Russell, and we quote "verses set to music and repeatedly intoned are very effective. Fourth, it is for a future scientist to make these maxims precise and discover exactly how much it costs per head to make children believe that snow is black."

Russell goes on, "When the technique has been perfected, every government that has been in charge of education for more than one generation will be able to control its subjects securely without the need of armies or policemen." As yet, said Russell, "there is only one country which has succeeded in creating this politician's paradise." It is interesting to note that shortly before his

death, Russell was chosen by the United Nations to re-write the history of the world.

#### FABIANS IN THE UNITED STATES

The Fabian Socialists opened their branch office in the United States in September 1905. Some of their prominent members were Jack London, Clarence Darrow, Walter Lippmann, Walter Reuther, Eugene Debbs, Francis Perkins, W. E. DuBois, Norman Thomas. There are many more, but I have only named the people you may be familiar with. The member most significant to us in this film is the father of our progressive education, John Dewey.<sup>11</sup>

#### PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION AND WHO FINANCED IT

So we find that same triangle which existed in Europe before the French Revolution was formed in the early 1900's in this country. The triangle: educators, socialists, and (thanks to President Wilson) men of finance protected by tax-free foundations.

These tax-exempt foundations are responsible for financing Dewey's progressive education, and our humanist education of today. These facts are completely documented in Congressional committee reports of 1958. If you are interested in this, there is an excellent book called *Foundations: Their Power and Influence*, written by the General Counsel of the Reece Committee, Rene A. Wormser.

But really—why would these foundations which have all this money, finance socialist educators? Perhaps only they can provide the real answer. Some of their writings provide clues. Take Andrew Carnegie, shown here. His foundation has provided millions to progressive education.

He gives us insight to his thinking in his book *Triumphant Democracy*, where he revealed his dream to unite our republic with Great Britain to create a one-world government.

John D. Rockefeller has given millions of his tax-exempt dollars to the General Education Board whose goals for change were outlined by its chairman, Frederick T. Gates.<sup>12</sup>

As I read these goals, let's look at the products of this philosophy of education. Quoting Gates, "In our dream we have limitless resources, and the people yield themselves with perfect docility to our molding hand."

Gates goes on, "The present educational conventions fade from our minds, and unhampered by tradition, we work our own good will upon a grateful and responsible rural folk. We shall not try to make these people or any of their children into philosophers or men of learning or of science."

"We are not to raise up from among them authors, orators, poets, or men of letters. We shall not search for the embryo of great artists, painters or musicians."

"Nor will we cherish even humbler ambition to raise up from among them lawyers, doctors, preachers, politicians, statesmen, of whom we now have an ample supply." End of quotes from Rockefeller's General Education Board. I'm sure these humble citizens will buy Rockefeller gas, but they will never be competitors—will they, Rocky?

Dewey and his financial supporters realized that it wouldn't take long for the American public to realize what was going on in progressive education, as evidenced by this article appearing in the 40's. So educators simply announced that Dewey and progressive education were dead. Ask any modern day educator and he'll tell you, "We threw out Dewey and progressive education years ago."

#### HUMANISTS AND AMERICAN EDUCATION

But they didn't throw out Dewey's Humanism which is in complete control of our educational system today. This book, *The Philosophy of Humanism*, was written by Humanist Corliss Lamont (who was publicly identified as a Communist by former editor of the Daily Worker Louis Budenz).

Footnotes at end of article.

The fifteen parts of the Humanist Manifesto make it perfectly plain that humanism is the denial of the Judeo-Christian ethic. Their demand for redistribution of the wealth is pure socialism. One of the signers of the manifesto was, of course, John Dewey.

#### WHAT DOES THIS MEAN TO US TODAY?

You may be saying, "This is very interesting, but what does it mean to me, with my child in school today?" It means the humanist educators have taken it upon themselves, without your consent, to change the attitudes of your children in regard to God, Family and Country. For example, most all social studies textbooks published today state in the preface and in the teacher's manual that it is necessary for the child to unlearn his old values; he comes to school "damaged by the concepts he has received during the first five years of life, and requires mental healing." Educators are now saying that if they have the child for two years before he reaches kindergarten, they can so affect his value system that the child will not depart from it when he grows up. If they cannot have him before kindergarten, the next best thing is to undo, at as early an age as possible, the damage done to him in his home environment. Seventh grade is considered much too late to begin this process of retraining. For this reason, the social scientists have moved into the elementary level to write textbooks. The new series of books for kindergarten through fourth grade by Paul Brandwein, adopted by the State of California recently, has the express purpose of unfreezing the child's home-taught values. These books will be in state-wide use shortly.

#### EDUCATORS BEING TRAINED AS CHANGE AGENTS

You are looking at a series of lectures from the PACE Center of Los Angeles,<sup>13</sup> for school administrators or principals, on methods to bring about the change of our children's attitudes.

On the inside of the printed text, they define their goals. "What we are after is a kind of dynamic equilibrium, wherein the system changes, solidifies, changes, etc. In order to create this dynamic state of change, we need to consider all dimensions of the system. Further, we can think in terms of adding forces for change, or in terms of removing forces against change." In the next paragraph they tell us "The hope for educational change resides in the single school as a unit, with middle management, principals and coordinators receiving sanctions to be free as change agents." Teachers have adopted a new name—"change agent." Again we ask the question "Change to what?"

#### SCHOOLS WITHOUT FAILURE

A new book sweeping the country is based on the premise of the need for change. *Schools Without Failure* by psychiatrist William Glasser, whose book presents theories any parent with a "real" honest-to-goodness 8th grade education could see through. However, as a salesman, Glasser knows his business. Not only is he making a fortune selling his system to country-bumpkin school boards, but his technique is derived from any sales manual: "Let the customer think he has made the decision." Note how this works, using an article in *Look* magazine as our example. The Glasser method has your children sit in a circle and discuss topics that are "relative" today, such as the war in Viet Nam, over-population, ecology, starving children. The headline even uses musical lyrics of the Beatles, "I Read the News Today Oh Boy." Now the teacher, who is to offer no opinion, merely shows *Look* magazine's answer to these problems, in full color.

A vision of a human revolution shows a beautiful nude model desecrating the American flag in the name of ecology. Now what 6-year-old is going to be able to fight off

this blatant humanist propaganda in a loaded presentation like this? Especially under pressure of peers and the guidance of the "change agent" teacher! Remember, this is for children from kindergarten to 12th grade and they are a captive audience. With this method it is relatively cheap to convince children snow is black. They think they have made this decision on their own.

Dr. Glasser believes that education's emphasis on imparting knowledge to the student has been very destructive. He eliminates textbooks, grades or marks, and subjects. The teacher stresses that there are no right answers, no constant truths, and no constant moral principles. Pestalozzi said this over 100 years ago. Rousseau said it over 200 years ago and Plato said this over 2000 years ago, yet this is being promoted as modern education and if you dare object you are criticized as being against change, and negative.

Psychiatrist Glasser makes another familiar pitch that Fabian socialists have used for 40 years. They bring this old idea out every so often and pass it off as modern, and that is *do away with grades*. Dr. Bella Dodd, shown here, an ex-Communist and organizer for the New York Teachers Union, testified that for years, part of the main thrust of the Communist Party in this country was the elimination of report cards and grades.<sup>14</sup> Do you really believe that schools where a student experiences no success or failures can produce engineers, doctors, scientists or lawyers?

#### THIRD FORCE PSYCHOLOGY

In reality, Glasser's schools-without-failure concept is the tip of an iceberg. Underneath is the school of humanist psychology called the Third Force,<sup>15</sup> fathered by Abraham Maslow.

Maslow, former president of the American Psychological Association, spells out what the third force is all about in *Pace Magazine*.<sup>16</sup> The very-much-over-30 Maslow "speaks" for young people because only he knows they are looking for the certainties that religion and traditions used to give them: "Now religions have cracked up. It is not only God is Dead, but Marx is Dead and Freud is Dead and Darwin is Dead. Everybody is Dead. They have no sources of values to go by. So they have to work everything out for themselves. This new humanistic revolution has an alternative source of values."

#### THE EUPSYCHIAN NETWORK

In this same article Psychologist Maslow states he has set up what he calls a "Eupsychian Network" for people of like thinking, to create change so your children will accept the one-world, one-species—humanist religion. In this network, there are many organizations he lists. I'll only mention the three that pertain directly to your children. Esalen Institute, NTL, and International Corporation Council—or ICC. You are looking at the ICC newspaper featuring psychologist Glasser who also appears on their letterhead as an advisor.

Here on the inside cover of their convention program, you see what they say their goals are: "The development of a kind of education and educating process that will point toward the coming world civilization."

The second name in the Eupsychian Network is Esalen Institute. Here you see the Ford Foundation's Esalen project in sensitivity training for training teachers to become change agents. You will find it interesting to note that practically without exception this humanist third force psychology has been funded by tax-exempt foundations. Dr. Glasser himself has been a recipient.

This is how teachers are transformed into change agents. They not only get to see each other, they get to feel one another! They are gaining personal insight by bumping rears. This would be amusing if it weren't for the fact that these change agents, once they are through with their free feels, are going out

to change your child's beliefs in God, family, and country.

Our third listing in the Eupsychian Network is NTL, standing for National Training Laboratories. They are even more specific in their definition of sensitivity training and what it is supposed to accomplish on your children, and I quote from their booklet. "It includes coercive persuasion in the form of thought reform or brain washing as well as a multitude of less coercive, informal patterns."<sup>17</sup> NTL receives money not only from tax exempt foundations, but also from the federal government.

#### PSYCHO-DRAMA AND YOUR CHILD

There are other ways of changing your child's values. We believe one of the most insidious is "psycho-drama," supposedly the brain-child of Dr. J. L. Moreno who said some interesting things about it in the California Investigating Committee Report on Education, 1958.

Psycho-drama is a very simple and entertaining method of changing children's concepts on any given subject by merely projecting their thinking to that of the person whose role they are playing. As Moreno stated so beautifully, "The only way to get rid of the God syndrome is to act it out." This technique is widely used in schools throughout the United States today, especially in grammar schools.

There's really nothing new about psycho-drama, like all the other tools being used on our young people today. Fabian socialist Harold Rugg,<sup>18</sup> who loved to boast how he was financed by Rockefeller, features his version of psycho-drama in his book *The Child Centered School* printed in the 1930's. In the text, he tells how this was started with Jean' Jacques Rousseau. Small world!

As a matter of fact, sensitivity training has been used in communist countries since the revolution of 1917. Group confession, the essence of sensitivity training, is helpful to all philosopher kings in weeding out any peasant who has a value contrary to the general will.

The humanists (that is also what the Communists call themselves)<sup>19</sup> relieve this poor soul of his values in the most humane way possible.

We Americans are the heirs to the greatest society in the history of mankind; yet Maslow and his fellow Third Force Eupsychians tell us we're in a revolution. We're living in 'misery' with color TV, air conditioning, and automobiles . . . so our only hope is One World and one species. Is this One-World One-Species totalitarian state what we want for our children?

#### BERKELEY AND THE HUMANIST REVOLUTION

The great One World spokesman, of course, is UNESCO (United Nations' Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization). Its publication, UNESCO Notes, tells how the humanist revolution started in Berkeley 6 years ago.

There in Berkeley, the Humanist Revolution which UNESCO is referring to, was a communist-led revolution headed by Communist Bettina Aptheker and her W.E.B. DuBois Club. (DuBois, of course, was one of the early members of American Fabian socialism, who in the last years of life became a Communist). This anarchistic tumult gave prominence to our New Left and spawned the drug culture, which is ruining America. (Is this Humanist Revolution what you want for your children? Of course, it isn't.) That's why they're going to *force* your child to change, whether you like it or not. John Fichte wrote in his book, *Address to the German Nation*, "It is imperative that the state remove the child from the parent." Hitler used Fichte writings to the point that he had children informing on their parents.

#### TAKING THE CHILD FROM THE PARENT

Now our government is up to the same tricks. James Allen, Nixon's appointment to U.S. Commissioner of Education, says the

Footnotes at end of article.

new legislation called "child advocacy" will start teaching children at the age of 2½. He plans that each school district will establish a central school diagnostic center, from which agents will go to the homes of children aged 30 months. Data secured by interviews and tests will be computerized and interpreted by teams of trained professionals, who will then "prescribe" for each child, therapy, drugs, training, or whatever the state may deem advisable and will make sure each "prescription" is filled.<sup>20</sup>

#### BEHAVIOR CONTROL DRUGS

The National Educational Association's Journal, January 1969, tells us how behavior control drugs will be used in the '70's, supposedly to improve learning and behavior.

Already we have 30% of the children in the San Francisco Bay Area on amphetamines like Ritalin, to control what is referred to as an "epidemic in hyperactivity."<sup>21</sup>

The amphetamine, Ritalin, is known on the streets as speed, uppers, or diet pills. Socialist Bertrand Russell revealed years ago how this was going to be done, and I quote from this book, *Impact of Science on Society*: "Diet, injections and injunctions will combine from a very early age, to produce the sort of character, the sort of beliefs that authorities consider desirable. Any serious criticisms of the powers that be will become psychologically impossible. Even if all are miserable, all will believe themselves happy, because the government will tell them that they are so."

#### SOCIALISTS SAY THEY MUST GET CHILD EARLY

Bertrand Russell told us not much can be done with children unless you get them before the age of 10. So the big push now is in grammar school, and next, even down to the age of 2½, to teach them that snow is black. To see how they're doing this, let's look at some current publications.

This modern-day U.S. "Health, Education, & Welfare" publication reports how unimportant writing and English are. It tells teachers the main thing is not to command the adult language, but to communicate. HEW tells the teachers, don't correct spelling, punctuation, and grammar, on student papers. Instead, discuss content.<sup>22</sup> Isn't that funny—that's just what Rousseau and Pestalozzi said.

The benevolent Rockefeller has given millions of tax-exempt dollars to make us into "rural folk" as he calls us. The benevolent Maslow gave us his third-force psychology to help us become one world and one species. What are the results of these humanist endeavors?

Berkeley, California, one of the first communities to launch wholeheartedly into integration, now has so many disciplinary problems that teachers are demanding protection.

But the worst damage is to Negroes themselves, who point to the fact that they are 35% below norm on the national reading test. They claim integration only worsens their reading problems. This can't be publicized—it might upset the one-world, one-species humanist Utopia.

The Ford Foundation quietly came into Berkeley with \$250,000 to help set up an all-black high school in an all-black community, run by Buddy Jackson, avowed revolutionary. Jackson has been responsible, along with Black Panther Eldridge Cleaver and Huey Newton, for the criminal insurrection at the University of California.<sup>23</sup>

Obviously, integration isn't working in Berkeley, but this is kept secret from the public while the Federal Government enforces laws for mandatory integration. This brings up the same old question—why? The answer is "change." And what are we changing to? Take a look at the new generation that is unhappy and lonely, alienated from

family, religion and American values, the new generation which seeks immediate gratification through indulgence in drugs. That question again! Why would anyone try to bring this about?

Author of *Brave New World* and Fabian Socialist Aldous Huxley told us why, years ago, and exactly what they will do with these masses, once they have been created. We quote Huxley: "Assemble a mob of men and women conditioned by daily reading of newspapers. Treat them to amplified band music, bright lights and the oratory of the demagogue, who, as demagogues always are, is simultaneously the exploiter and the victim of herd intoxication, and in next to no time you can reduce them to a state of almost mindless subhumanity."<sup>24</sup>

Many youngsters who have been taken in by all this think a revolution here will bring Utopia. Do they know that in the Humanist Utopia of Cuba right now, you can get up to 2 years in jail, just for absenteeism from school or work?<sup>25</sup>

One thing is sure. This kind of revolution will never happen in Communist countries. There they know all about hedonistic return-to-nature theories, hippies, nihilists, communes, and revolutions. They wrote the books!

You won't find "progressive education" in Russia either. They used it themselves to come into power—to destroy religion and family. When it was accomplished, they returned to school grading . . . to strict dress codes, as shown in this Norman Rockwell painting . . . to a set curriculum, the 3 R's . . . and everything the Humanists are trying to eliminate now in this country.<sup>26</sup>

The traditional education which we knew in the past and Russia's current system of education—both stress intellectual discipline. Their purposes have been entirely different, however. Our past educational system prepared a student to take full advantage of his individual freedom in the free-enterprise system. Russian training is to prepare robot-like men to best serve the ruling elite "philosopher kings."

So here we are, almost 2 hundred years after Adam Weishaupt founded his illuminati. Even though we put a man on the moon, we have regressed to Weishaupt's permissive education. His political philosophy of totalitarian socialism has all but taken over. The financial backers on the 3rd leg of the familiar triangle have grown constantly richer and more powerful . . . and now see total world conquest within their grasp.

You doubt this? Surely you agree that only the United States stands in the way of a totalitarian takeover of the world.

Here are 300,000 of our own young people . . . just as Huxley envisioned in the Socialist plan . . . gathered together to hear amplified band music—with the only flags flying . . . the Viet Cong enemy flags.

History has shown that every generation has to rise up against the threat of a tyrant. Will yours? Will YOU rise to it?

Whatever you do, don't look to government—it is the problem! For example, the Nixon Administration's answer to the crisis in education is to spend \$2 billion-per-year more than was being spent when it took office. Has this helped?

Since Nixon took office, crime has risen 23% . . . the suicide rate jumped 66% in 1970 alone. One of the highest suicide rates occurred in the 15 to 24 years-of-age group. By the way, government statistics show that the psychiatrists and psychologists (the people who want to treat your children's so-called "damaged minds") top the list as the occupation with the greatest number of suicides!<sup>28</sup>

So what is the answer?

We have seen there are three ingredients necessary to revolution: Education . . . Socialism . . . and Finance. The financial powers in this country are protected by tax-

exempt foundations. So the first thing we must do is break this stranglehold over all of us. If we cut the purse-strings of the tax-free foundations, we could break the triangle tomorrow. You would see education change within the week!

Not only that—you would get a raise. 85% of income tax comes from \$5000 to \$15,000 income bracket. If Rockefeller and Ford and all the rest had to start paying taxes on their billions, it would lessen your share by a huge amount. So! You have nothing to lose, and everything to gain. Your children back, plus money, too! And a free nation with a future.

Second: dare to ask why?

You will drive your teacher, principal, or school board to distraction if you ask them why they are promoting programs like this. Their first reaction will be, "Who are you to question education?" When you again ask why, they will give you what is called "educational swahili"—which means, "we're smarter than you because you don't know what we're saying if you persist in asking why. Most educators will finally break down and admit they don't know what's going on either!"

Third: The law requires that your children go to school—or you go to jail! But you can hold the Humanist educators largely responsible for any damage they do your child simply by filing out this form. It's available from the Patriotic Letter Writers, Box 2003D, Pasadena, California. It tells the Humanist "child changers" that your child is not to attend any class in sex education or sensitivity training. Further, it states that for any damage your child suffers by being removed from the group—emotional, physical, mental, or otherwise—they will be held responsible.

Fourth: Take your child out of public school as soon as you can. This is the best investment you can make. Why save money to send your children to college if they can't read when they get there!

Finally—ask for a printed copy of this script with complete documentation on all important points we have covered. Be ready with answers. Keep in mind that anyone today who criticizes education is accused of being against "change, or negative." Teachers as "change agents" are being instructed to convey this message.

Don't accept only the facts presented in this brief film, find out for yourself.

The best place to start is in your local library, with current publications on education. For example; this teachers' edition of "American Observer" tells how a department of the National Education Association (NEA), called Association for Supervision in Curriculum Development (ASCD) is bringing about change. "Curriculum must change to fit a new culture." "Educators have a responsibility to decide what aspects of society cannot be tolerated and to do something about them." The article goes on, "Educators are society's 'cultural cops,' and the crisis in schools today is not caused by an inferior 'educational establishment,' but by the 'largely worthless' culture of an industrial society."

After reading these publications, you will understand why modular high schools, such as Troy High School in Fullerton, California, offer short courses in "How to Hate Your Parents Gracefully," "Encounter Group," "Brainwashing," "The Draft," "Revolution," "Student Rights," "War Crimes," "Women's Lib," "Yo-Yo" and "Atlantis and Reincarnation." This is termed "relevant" curriculum.

This new education is now costing the American taxpayer \$839 per year, per student, and if current legislation is passed, this figure could double.

There is nothing new about attempts to control another person's behavior. Physical forces and psychological warfare have been used since man first appeared on earth.

But remember, the ultimate goal of warfare is for the victor to control the behavior of the vanquished.

That age-old war for the mind and the emotions has been successfully rekindled and now rages in our school system.

The question is, "Will our generation be the one that finally succumbs?"

## FOOTNOTES

- <sup>1</sup> The Lincoln Library of Essential Information.
- <sup>2</sup> Jean Jacques Rousseau and Education from Nature, by Gabriel Compayre, p. 28.
- <sup>3</sup> Occult Theocracy, by Lady Queenborough. See also, Political Philosophy, by Bakunin.
- <sup>4</sup> The authorized biography of Volties by Redman, pg. 41-42.
- <sup>5</sup> The History of Educational Ideas in the West, by William K. Medlin, pp. 89-90, 100-101, also Messianic Character of American Education, by Rushdoony.
- <sup>6</sup> The Educational Theory of J. G. Fichte, by G. H. Turnbull, University Press of Liverpool. See also History of the Pestalozzian Movement in the United States, by Monroe, published by Bardeen, 1907.
- <sup>7</sup> Web of Government by MacIver.
- <sup>8</sup> Horace Mann, 7th Annual Report, 1843.
- <sup>9</sup> Doctrine of Anarchism of Bakunin, by Eugene Pyziur, p. 23.
- <sup>10</sup> Keynes at Harvard, by Zygmund Dobbs, published by Probe Research, Inc., revised, 1969.
- <sup>11</sup> The Turning of the Tides, by P. W. Shater and J. H. Snow, published by Long House, Inc. 1962, pp. 1-2.
- <sup>12</sup> Ibid., p. 162.
- <sup>13</sup> See glossary.
- <sup>14</sup> Bending the Twig, by Augustin G. Rudd, published by New York Chapter Sons of the American Revolution, 1957, p. 117.
- <sup>15</sup> The Third Force, by Frank Goble, published by Grossman Publisher, New York, 1970.
- <sup>16</sup> Pace Magazine, December, 1969, Vol. #12, p. 56.
- <sup>17</sup> The Child Seducers, by J. Steinbacher, Educator Publications, Inc., p. 158.
- <sup>18</sup> Bending the Twig, by Augustin G. Rudd, p. 262.
- <sup>19</sup> The Psychology of Humanism, by Corliss Lamont, Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., New York, p. 26.
- <sup>20</sup> Paul Scott's column, March 13, 1970, Anaheim Bulletin.
- <sup>21</sup> Los Angeles Times, April 25, 1971.
- <sup>22</sup> American Education, U.S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, June 1970.
- <sup>23</sup> Berkeley Union School District Bulletin, Jan. 20, 1971 and Feb. 1, 1971. Also, Berkeley Citizens United Bulletin, Jan. 1971.
- <sup>24</sup> The Devils of Loudun, by Aldous Huxley.
- <sup>25</sup> Bending the Twig, by Augustin G. Rudd, pp. 34-37.
- <sup>26</sup> Los Angeles Times, March 18, 1971.
- <sup>27</sup> F.B.I. Crime Index, 1969—increased 12%, 1970—increased 11%.
- <sup>28</sup> Center for Studies of Suicide Prevention, Nat'l Institutes of Health.
- <sup>29</sup> See glossary under Systems Analysis.
- <sup>30</sup> Los Angeles Times, May 11, 1971.

## GLOSSARY OF TERMS USED IN NEW EDUCATION

**Analytic**—Dividing into elemental parts or basic principles.

**Behavioral objective**—contains four characteristics; (1) identifies who is to exhibit the behavior. (2) identifies the behavior to be exhibited. (3) identifies the standard of performance (criteria). (4) identifies the givens and/or restrictions.

**Critical**—Characterized by careful and exact evaluation and judgement.

**Decentralization**—a theory of organization, a technique, a tool. Main purposes of decentralization; (1) Increase potential productivity. (2) Allow more creativity. (3) Organization can respond to change faster. (4) More people are accountable.

**Differentiated staffing**—Under differentiated staffing, staff members receive differentiated compensation commensurate with differentiated assignments.

**Educational park**—the "FACE" project in Berkeley Unified School District was based on a plan to end segregation. Black children to white schools, and white to black. Reorganized elementary grades from K-6 into K-3 and 4-6. Long-range planning included re-structuring primary grades to age three and middle schools for grades 4-8.

**Evaluation procedure**—the measurement indicated by behavioral outcomes, is a continuous procedure by the involved personnel.

**Exemplary programs**—worthy of being imitated; (2) serving as a model or archetype.

**Flexible scheduling**—The goal of flexible scheduling, also known as modular scheduling, is to individualize instruction so students can learn at their own pace. Traditional "periods" are replaced by "mods" of usually 15 or 30 minutes. The number of mods varies from class to class and from day to day. Large and small group instruction and in lab sessions. Free time for independent study, and most modular schools have some form of "learning package"—a course usually written by the faculty.

**Gifted Students**—(Mentally gifted Minors-MGM) above average students. "California Project Talent" is the official title by the State Dept. of Education-Calif. Also called "Enrichment."

**I/D/E/A**—A national Demonstration School Project to increase research and provide worthy dissemination material in the areas on non-gradedness, multi-age groups, variation in group size. Continuous progress, team teaching, flexible scheduling, and the promotion of individualized instruction.

**Individually prescribed instruction (IPI)**—The basic concept is that each child is taught at his own pace. The application of a scientific system of managing instruction that brings the teacher and pupil into a one-to-one relationship and, through continuing evaluation of the pupils work, permits the teacher to prescribe assignments specifically for him according to his need enabling the youngster to advance at his own pace (requires numerous parents to help in classroom, correcting papers).

**Innovation**—That which is newly introduced; a charge.

**Inservice-training**—is the "planned" education, after service begins, which continues to promote professional growth. Professional growth, in turn, encompasses activities that extend one's liberal education, increase his competence in a subject area, enlarge his professional knowledge, and refine his professional skills.

**Learning activity packages (laps)**—Instead of textbooks, teachers have broken down the curriculum into smaller "bite-sized" packages.

**Learning through "Inquiry"**—the most important result of learning through inquiry is a change in attitudes toward knowledge. As they engage in the dialogue of inquiry, they begin to view knowledge as tentative rather than absolute.

**Merit pay**—Under merit pay, staff members have the same responsibilities but get different compensation.

**National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP)**—a national census-like survey of the knowledges, skills, understandings, and attitudes of certain groups of young Americans. The procedure utilizes behavioral objectives to collect information.

**National Training Laboratories (NTL)** Division of Adult Education of the National Education Association (NEA). The field of human relations and leadership training has gone far beyond inspirational courses on how to influence people of institutes on tech-

niques of conducting meetings. The National Training Laboratories, and the regional laboratories and university centers growing out of its activities, attempt to bridge between the emerging social science research findings about human and social behavior and the growing complexity of human and social problems. (Sensitivity training).

**Ombudsman**—"The function of an ombudsman as conceived in Sweden more than 100 years ago is to receive, investigate and recommend appropriate action on citizen complaints against government administration. "Currently being used on school campuses.

**Operation PEP**—the project to 'Prepare Educational Planners.' PEP trained administrators in systematic planning procedures, systems analysis techniques, program evaluation review techniques, "planning, programming, budgeting system" and cost-benefit analysis.

**PACE**—(Projects to Advance Creativity in Education): supplementary education centers, to encourage school districts to develop imaginative solutions to educational problems, to utilize more effectively research findings. (Title III programs that foster educational change).

**Pass-fail**—A new system of grading students, devised by psychiatrist, Dr. Wm. Glasser. Utilizing three types of classroom meetings; (1) social problem-solving, concerned with the student's social behavior in school; (2) open-ended meeting, concerned with intellectually important subjects; (3) educational-diagnostic meeting, concerned with how well the students understand the concepts of the curriculum. No D's or F's are given in this controversial grading system. Dr. Glasser proposes to rid schools of "failure" with this new technique. Ref. "Schools Without Failure" written by Dr. Glasser.

**Planning, programming, budgeting system (PPBS)**—is a tool which can be used to plan and manage the activities and resources of a school district in its efforts to develop relevant and constantly improving educational programs. Also known under the title of "accountability." Also listed in the California State Manual on PPBS (1970) under "educational evaluation," are B. Bloom's three classifications of Taxonomy. (1) COGNITIVE—deals with recall or recognition of knowledge and development of intellectual abilities and skills. (2) AFFECTIVE—deals with interest, attitude, values, and applications. (3) The PSYCHOMOTOR—is concerned with manipulative skills.

**Problem solving**—students should be able to recognize problems, analyze problems by inductive/deductive methods, select a solution, apply the solution to the problem, and recapitulate the entire problem.

**Sequential curriculum**—a "cone" shape pointed down. As children grow older, they are introduced to more difficult materials. Different children of the same chronological age will be at different places.

**Systems analysis**—There are at least 60 different code names and acronyms for approaches or management controls such as systems analysis, operations research, operations analysis, PERT, PPBS, program budgeting, cost-effectiveness, input-output analysis, cost-benefit analysis, modular scheduling, computer-assisted instruction, and so forth. Systems analysis is more than computer-based techniques. It is an outlook, or more, of thinking, by which a particular organization may be defined, examined, evaluated and improved.

**Systems approach**—a composite of a number of planning, procedural, and allocative strategies, spreading from industry and the federal government to local school districts. It includes four major areas of educa-

tional application. We may view schools as an open system; identify the properties of various subsystems; analyze processes such as instruction, budgeting, and negotiations; and evaluate performance of the school system with the help of specific concepts such as the PPBS.

Taxonomy of educational objectives—(Handbook I—by Benjamin S. Bloom, Editor): the classification of the *intended behavior* students—the ways in which individuals are to act, think, feel as the result of participating in some unit of instruction. Taxonomy should be an educational-logical-psychological classification system and should be consistent with relevant and accepted psychological principles and theories. Taxonomy has three domains: (1) Cognitive—how you think. (2) Affective—how you feel. (3) Psychomotor—how you act.

By directing his attitudes, therefore we direct his behavior and, conversely, any attempt to control behavior by other means, unless accompanied by the development of appropriate attitudes is doomed to failure.

Teaching through "inquiry"—Teaching through inquiry is the process of formulating and testing idea and implies an open classroom climate that encourages wide student participation and the expression of divergent points of view. A truly inquiry-centered class is a small society whose members utilize the concepts and skills of the arts and the sciences, drawn upon their own personal experiences, and attempt to deal judiciously with important natural and social problems. Values are examined.

Teach teaching—This is the device by which two or more regular teachers work together and plan large-and-small group instruction for classes ranging from fifty to two hundred students.

[From the American News Analyst, Mar. 29, 1971]

#### EDUCATION?

The Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School is located in Maryland just across the boundary of the District of Columbia. According to the Silver Spring, Maryland, Advertiser it offers its students 225 subjects among which are these:

"Draft Counseling;" "Drug Offenders' Rights;" "Black Panther Seminar;" "Revolution: Why and How People Revolt;" "Student Dissent," and "Gay Liberation and the Rights of Homosexuals."

"And you, dear taxpayer," said the Advertiser, "are footing the bill."

[From the Washington Evening Star, Mar. 7, 1971]

#### PUPILS SEEK RACIAL HARMONY

(By Diane Brockett)

The slender black girl stood shoulder to shoulder with other blacks in the inner circle. Her partner facing her from the outside circle was also black.

She put her palms on her partner's, looking directly into his eyes, smiling but saying nothing. The outside circle moved to the left as the inside moved to the right, and the girl had two more black partners in succession, then a white girl, then another black.

Each time, the girl put her palms on her partner's, her eyes gazing earnestly into the other's, saying nothing.

Then a white youth looked over her head, behind her ear, at their hands, and over her head—everywhere but into her eyes. She looked at his face uncertainly, finally dropped her hands and her smile and moved on.

The young girl, a Wakefield High School junior, wasn't playing a child's game. She

has been among students participating in an experiment aimed at improving race relations at the 2,000-student Arlington school.

Called Project Wakefield, the program has involved 190 students over the past two months in sessions like this with a psychiatrist from the University of Virginia.

Through exercises such as the one described above, and other sensitivity training activities, the students have been forced to communicate with one another—black with white and white with black.

"You are going through a series of experiences that will permit you to communicate honestly with each other, permit you to look at your problems without turning each other off," Dr. John Messinger explained.

Late last week, these 190 students began conducting similar sessions in their home rooms.

The result, students and staff members hope, will be a better understanding of the two races' similarities and a respect for and acceptance of their differences.

The experiment is the result of meetings that began last summer between a group of students and staff members. They were looking for some way to make integration work at Wakefield.

Wakefield was integrated in the fall of 1964 when the Hoffman-Boston High School for Negroes was closed. But the two student bodies did not in fact become one.

The day after Martin Luther King was slain, the school's 450 black students held an all-day service in the gym instead of attending classes. The report that recommended Project Wakefield called this the black student's "first obvious protest" of their new school situation.

In 1969, the black students walked out of an assembly and presented demands for ending what they considered various forms of tokenism to Principal Thomas J. Cabelus, Jr.

White students, on the other hand, told of fearing shakedowns by black students and other incidents. Some also resented the King service and various protests the blacks held without punishment.

#### TENSIONS MOUNT

Tensions increased until November 1969 when a white youth committed suicide after wounding a black student with a knife.

School officials knew they had to do something and Project Wakefield eventually evolved.

During his five sessions with them, Messinger told the 190 students repeatedly that "You are going to have to open the lines of communication and keep them open."

"You're not going to be a friend of everyone, but at least find that out after you get to know him."

All of the recent sessions began with warm-up exercises, such as the one described above. These exercises were designed to make the students communicate with strangers in ways they normally reserve for their most intimate friends.

The first session dealt with "how do I feel when I am forced to deal with a stranger" and "can I commit myself to him." Each student selected the person he felt most unlike, and discussed the reason.

Then one member of each pair was blindfolded and led through the building by his partner. The lesson was trust.

#### INTERVIEWS HELD

On the second day members of each pair interviewed each other to evaluate what data they use to "know" someone. They reported what they heard each other say and their analysis of that person. Then each wrote "the person I really am."

Masks were given for the following session, white masks to black students and black

masks to white students. The students were assigned at random to racially mixed groups to talk about racial problems.

Each was to attempt to take the view of his mask.

Few had the masks on long, and most quickly gave up any attempt to talk for the other race.

But students in one group and then others began leaning in toward the center of their circles and the noise level in the room rose. A couple of groups didn't make it that day, but those that did contained some of the students, both black and white, who had hung back the most during the first two sessions.

One black youth sat for the first hour, his back almost to his circle, looking unhappy and bored. Gradually he turned around and by the end of the next hour was leading his group's discussion.

#### SHOCK TO WHITES

Messinger commented that "this lesson in empathy is usually more of a shock to whites who for the first time must think black. Blacks are used to working within the white power structure."

Students were segregated into two white and two black groups and put in four separate rooms for the fourth meeting. The blacks were assigned to either make a list of what blacks think about blacks or what blacks believe whites think about blacks. Corresponding assignments were given to the whites.

"You have one somewhat productive biracial experience," he explained, "and you tend to overestimate your agreement with the other person."

The separation also made both blacks and whites feel freer to say what was on their minds, he continued.

During the last day the students were reunited and divided into integrated groups to discuss goals for the school.

Conversations on black and white awareness began immediately and with volume. One black girl was standing and shouting at the whites in her circle.

#### LIKELY TO HIT YOU

"If you call a black a boy, he is likely to hit you," one youth explained to the whites around him.

"In New York I had more white friends than black so all whites aren't bad," a black girl was saying in another corner.

"You're yelling at me. I'm not used to this so it scares me," a white senior was trying to explain to the black girls around her. A frequent topic had been the noisiness of blacks in the school.

All of a sudden the blacks in one group were yelling at each other about helping and not helping "your own people" and how "whitey won't let you." Everyone gathered around and confusion grew.

Then a white youth jumped on a chair. "If you black people want to improve yourselves, we're behind you," he screamed emotionally. "But you start talking about making us slaves—we're gonna kick some . . ."

Messinger cut in. "You have proved everything you've been saying about each other. You've totally closed your minds to everything anyone else is saying. Now I hope maybe you can begin to learn."

#### MIXED EXPECTATIONS

The students who have participated so far, called home room facilitators by school officials, are mixed in their expectations. Most feel the school had to start somewhere, and it's a start.

"I don't think it's a smashing success," commented one senior who helped with the initial planning, "but we have to try. And if we can reach a few, it's been a good job."

James H. Fox, assistant principal who has worked closely with the project, said the degree of success will be as varied as the number of students.

"But we're trying to build a society in school which is better than the society in which the school exists. That's a pretty tough job."

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 15, 1971]  
"AWARENESS" REPLACES PUPILS' INVOLVEMENT'  
(By Lawrence Feinberg)

"Black Witchcraft Has Been Cancelled," the sign read yesterday at Gaitthersburg High School. "Occult Awareness, Offered Instead."

The signs and the seminars then referred to were part of the annual conference on "American civilization," sponsored for each of the last eight years by the Montgomery County Association of Student Councils.

In 1970 the main speaker was John Froines, defendant in the Chicago Seven riot conspiracy trial, who drew shouts and cheers of "right on," when he exhorted the students to overturn "the system."

Two years before that there was loud applause for Rufus (Catfish) Mayfield, the Washington "street dude" turned anti-poverty consultant, who set forth what he called "the black man's three Rs—resistance, rebellion, and revolution."

Yesterday the main speaker at the conference was Edgar D. Mitchell, the Apollo 14 astronaut, who walked on the moon last February. The bearded Mitchell showed movies of the moon and spoke of the need for scientific exploration. He won warm applause and apparently admiration.

As usual, the majority of the 800 students at the conference came from schools in Montgomery County, the others from the rest of Maryland and several nearby states. Much of what they said and heard at the two-day meeting was different from what such conferences have been in recent years.

Workshops on political issues were still held, but the sessions with the largest attendance were about astrology, religion, and music—electronic and Renaissance.

There was only one session on the Vietnam war, conducted by Donald Duncan, an anti-war ex-Green Beret. He drew only about 40 students.

Unlike other years, when they attracted the largest groups, there were no workshops on poverty or race relations or the problems of Black Americans.

"Race relations and the war in Vietnam are sort of worn out now," said Barbara Most, a senior at Churchill High School in Potomac.

"They've both been going on so long. What can we do? There's a feeling of frustration."

There also apparently is a feeling of withdrawal, of looking inward, one teacher at the conference said, and students being more interested in themselves and their own ethnic groups than in others.

Although the topic was not on the conference program, Jewish students at several workshops brought up the problems of Soviet Jews. One said he felt "a greater tie to them than I do to the blacks."

By contrast, three years ago when Mayfield criticized the way Jewish merchants operated in the black community, he encountered few objections, even from Jewish students, who later joined others in the applause.

There were about 60 black students at the conference—probably a few more than in most recent years—and some seemed upset there was nothing about blacks on the program.

"Last year everybody was gung ho on race relations," said Wendy Taylor, a junior at Springbrook High School in Silver Spring.

"This year it's the occult, next year who knows?"

She had the same explanation as many whites about why it happened. "Everybody's been faced with so many heavy things during the past 10 years," she said, "the riots, the assassinations. People just want to get away and coat them over."

The best of the workshops held today, Miss Taylor said, was on the "Philosophy of the East," discussed by a middle-aged Buddhist monk from Ceylon who was dressed in a bright orange robe.

Another speaker who was well received was the Rev. Joe Gipson, of Washington's Nash Memorial Methodist Church. He spoke about comparative religions—Christianity, Judaism and others, and although often identified as a black militant, said almost nothing about race relations.

The only other black speaker at the conference, William Denham, led a workshop on prison reform.

The male with the longest hair at today's conference was probably Joel Meltz, 33, an astrologer from Washington, who predicted that the world might undergo convulsions next year.

Meltz's talks on astrology drew a large group, and although many students listened respectfully, others drifted out. A few argued back, and Meltz responded to them with obscenities. He punctuated each talk with a low-pitched "Bah." The students were supposed to respond to that with "humbug."

One youth said he enjoyed hearing "bah" much more from the lambs that had been brought to the school courtyard for a session called "Animal Farm." Students crowded in to see farmers shear them. And in the warm April sun they seemed to enjoy lambs and farmers more than some of the discussion inside.

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer, Sept. 30, 1970]

HOUSE UNIT TOLD; DRUGS SOUND THERAPY FOR "PROBLEM CHILD"

WASHINGTON.—Behavior-modifying drugs are a medically sound method of treating certain learning disabilities that may affect as many as four million U.S. school children under age 12, government specialists told Congress Tuesday.

But a House privacy subcommittee also heard testimony from laymen who questioned the safety of such drugs, hinted they may be administered in some cases to normal but fidgety children, and said some school officials in Omaha, Neb., and Little Rock, Ark., had harassed parents who objected to the use of drugs on their children.

Subcommittee Chairman Cornelius E. Gallagher, D-N.J., said he remained skeptical of the merits of such drug use and intends to recall the government witnesses for further testimony later.

Dr. Thomas Points, a deputy assistant secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, said drugs such as CIBA Pharmaceutical Co.'s Ritalin and certain amphetamines are, under proper medical supervision, a "safe and effective drug treatment" for a children's nervous disorder known variously as hyperactivity, minimal brain dysfunction or hyperkinesia—the so-called problem child syndrome.

He said there is no evidence such drugs are habit-forming or addicting when properly administered, but conceded further research is needed.

Points said 38 studies over the years had all shown such drugs to be helpful in relieving symptoms of the disorder—inability to concentrate, restlessness, destructiveness, excessive energy and the like.

Dr. Ronald Lipman, a clinical psychologist

with the National Institute of Mental Health, estimated 150,000 to 200,000 children are being treated with the drugs by their doctors.

He said current estimates are that 1.5 million to 4 million children could be affected by the disorder and might be helped.

Points noted a doctor's prescription and parental consent are required for any child to receive the drugs.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 21, 1971]  
TWO NEW YORK TEACHERS RAPED IN CLASSROOMS

NEW YORK.—The top officials of the nation's largest school system called meetings with parents, teachers and police officials to devise additional safety measures following the rapes of two teachers in their classrooms Friday.

The rapes, latest in a series of violent incidents involving intruders into the public schools in The Bronx and in the Chinatown section of Manhattan. The second was disclosed only yesterday.

Both were carried out at knifepoint, police said.

"Our staff must be protected at all times in the exercise of their duties and so must the students be protected while they attend school," the officials said.

"Toward this end we will meet as early as possible during this next week with representatives of parents, teachers, supervisors and the police department to consider what additional measures for protection from such attacks can be taken by us and the police department and all other city wide agencies which have a responsibility for safety in the city," they said.

In the first attack Friday, a 28-year-old teacher found a youth of about 15 waiting for her when she entered her third grade classroom at P.S. 63 in The Bronx about 20 minutes before classes began. Police said the youth forced her into a closet where he raped her.

A 23-year-old teacher at P.S. 23 in Chinatown was raped in a classroom at 4 p.m. by a teenager. The Board of Education said it was not notified until yesterday of this attack.

The first victim was treated at Bronx-Lebanon hospital but the other woman did not require medical care, police said.

Mayor John V. Lindsay said after the first reported rape it was "an outrageous act of violence" and that Police Commissioner Patrick V. Murphy had assured him he was giving the case his "personal attention."

[From the Washington Evening Star, Mar. 22, 1971]

POLICE IN SCHOOLS

BOSTON.—Mayor Kevin H. White has ordered plain clothes police to patrol the corridors of some high schools today, to stop what he called "the disruption of education, the destruction of property and in some cases assaults on teachers."

Boston schools have been plagued by a series of student strikes, disruptions, false fire alarms and other disturbances.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Mar 1, 1971]

RACIAL STRIFE DISRUPTS SCHOOLS IN CHARLOTTE

(By John Mathews)

CHARLOTTE, N.C.—The Queen City; a white-collar sales and distribution center for the Southeast, aspiring to become the Atlanta of the Carolinas; a community now agonizingly caught in the crunch of history.

For Charlotte, the historic moment arrived

last September. Reluctantly responding to a local federal judge's orders, the school board instituted a massive cross-town busing and school rezoning plan, perhaps the most elaborate of any plan, North or South aimed at achieving total desegregation of a school system.

For the first 5½ months, efforts toward total desegregation of the combined Charlotte-Mecklenburg County school system appeared to be successful, with few racial incidents.

But in the last two weeks a pattern of racially motivated fights between black and white students in junior and senior high schools has led to temporary closings of several schools.

The racial lines, which many hoped were in the process of being blurred in the schools, are sharply drawn again.

Black students and teachers say racial tensions and the frustrations of black students have been seething for months. Whites tend to blame outsiders for provoking the trouble.

Under the desegregation plan adopted here, some 30,000 children from a school population of 82,500 were assigned to different schools in September. About 20,000 of these were bused for the first time to schools away from their neighborhoods.

Because of the desegregation plan, the school district is using 540 buses daily to carry some 43,000 pupils, almost twice as many as last year, when some 23,000 children were bused.

The additional buses carry black children to schools in affluent suburban areas and white children to formerly black schools in the inner-city or in Northwest Charlotte. About 71 percent of the pupils in the district's 103 schools are white.

In addition to children reassigned and bused, another 10,000 walk to "new" schools created by the revision of attendance areas.

#### BEGAN 6 YEARS AGO

This upheaval in the educational and social patterns of the school district results from a protracted school desegregation suit that began more than six years ago. It culminated with the decisions and orders of U.S. District Court Judge James B. McMillan.

The judge, a native North Carolinian, interpreted the Constitution and U.S. Supreme Court decisions to mean that desegregating the school system required eliminating any schools with a majority of black students and guaranteeing that each school reflect as nearly as possible the racial composition of the entire district.

The judge's order meant that each school should approach the 71 percent white and 29 percent black ratio of the school system as a whole. In practice, the ratio has varied from about 10 percent black in several schools to more than half black at three schools with unanticipated enrollment changes. Most schools, however, are within 5 or 10 percentage points of the 71-29 ratio.

Judge McMillan's decision is under review by the U.S. Supreme Court. Before the end of its current session, the court will pass on the judge's decision and two related cases. The high court's eventual decision, expected to deal with the unanswered question of what constitutes a desegregated school system, may rank in importance with the 1954 desegregation opinion.

#### PARTIAL REVERSAL

Although the Charlotte-Mecklenburg school board received a partial reversal of Judge McMillan's decision last May from the 4th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in Richmond, McMillan's original orders still went into effect.

U.S. Chief Justice Warren Burger refused to delay implementation of the orders after the black plaintiffs appealed the 4th Circuit

decision. The school board then chose to implement the most sweeping desegregation plan presented before Judge McMillan, although some observers feel McMillan would have accepted a modified plan.

After a spring and summer of legal maneuverings, the school board on Aug. 27 declared the complete desegregation of schools would have to take place. School Supt. William C. Self and his staff managed to open schools on Sept. 9, but it took a month to get them on full schedules because of difficulties in getting additional buses and drivers.

At first, community response was mixed. The Concerned Parents Association, which espouses "freedom of choice" and no "forced busing," called for a school boycott. It fizzled, although more than 2,000 white children were removed from public schools by their parents and placed in new or expanded private schools.

Over the next few months, isolated "black-white" fights erupted, along with some "black-black" and "white-white" fights, as school officials characterize such encounters, but the level and frequency of violence was negligible.

But during the last two weeks the picture has changed.

No student has been seriously injured, but "black-white" fights have become almost daily occurrences in junior and senior high schools. There have been threats and intimidations, property damage, walkouts by students and panicky visits by parents to take their children home.

Several schools have had to close early as police in riot gear guarded their campuses. The day after confrontations erupted at two high schools, only seniors were allowed to return, for lengthy talk sessions.

Looking down a high school hall last week, as extra school personnel, plainclothes police and volunteer parents wearing yellow armbands patrolled it one teacher said, "You can cut the tension here with a ruler."

#### Some scenes:

A white parent at a public meeting called by the Myers Park High School PTA to ease tensions demanded that the principal take action against the "savages" who hit his son with a plastic plate. Several black students among the handful of blacks at the meeting of some 1,000 parents, angrily walked out.

At a parents' meeting at West Charlotte High School, all black last year and now more than 50 percent white, several youths among a group of black students who were refused the chance to address the meeting say, "It's not going to be safe for a white to walk around here."

At the Education Center, school headquarters, a group of white students picketed daily with signs saying, "Segregation" and "Who Founded This Country?"

Recriminations are traded on all sides.

#### REFERS TO YOUTHS

William E. Poe, the school board chairman, suggests that "outsiders" helped foment trouble in the schools. The term is later redefined to mean students or youths from outside a troubled school, rather than adults or out-of-town agitators.

Julius Chambers, the black lawyer who has represented the plaintiffs, says in an interview: "The problems we have now could have been anticipated if the proper leadership had been given. The leadership has promoted polarization. Things couldn't help but explode."

Chambers, whose law firm's office burned down earlier this month, cites the Concerned Parents Association campaign for the school board during the spring as a particularly divisive factor. He also criticizes the school board for turning down a chance to apply for some \$50,000 in federal impacted-

area aid funds as a factor in creating a continuing crisis about where to find additional funds needed to finance busing.

Poe, Chambers adds, has not helped the climate by stating publicly his belief the Supreme Court would rule by midyear and would likely overturn Judge McMillan's busing requirements for elementary schools.

In a separate interview, Poe acknowledged that his prediction of Supreme Court action was wrong and says it was not aimed at promoting resistance. He emphasizes that at the beginning of the school year he resisted pressure to keep the schools closed.

#### NORMAL OPERATIONS

While most attention has focused on the troubled junior and senior high schools in recent weeks, the school system's 72 elementary schools have operated normally. And at the senior high level there were some signs that tensions were easing.

School officials who had taken the hard line that order must be restored first and grievances—if any—would be discussed later were beginning to handle the grievances.

Black students were calling for black assistant principals and counselors and in some cases getting them.

#### CONCERN OF ADULTS

While maintenance of discipline in the junior and senior high schools was the focus of adult concern last week, the main concern since the beginning of the school year has been busing, particularly cross-busing between city and suburbs.

Harry Golden, the author, a 27-year resident of Charlotte whose letters to local newspapers still produce angry reactions, says of busing, "It's now become the substitute for 'Would you want your daughter to marry a Negro?'"

At the elementary level, the most severely criticized transportation arrangement is cross-busing between 24 schools in white areas and a dozen schools in black sections of the city. Some 10,000 white and black children are involved, with blacks bearing more of the burden since grades one through four are in the formerly white schools and grades five and six in the formerly black schools.

At two paired schools, Beverly Woods, located in an area where homes cost from \$30,000 to \$100,000 or more, and 1st Ward, an inner-city school serving a public housing project, the disparities between student achievement levels are striking.

Teachers at Beverly Woods operate on a non-graded team approach, but they group children for part of the day according to reading achievement scores. As a result, the lowest reading groups are invariably largely black and the higher groups are predominantly white. Mrs. Deane Crowell, the principal, and her teachers say there is no other way to deal with educational deficiencies.

In a first-grade group, the teacher says none of the black children has had any nursery school or kindergarten experience, but the white children have all gone to either private nurseries or kindergartens and start off with a big advantage.

At 1st Ward, the formerly black elementary school, Principal Preston R. Allison, who is black, operates without special grouping by achievement. "I put my foot down to prevent any segregation within the classroom," he said. Low-achieving students, however, do come out of the classroom for special tutoring sessions.

Both schools have parent volunteer programs. Some of the parents spend time in the schools acting as policemen, but others are doing such things as tutoring.

One suburban housewife says her fifth-grade daughter is receiving "as good an education as children in any private school." She hopes her tutoring efforts are helping the

black children and several whites needing special help.

But like many of the minority who reluctantly accept integration, the woman worries about the high school disturbances. When her son came home after a series of fights at his high school, the boy burst out in a fit of anger, shouting, "I'm not going to be intimidated by those niggers." She said, "I was shocked to hear him use that word, which we never had at home, but at the same time I have mixed emotions about what is going on at his school."

[From the Washington Evening Star,  
Mar. 31, 1971]

#### ALEXANDRIA WHITES HIT DISORDER AT HIGH SCHOOL

(By Ellen Perimutter)

About 200 irate Alexandria residents last night charged that recent racial incidents at George Washington High School have caused a deplorable situation for white students and their parents.

"We're becoming total wrecks. We want to know how much longer protection for our children is going to be necessary," one mother said at the all-white meeting of the Rosemont Citizens Association in the Maury School basement auditorium.

Many members have children in the integrated high school which last week was the scene of a series of small fires after some black students pressed demands for changes in the school. Principal Richard B. Hills, who was present last night, was struck in the face by a student yesterday.

One parent with a son at George Washington said, "we cost the city money by sending our children to school. And all my son comes home with at night is turmoil."

Jack Clark, who has a daughter at the school, blamed the situation on "the attitude of the administration. We've talked to John Albohm (school superintendent) till we're blue in the face."

"My daughter was in school for four days last week until I took her out," he continued. "One of those days they showed films of Martin Luther King being put in jail. We've just got to get a change in the administration's attitude and from the school board."

The Rev. Carl Beyer of the Good Shepherd Lutheran Church in Alexandria tried to set a more conciliatory tone by telling the group "we have to concern ourselves with the long-range goals. We have to draw on members of the whole community—the black community."

"There is the long haul, even if everything went back to normal tomorrow. The long-range goals include reaching out to the black community," he said.

But remarks flew back and forth as parents demanded to know "why—how did this situation get this way in the first place?"

George Washington High Principal Hills, who authorities said was hit by a black student yesterday after the principal demanded that students return to class or face suspension, described the series of confrontations.

The incident in which Hills was struck came as 40 to 50 students tried to leave the school yesterday for a protest meeting at Market Square.

Hills met them at the door, a school spokesman said, and told them they would be suspended if they left. About 15 returned to class and action was being taken today to suspend the rest if they could be identified, the spokesman said.

About seven girls showed up at Market Square and went home when the rest did not arrive.

Today, a municipal court judge dismissed a trespassing charge against one of two non-

students who attended a "rap session" which the students held in the school March 22.

The charge against Ray Jivens was dismissed when Hills testified he had not instructed Jivens to get a visitors pass as he had told the other youth, Robert Moses, whose case was taken under advisement.

At last night's meeting, Hills assured the parents that faculty members are guarding the halls, and are demanding to see passes from everyone in the halls.

"Where were they when my boy was shot with Mace?" retorted Charles Hicks, who said his freshman son was hit in the eyes Monday. "Where were they when that happened?"

Vice major Wiley Mitchell told the father the assailant will be punished if he is found.

Mitchell said he thought "Mr. Hills painted an unnecessarily dark picture with respect to what happened at George Washington. I'm perfectly aware of the problems. I believe firmly that confidence from you and members of the George Washington High School is the key to our survival."

One mother observed that her daughter has had a "wonderful exposure to the sociological problems, even though she's been denied a certain amount of academic activity."

Some members equated the school problem to a discussion earlier in the evening about the noisy truck traffic through Alexandria's main thoroughfares, and the rising real estate tax assessments.

With rising costs, some said, and no protection, they wondered to whom they could turn for help.

Mayor Charles Beatley told them, "We might as well face it. We have risks in life we haven't planned on. We're doing our damndest and . . . looking at many cumulative things—well, just bear with us. We're just going to have to attack everything from a rational standpoint."

[From the Washington Evening Star,  
Mar. 25, 1971]

#### ALEXANDRIA COMPLAINTS AIRED: HIGH SCHOOL FIRES END DAY OF "RAP SESSIONS"

(By Thomas Oliver)

Several small fires erupted within minutes of each other at George Washington High School in Alexandria yesterday at the end of a session at which a group of black students aired their grievances with the principal.

At least one of the fires appeared to have been deliberately set, fire officials said. The biggest blaze damaged a room of the school gymnasium where wrestling mats were stored, but the others caused only minor damage. No one was injured. The school appeared calm today.

The blazes came after a day of "rap sessions" held between about 250 black students and Principal Richard Hills. After the fires, about 10 students also took their complaints to School Supt. John C. Albohm. At that meeting, the school's Black Student Union denied responsibility for the fires.

The first fire started as the students were filing out of the gymnasium after a boisterous meeting with Hills. Heavy black smoke began billowing from bleachers at the far end of the gym and the remaining students were evacuated.

That fire destroyed a number of wrestling mats in the room behind the bleachers and damaged the ceiling. There also was water damage to the gym floor, Fire Chief Milton T. Penn, Jr., said.

Cause of the fire was not immediately known. Penn said it could have been a defective light fixture. A reporter also saw stu-

dents smoking clandestinely at that end of the gym.

A few minutes after the first fire started, another began in the school auditorium when "apparently some attempt was made to ignite" the ends of curtain ropes, Penn said. Firemen extinguished that blaze quickly.

Meanwhile, "at least two" fires were found in trash cans in classrooms, Penn said, and were put out by school supervisors.

As the firemen fought the gymnasium blaze, a small group of black students stood by singing "burn, baby, burn" in unison. Some white students, who attended classes while the blacks were having their meetings, were visibly upset by the day's events. All students were evacuated from the school and sent home early.

GW has a black enrollment of 47 percent, largest of the city's three high schools. It has had the greatest number of racial-type complaints from parents.

Black students there first met with Hills on Monday to present complaints. One black student, a junior, went from classroom to classroom urging students to go to the "rap session," both students and officials said, and he was suspended.

The suspension appeared to be the main focus of the students' complaints yesterday, although the quality of the lunches was also mentioned prominently.

Curtis Carmichael, head of the Black Student Union, told Albohm that a questionnaire distributed mostly among black students also had brought requests for a student lounge in the rear of the cafeteria, the restoration of a juke box taken out last year, a student committee to advise the administration and more frequent "rap sessions" to air complaints.

The black students also demanded a relaxation of the school's disciplinary policies on suspensions, tardiness and absences.

They also complained that the school was not evacuated after bomb threats. Albohm responded that the fire and police departments had agreed that searches for the reported bombs, without evacuation, was the best policy. Otherwise, he said, "we'd be out of here twice a day."

#### REMARKS OF MRS. BESSIE PARTEE IVY BEFORE THE ILLINOIS STATE SENATE

HON. RALPH METCALFE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Speaker, on June 2, 1971, Mrs. Bessie Partee Ivy, the mother of my good friend, the distinguished President pro tempore and majority leader of the Illinois State Senate, the Honorable Cecil A. Partee, was called upon to deliver a speech in tribute to her most deserving son.

It was such a beautiful and heart-warming presentation, I thought my fellow colleagues here in the Congress of the United States would like to share the inspiration of her words, that now may become as immortal as those of Nancy Hanks. And so, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include Mrs. Ivy's speech before the Illinois State Senate in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

REMARKS OF MRS. BESSIE PARTEE IVY BEFORE THE ILLINOIS STATE SENATE, JUNE 2, 1971

You do me a great honor today, and I am indeed very, very grateful to you.

During the years of 1854 to 1856 there existed in America a political party known as the Know-Nothing party that got its name because its members answered all questions about the party by saying, "I don't know."

Right now, standing here with wobbly knees, half frightened, I think I could qualify for a membership in a Know-Nothing party as I keep asking myself the questions, "Why am I here? What could I be expected to say to this distinguished group of lawmakers who are my peers? and my answers are, 'I don't know, I don't know'."

Since I was presented as the mother of one of you, I would like to pay a tribute to the mother of the greatest of all Illinois statesmen, by reading a poem written by Rosemary Benet entitled *Nancy Hanks*.

If Nancy Hanks came back as a ghost,  
Seeking news about what she loved most.

She'd ask first, "Where's my son?  
What's happened to Abe?  
What's he done?"

Poor little Abe. Left all alone. Except for Tom  
Who's rolling stone;  
He was only nine. The year I died,  
I remember still. How hard he cried.

"Scraping along in a little shack  
With hardly a shirt to cover his back,  
"And a prairie wind to blow him down,  
Or pinching times. If he went to town.  
"You wouldn't know. About my son?  
Did he grow tall? Did he have fun?  
Did he learn to read? Did he get to town?  
Do you know his name? Did he get on?"

The Answer:

Yes, Nancy Hanks, we know your son. We know him not only as Abraham Lincoln but as *Honest Abe*, *The Rail-Splitter*, *The Great Emancipator* and the *Savior of the Union*.

He served the great commonwealth of Illinois as legislator for many years and then became the sixteenth president of the great United States of America, but he always said, "All that I am, and all that I hope to be; I owe it to my angel mother."

Unlike Nancy Hanks, I am privileged to know that you know my son—that you know what he's done—and that you know his name, Cecil Armillo Partee.

Thanks be to God for this privilege.

#### SUPPORT FOR THE U.S. COAST GUARD RESERVE

**HON. JAMES D. (MIKE) McKEVITT**  
OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. McKEVITT. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned over the plan to phase out the Coast Guard Selected Reserve.

My concern is based on several factors, not the least of which is that the phaseout seems to be false economy. I say this because after the Coast Guard Reserve training program is phased out by June 30, 1972, any Coast Guard Reserve requirements will be funded as an element of the Navy Reserve. The amount of that funding is uncertain. It will depend on what extent the Navy picks up the duties that are currently performed by the Coast Guard Reserve.

A substantial part of the Coast Guard Reserve program involves port security. As near as can be determined, the Navy

CXVII—1615—Part 19

has not made plans as yet to take up this important function. I would say that the port security function by itself is a rather critical one. It seems apparent that this important function must continue and it seems apparent that we can expect additional expense as the Navy devises its own program. We will also lose the services of those trained and qualified coastguardsmen who have been working in the area of port security as reservists.

It has also been estimated that about one-fourth of the members of the Coast Guard Selected Reserve are volunteers with prior service. The Secretary of Defense has stated that in future emergencies there will be a greater reliance on the Reserve.

This phaseout means the loss of a valuable personnel resource. There is also the question of what will happen to those presently in the Coast Guard Reserve. If we wish to give them the option of transferring to the Navy Reserve, additional legislation will be required.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there is a valid requirement for a Selected Reserve and that if we permit it to go down the drain we will be making a potentially serious mistake.

#### RESTRUCTURING THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

**HON. VERNON W. THOMSON**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has presented the Congress with an exciting blueprint for restructuring the executive branch. While the details of this reorganization plan should be carefully examined by the Congress, there can be little doubt that institutional malaise has robbed our burgeoning bureaucracy of the vigor and efficiency which our taxpayers should expect.

On July 1, the *Blade-Atlas*, published by Dennis G. Novinski in Blanchardville, Wis., carried a lead editorial that declared, "Let's Have Action." I suggest that the Congress would do well to follow editor Novinski's advice. A full text of the editorial follows. It clearly explains the taxpayers' position in support of streamlined Federal administration:

#### LET'S HAVE ACTION

The Administration's plan to reduce seven of the cabinet departments to four would be a major advance toward improving the federal structure.

The four new ones would be the Department of Community Development, Human Resources, Natural Resources, and Economic Affairs. This would require restructuring the present Departments of Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, Labor, Health-Education-Welfare, Housing and Urban Development, and Transportation.

The Departments of State, Treasury, Defense, and Justice would be untouched.

An estimated \$5 billion a year savings

could be realized. However, both elected officials and federal workers are expected to resist change.

Public support for Congressional consideration of this plan is essential to keep it from becoming lost in the shuffle of partisan politics and apathy. A \$5 billion incentive should be enough!

#### VICTIMLESS CRIMES: THE MORALITY OF THE MOMENT

**HON. ABNER J. MIKVA**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I recently saw a story in the *Chicago Sun-Times* which once again brought to mind the confusion and irrationality in our criminal justice practices.

According to the newspaper a young man from St. Louis, recently graduated from Harvard University, just began serving a 5-year sentence in a Federal prison for tearing his draft card in half during a 1968 protest against the Vietnam war.

In the popular rock-opera "Jesus Christ, Superstar" Christ at one point questions his coming fate, and asks God to explain why he must die. "You are awfully big on when and where but not so big on why," he complains. The same is true of our criminal justice system. We have forgotten why we do most of the things we do. Many of our practices are not only failing to do anything productive, but are actually counterproductive.

Nowhere is this more clearly seen than in the case of "victimless" crimes. The function of the criminal law should be to protect us from one another, not to protect us from ourselves. That is a problem for the churches and the schools and the psychiatrists.

It is both inefficient and ineffective to use the criminal law to impose our notions of morality on people's private conduct. We expend more of our limited criminal justice resources on prosecuting and incarcerating drunks, prostitutes and homosexuals than we do burglars, murderers, and rapists.

Even the Attorney General, in a recent speech before the National Conference of the Judiciary, agreed that the first obvious step we should take to help streamline the criminal law is to "clear the courts of the endless stream of what are termed 'victimless crimes' that get in the way of serious consideration of serious crimes."

For once I am happy to agree with the Attorney General—especially in the area of political crimes, like tearing up one's draft card.

In whose interest was the taxpayers' money spent trying and incarcerating this Harvard boy from St. Louis? Will he somehow come out a better and more moral man after 5 years in a Federal prison amidst embittered, hardened criminals? Will society somehow be better off by punishing this young man who

committed the crime of expressing his revulsion for a war which it is now agreed was an immoral and unjustifiable mistake? It is safe to predict that today, most of the jurors and officials who helped send this young man to prison agree with his judgment on the war. The difference is that he had the courage and the moral sense to understand this 3 years ago when such feelings were not yet in vogue, and he had the strength of conviction to express his feelings in the most dramatic way.

Without the constant pressure and unrelenting honesty of men like him, it would not be fashionable today to be against the war. Nevertheless, we have sent him to prison for his crime against the morality of the moment.

In such an Alice-in-Wonderland world, it is hard to know who the real criminals are. I only hope that we have not completely destroyed the idealism and moral courage this young man evidenced in 1968.

**PRESIDENT SIGNS THE PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT ACT**

**HON. JAMES ABOUREZK**

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. Speaker, one of the most grievous problems that has been facing our Nation is the problem of unemployment. Congress has taken cognizance of this problem with the passage of the Public Service Employment Act. However, in a system of government that is dependent on the concept of separation of powers, it is important that the actions on the part of one branch of the government be matched by action on the part of the others.

For that reason, I note with a great deal of pleasure the fact that President Nixon signed the Public Service Employment Act earlier this week. This action on the part of the President was a realistic response to the increasingly serious unemployment problem. I have frequently criticized the President for economic policies that have brought us simultaneous unemployment and inflation. But today I am pleased to be able to support him in his effort to deal with the unemployment problem and provide jobs for returning veterans.

Public service employment makes good common sense. All it does is to bring together those who want jobs with the thousands of jobs that need to be done. It is about time that we recognized the stupidity of letting thousands of men remain idle in a country which needs better hospital facilities, more irrigation, better recreation centers, and a cleaner environment. There is plenty of work around and this act will put 150,000 people to work doing it.

By signing this bill the President has recognized that there is no reason for a man to be out of work while there is so much work to be done. I think that he deserves credit for that recognition.

Of course, this act will not work miracles, nor will it make up for the basic economic failures of the present administration. But only those who refuse to praise the President no matter what he does will refuse to give him credit for signing this bill. I have always supported Mr. Nixon when I felt he was acting in the interest of the people of South Dakota. I believe that this Public Service Employment Act will help our state, and that is why I am offering the President my congratulations here today.

**THE JAYCEES, BLACKS AND THE FUTURE**

**HON. LES ASPIN**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the Johnson Foundation which is located in my congressional district sponsored a seminar on affirmative action and equal employment opportunity in cooperation with the educational programs division of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and the National Center for Voluntary Action. This seminar was held at the Johnson Foundation Conference Center May 13-15, 1971. The seminar was attended by representatives of U.S. Jaycee chapters from 50 cities throughout the country. The keynote address was given by the Reverend Leon Sullivan who is the founder and developer of the Opportunities Industrialization Centers which have now trained more than 75,000 persons for employment.

This speech, I think, is particularly good in suggesting how business and minority communities can join together in finding solutions to one of our nation's most pressing domestic problems, the unemployment and underemployment of minority group persons.

I commend it to the attention of all my colleagues. The speech follows:

**THE JAYCEES, BLACKS, AND THE FUTURE**

I got my first introduction to community organization work through the U.S. Jaycees. When I arrived in Philadelphia in 1950, one of the first things I did was to become a part of what was then the Junior Chamber of Commerce. As a matter of fact, it was during that time when there weren't Afro's in the Junior Chamber of Commerce much anywhere. There were a few, and I wanted to go in the Junior Chamber because first I wanted, as a black man, to be a part of breaking through something that I thought was meaningful at the time, and second because I saw in the Junior Chamber of Commerce an opportunity to learn how the whole enterprise system worked, to make acquaintances, and to meet and know people.

Some of the best friends I met were men who came to the Junior Chamber of Commerce, and these men are now emerging into the presidencies of our banks and chairmen of boards, members of the boards of trustees of foundations and enterprises. Those of you who are in the Jaycees are part of one of the most important organizations for opportunity that a young man can belong to in this country, and I say that as one who

has been in it. It is very simple now, as a result of that experience 20 years ago.

When I want to talk to a banker, I know a banker, because we were together in Junior Chamber. We went to the parties together, and we had our projects together. It makes it easy to get things done. So those of you who are from the Jaycees represent something very significant.

I was a TOYM (ten outstanding young men) recipient of your organization many years ago, and I prized it. One reason I came to this meeting was because it was your meeting, and I understood that you would have men here from various Jaycees groups around the country. That's really the only reason perhaps for my being here other than that I got an honorarium. But the reason I came primarily was because of you; otherwise I certainly would not be here at all—there are too many other things that I should do. But I thought it was important to be here, because you are opinion-makers; you are young men who are climbing the ladder; you are young men who one day are going to actually make determinations for your communities, for your States, and for your country.

This group has an organizational base with a philosophy I believe. I believe earth's great treasure lies in human personality. I believe service to mankind is the greatest service. I believe that things can best be served through free enterprise. I believe that is part of your creed, and it is a part of my creed, and at some point those of us who have the same kind of philosophical beliefs are going to have to utilize our contacts and our constituencies to pull this country together and to get us going in the direction that most of us, I hope, want to go.

It is an illusion to assume that the President can do it. I know the President, and I know the last President and the one before that. And as great or as weak as a President might be, the President does not have in his capacity the ability to really lift the Nation, to make it go forward in the direction we want it to go.

It still resides in the will of the people. Not until we Americans are able to pool our resources and get our dedications and ourselves together will we ever realize anything like a "great society," or will we ever realize anything like a "great America for our times." And you are the men who represent those who will be able to do it.

There are cataclysmic problems facing us. In the first place there are 300,000 veterans without jobs. There are going to be 100,000 more who will be out of work added to that number within the next 12 months—almost a half million. You will see the impact of it and the significance of it when you go into the inner city, what I call the "concentrated communities" of this country, where at this moment while the sun is shining you'll find a host of young men on street corners. Nothing to do. No place to go. And it spells trouble for the Nation.

These young men, particularly those who are Afro and those who are Chicano and those who are Puerto Rican, Indian and other minorities, represent one of the great challenges of America and also represent one of the great terrors of America. It's a volcanic situation. You may not see the fire, but there are flames. As I said on "Meet the Press" about a month or so ago, "these are no babies on those street corners. These men are the best trained killers in the world." Those of you who went to Vietnam were trained to be the best fighters in the world.

There is no fighting man in the world superior to a well-trained American soldier. The one thing that many of these men have learned to do is to kill and to use fire arms. I'm not here to try to excite the

country. I'm here because I'm in the community every day, and I know there is an unprecedented discontent among young men who are coming back to America these days. Either we are going to find a way to help these men to help themselves or else this country is going to have trouble in the next five years that you never dreamed of.

As a matter of fact, a presidential election period may well be the most disturbing period in American history by summer of next year—when they're all back home for the most part and when jobs have not been opened and when training centers are not available and when there is no getting through invisible walls of segregation and prejudice that have shut out blacks, chicanos, Puerto Ricans, and Indian Americans.

We have two years. If we don't do something decisive and conclusive in those two years, this country is going to be in a great deal of trouble. There are forces that will stir it up. It won't be forces like you sitting here; you represent the American ideal. They'll be forces who are organized to take advantage of the situation; they'll come into our cities and our communities. They will divide our leadership. They will categorize us, those who are trying to help, and they will call us all kinds of names. They will organize against us, and if we are not careful, they will throw the inner cities of America into virtual turmoil.

I'll be able to handle my city to some extent. Maybe there will be those of us who will be striving to go down to the wall, continue down the road of America, democracy, and opportunity, but I wouldn't take any chances on it, which means that the main priority, the chief priority of America as I see it, is dealing with the problems of the concentrated community.

It's not just an employment problem. There are other problems that enmesh the total perspective of the situation. Housing problems. In the name of urban renewal we have seen black removal all over America. There are 50,000 plots of land that are surrounded with little white fences all over this country where blacks and browns once lived, nothing was put up in these places. People are crowded into houses that existed for one family or two; now you find four and five or seven families in them.

Absentee landlords are getting rich off the plight of those who have no place else to go. The houses that are being built and all the regular money that is going into what we call urban renewal is going into downtown malls, university and college development, and into building bridges around the black community. The real concern for the emergence of these programs was to help the poor, the black, the brown, the red man to have a place to live. It has never been fulfilled. It has been one of the gross failures of the decade, the whole concept of what we call urban renewal. In the name of community development and the development of America, tax dollars and tax insurances have been put into suburban areas, restricted to whites.

Even where there were no laws, the minorities were restricted because of the lack of cooperation of banks, lending institutions, loans and savings institutions, and sales organizations. It is no joke any more. Several years ago a young couple in my church went to look at new houses. There were no salesmen there, though it was a new development. They went all through the house. There were no salesmen. They got ready to leave and opened the closet door. The salesman was in the closet. This was in Philadelphia.

You can look at the very state of the country, and you see the problem that exists. This is all compounded by the problems in our schools. All these things go to create

economic problems within the city. The inner cities are cracking up. They don't have the tax base to pay the police and firemen a salary commensurate to their needs. The tax base has eroded. There's nothing inside.

Because there is no money to sustain public services you have another problem.

Talking about pollution, we haven't seen anything yet like what we are headed for unless we do something about the tax bases of our cities, of our large cities.

Now I can go on and mention other things, but on top of it all is the fact America gets deeper and deeper into a hole. If the expectations of the Department of Labor are accurate, by the year 2000, about 29 years from now, there will be 300,000,000 Americans; of this number 60,000,000 will be Afro, Chicano, Puerto Rican, and American Indian.

Minorities and Orientals are coming in large numbers to some of these large cities. One half of all the jobs that exist in America now won't even exist in 29 years. New jobs will have taken their places.

They now build no elevators run by people instead they build elevators run by machine. The idea of a service worker is going more and more out of existence—the cook, the house cleaner. Now they build kitchens so small they put them into the middle of the living room. They are planning new methods of food delivery. There'll be infrared containers at your door; they'll put the week's supply of food there, bring your dessert special on special visits, take it back, put it in again.

The old idea of having someone cook for you is just going to be out of date in a few years. I saw some of the biscuits they are experimenting with; they boil up and jump out and cook themselves. You can go to work and come back and set your dinner. Then they have a hole, and you just take your dishes and put them all into the hole. And they squeeze them like a little box, and you throw them out.

This is the shape of the future. Most of the jobs will require some information and some ability. And yet, one out of every three blacks in America cannot read back what he reads in a page of an encyclopedia. Some people call it functional illiteracy. In addition to that, there are 30,000,000 whites who are functional illiterates.

They talk about 24,000,000, but there are 30,000,000 whites who are functional illiterates right now. Seven out of ten Americans never finished high school: white, black, brown, seven out of ten! Now, if we don't train men and women for the jobs that are coming into existence in our American society you are going to have more and more people depending on the Government for their existence.

If you think welfare is a problem now, you haven't seen anything. By the year 2000 we have calculated that one out of every three black and brown Americans will be on direct relief. One out of three. The relief by the year 2000 just for the blacks, browns, and the reds will be \$120,000,000,000 a year. For the whites it will be \$240,000,000,000. For America it will be \$360,000,000,000 for relief. In just 29 years!

That's more than the whole budget of America now, with the war and everything else. The country now is bankrupt. If we hadn't paid our taxes (those of us who did a few months ago), we would have to go to jail. The country right now is bankrupt; the American debt is now \$350,700,871,252 as of 1969. Every citizen owes \$1,781, from a little baby to you, on the American debt right now.

This is not a question as to what you are going to do for people; the question is how

you make a man independent, self-dependent so he can earn his way, so the man can earn a living, so he can buy a home where he wants to live, so a man can educate his children, so a man can be self-dependent.

Now, my concern goes deeper even than that, and I might as well be very honest with you gentlemen because those who know me know that I'm an honest man, the best I know how. If I thought that just getting these benefits would be all, I wouldn't mind it that much, but I have another problem. It's a problem of my survival. Some people ask me why do I keep going.

I pastor a church with 5,000 members, 6,000. Many men here are members of my church, all over the country. I have the largest church outside of New York, I guess in the country. They pay me well, at least they did last week. I don't have to be a big man; I'm already a big man, six feet five inches. I don't have to run for office. Mr. Johnson asked me to be a member of U.S. delegation to the United Nations; I turned that down. Mr. Nixon asked me to take jobs. I do it for my survival.

About eight years ago I was invited by the West German Government to come to Germany to make an evaluation of the progress of the democratization of the West German Republic. I went there and made a study for the West German Government. The most significant visit I made was to a little town called Dachau. I went in that little place and stood on the ground where the bodies of 25,000 people had been burned underneath my feet. I stood where 10,000 people were shot down like dogs.

I went into the gas chambers; the jets were still there, calculated to destroy a race of people. I realize what can happen when a centralized government has control over vast number of people from a central point of control.

I realize that if this could have happened in Germany in an enlightened age to one of the most vital minorities in the world, it could come to America where one out of every three black men has to depend on the Government for where he lives, where he works, the money he gets. One third of a population! A government that gives me that kind of support is a government that can take my life away.

I further looked at the country, and I saw that 70% of the blacks and the browns of America live in 70 communities in this country. Whites are moving out; blacks and browns are moving in. I know that unless I can make blacks and browns self-dependent taxpayers, independent, I'm headed for trouble, because a depression will hit this country—not a recession, a depression—by the weight of its own welfare.

And scapegoats will be sought for and will be found, and the scapegoat of America will be the black man. My children will hardly survive it. You say on a day like this, sitting in a nice city like this, it couldn't happen. They said it couldn't happen before Hitler, but it happened. You'll be surprised what people can do, what they will do.

So for my survival and for the survival of America, I decided that I will do everything within my power to help the free enterprise system work for everybody, to make everybody I can reach and help, self-dependent, independent, a proud man. I started with boycotts; I boycotted everything in my town that didn't employ black people, until they all employed them.

Then when I found that jobs had become available I decided to develop a training program to train people for jobs, because the government jobs programs were not reaching my people. They screened us out. They didn't care much about us.

I created a program first with my own money. My church loaned me \$40,000, and I got a loan on my house, organized a thousand women, and raised \$100,000. An anonymous donor gave me \$50,000.

With that money I took an old jail house and started the first OIC, Opportunities Industrializations Center, to train people to help themselves, saying to people that man is like a balloon; it is not his color that makes him rise, but what he has inside him. I took many women who never finished high school, who had given up hope, and men with bricks in their hands to break out windows, to teach them that America need not be torn down. We can build it up for everybody.

Just to make a vocational training program wasn't enough. I wasn't interested in making a school or building schools, but in building a training program that would reach the needs of the common man. So I started what I call a feeder program to get a man's attitude straightened out and help him have a great dose of self-belief. In the feeder program we taught the basics—reading, writing and arithmetic, only I didn't call it reading, writing, and arithmetic.

I knew the people didn't want to read, write, or do arithmetic, so I called it communication skills and computational art. We taught consumer education—how to make your dollar stretch for you, how to tell a good loaf of bread from a stale loaf by the marking on the wrapper, how to tell a good chicken from a stale chicken by the way it smells, how to tell the weaving of a piece of cloth by its feel and texture.

We told a man where he came from, told a black man to be proud of being black and a black woman to be proud of being black, the greatness of a black man named Aesop; a black man by the name of Hannibal, a black man by the name of Pushkin, and of black men straight through the history of the world, so the people could identify with some of the greater men who were black. At the same time I taught about other people—Ireland and how the Irish came, Italy and how the Italians came, Germany and how the Germans came. We found out what America is—the combination of many minorities from all over the world, the greatest experiment in the world.

Every man has his problems; every man must have respect for himself. I found out that when a man respects himself, he doesn't have to hate anymore. I taught self-respect; "Put your head up, your shoulders back; you can." I taught about the free enterprise system. We are the only program in America that talked about the free enterprise system, a black program serving blacks and browns, because to me the future of the world is still going to be determined by the extent that the free enterprise system works, as long as it works for everybody. If it works for a few and for whites only, it will never survive, because people like me won't let it survive; I'll break it up.

We are moving into a skill training center where men learn the skills—how to be a lathe operator, a grinder, a miller, a typist, an IBM keypunch operator, a computer programmer, a plumber, a carpenter, an electrician. Then we move people through that training program, at the same time teaching attitude, motivation, and self-confidence, until they come out near the spout an OIC trainee, and when they are on the job they become the best workers in town. Many of them had police records, had been in jail or prison; girls had been prostitutes. They came to OIC and got a new name, a new skill, new hope. People before had not wanted them, didn't let OIC's in. Now in Philadelphia 11,000 trainees are working on jobs, earning \$60,000,000 a year, saving the commonwealth of Pennsylvania \$12,000,000

which would have gone to relief checks for 10,000 people on a waiting role. Companies that never employed blacks before now have girls, men, women in all their offices, because OIC proved what could be done with a man. It was a miracle. It was like a man being born again in another way. I didn't do it, I initiated it. I founded it, but men and women in Philadelphia, black and white who believed in what we were doing, gave their time, helped interpret what we were doing to their plants and their businesses, sold the OIC concept until the concept pervaded the whole city. OIC became a success.

Now in 100 cities there are OIC's for blacks, browns, Mexican-Americans. The greatest OIC to see is in the West. In Oklahoma the OIC are Indians, the OIC in Roanoke, Virginia, are Appalachian whites. There are some hills where they have OIC centers, and they don't put my picture up, because Sullivan is supposed to be white. They don't want people to know that I'm a black man. I'm going to visit them; I'm going to take a tour of all the white places.

The goal in the next decade is to train a million men and women for jobs, black, brown, red and white. If we do, we can add \$24,000,000,000 to the American economy and save this country \$70,000,000,000 in relief money in ten years. It isn't being done by the government, isn't being done by Mr. Nixon nor anyone else like that. If the government runs it, they will ruin it. Pardon me, any of you government guys in here. All I want is your money. Give me your money, and I'll run it. Let me run it. But I need the support of government for the expertise they have, the support they can give. Most of all we need the help of America, of all Americans.

The decade of the 50's was a decade of protest. It was the decade of redress. It was in the decade of the 50's that we got laws on the books. The decade of the 60's was a decade of protest. The decade of the 70's must be the decade of progress for all of us. And if we all work together, we can realize those ends.

We have been able to get support of big business. The OIC program has an advisory committee comprised of the greatest industrial leaders of this country—the head of AT&T, head of Chase Manhattan Bank, head of The Bank of America, head of Kaiser, head of most of those firms you work for. But you know they can't help me that much. OIC's will succeed to the extent that the man in the community is willing to give of himself—his time, his effort, his health to make that program succeed.

I met a young man here from Omaha; I know where he is. I was out in Omaha a few weeks ago, and they told me that some of the Jaycee people were there, and they heard about the work of OIC in Omaha. They got on fine with the OIC idea. Now they are out there helping that program, and that program is going to become one of the greatest programs in Omaha, and it is going to help save Omaha. It couldn't be done by the blacks themselves. It had to be done by the blacks and the whites working together.

The greatest network of man power in America outside of AT&T, where you have Bell telephone companies everywhere, is in the U.S. Jaycees. After a while you become exhausted roosters; then you move on. You become middle class, but before you become an exhausted rooster you are full of energy and vim and vibration, dedication; some of you even get militant about things every once in a while. You must harness the Jaycees organization behind programs, not just OIC, but programs developed by the Urban League and other programs developed by other groups in those communities, by the Chicano community, by the Puerto Rican community.

You must identify some priority efforts and put your eggs in that basket, in addition to what we do on Christmas with our Christmas toy program, in addition to our club scout programs, in addition to our projects that we carry around in our project portfolio. We really must get down with it where the needs of America are. Concentrate on specific work, to bring out of you the best that you have to build the best that can come out of America; then the Jaycees will have its greatest day. Most of all it will help to save America. Because if we don't save it, I tell you, neither the President nor anyone else will.

And not only must we train people for jobs. We have got to get people in the main stream of owning businesses and enterprises. There are 6,000,000 businesses of any consequence in America today. Very few are owned by blacks, because blacks never had the opportunity to move in that direction. More and more they are going to be moving in that direction. Those of you who have skills, who have been to the business schools, the law schools, the universities, are going to have to help those programs, those businesses to succeed. Big business has to become more sensitive to the needs of the humanity of the nation.

Before I became a member of the General Motors board, I was asked to be a member of the boards of large national corporations for three years. I turned them down. One day last December I got a call from Detroit. The man said he was chairman of the board of the General Motors Corporation. He wanted to know if I could come out to see him. I said, "No, I cannot come out to see you, but you can come out to see me." A couple of days later he called back, and I gave him the time that I could see him. He came to Philadelphia to discuss whether or not I wanted to be on the board of General Motors. I went home and talked to my wife and children about it. We had a vote on it, the three children, my wife, and myself, five of us. We voted, and the vote was four 'yes' and one 'no'. I said, "No." I went on the General Motors board. I have been fighting ever since. But I went on because I felt that if there's one place in the world that represents the establishment and big business, it is General Motors. Some people ask me why I think they wanted me on the board; I say they wanted me so they could use me. So I decided I could use them. We are using each other.

Since I've been on it, that is what we have been doing, and throughout this country in the months ahead you are going to see some vast changes. Extraordinary things will be happening to the corporate structure of General Motors. You are going to see black men in board rooms of every major corporation in this country. You are going to see black women, black men; you are going to see white women—you guys have been keeping these women down. If you are going to have changes like that in the corporate structure, you are either going to use it to help people or one day the people are going to take it away. You either use it or you are going to lose it. The day will come when those who own stock in big business are going to have to recognize that a portion of those dividends is going to have to go to social uplift. If you don't do it, you are going to lose what you have got. Big business is going to have to realize that it has got to become as humanitarian as it is profit-centered. Or else we are going to lose what we have. We must make free enterprise sensitive to the needs of the American people. That's why I'm on the General Motors board.

Sometimes you have to do things that people don't like. Two months ago, for the first time in history, a member of the board of directors voted against the board of General

Motors. I voted against them. They didn't even know how to put it down. It never happened before. Why did I do it? Well, it was because of an issue that I disagreed with: the issue affected what was happening to my people in Africa, in South Africa and the people for all these years had let it go by. No one had said anything. No one had spoken. Well, I had to speak, and I spoke. It might not mean much immediately, but in time that will mean something, too. Those people are waking up and seeing how billions of people are treated like dogs in other parts of the world. I think we are on our way, and I think we can go as far as we will together.

I'm not just hung up on black power; I am black power. I say, "I'm Mr. Black Power", but I know that you need black and white power together to build American power. This is the road we have to walk now because we all are going up together or we all are going down together.

So I came to this meeting because I wanted to say as one black man to you who aren't black, "I ask you to take my hand." I remember in Springfield, Illinois, when I received the Toym Award and I said, "Take my hand."

I ask America to take my hand again, so they can do something about the problems of the returning veterans and the poor and the impoverished who aren't veterans in the large cities of America, where one of every three blacks is still underneath the poverty line, where Chicanos still live in the most miserable conditions in some parts of this country, where Indians still live much as they lived before the white man ever arrived here.

If you don't believe it, go into those corners in Oklahoma and see how your Indian brothers live. I ask now, once again, to take a hand, to make the U.S. Jaycees relative and meaningful for our day. The old junior chamber of commerce can't exist and survive in the world now.

It's got to take a new road of service and uplift, help men to help themselves. You are the greatest organization in America. I challenge you to use that strength and power, that resource, to help save this country. If you do, together, it will change the cries in our streets from "Burn baby, burn" to "Build brother, build".

#### GOVERNMENT AND THE ARTS

### HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I would call to the attention of the House the following editorial which I think outlines our responsibilities to the arts. While President Nixon and Congress have taken greater strides to support the arts and humanities in the past few years, the article indicates there is still much that is worthwhile to be done:

#### GOVERNMENT AND THE ARTS

Historically in the United States, support for the arts has been a matter of patronage by art lovers and their checkbooks. But this era of the patron of the arts seems to be coming to an end. Spiraling prices, increased taxes, coupled with a slowdown in the economy, have brought many symphonies, art museums, theatres and other cultural enterprises to the brink of insolvency. In our own area, the Loretto-Hilton professional

theatre company had to close down. This year, the Mississippi River Festival has managed to hang on by its teeth, largely through welcome support by the Illinois State Arts Council. And the St. Louis Symphony is struggling to keep its head above water.

Many people don't know that Illinois and Missouri have State Art Councils. These Councils have been set up for the purpose of helping to support artistic and cultural enterprise in the two states. In both states, the amount of assistance requested by the respective governors is relatively modest—\$750,000 in Illinois, \$306,000 in Missouri. Nationally, the Congress has authorized \$60 million for the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities.

Many people do not believe it is a proper function of government to help nurture the arts. But in terms of what six other progressive Western nations provide, governmental aid to the arts in the United States is infinitesimal.

We are seventh—it's computed our per person tax tab for the arts is seven-and-a-half cents. Number six is Great Britain, where the cost to the average citizen is \$1.23. Sweden and Austria both provide \$2.00 per capita for the arts, and up to a whopping \$2.42 in West Germany.

Now, Americans are taking a long hard look at this country's priorities. The most glaring inequities are those which exist for the poor, the elderly, and the deprived. We are demanding that our government balance these inequities. But KMOX Television suggests concern for the arts is also deserving of a higher slot on the priority list.

Man needs his music, his literature, his art, his crafts. We ask our viewers to think about it. And then think about man without his arts.

#### VIETNAMESE ELECTION

### HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, since introducing a resolution providing for the appointment of an American study team to observe the Vietnamese presidential election, I have repeatedly sought the administration's views on my proposal. The administration has for months promised to comment on my legislation, which was introduced with 48 cosponsors on March 3.

The promises have been constant for the past 3 months, but the administration has failed to deliver in this area, as in many others, I can only anticipate that, when a response does come, it will be too little, too late, and we will have reached the point where we can have no assurances as to whether the Vietnamese elections are in fact free. This would be a grave disservice to the American people, who have sacrificed tens of thousands of their young men in an effort to preserve freedom of choice in Vietnam.

Recent articles from three newspapers—the Washington Post, the Washington Star, and the New York Times—indicate that events which will have great influence on the October election are already occurring in Vietnam. If we

are to know what is happening in the political campaign, we should have had observers there already—but the House of Representatives will not act on my resolution, or similar legislation, until the administration makes known its attitude. I, therefore, urge an early response to my inquiries to the State Department, and prompt subsequent action by the House.

The articles referred to follow:

[From the Washington Post, June 24, 1971]

THIEU SIGNS CONTROVERSIAL ELECTION BILL WITHOUT CHANGE

(By Peter Osnos)

SAIGON.—President Thieu today signed into law the comprehensive election bill setting out the procedures to be followed in the upcoming presidential campaign and balloting.

Thieu delayed signing the measure until almost the last possible moment, prompting speculation that he might amend controversial provision requiring candidates to get the endorsement of 40 national assemblymen or 100 provincial councilors.

But Thieu signed the bill intact. The move was announced on the government radio's 10 p.m. news broadcast. The measure would have gone into effect automatically at midnight.

The requirement for legislative endorsements has been criticized here and abroad both for the heavy-handed way Thieu maneuvered for its passage and the fact that it is clearly designed to limit Thieu's opposition next October.

#### U.S. VIEW

American diplomats, despite their avowed policy of noninvolvement in the election, have stressed privately to Thieu the great importance attached by U.S. public opinion to a legitimate campaign.

Fearful that Thieu could end up in a one-man race, American officials right up to Ambassador Ellsworth C. Bunker have met in recent weeks with Vice President Nguyen Cao Ky and Gen. Duong Van (Big) Minh to encourage them to run, informed sources said.

Thieu is a very heavy favorite to be re-elected. However, with Ky in the race, Minh's chances are thought to be better than they would be if he faced the president by himself.

The principal concern of the Americans has been that Ky would be kept off the ballot by the endorsement provision and Minh would then drop out also charging that Thieu is rigging the election.

Immediately after the election bill was passed by the National Assembly June 3, Ky's chances of getting the necessary signatures were thought to be small. But the vice president may have outflanked Thieu by creating an alliance with Minh to assure that neither would be squeezed out of the race.

#### MINH'S BACKERS

Under the agreement, sources said, Minh will get his backers from the National Assembly and will help Ky concentrate on the councilors. The vice president's campaign manager, Le Van Thal said today that Ky already has pledges from 100 provincial legislators.

Informed Vietnamese observers regarded Thal's assertion with scepticism and noted that in any event, the pledges must still be turned into "legalized" signatures.

Whether Ky will eventually get the backers he needs is still not clear, although his chances now are thought to be better than they were three weeks ago. Minh is confident of finding sufficient support in the National Assembly and, sources said, he assured Bunker that he will make the race.

As for Thieu, there are reliable reports circulating in Vietnamese political circles that the president, acting through his province chiefs, is exerting strong pressure on local councilors to line up solidly behind him.

One progovernment source said Thieu has so far signed up 400 of the country's 550 provincial legislators.

In Giadinh province, just outside Saigon, where the pressure has been so blatant that even seasoned Americans were startled, 20 of 27 councilors have already declared for Thieu, sources there said.

The president's influence over the councilors is substantially enhanced—and that of Ky diminished—by the fact that Thieu's province chiefs can recommend dismissal of any of the provincial legislators.

#### PROVINCE CHIEFS

By bearing down on his province chiefs and at the same time deciding not to make the election measure less restrictive, Thieu is believed demonstrating anew his determination to run the election his own way, regardless of what it might cost him in international prestige.

A number of American diplomats who several months ago spoke optimistically of Thieu's intention to carry off the election with a minimum of political hanky-panky, are now taking a markedly gloomier line.

"I'm not convinced anymore that it's going to be honest," said one official, "but there aren't enough signs yet to say that it's going to be dishonest either."

Some of the other provisions of the election law are these:

Applications for candidacy must be submitted before Aug. 3 and the candidate must deposit \$7,500 with the national treasury for campaign expenditures.

Anyone deemed Communist or a "pro-Communist neutralist" by the Supreme Court is prohibited from running.

The election will be held Oct. 3 and any Vietnamese citizen 18 or over can vote, provided he places his name on the voting list and has a voters card.

[From the Washington Star, July 13, 1971]

#### VIETCONG CARRYING FIGHT TO THE VOTING BOOTH

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

A development of potentially large importance is taking place in Vietnam, completely unreported in the American press. For the first time, the Communist National Liberation Front is calling on its supporters to take an active part in South Vietnam's political process.

The Communists, as is their wont, still are denouncing the forthcoming elections as a fraud. But at the same time, they are urging their followers to take an active part in the August vote for the South Vietnamese National Assembly and the presidential elections that will follow in October.

The purpose of the change in tactics is not clear. In earlier elections, the NLF has always called on its people to boycott the vote and try to disrupt the electoral process. Today they are being told by the NLF radio that they cannot continue to "stay outside of the struggle" and must join in a political effort to unseat the regime of President Nguyen Van Thieu.

The Communists do not seem confident that this can be done and, like other elements of Thieu's opposition, are calling foul well before the elections are held. At the peace talks in Paris, Mrs. Nguyen Thi Binh, the representative of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the NLF, has denounced the coming vote as a fraud.

As long as American troops remain in South Vietnam, the party line claims, free and democratic elections will be impossible.

Yet evidently the leadership of the NLF sees interesting possibilities in the coming contest, if only as an effort to undermine Thieu's hold on the electorate and the assembly. American officials have predicted for years that the time would come when the Communists would take "the political road" as a means of attaining their objectives. And now for the first time, this may be happening.

In calling for defeat of the present regime and the establishment of a "real political force" in the South, the NLF appears to be concentrating its hopes on opposition candidates for the National Assembly and on Gen. Duong Van (Big) Minh, Thieu's principal rival in the presidential election.

At various times, the NLF has made it clear that Minh is a political figure they believe they can work with, as opposed to the rigid anticommunism of the Thieu regime.

Minh, though no Communist, has allied himself with vaguely identified "peace factions" in South Vietnam. With a studied lack of precision that can be interpreted in different ways, he is calling for a "strong and honest government representing a just cause" in South Vietnam.

The Communists also may have reason to believe that Minh is a less determined and effective political leader than Thieu. After leading the military coup against President Ngo Dinh Diem in 1963, Minh served briefly and without distinction as prime minister of a provisional military government.

Though popular with the electorate, he is generally regarded as indecisive and easy-going.

The impact that the NLF could have on the election, if its plea for political action by its supporters is followed, is hard to predict. The Front itself cannot play any open part as a political organization under the present constitution.

Still, it is quite certain that the Communists are the most effective and disciplined political bloc in the country, given the fragmentation that exists among other groups. And if they succeed in throwing their support behind Minh, even in a covert way, the outcome could be placed in doubt.

This, in turn, might force Thieu to take more repressive action against his opponents. Anything that he may do in the way of rigging the election laws, suppressing newspapers and harassing opposition candidates is grist for the Communist mill.

The preliminary charge of fraud—standard procedure in virtually all Asian elections—is carefully calculated to increase public unrest in the country and damage the image of the regime.

One point, however, is clear. The Communists, in taking the political road, are not in the process of abandoning their efforts to seize power by military action. On the contrary, all the signs point to stepped-up military pressure between now and the elections, concentrated near the Demilitarized Zone in the north and in the central highlands, with renewed acts of sporadic terrorism throughout the rest of the country.

By a combined military and political offensive, the Communists hope to bring about a gradual disintegration of the political structure that has been built up in South Vietnam over the last five years. And their appeal for participation in the elections is only a first step toward this objective.

[From the New York Times, July 15, 1971]

#### KY SAYS THIEU TRIES TO RIG VOTE

(By Alvin Shuster)

SAIGON, VIETNAM.—Vice President Nguyen Cao Ky accuses President Nguyen Van Thieu today of using "dictatorial practices" to silence the opposition, muzzle the press and insure his re-election.

Mr. Ky's sharp personal attack, in the form

of a letter to the President, asserted that Mr. Thieu had failed to achieve his objectives in four years in office, that democratic institutions had been abused and corrupted, that society had been weakened and that "the basic rights of the citizens are under serious threat of annihilation."

Mr. Thieu has "an excessive attachment to power," Mr. Ky said.

Mr. Ky, who reiterated that he would challenge the President at the polls on Oct. 3, is trying to meet the requirements to make the race. Under a law backed by Mr. Thieu, a presidential hopeful needs the endorsement either of 40 of the 195 members of the National Assembly or of 100 of some 550 city and provincial councilors.

#### DEADLINE IS AUGUST 3

According to Mr. Ky's aides, he has received pledges of support from about a hundred councilors but province chiefs, who are appointed by the President, are hesitant about validating the endorsements. The deadline is Aug. 3.

Apart from the political implications of the Vice President's allegations, the letter underscores the rift between the two men, who joined up in 1967 at American insistence. There is substantial bitterness and they are no longer on speaking terms.

"You promised to resolve the war," Mr. Ky wrote Mr. Thieu, "yet more than ever we are locked in a situation of war with no end in sight. You promised social reforms, but our society is fraught with unprecedented injustice and corruption while the soldiers, the civil servants and the unprivileged citizens are condemned to a life of destitution unknown to this date."

Now, Mr. Ky continues, President Thieu has embarked on what was termed a blatant attempt to fix the elections through a series of acts showing "undeniable indications of dishonesty." He charged that the President was exerting pressure on legislators and local councilors "to prevent them from sponsoring the candidates whom you fear."

The Vice President, like the President a former career military man, coupled a plea for the end of the alleged practices with a warning of the repercussions from fixed elections. He said the winner would meet with indifference and contempt from the people and would have neither the authority nor the prestige for leadership.

The other potential challenger, Gen. Duong Van Minh, has also accused Mr. Thieu of attempting to rig the vote.

Although General Minh, the hero of the 1963 coup d'état against the Government of Ngo Dinh Diem, seems assured of the required endorsements, the question of Mr. Ky's ability to get them remains. General Minh has suggested that he will not run unless Mr. Ky does.

American officials are still concerned that both men may drop out of the race, leaving President Thieu unopposed and tarnishing the democratic processes the United States has tried to foster.

Mr. Ky concurred in General Minh's view that the election law requiring endorsements was unconstitutional because it "flagrantly violates the principle of direct suffrage." The Supreme Court ruled early today, however, that the controversial law was constitutional.

#### FREDERICK PRICE ROONEY

#### HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, recently, at the graduation ceremony of the Gar-

den City High School, Frederick Price Rooney, president of the graduating class, formally addressed the audience.

The school is in my hometown village, and the young man is not only known to me personally but is a nephew of my colleague in Congress, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable FRED B. ROONEY.

The speech was direct and to the point. Rather than a speech of despair blaming the whole world for a specific individual's unhappiness, it was one which asked patience from parents in seeing that their children achieve the high goals and idealisms they have set for themselves.

Frederick Rooney is remarkable because of his many achievements, both in his school and in his community. I had the pleasure of awarding him my Congressional Medal of Merit, which was given for many reasons but is best summed up in one phrase, "Because he loves his country."

I believe my colleagues would like to read the speech of one young man who speaks for his own generation, for our generation, and for generations yet to come.

The speech follows:

**SPEECH OF FREDERICK PRICE ROONEY**

Parents and friends of the Class of 1971: First of all I would sincerely like to thank the Class for giving me the opportunity to speak on their behalf.

I am extremely proud to be able to speak for a class such as ours, a class which has excelled in the 4 basic goals that Garden City High School sets out to instill in its students, those goals being scholarship, sportsmanship, service to the school and community citizenship.

In the field of sportsmanship our teams can be gratified by the many awards brought to our school for athletic achievement. The students in this class having participated in organized sports have benefited greatly not only in the physical sense, but they have benefited from the values and teachings instilled in them by their coaches and fellow sportsmen.

We are also very proud of the fine scholars who have brought credit not only to our class but also to our school and community.

The class has a large number of students participating in community activities ranging from candy stripping, nurses aides, junior male volunteers, human resource workers, etc.

But most of all in the field of citizenship we are the proudest. For the first time in the history of Garden City High the class gift has been given to an outside organization. We have awarded the United Cerebral Association \$550 to be used for obtaining an exercise staircase which will train young cripples how to walk. This proves the deep concern we feel for our fellow human beings, especially those less fortunate than we.

When people say we are very different from our parents they are only partially correct because we are very similar in this same respect, for we are striving for basically the same goals that you strove for only in different ways. The times have a lot to do with the way we do things. For example when you were young the depression and the war left little time for a young person to think about being an individual. Young people had to work and earn money to help support the family. Today we have much time for ourselves, time to think and hope.

Hoping that we may do the things that we want to do in our own special way thereby setting us apart from others working for the same goal. And hoping that the skills, knowledge, values and ideals that we have learned during our years in school will serve us well in our contributions to society.

We sincerely hope that our training both at school and at home will prepare us to stand up for our ideals in a world where being an individual takes a lot of strength. We ask that you stand by us in the years to come and not be discouraged by our failures, but have courage and faith in us. We thank you for standing by us during our long years in school and we greatly appreciate all that you have done for us. We only hope that the pride you feel for us now never fades, "for yesterday is already a dream and tomorrow is only a vision, but today well lived makes every yesterday a dream of happiness, and every tomorrow a vision of hope"—sanskrit.

**THE INVISIBLE JEWISH POOR**

**HON. BELLA S. ABZUG**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, among the many myths about America's poor is the widely held but totally inaccurate belief that poverty is confined to the black and Puerto Rican population and certain sections of Appalachia.

In fact, poverty among more than 30 million Americans extends into all parts of the United States. One group that has been virtually ignored consists of almost 1 million Jews with incomes of under \$3,000 a year.

This problem is discussed in fascinating detail in a recent article in the Manhattan Tribune by Mrs. Anna G. Wolfe, program consultant in the intergroup relations and social action department of the American Jewish Committee.

She points out that more than 15 percent of the 6 million Jews in our Nation live below the poverty level, and that approximately 60 to 65 percent of poor Jews are elderly. As I have observed in the 19th Congressional District, the major problem facing the elderly poor is housing.

Mrs. Wolfe reveals:

Their living conditions are often inadequate, in various stages of dilapidation or repair. Frequently, they need help in improving their current housing, or assistance in relocation.

Studies in New York City have revealed that about 10 percent of the Jewish population there is sustaining itself on \$3,000 a year, or less. Thus, about one quarter of a million Jews subsist in our city below a level of \$3,500 a year, and another 150,000 live at near poverty on incomes below \$4,500. There are Jewish families receiving aid to dependent children, a fact that is usually greeted with disbelief. The third largest poverty group in New York can be found among the 80,000 Chassidic Jews in the city.

The discussion of "the invisible Jew-

ish poor," as Mrs. Wolfe refers to them, indicates the need for our government to confront the problems of poverty among many diverse groups in our population. We need more research and data, but most of all we need government action to end poverty, including the creation of more job opportunities, public works programs, job training programs, a higher minimum wage and a guaranteed annual income that will allow all Americans to enjoy their basic rights of adequate food, shelter, and clothing.

At this point, I insert into the RECORD the full text of the Manhattan Tribune article:

**THE INVISIBLE JEWISH POOR**

(By Ann G. Wolfe)

Some 7 years ago America was startled to learn that there were, among us, 30 million poor people living below a level that was considered the poverty line by government standards. For a reason that is not altogether clear, the Jewish community did not recognize the relevance of this phenomenon to its own people. To be sure, from time to time, we would read about a group of Jews living in extreme poverty, but these groups seemed to be few and far between, and with an occasional exception, did not arouse either passion or anxiety. It is difficult to explain why it took so long for us to come to the realization that we too, have our poor—our "others"—a situation which now presents us with a new and urgent challenge.

A recent issue of Jewish Week, an Anglo-Jewish publication—the April 22, 1971 issue—has as its lead editorial, an item with the caption, "Belated Recognition of a Problem." In it the editorial states:

"Better late than never is the utmost of enthusiasm earned by the announcement of the Central Conference of American Rabbis (Reform), that its incoming President, Rabbi David Polish of Evanston, Illinois, is proposing a far-reaching program of service to the Jewish poor in America.

"It is not merely neglect that the American Jewish poor have suffered. They have been the victims of prejudice and discrimination as well, and they have suffered from these attitudes at the hands of fellow Jews. Lest the Reform rabbis be allotted a disproportionate share of the blame for past error because of their present decision to take action, let it be recorded that the whole of the affluent Jewish community, including even much of the Orthodox establishments, is to blame.

"Because the myth that the American Jew has conquered poverty has been generally accepted by the affluent Jewish majority, we do not even have reliable statistics on the extent of Jewish poverty."

The publication carries a news item that quotes from Rabbi Polish, to the effect that thousands of Jewish poor families do not have a place in the Jewish community and he went on "We have swept the Jewish poor out of sight and acted as though they didn't exist."

The years of the past decade have moved along with increasing technological advances, leaving behind institutions and people who have become both out of fashion and ill-equipped to deal with challenging needs. Some of us believe that many of our most serious national problems stem from the failure of our institutions to adapt to change. In the Jewish community, we see a larger aging population unable to adapt to a new and different society, and if we are candid, the same failure of national institutions to take cognizance of these changes, holds true for some of our Jewish

institutions. Part of the blame lies with the institutions, but the greater blame lies with us. For more than a decade after World War II, until the 1960's began to shake us out of our complacency, many of us were content to sit back and take comfort in the fact that we never had it so good. It was during this period that we became aware, and the country as a whole was convinced of the affluence of the Jewish community; it often created problems for us. All the statistical figures on income showed the Jewish community enjoying higher average incomes, and a higher median income than that of the general population.

The researcher encounters the greatest difficulty in collecting information on income. Not until 1940 did the federal census include such a question. Among the large numbers of Jewish communities surveyed, very few collected information on income, and some of the information which was collected is often questionable. However, a small number of national surveys did include such questions. These clearly documented the fact that the income level of Jews is above that of the general population. A study conducted at the University of Michigan in 1956, indicated that 42 per cent of Jewish families had incomes of \$7,500 and over, compared to only 19 per cent of the general population. The National Opinion Research Survey conducted in 1955, had similar data. The median income for heads of Jewish households was just under \$6,000 compared to just over \$4,000 for the total population. Somehow, these facts hid some others, less pretty.

It is in these studies that we find significant indications of the extent of poverty in the Jewish community. The National Opinion Research Survey on income related to religion, reported that 15.3 per cent of Jewish households had incomes under \$3,000 a year; and 22.7 per cent of Protestants had incomes under \$3,000 a year; 15.6 per cent of Catholics had incomes under \$3,000 a year. If we were to add the figures for the near-poor—those earning under \$4,500 a year, the figure for the Jewish community would be much greater. 15 per cent of six million people is a large number.

Who are the Jewish poor? Who are those in the Jewish community who have not made it, who are not making it, and who live their lives in quiet desperation, out of the mainstream of the Jewish community?

We had blind spots in our vision of ourselves and it is time to look at the facts. An interesting example of a blind spot related to wealthy Miami Beach. In a study done in that community called South Beach, it was learned that 40,000 people were clustered in an area of some 30 square blocks. Of these, 80 per cent are over 65, and 85 per cent are Jews. The average annual income is \$2,460; thousands are living on less than \$28.00 a week for rent and food.

Elderly Jews, the remnants of the vast immigration of the beginning of the 20th century, constitutes the largest group of Jews living in poverty. In spite of all the figures I have given, we do not know, accurately, what proportion of the poor in our community are elderly. The 8 or 9 community studies which we have reviewed reveal that something like 60 to 65 per cent of Jews living in poverty are over 60 or 65 years of age. An impressionistic look at the needs of the elderly poor—discloses that the major problem facing the elderly poor is housing. Their living conditions are often inadequate, in various stages of dilapidation of disrepair. Frequently, they need help in improving their current housing, or assistance in relocating. They often find themselves the last hold-outs in areas that have ceased being Jewish. Loneliness and isolation are perhaps the most poignant

characteristics of old age, and these are reinforced for the Jewish elderly who are locked in to neighborhoods that no longer offer them the support and security they need. More than emotional insecurity is the sense of physical fright that the deteriorating neighborhood induces.

The aged often live alone, (one report says 2 out of 3), as widows or widowers, in housing arrangements that do not allow for much meaningful social contact with others.

We owe a great debt to the present population of the elderly in our community. They were the ones who helped build our community. The vast numbers managed on their own—some had some help, but for the most part they were a vigorous, powerful, independent force. It should be possible for them to live out their years involved and cared for, and we should make it clear by what we do that we value their lives, their experience, the work of their hands, their humor, and their constant hope.

In a recently published book about the elderly Jews in a old age home—Home Life, by Dorothy Rabinowitz and Yedida Nielsen—this hope is etched sharply by one resident of the home who said:

"I don't want to talk about the past . . . I don't want to think I am getting older. I want to think about living. Now the world is altogether different. I like to know about the future. I want to look through a window to see how it will be after I am gone. I want to know about this world."

The aged who make up about two-thirds of our poor are perhaps easier to see, and evoke sentiments that all of us feel. But there are significant numbers of poor who are not old folk, and I think it is important to explode the myth that the Jewish poor are all the Jewish old.

There is less sympathy for this other group—30-35 per cent of our poverty group—which is made up of single, unrelated people or families, many with young children, some headed by one parent. There are Jewish families receiving Aid to Dependent Children—a fact that is usually greeted with disbelief. In New York City alone it is estimated—although here, too, we wonder why it has not been possible to get more accurate statistics about the Jewish poor—that one quarter of a million Jews subsist below a level of \$3,500 a year, and another 150,000 live at near-poverty on incomes below \$4,500. A study undertaken in 1963 and '64 by the Columbia University School of Public Health and Administrative Medicine, shows that 10 per cent of the Jewish population is sustaining itself on \$3,000 a year or less. For the foreign born Jews in New York City, this figure rises to 15.7 per cent. A figure fairly similar to the Puerto Rican community where 16.3 per cent are living under \$3,000 a year. 75 per cent of the foreign born Jews in New York are 50 years of age and older, but in addition to this aging population, there are Orthodox and Chassidic poor, many of them with young families. There are 80,000 Chassidic Jews in New York City, and this group is the third largest poverty group in New York.

A study conducted by the Jewish Employment and Vocational Service reveals what some of us have long suspected—that we are like anybody else. Unemployed Jews who came to this agency reflect the same problems that the poor of any group have. The study covered a sample of Jewish men and women representing an active caseload of more than 700 persons. The age range was from 17 to over 65 years, and about half of them were in their prime work period, in the ages between 21 and 50. One-third of the persons coming to the Vocational Service were older than 50, and 17 per cent were under 20. About two-thirds of the persons coming for

help with employment had incomes in the previous year below \$2,600, and one in six had an annual income of \$4,000 or more.

Up until the very recent past we have had a long period of full employment in America. During such periods, jobless persons are usually people with severe problems of a personal nature, or were those against whom society discriminated. In the Philadelphia study, it appeared that six out of ten of the Jews coming for help with employment had disabilities classified as primarily emotional, but this group overlapped another group of four out of ten who had problems relating to aging or physical health. Limited education was found to be an important factor among poor Jews, half of the job seekers having less than 11 years of schooling, and one in five with less than an eighth grade education. Here, too, our blind spots operate. Because of the high proportion of young Jews in college today, and our tradition as the "People of the Book," we tend to overlook the earlier generation that has had a less impressive education.

One might consider too, current situations of economic recession and rising unemployment and its effect on that part of the Jewish community which lives marginally.

In summarizing the problem of the Jewish poor—estimated at 700,000 to 800,000 in the United States—we must make the point that their problems are common to all poor, but that there are problems peculiar to Jews, problems in inter-group relations, problems related to a Jewish identity which exist in a society whose image of the Jew is not altogether accurate, an image which the Jewish community persists in perpetuating. The problems include poor housing, inadequate medical care, neighborhoods that are undesirable in terms of emotional and physical security and outside the Jewish cultural mainstream.

There are special needs in the Orthodox community to which we must pay attention. There are demands which Jewish ritual makes—the need to buy Kosher food, for example. The Chassidic community has a built-in resistance to secular education, particularly at the high school and college levels. Few Chassidim have a college degree—an impediment to benefiting from the economic advantages which higher education normally bring. Jewish education for this group drains the resources of the Chassidic family. On religious grounds, the Orthodox and Chassidic communities are opposed to birth control and tend to have large families. In Williamsburgh, in New York City, the median family size is 6.3 children, as opposed to the average Jewish family size of 2 children.

My thesis is a plea to "raise our consciousness"—a phrase borrowed from women's Liberation—about what we have been unconscious about. What, then, is to be done and who is to do it?

Future historians may likely assess the pattern of Jewish community organization as the unique characteristic of 20th century Jewry. It has become a model for the structure of voluntary organizations of other religious and ethnic groups. Students from all corners of the globe come to study the complex of Jewish health, welfare, and other agencies. We have the structure and the processes for rational planning. What may need some doing, in my opinion, is the use of our structures in a way more responsive to needs which we now perceive. And in moving towards this responsiveness, I suggest that some basic questions need to be asked:

Who decides what service gets how much money?

What process is used in making the decision?

Do all elements in the Jewish community share in this decision-making process?

How are priorities set?

Where is the power?

Does the Jewish community need to re-order its domestic priorities?

Are we paying enough attention to our domestic Jewish needs?

A word about the American Jewish Committee and its role in this field. Our organization is constantly changing. For those of us who work for AJC, it is revealing to look back on our jobs and realize that what we do today is vastly different from what took up our days five, ten or twenty years ago. It is a characteristic that makes working for AJC so exciting, and it is the quality that makes our membership so knowledgeable and so challenging in the Jewish community. From a "defense agency" in the early days, we grew in knowledge and understanding of the fact that Jewish security could not be achieved in a society which did not protect the rights of all groups. In the 1940's we moved into areas of scientific research, to understand the nature and dynamics of prejudice. In 1947 we took our place in the civil rights movement, placing our resources and knowledge at the disposal of all America in its great struggle for equality. We became what we now call a community relations agency.

We have been refining our understanding of equality, and in the early 1960's we recognized for example, that we could not continue to call for fair employment without also calling for full employment. We perceived a truth which is becoming even more apparent today, that economics has a great deal to do with equality.

In 1969, our Executive Board took a step which may in its long-range implications be as important as the step we took in 1947 when we moved into the field of race. In 1969, after 3 summers of turmoil in our cities, we recognized that the domestic tranquility which we believe to be an ultimate goal, cannot be achieved in a society in which a large number of people subsist on incomes inadequate to maintain health and decency. We moved to help in public welfare reform, and in a rather curious by-path, discovered a truth which had been buried for too long. In our activity around welfare reform in behalf of the poor, we "discovered" our own poor. We also discovered that many of our poor had little or no contact with the existing institutions we take such pride in. In cities across the country—Dallas, Philadelphia, Boston, St. Louis, Los Angeles, Miami, Chicago—our Chapters began to view their own communities with a diagnostic eye and the questions that I have suggested are questions being asked by our own membership. As a result of this growing interest we are beginning to define our role. Today, the AJC is moving to become more of a Jewish "civic" agency, expressing the views of our members on the major issues that touch the Jewish experience today, and which affect the quality of Jewish life.

We have just received a grant from the Baron DeHirsch fund—a fund with an illustrious history in helping the immigrant Jew become a productive and self-supporting citizen—to convene a consultation on the nature of Jewish poverty which will be held in New York in the fall of this year. The consultation will, we hope, bear the hallmark of AJC—with scholarly papers and analysis by experts that will help clarify the situation of Jewish poverty today, and project for us the needs of the next decade. We hope to enrich the whole Jewish community's knowledge by publications that will result from this consultation. Under consideration are some pilot and demonstration programs that will attempt to get at an understanding of the

OCXVII—1616—Part 19

blocks that stand in the way of communication between the Jewish poor and those of us who are in the mainstream of Jewish communal life. This will involve work in transitional neighborhoods, which may yet be saved for those Jews who wish to remain in a familiar and congenial environment and where supportive services may help in this process.

In all of our work, we do not intend to become a competing agency with those in the Jewish community that are responsible for on-going and direct services to people. We do not intend to set up agencies. We see ourselves as supporters and stimulators, and we hope to develop the closest and most cordial relationships with Jewish organizations in those fields in which we have mutual concerns. If in this process, we all heighten our awareness, and refine our skills to do what needs to be done we will consider our undertaking to be successful.

(Mrs. Ann G. Wolfe, Program Consultant in the Intergroup Relations and Social Action Department of the American Jewish Committee, is a specialist in youth work and social welfare for the American Jewish Committee.)

She carries major responsibility for AJC's activities in the social welfare field, helping to organize programs in local AJC chapters and working with a variety of national coalitions in the specific areas of hunger, welfare reform and health.)

#### HOUSE RESOLUTION 319

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the following is the language of House Resolution 319, which I introduced on March 17, 1971. I was hoping it might catch the attention of the administration:

H. RES. 319

Whereas the President of the United States on March 4, 1971, stated that his policy is that: "as long as there are American POW's in North Vietnam we will have to maintain a residual force in South Vietnam. That is the least we can negotiate for."

Whereas Madam Nguyen Thi Binh, chief delegate of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam stated on September 17, 1970, that the policy of her government is "In case the United States Government declares it will withdraw from South Vietnam all its troops and those of the other foreign countries in the United States camp, and the parties will engage at once in discussion on:

"—the question of ensuring safety for the total withdrawal from South Vietnam of United States troops and those of the other foreign countries in the United States camp.

"—the question of releasing captured military men."

Resolved, That the United States shall forthwith propose at the Paris peace talks that in return for the return of all American prisoners held in Indochina, the United States shall withdraw all its Armed Forces from Vietnam within sixty days following the signing of the agreement: Provided, That the agreement shall contain a guarantee by the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the National Liberation Front of safe conduct out of Vietnam for all American prisoners and all American Armed Forces simultaneously.

#### ALL-WEATHER HELICOPTER STATION NEEDED

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 14, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, the city of Cordova, Alaska, is an important fishing resort for many Alaskans. Because of the beautiful outdoors and the magnificent wildlife in the area, many people from all over the world visit Cordova to fish and hunt.

It is truly one of the great hunting and fishing areas of the world. Many citizens and visitors to the greater Cordova area suffer loss of life and equipment every year due to fishing and hunting accidents. Many of these accidents would not be as costly, however, if an all weather helicopter station were located within minutes from the disaster area.

It is obvious that victims to fishing, hunting or boating accidents would have a greater chance of survival and a greater chance of less serious injury if there were some dependable, practical means of lifting victims of accidents to hospitals and other stations where they may receive the necessary aid.

The city council of the city of Cordova has requested that the U.S. Coast Guard establish a lifesaving station with an all weather helicopter unit within the greater Cordova area. As a visitor to this area, I know it would be of immeasurable service to the citizens of Cordova. I am including in the RECORD a copy of the resolution from the city council and I believe it deserves your careful consideration.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION No. 71-6

(A resolution urging the U.S. Coast Guard to establish a lifesaving station with an all weather helicopter unit within the greater Cordova area)

Whereas the community of Cordova supports a fishing fleet of several hundred vessels and individuals, and

Whereas many hunters and sportsmen come into the area from more populous areas of Alaska and the other 49 States, and

Whereas citizens and visitors of the Greater Cordova Area suffer loss of life and equipment every year due to fishing and hunting accidents, and

Whereas a locally based all weather helicopter could reach these victims within minutes, and

Whereas in many instances, a matter of minutes may mean the saving or loss of a life, now therefore be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Cordova, Alaska, that the U.S. Coast Guard be urged to establish a Life Saving Station, with an all weather helicopter unit, within the Greater Cordova Area.

Be it further resolved that copies of this Resolution be forwarded to the Commander 17th District U.S. Coast Guard, Governor William A. Egan, Senator Ted Stevens, Senator Mike Gravel, Representative Nick Begich and Lt. Commander William Hudson.

Passed and approved this 21st day of June, 1971.

ENERGY CRISIS HURTS  
CONSUMERS

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is facing an energy supply crisis of the utmost seriousness.

The unpleasant truth is that, on the basis of present known reserves, the United States must expect shortages in all of our present energy sources: Oil, natural gas, water power, and nuclear power. Even coal, although in plentiful supply, is not always economically available and, furthermore, its expanded use would be costly in terms of environmental pollution.

The energy supply shortage is understandable. Of all the energy consumed by man in the last 2,000 years, half has been consumed in the last 100 years. That is not the end of the story. It is reliably estimated that by the year 1990, less than 20 years from now, the United States will require almost double the amount of energy we used in 1970. And the experts say there is a strong possibility that our total energy needs may triple by the end of this century.

During the decade between 1960 and 1970, our national population increased by about 12 percent. In that same period, our national energy requirements increased by more than 41 percent.

Significantly, natural gas consumption increased by more than 50 percent.

In 1968, for the first time in the industry's history, more gas was consumed in the United States than was discovered, reducing the known reserves by 5.6 trillion cubic feet. In 1969, the deficit was 12.3 trillion cubic feet. And in 1970, the shortfall for the contiguous 48 States was 10.6 trillion cubic feet.

No comfort is to be derived from the fact that total gas reserves increased last year because of reserves associated with the discovery of oil in Alaska. No pipeline facilities at present exist to get either the oil or the gas out of Alaska, and no one knows how long it will be before they are in operation. But we do know that these reserves will not become available for use in the near future.

And the need is now.

Two factors are responsible for the gas supply crisis. One is greatly increased demand for this cleanest, most economical, and most convenient of all fuels. The other is an extremely serious faltering in the search for new gas reserves.

What is the reason for this critical slowdown?

It can be traced back to a ruling of the Supreme Court in 1954 that the Federal Power Commission must control wellhead prices charged for gas by producers selling to interstate pipelines.

During the ensuing 17 years, the price of gas at the wellhead has been kept so low that there has been a grave erosion of the incentive for people to go out and look for new sources of supply. On a

B.t.u. basis the average price of gas at the source is less than one-third the price of oil and approximately two-thirds the price of coal.

Not only has the Federal Power Commission set producer prices for gas so low that it sells below other less desirable competing fuels, it also has removed validity from sales contracts between producers and interstate pipelines.

Under present regulations, the contracts cover volume of gas to be delivered, prices, and delivery terms, all of which must be approved by the Federal Power Commission. But the contracts have little meaning.

After the producer begins deliveries, every provision of his contract with the pipeline company is subject to subsequent change and revision by order of the Commission. It can change the prices stated in the contract, or extend the terms of the contract, or change the actual volume of gas to be delivered. Once it has set a price the Commission can change that price and frequently has. The uncertainty caused by these possibilities naturally makes producers less eager to go out exploring for new fields.

But unless such exploration does go on, American consumers will be plagued by a critical shortage of this clean burning fuel; and our supplies are already being strained. As an example, Chicago consumers are now faced with a critical shortage of natural gas—the result of a strict air pollution ordinance. The Oil and Gas Journal reports that within 1 year after the passage of this ordinance, the Chicago backlog for natural gas service mounted to 16,550 applicants. In the state of Michigan, the Consumer Power Company, which serves 840,000 customers in 37 counties, is now connecting new residential customers on a strict priority basis, and is refusing to accept any new industrial or commercial customers. Furthermore, they estimate that they will be forced to cut off all new customers by the end of 1971. A similar situation exists in Ohio. The East Ohio Gas Co. has been unable to accept any new industrial gas customers since May 1, 1970, even though the requested supplies would have significantly reduced air pollution.

Presently over 140 million Americans rely on natural gas to heat their homes, cook their food, fire the burners of industry, and generate their electricity. Moreover, the number is increasing at an alarming rate. At such a time when the demand for clean-burning natural gas is rising sharply, we cannot short-change consumers by continuing to discourage the search for and the development of natural gas reserves.

Last April, I introduced in the House a bill—H.R. 7144—designed to make at least a start toward avoiding that catastrophe. Similar measures have been introduced by other Members.

The proposed legislation would validate contracts between gas producers and interstate pipelines once they were approved by the Federal Power Commission. This is not a decontrol measure. All new contracts would still have to be sub-

mitted to the F.P.C. They would become binding only after approval by the Commission or approval with stipulated conditions agreed to by all parties. Or the Commission could disapprove any contract, thereby voiding it.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that this is the minimum legislation required at this time to alleviate the present urgent situation. It is not advanced as a complete solution to the gas supply shortage. But its enactment by Congress would show the gas producers that we are aware of the problem they face—and in which all gas consumers share—and that we are ready to make a start toward a solution.

A recent Wall Street Journal editorial on this subject was captioned "Out of Gas". We are not yet out of gas, but it would be the part of wisdom to heed the Journal's statement that:

Regulation has tended to keep the price of natural gas cheaper in many markets than coal or oil with the result that demand for natural gas and expansion of the pipeline network to supply the demand has outpaced the development of gas reserves.

The full text of the Wall Street Journal editorial follows:

[The Wall Street Journal, June 30, 1971]

OUT OF GAS

Given the sad state of the nation's railroads and airlines, federal regulation doesn't have a very shiny image these days and the shine isn't improved much as we hear more of the plight of another regulated industry, natural gas.

It became evident last summer that gas pipeline companies had expanded facilities close to the point of offering customers more gas than was in fact available. The industry scraped through last winter but there are other winters, and new possibilities of shortages in some markets, on the way. The Federal Power Commission regulates the industry under the Natural Gas Act of 1938; regulation deserves some of the blame for the present state of affairs.

Regulation has tended to keep the price of natural gas cheaper in many markets than coal or oil, even though these are in many ways less desirable fuels. The result has been that demand for natural gas and expansion of the pipeline network to supply the demand has outpaced the development of gas reserves.

Most of the trouble goes back into the controversial history of natural-gas regulation. The 1938 act was initially interpreted as allowing the FPC to regulate only gas transmission and resale. But in the late 1940s the FPC, with backing from Harry Truman, broadened its interpretation of the act to include setting "wellhead" prices paid to producers. The Supreme Court upheld this expansion of the FPC power in the landmark Phillips decision of 1953.

However, the FPC of that era had not reckoned sufficiently with the complexities that would be involved in setting fair producer prices. Natural-gas price regulation has been a battleground since. The commission usually has leaned towards holding prices down in the face of pressures from consumers and consuming-state politicians.

Now, however, with a shortage impending, the FPC is faced with the task of trying to crank some belated price increases into the cumbersome regulatory system, with the hope of stimulating a higher rate of exploration and development of natural gas and damping some of the demand. The adjust-

ment will take time and it won't be popular with consumers suddenly faced with some surprisingly large price increases.

In reviewing the whole affair the other day in a speech to an industry group, FPC Commissioner Lawrence J. O'Connor Jr. said the FPC doesn't deserve all the blame. That is no doubt true. He faulted pipeline companies for not being more careful in seeing to it that their customer commitments were adequately backed with gas reserves. He blamed the Department of Interior for being too restrictive in granting offshore exploration leases. He blamed the federal General Services Administration and state power commissions for constantly intervening in rate cases to demand lower prices.

Mr. O'Connor said the FPC should establish a new "pricing mechanism" to restore market stability. There is an alternative, though. The nation could reexamine the whole concept of federal regulation, which is in trouble on so many fronts. It might find that market forces could do a better job in most areas and that the idea of regulation ran out of gas even before the gas industry itself did.

#### WOMEN'S PAGES: AN IRREVERENT VIEW

### HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest problems in advancing the cause of consumer protection has been the reluctance of many newspapers to treat the issue as the vital concern it is. Consumer articles are frequently consigned to the women's section of most papers, along with others on health, safety, food, clothing, and the like. These stories are too often treated as a kind of filler and given no priority in terms of demanding hard-hitting investigative reporting. Accordingly, consumers are being shortchanged in an area of major interest to them. Papers are often reluctant to display prominently, articles condemning products which may be advertised in the pages of that same paper.

Nicholas von Hoffman has written a perceptive analysis on such low quality "attic journalism" and has made some recommendations on changing our newspapers' priorities in the consumer field. Of course, there are some papers which handle consumer protection stories in an appropriate manner. The article, from the Columbia Journalism Review of July, 1971, follows:

#### WOMEN'S PAGES: AN IRREVERENT VIEW

American newspapers do their worst job on the topics that are most important to people: food, clothing, shelter, health—the areas that the women's page most often has responsibility for. The fault doesn't lie with those who put these sections together, but with the top editors, publishers, and owners who run their operations so that it is next to impossible to print something that isn't a combination of shock and hokum.

Some newspapers do make a major effort with all or parts of their women's sections. The Chicago *Tribune* is one. Then there are some women's page editors who, by pure force of character and ability to improvise and politic, are able to defeat their management's determination to put out a mediocre

to inferior product. But, for most papers, I think my observation is a fair one.

I write a column that appears in the *Washington Post* women's pages three days a week, and one of the most frequent questions I get is, "Don't you resent being put on the women's page?" I don't, because I have learned that people read the women's pages far more than the editorial page, where our big hitters hold forth. A few months ago Art Buchwald came to the same conclusion and asked to be moved out of the editorial section and back with us.

The women's page is a place that ambitious, younger reporters want to leave, it's where you don't see the raises passed out, it's low priority, the afterthought of the managing editor who is always saying, "Oh, on that Nixon visit story, let's get a woman's angle. How 'bout a sidebar on Pat?" In the back of the bus where we ride, that passes for creativity.

The rules for journalism are upside down on the women's page. Again, I want to emphasize, this isn't a reflection on the staff but on the management. Take the printing of press releases. A man on city side who gets a press release and retypes it and moves it without checking, without trying to make it some kind of filled-out, fair, and full story, will get fired on any good paper. Yet that same paper will encourage the people in the women's section to do exactly that.

In place after place, the women's section is where they let old newspaper people out to pasture: the sick, the tired, the neurotic, the incompetent, and the paralytically cynical. Then, after they do it, the managing editor will say to you, "Hell no! I don't ever go back there. You make one little remark and all those girls start bawling and weeping. I always stay out of the women's section."

We like to say we're not in a business but in a profession, so we can tout our ethics and our standards. Notice that whenever some fellow like Agnew attacks us that's what we always come back with—all that yuck about the highest standards of responsible journalism. Newspapers do have it, but not in the women's section.

In many newspaper offices a publicity man dare not appear in the main newsroom; he would get thrown out. In the women's section it's another matter. He may have more power than the editor; he often has more gall. Before our section was reorganized, I could have come in after lunch and seen flacks sitting at my desk using my phone and typing up their stories that I was supposed to use.

The flack has a certain color of legitimacy. He is supposed to be some sort of information officer. But more pernicious and more widespread is the direct intervention of the newspaper's own advertising department in the operation of the women's pages. It permeates everything from fashion to travel.

On the simplest level you get some papers where it is a matter of straight policy: never bum rap an advertiser in the restaurant column, even when he's serving ground glass and rat poison in the Caesar salad and kiting the Diner's Club checks. Or there is the practice in some newspapers of tying the department's budget directly to how much advertising it brings in. In the area of fashions we have people like Eleanor Lambert paying reporters' airplane and hotel bills. The same thing happens with food editors, with almost anything you care to mention.

On most papers—but thankfully no more on the one I work for—we are beggars in the women's page, living on payola and freebies, and what's really so sad is that the staff people do it not because they want to but because they either take the handout or they don't get to cover the story. Go out and cover anything you want—the Paris openings, the Cannes Film Festival, the inauguration of the Antarctica Hilton—just so long as somebody other than the paper gets the tab.

The result has been that the papers have missed the biggest muck-raking stories of the last decade. Ralph Nader and the whole consumer movement have shaped themselves the way they have because the specialized sections of American newspapers didn't break the story; often they have either refused to cover it or done so with shocking tardiness. It could have been the newspapers that got into all of this first—unsafe cars, automobile insurance, outdated food, shoddy workmanship, false advertising, dresses made of flammable materials, glass storm doors that shatter and decapitate children when they open them, and on and on. But that's not the way the public typically gets any of this enormously important information.

The pattern is for some private group to do the investigating, using its own often-thin resources, and, after it has assembled the facts, to go to a friendly senator. He holds a hearing, which is televised or written up in the front of the paper. Much, much later, if ever, does it get to the women's section, where you would think it would do the most good and where it certainly belongs.

We can only speculate at the consequences of all these years of nonservice. They may have been sad but limited, as in the case of women who continued to take the birth control pill because they kept reading in the local paper that it was safe. Or our low-quality reportage, our self-satisfied peeping that all is as advertised, may have had a kind of diffuse, maddening effect. For we have encouraged people to look at all the things around them that won't work, that blow up in their hands, that are at repeated variance with their subsequent experience.

Maybe it doesn't matter that for years your newspaper led you to believe canned tomatoes have an indefinite shelf life and then you found out they don't. Maybe it doesn't matter that the paper solemnly talks about government-established minimum daily vitamin requirements as if these were known, demonstrable facts; then later you find out they weren't facts, they were just hypotheses that a group of scientists took a vote on.

From aspirin to radiation, from child psychology to interior decorating, we have gone along, gullible to every commercial interest, every authority figure, every flash-in-the-pan guru. It has been pleasant, or at least without conflict and intraoffice strain, but in the end we have done our bit to foster the conviction going about that it's all a shuck, that the media, the politicians, and the advertisers are in collusion to keep everybody ignorant. If a man can't find out the truth about trading stamps in his morning paper, is he going to believe anything else we print? If we have trained him to be satisfied with the information we supply him about his food and clothing, will he demand better on other topics?

Let's not dilute on the superiority of network TV news to the front page, except to remind ourselves that everybody but newspaper editors knows it, and that's why surveys show that people believe the tube, not our headlines. Those editors are not going to change; they will continue to print the front of the paper just as though the news is fresh and everybody hadn't seen it on TV the night before.

The part of the paper that isn't tied into inherited ideas of what an event is and when you have to write about it is the women's section. There are almost no must-cover events in a women's section. There are announcements, but no mandatory events unless the publisher uses the society page to puff his friends and orders coverage of here-and-hounds hunt breakfasts.

You can write about anything anytime. You are not hamstrung by the notion that there must be a newsworthy event before you can deal with a topic. The women's page is also freed

from the conventional forms of presentation, the three or four W's pyramid construction, all the things that allow us to kid ourselves into thinking formula writing is good writing, or even good journalism. About the only restraint put on many women's pages is that the material be connected with the lives of the readers, that they be shown why it might matter to them.

The point is that what we call the women's pages aren't so heavily weighed down with unchangeable definitions of what they must contain and how they must present it. They are in the best position to show the rest of the paper what you do when most people get their first news, and the news they believe most, from radio or TV. Women's sections have always performed as a backup, auxiliary service to the hard news operation, but now, with TV, that has increasingly become the whole newspaper's function.

To carry forward and enlarge on this function, however, women's pages are going to have to change some of the ways their staffs look at the world. They are going to have to move away from the idea that women do one set of things in this world and men do another, that the baseline for judging every topic is the values and practices of the idealized American family as it mythically existed in a smallish-sized city, circa 1927.

This is not to say that all this talk about the sexual revolution, the style revolution, the revolution in consciousness, the revolution revolution—that all of that isn't often dreadfully exaggerated. It frequently is, but even admitting that, there have been some very important changes.

People are living differently. You can see it at the supermarket. Look at the rows of what are called convenience foods; what they betoken is a new kind of family life where the wife/mother has ceased to prepare all the meals. People get up, go in the kitchen, and do for themselves. That doesn't mean that unisex is on us, but it does suggest that people are far less bound by sexual roles or other kinds of roles that were once ascribed to them. This hits harder, I believe, at newspapers and other general-circulation mass media than at specialized men's and women's publications.

You can put out a youth-market publication and sell it—although that is tricky, because in this time of shifting self-definitions you may aim for youth and hit the bubble-gum crowd, while the real young adult market elects to buy *Psychology Today*. But a newspaper can't play those games very well. Our tries at it, be they old-fashioned ladies' pages or teen corners, bomb out. Increasingly our success comes from assuming that our readers are like ourselves, people who want solid information and understanding on a broad range of topics, and no jazzbo stuff dressing it up to make it male or female or mod or with-it.

This, at any rate, has been my experience on the women's page of the *Washington Post*. By every indicator we are attracting large numbers of people who aren't supposed to read such a section. But perhaps more important, we have been learning that the women who read the page are a remarkable and rewarding audience. Not only do they read, but they read carefully, and they think about it. The quality as much as the quantity of the mail is impressive. These are thoughtful, carefully written letters by informed people. The kook mail is way under 1 per cent, even though the readers often get highly controversial material in tough, undiluted language.

However, if the right readers are there and are readily receptive, if the women's section is the place to do much of the kind of journalism the front of the paper can't or won't do, none of it means much if management doesn't change. In a few places you can talk to management, but that is precious few. In most places the women's page is low pres-

tige and low political clout in the organization. More than friendly persuasion is needed. If you doubt that, look at the rest of the newspaper, look at the sections management is interested in. Look at the contents of *Editor & Publisher*, its magazine, the publication that reflects its interests and its concerns about newspapering. It may be a profession for us, but it's a business for them.

Yet the people who run newspapers are moveable. They respond to the embarrassment of exposure. In this middle-class era, nothing shocks our increasingly lettered public more than the violation of professional standards—any professional standards—and while much of this is a con put over on the public it can serve some good uses.

Some kind of association of women's page editors putting out a publication assessing various newspapers' performances could do a great deal. Dealing with management alone will only get us slaughtered off. The advertising director of the city's largest department store has more power on a paper than its women's page editor has—except on that 10 per cent of papers which do operate on somewhat more elevated principles. But this situation has confronted people who have wanted to do a good job in many occupations—teaching research, social work—and they have learned that the national professional association can give them the muscle to insist on the quality work they can't get when they argue as individuals.

I think women's page editors can do the same, and if they do, they will be able to make what we call the women's section, or whatever one wants to call the back of the book in daily journalism, the most exciting, the most useful, and even the most important part of the emerging modern American newspaper.

#### THE GENERATION GAP

### HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the learned and distinguished dean of the House has remarked on the three ages of man. He avers there are teenagers, middle-aged, and "oh, my, but you're looking better." Nevertheless, as the following article indicates, "the generation gap" which sometimes divides us, also ultimately and inevitably joins us together:

#### THE GENERATION GAP

It is a widely held mistake that it was modern youth who invented (1) rudeness; (2) beard; (3) sex; (4) a detestation of the older generation.

Sex, in fact, was already known during the Thirty Years War—certainly in the second half of it. Indeed, if some interpretations of Ovid can be taken seriously, it was not completely unknown even to the ancient Romans.

Beards already grew as early as the 14th century. And long hair was generally worn and extremely fashionable by women and men before the invention of scissors.

Rudeness and ill manners started earlier still. It is generally known that Adam and Eve had two sons. As soon as the two boys grew up, one of them killed the other, thus establishing the future pattern of family love, warmth and understanding. How humanity survived after this, is not quite clear. One school maintains that—as Adam and Eve had no other children (at least no other births were reported in Genesis or the local, contemporary press)—incestuous, homosexual love was not only legal in those

early, somewhat unenlightened days but it could also produce issue; the other school—and I am a believer in this second theory—states that as sex was as yet unknown and undiscovered, humanity must have multiplied by some other means.

The last but one generation who thought that they discovered all the miracles and panacea of life, who thought they would produce a brave new world and who invented new dances of shakes and jerks, was the post-World War I generation. They also thought that by showing women's knees they installed a new, free and enlightened era for humanity. These young ones are around 70 years of age today and know that neither the Charleston nor the exposition of the female knee has saved humanity. They live on their private fortunes or their private old-age pensions and, as a generation, are not even despised any more; they are just forgotten.

Post World War II generation started it all over again. They invented even jerkier dances and showed larger slices of the naked body as a revolutionary innovation, forgetting that there was about a million years in our history when our female ancestors walked about topless and even without miniskirts. There were two fashionable explanations for the revolt of this latest generation:

(1) The nuclear bomb has changed all our lives and the threat of war and total destruction produced an irresponsible, could-not-care-less attitude;

(2) Every previous generation had to fight a war but the nuclear bomb has made it absolutely impossible for this one. This total lack of threat of war and absence of fear of destruction produces an irresponsible and could-not-care-less attitude.

People are confused and there is only one great living scientist (it happens to be myself) who sees this problem in its proper perspective.

(1) The present young generation is the 149th to believe that it is about to change the world at a stroke; it is the 149th which thinks that it is absolutely unique. It is the 149th because there were altogether 148 previous generations in recorded history.

(2) Young people have always looked down upon their elders. Much less publicity has been given to the fact that the older generations, too, have always looked down upon the younger. The old were always hypocrites and spoke about their love, admiration and adoration of youth. But the detestation has always been mutual.

For a long time I could not make up my mind in this dispute. I knew an equal number of young fools and old fools; I knew an equal number of intelligent and wise young men and some old ones who, whatever their age, refused to grow up. If "youth" finds me boring, I find them (or at least many of them) much more boring; I find their conversation exasperatingly dull, their conceit ridiculous, their self-confidence pathetic. I have been slowly driven to the conclusion that it is the middle-aged who are the salt of the earth, the cream of humanity.

What are, after all, the great achievements of this age?

(1) The glorious advance of pornography—quite a few people would say. But this is a trade and a passion of the middle-aged. They are the purveyors of pornography, of filthy magazines, nude pictures and sex-films. Oh yes, but they produce it for the young. Nonsense. They produce it for one another. It is the middle-aged who go to strip-tease shows, gloat over bosoms in glossy magazines and buy up the gadgets in sex-shops. The young do not need them; they regard sex as something almost natural.

(2) It is the middle-aged who keep all the silly vogues and outrageous fashions alive. The young get soon bored and, after a while, they are quite prepared to wash their necks and mend the holes in their sweaters. How often did I see gatherings—here or in Cannes

or in Scandinavia—consisting of two groups: soberly dressed, clean shaven young men with ties and middle-aged children, men over fifty determined to look 18, wearing blue jeans, long dirty beards and using three four-letter words in the shortest of sentences.

(3) Youth is, to a large extent, the invention of the middle-aged. Admittedly, some of the young people are so proud of the flattery of their middle-aged brethren that they grow arrogant and believe in the superiority of youth.

This modern battle of generations is an unjust and unequal one. In a battle between nationalities an Arab never becomes an Israeli; in religious strifes a rich Ulster Protestant never becomes an I.R.A. man; in racial struggles a white man never becomes black. But in this fight between generations, the young becomes middle-aged in no time. What can he do? He pretends to have remained young and continues the struggle as if nothing had happened.

Let us proper, reasonably intelligent middle-aged people bow to facts and accept our own superiority. We know that we shall never revolutionize the world; we have tried and failed. We know that there are some good sorts even among the young who deserve to become middle-aged. We know—or suspect—that sex is not the main problem in life and if some of us cannot behave as decently as the young let us behave at least as decently as the old. We know that while most of the young become old, the majority of humanity—young, middle-aged and old (including ourselves)—will never really grow up, so what's the difference, in any case?

One problem, not so easy to decide is: when does middle-age begin? A similar problem exists for the young, too. The seventeens regard the twenty-ones as aged; the sixteens regard the eighteens with suspicion; the fourteens maintain that one cannot really trust anyone over sixteen. Similarly, middle-age never begins; but once it has begun it never ends.

My ideal is an American lady of Hungarian origin, a famous name, a television star. She used to be amazingly young for many, many years. Now she has been not quite so young but still witty and beautiful for some decades. It has been said about her: "Miss Sandoz has invented the secret of eternal middle-age." And that is the greatest invention of our era.

**EVINS BACKS FULTON BILL TO  
CREATE RFC-STYLE FEDERAL FI-  
NANCE CORPORATION**

**HON. JOE L. EVINS**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Small Business Committee, I have consistently advocated programs to aid, assist, and promote the small business sector of our economy.

Small business is the seedbed of our American economic system, the foundation of our competitive economy, and our free enterprise system.

I recognize also that big business in our country is also essential, vital, and important to the Nation and to our economy.

I have said many times that while our committee is certainly pro-small business—we are not opposed to big business—that both are essential—and that both small business and big business complement each other—and both serve the economy and the Nation.

A substantial percentage of small business derives its livelihood directly or indirectly from larger firms through contracts and subcontracts, services, specialized production, and other means.

Big business and small business should complement each other. Both have their roles in our economy.

In this connection I want to say that I favor in principle a bill recently introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FULTON)—H.R. 9523—which is patterned after the act which established the former Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The RFC assisted in "bailing out" the railroads, banks, and many big business enterprises that were either bankrupt or in deep financial stress during the Hoover depression.

The bill proposed by my colleague from Tennessee would provide for direct and guaranteed loans to large corporations in this Nation. Under the bill these loans initially would be for 5 years and could be extended under specific circumstances for an additional 5-year period.

This bill proposes to do for big business on a large scale what the Small Business Administration does for small business on a more limited scale. It is needed at this time.

Both big business and small business deserve assistance as a matter of self-preservation to assure employment for our people.

I urge that my colleagues study this bill and that the Committee on Banking and Currency act favorably and promptly in reporting and passing legislation to create an RFC mechanism to guarantee loans and help American big business now in financial stress and need of assistance.

**NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL POLLUTION  
CONTROL COUNCIL**

**HON. JOHN D. DINGELL**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, when the State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary appropriation bill, H.R. 9272, was before the House on June 24, 1971, I questioned the validity of funding the activities of the National Industrial Pollution Control Council. Unfortunately, my amendment to eliminate funds for the Council was not adopted by the House.

The July 2, 1971, issue of the National Wildlife Federation's conservation report carried an item on hearings before Senator METCALF's Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations which brought out some of the perils involved in the operations of the National Industrial Pollution Control Council. I insert the text of the conservation report's news item at the conclusion of these remarks.

I also have been concerned about the fact that the corporations represented on the Council might be polluters. Therefore, I wrote Administrator Ruckelshaus of the Environmental Protection Agency on June 9, 1971, to ask if any other corporations represented on the Council

have pollution abatement proceedings pending against them.

In a response under date of June 29, 1971, the Environmental Protection Agency advised me that there are in fact pollution abatement proceedings pending against various of the companies represented on the Council.

For the information of my colleagues, I include the text of my June 9 letter and EPA's June 29 response at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

**CROSS DEFENDS CLOSED-DOOR SESSIONS OF  
INDUSTRIAL POLLUTION CONTROL COUNCIL**

Chairman Bert S. Cross defended the closed-door policy for meetings of President Nixon's blue-ribbon National Industrial Pollution Control Council in recent testimony before the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Senate Committee on Government Operations. The hearing was conducted to receive testimony on S. 1657 and S. 1964, relating to Federal advisory committees.

Accompanying Mr. Cross as he testified were Walter A. Hamilton, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Industry Economics, and Michael F. Butler, Acting Deputy General Counsel for the Department of Commerce.

The National Industrial Pollution Control Council was created by the President by Executive Order 11523 on April 9, 1970. It is organized in 30 groupings of major industries. The members are chief executives from two companies in each of the 30 groups plus three members-at-large, or 63 in all. In addition, the Council has 30 sub-councils covering each of the industrial groups.

"I do not believe the Council could function effectively if it were required to have representatives of other viewpoints and interests among its members," Mr. Cross declared. "I recognize that there are other points of view and other assignment of priorities, and these other points of view should be heard and considered. But the purpose of NIPCC is to get an expression of independent industries' point of view. The present setup, in my opinion, encourages Council members to participate with candor. . . . Recognizing that other segments of our society wish to be heard and have a right to be heard, I can only suggest that they should continue to do so through other channels."

Chairman Cross said the Council should not be the crucible for resolving or reconciling all interests and conflicts. "Our advice to the President and views on these issues are spelled out in plain and readable English and made publicly available for all serious-minded persons to read and study," he declared. "Contrary to the notion expressed by some, our advice is not hidden or secret. The reports, which are the essence of our advice and ideas, speak for themselves."

"I do not believe that the frankness of exchange of views or the effectiveness of Council discussions could be sustained if our meetings had to be open to the public," Chairman Cross testified. "In fact, the ability of the President to obtain the advice of top businessmen on matters as vital to our Nation as those with which this Council deals would, in my judgment, be seriously impaired if not destroyed if all such advice had to be proffered in public meetings." He later said that the same problems exist with verbatim transcripts.

Sen. Lee Metcalf (Mont.) then asked if Messrs. Cross, Hamilton or Butler were bothered at the open public hearing at the presence of a reporter and received an answer that it was "no problem". Sen. Metcalf followed with this comment: "What I am trying to find out is why you are saying that some of the outstanding industrialists of America do not want to sit in an open and free discussion in front of a reporter." Mr. Cross observed: "There is no question in

anybody's mind that they have got to be very cautious and very careful of what they say for the purpose of the record," saying that the Council has to have discussions "that are open enough to get this result that we are trying to get."

"I am getting to think perhaps we should have a lawyer from the Antitrust Section at the meetings if they are closed," Sen. Metcalf observed. He said he felt that perhaps the American people should know "that a group of industrialists get together at a country club or over cocktails or an advisory committee with a closed session and decide the merits and the future of pollution in America." Mr. Butler said a lawyer from his staff is present at all meetings of the Council and the Subcouncil to guard against any possible violations of antitrust laws.

"Now, this is a closed group, Mr. Cross," Sen. Metcalf said. "Their recommendations are bound, from a closed group, to be biased and suspect. At the very least there should be a certain percentage of observers there to allay the public's suspicion that this closed group is sitting there to continue the kind of pollution that they have contributed over the years. Isn't that true?"

"No, I do not think so," Mr. Cross responded.

Secretary Hamilton said that minutes of Council meetings are kept by a full-time salaried officer employed by the Federal Government.

Sen. Metcalf then switched his questioning to a specific recommendation of the Council. He said that, in October, 1970, the Detergent Subcouncil issued a report prepared by the industry and printed by the Government which spoke glowingly of a new material, NTA, as a replacement for phosphates in laundry detergents. Sen. Metcalf quoted from the report a passage saying NTA is safe for people and the environment. However, he also pointed out that, in May, 1970, Dr. Samuel Epstein, Chief of the Environmental Toxicology Carcinogenic Children's Cancer Research Center told a Senate Subcommittee that the proposed use of NTA must be disallowed until a wide range of problems were resolved. Subsequently, Sen. Metcalf pointed out, in December, 1970, one month after the Subcouncil report had been issued, the Surgeon General and the Environmental Protection Agency recommended the discontinuance of NTA. Finally, in March, 1971, the Detergent Subcommittee came in with another report, saying the earlier version was obsolete and, if uncorrected, would be misleading.

"I have here an example of the industry promoting a questionable product, NTA, in what appears to be a Government-sponsored document," Sen. Metcalf declared, saying it was on sale by the Government Printing Office. Secretary Hamilton said the report was the view of the men who signed it, not the Government, and that the printed copy has a disclaimer to that effect. He also said that the Commerce Department has made no move to take the discredited publication off the sale list at the Government Printing Office.

Sen. Metcalf then called attention to frequent references in the Oct. 14, 1970, meeting of the Council to "get going on a communications-PR program". He read a document calling for information on pollution cleanups, then observed: "Now, that is a very revealing document that the purpose of the National Industrial Pollution Control Council is largely a public relations activity." Secretary read from the minutes of the meeting and said the purpose of the discussion was to both let Government and the public know what industry is doing as well as to serve as a spur for others with similar problems.

Also appearing before the Subcommittee was Jacob Clayman and Sheldon Samual,

representing AFL-CIO. Mr. Clayman spoke to the points brought out in Mr. Cross' testimony. "There are two precepts that I think are overriding," he declared. "One, the public's right to know, and it is preeminent in our society. And, number two, any institution, any organization, any committee that operates outside of the span of the general public will never get credibility. This is one of our problems in our society today, as all of us know the fearful loss of credibility on the part of government. This is one of the easy ways to achieve that unfortunate resolve—so close the door to the public, leaving the balance to their imaginations, which can run wild, too."

Prof. Henry J. Stack, State University of New York, College at Cortland, declared: "An advisory committee should, it appears, be effective yet it should be open and public. It should be competent and expert; yet it should be wisely representative. It should be able to generate independent thinking and detached, tough criticism; yet it should be accountable and subject to the needs of its 'mother' agency. It should be critical and independent; yet it should not be in a position to obstruct the work of a public agency. It should represent legitimate social interest; yet it should not be in a position to define the public interest in private terms or convert public authority into private power."

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY,  
Washington, D.C., June 29, 1971.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Fisheries and  
Wildlife Conservation, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: In response to your June 9 request, we have searched our files to determine whether pollution abatement proceedings are pending against any of the companies which have officials serving as members of the National Industrial Pollution Control Council.

Using the Council's most current membership list, undated to June 8, 1971, we find that the companies listed below fit into the category you established.

1. United States Steel Corporation.
2. Republic Steel Company.
3. Interlake Steel Corporation.
4. National Steel Corporation.
5. Armco Steel Corporation.
6. Weyerhaeuser Company.
7. Allied Chemical Corporation.

Additionally, a consent judgment was filed in the case of General Motors Corporation in January 1971; the Company agreed to eliminate all discharges of toxic metals and caustics from its plant at Tarrytown, New York. This case is considered pending until compliance terms and dates are satisfied.

Please note that this listing does not include cases in which the Department of Justice may have brought action on its own initiative, as it has done under the Refuse Act. We are, therefore, taking the liberty of forwarding your letter and a copy of this reply to the Justice Department.

Should you require additional assistance, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

GRAHAM MCGOWAN,

Director,

Office of Congressional Affairs.

JUNE 9, 1971.

HON. WILLIAM D. RUCKELSHAUS, Administrator,  
Environmental Protection Agency,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RUCKELSHAUS: The National Industrial Pollution Control Council is an advisory commission made up of approximately sixty-five industrial executives from across the country. I would very much like to know if any of the companies who employ these gentlemen have pollution abatement proceedings pending against them.

I would appreciate it if you would give this matter your immediate attention.

Sincerely,

JOHN D. DINGELL,

Chairman,

Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation.

WILLIAM G. GISEL—AN INNOVATOR

## HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, my good friend Bill Gisel has been president of Bell Aerospace for 11 years and is leading the search for new dimensions in writing tomorrow's aerospace history. Bill is thinking about research and development for needs in the next decade.

Mr. Speaker, I look for spectacular news this fall or even earlier concerning Bell Aerospace research and development on the application of aerodynamics to large, oceangoing vessels.

A recent aerospace article in the June issue of Business in New York State emphasizes the abilities of Bill Gisel. I am delighted to call this to the attention of my colleagues.

The article is included at this point:

### THE INNOVATORS

Bell aerospace has been pioneering in new concepts for aircraft ever since Lawrence D. Bell founded his Bell Aircraft Corporation in 1935. Today, its new name points up changed directions and its president, William G. Gisel, is leading the search for new dimensions in writing tomorrow's aerospace history.

Mr. Gisel, who has been president of the company since 1960, joined Bell 20 years earlier as a cashier and rose through the financial side of the business. "So," he says, "I've spent a greater portion of my time in the last ten years in engineering and marketing fields—I could concentrate on those because I was familiar with finances."

Engineering knowledge is vital to Bell, which invents, develops and builds systems and products in rocket propulsion, aerospace components and electromechanical and electromagnetic electronics fields. Currently it has 138 separate, individual programs within those three areas.

### APOLLO PROGRAM

Bell has been deeply involved in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's manned spacecraft program and the U.S. Air Force satellite programs since 1959, when its Agena upper stage rocket engine performed perfectly in the first launching of a Polar orbiting satellite. Since then, the Agena engine has placed a variety of U.S. Air Force and NASA payloads into orbit—more than 300 for the Air Force alone.

Mr. Gisel was an observer at the launchings of Apollo moon missions, watching the performance of his company's equipment assignments which extended from lift-off to splashdown.

Astronauts trained in the Bell developed Lunar Landing Training Vehicle and the Lunar Module Rendezvous Simulator. The Command, Service and Lunar Modules have 31 Bell designed and produced zero-gravity propellant and water tanks. Most critical of all, however, is the Bell designed and developed LM ascent engine, which had to function properly the first time, because, unlike many of LM's other subsystems, there is no back-up ascent propulsion system. It did!

## COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY

Under a NASA contract for computer structural analyses to trace and define the thermal and mechanical stresses at some 5,000 key points throughout the intricate framework of the Apollo spacecraft and its modules, Bell applied its expertise in computer applications.

According to Mr. Gisel, "one of the things that most people want to see is a spillover from our space program to solve earthbound problems. And we've done just that as a result of our computer knowhow. In cooperation with the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare we have automated all medical, environmental and sociological files for 8,500 American Indians of the San Xavier and Papago Indian Reservations in Arizona as a pilot program. The system provides physicians, public health nurses and environmental specialists with a single data base that is current, complete and immediately accessible regardless of the location at which the patient is being treated.

"I believe this is an important breakthrough which will ultimately bring better health to everyone in the nation, and it is typical of the innovative thinking we have here at Bell."

Many of Bell's engineering staff of about 1,000 have M.S. or Ph.Ds, usually in aeronautical engineering. "We look for specialists, with growth potential, to handle the inter-disciplinary types of innovative projects we are constantly developing here," Mr. Gisel notes. "Our fine New York State universities—Columbia, NYU, RPI, Cornell and the State University of New York at Buffalo, which is becoming a fine scientific institution and we are working very closely with them—provide much of our engineering talent.

"We usually make our judgments on projects as a team decision. I get complete briefings in all engineering areas and query advanced research so I can evaluate it for merit."

Currently, Bell is engaged in research and development in the fields of its expertise for needs a decade hence. For example, it is participating in an experiment designed to determine the technical and operational feasibility of developing an air traffic control system employing a satellite relay. The experiment is being aimed at achieving the improved air-to-ground and ground-to-air communications that will be required simultaneously to monitor and control the 250 aircraft that are expected to be crossing the North Atlantic at peak load periods in the 1980s.

In materials research, the company has designed a test apparatus for evaluating the damaging erosive effects of impinging rain, sand and ice particles upon materials at speeds up to Mach 3. Such information is vital to the development of today's high-speed military and commercial aircraft and tomorrow's supersonic jets.

## AIR CUSHION VEHICLES

But one of the projects nearest and dearest to Bill Gisel's heart is Bell's air cushion and surface effect vehicle developments.

"There is no limit to the applications of the air cushion concept," he says enthusiastically. "We can have air cushion landing gear on planes, and make airports, as we know them today, obsolete. Since they are amphibious, the plane could land anywhere there's a relatively flat surface.

"It is one of the most promising developments in surface transportation. ACVs have been demonstrated in San Francisco, where in one year nearly 14,000 people were whisked in direct routes across San Francisco Bay between Oakland and San Francisco Airports and downtown San Francisco. And, of course, the British are using a 177-ton ACV to ferry cars and passengers across the English Channel.

"This development is a classic example of the adaptation of a military development to

solve civilian problems," he adds, pointing out that "Bell's ACV Voyager, being built in Canada, meets the demand for effective, economical transportation—particularly in the Arctic and other not easily accessible areas of the world."

The 25-ton payload of Voyager is equal to that of most transport airplanes now in regular supply operations in the Arctic—but lacking the dependency on weather that limits flight. Because they ride on a cushion of air above the surface, ACVs take ice, snow, water and the tundra in their stride. "Furthermore," Mr. Gisel notes, "the environmentalists will be happy to know that tests show that the low cushion pressure will not affect the ecology of the tundra country."

Bell is currently building for the U.S. Navy, Maritime Administration and Department of Commerce a 100-ton Surface Effect Ship (not amphibious) which will be capable of speeds of 80 knots or more. A prototype of possible ocean going vessels, the craft rides on a drag-reducing cushion of air contained by two side hulls and flexible bow and stern seals.

## OTHER ACTIVITIES

The old adage of "let a busy man do it and it will get done" certainly applies to Bill Gisel. In addition to the far flung responsibilities of his leadership of Bell Aerospace, he finds time for an amazing variety of civic assignments.

He is vice chairman, appointed by Governor Rockefeller, of the Niagara Frontier Transportation Authority, which is actively planning for transportation growth in Erie and Niagara counties. After the problems involved in assuring the moon walkers a safe return to their mother ship, the charting of new bus terminals, airports, roads and public transportation must seem relatively easy to implement.

Mr. Gisel is also a member of the New York State Advisory Council for the Advancement of Industrial Research and Development, a group of leaders in science-oriented industries and universities, who meet to survey needs of industry, the capacity of the academic world to fill them, and to make recommendations for new or enlarged programs. "This work is extremely important," he says, "to assure the continued excellence and responsiveness of scientific education in our State."

Other science-oriented affiliations include membership in the Air Force Association, Navy League of the U.S., National Space Club, the National Aviation Hall of Fame, National Defense Transportation Assn., and on the Niagara University Council. He is also a director of the Western New York Nuclear Research Center.

But the outside activity that he enjoys most is his work as director of the Marine Midland Bank-Western and trustee of the Western New York Savings Bank. "Perhaps it's because of my financial background, but these responsibilities give me great satisfaction. Through them I become more involved with affairs in my own local community with the concomitant possibility of influencing events for the better."

## THE FUTURE

Mr. Gisel is guardedly optimistic about the near future but completely so for the long haul.

"As I see it, for the next two or three years there will be a plateau in the aerospace business—and in the general economy as a whole—until we make the adjustment to a peacetime economy. Actual growth of the country will continue, but at a very limited rate. After all, no period in the history of man has been as exciting as the technologically dynamic last 35 years.

"After this short hiatus, I believe that we will move forward at an even greater pace, spurred on by the expanding technology resulting from the space program and other research and development funded by the De-

partment of Defense, NASA and other government agencies. My guess is that the effects of this redirection by the government to science and technology in the aerospace industry, and in the fields of environment and oceanography, will prove as rewarding and beneficial to mankind in the next decade as was Neil Armstrong's 'one giant step' in ours."

## PUBLIC ASSISTANCE TO STRIKERS

## HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, increasingly our programs of public assistance in this country are being used by striking workers to ease the economic pinch in which they often find themselves during a labor dispute.

Liberalization of welfare eligibility rules and expansion of the food stamp program have made these programs both more attractive and more available to employees looking for ways to make it easier to endure a strike.

Labor contends that they have a right to such benefits as taxpayers and that they are necessary to offset other bargaining advantages enjoyed by management.

Management, on the other hand, counters that the benefits provide a distinct advantage to labor, reducing the incentives to negotiate, and encouraging longer strikes and higher settlements.

There can be little doubt that the availability of public assistance to strikers does have a significant impact on the labor-management bargaining process during a strike, and this plus the growing cost of this practice to the taxpayer is bringing into focus some very basic policy questions with which Congress, sooner or later, is going to have to deal.

Last month when we considered the agricultural-environmental appropriation bill I offered an amendment to prohibit strikers from receiving food stamps. Although my proposal was not adopted at that time, we are still going to have to meet head on this whole larger issue of public assistance to strikers somewhere farther down the road.

The front page of yesterday's Wall Street Journal carries an article entitled "Strikers on Welfare" which provides a concise analysis of the present situation. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues in the House:

## STRIKERS ON WELFARE: PUBLIC AID DURING WALKOUTS EVOKES CRITICISM

(By JAMES P. GANNON)

PITTSBURGH.—One man who is really worried about the threat of a steel walkout Aug. 1 is Edward H. Kalberer. "I just hate to think of it," he says. "It makes me pray for a miracle of no strike."

Mr. Kalberer isn't a steelworker, a steel executive or a mill customer. He is the man in charge of public-welfare programs in Allegheny County, which encompasses this steel-making center. And he is worried that his understaffed, tightly budgeted county welfare agency may be overwhelmed by strikers applying for food stamps, public assistance and other benefits if the United Steelworkers of America calls a steel-industry walkout next month.

To prepare for the possible deluge, the agency is considering setting up temporary welfare offices near the mills or setting up shop in the steelworkers' union halls. It estimates that at least 250 extra staffers would be needed to process aid claims from many of the approximately 59,000 steelworkers in the county. But, because of a budget bind, the agency has little hope of adding so much manpower. It has been sending representatives to USW local union meetings to explain eligibility rules and benefits of public-aid programs, hoping that the union officials may do some screening of members to ease the threatened paperwork jam.

The problems of the Allegheny County welfare agency are only one symptom of a major development that has important implications both for welfare programs and for labor bargaining generally.

#### WELFARE: AN AID TO UNION BARGAINERS

Without attracting much attention until recently, American labor unions have developed an increasingly successful technique of using the nation's growing public-aid programs to reduce the economic pinch on striking members. Only now are big employers fully realizing, with alarm, that as a result they face a stronger foe at the bargaining table. Financially, strapped state governments are finding more of a different type of welfare client at their public-aid offices: the factory hand who is generally stereotyped as antiwelfare but who may be changing his attitudes as welfare eases the woes of the walkout.

A considerable controversy is brewing over this trend. Big employers hit hard by recent strikes, such as General Electric and General Motors, are stepping up public attacks on welfare for strikers. Congress and the courts have been considering its merits. The debate, both sides agree, is likely to persist a long time. "This may be the new industrial-relations issue of the 1970's," one GE management man believes.

Although the big controversy is new, the actual practice isn't. For years striking workers have resorted to public-aid programs during long walkouts. But both management and labor officials agree that the liberalization of welfare-eligibility rules, the development of new programs such as food stamps, and especially the unions' growing sophistication in taking advantage of such aid have made welfare for strikers much more significant in labor-management struggles.

A few samples illustrate this increasingly important role.

#### THE GE AND GM STRIKES

In the 101-day national walkout by a coalition of unions against GE in 1969-1970, strikers collected an estimated \$30 million of publicly financed aid, ranging from food stamps to welfare checks to unemployment compensation, according to one AFL-CIO official. In Massachusetts, more than 5,000 of the 20,000 GE strikers went on welfare, collecting more than \$2.3 million.

James Compton, assistant to the president of the International Union of Electrical Workers, says there is "no question" that public aid "played a very major role" in the strike against GE. He credits the AFL-CIO's community-services department with a "tremendous effort" to tap all available public benefits. The public benefits, in fact, dwarfed the unions' strike funds; the \$30 million in public aid was 10 times larger than the special fund the AFL-CIO collected for the union coalition.

In last year's 10-week walkout at GM by the United Auto Workers Union, strikers collected \$12 million to \$14 million of federally financed food stamps in October and November, the U.S. Agriculture Department estimates. In Michigan, according to state statistics, 75,000 of the 200,000 GM strikers there were certified eligible for food stamps; 25,600 received welfare under either the program for aid to dependent children or general-assist-

ance plans. The dependent-children payments totaled \$4.3 million in the last three months of 1970.

#### THE WESTINGHOUSE STRIKE

In a five-month strike by the United Electrical Workers Union against Westinghouse Electric Corp.'s big plant at Lester, Pa., the welfare caseload in surrounding Delaware County ballooned. When the walkout by 5,700 workers started last August, the county had 367 persons in one category of dependent-children relief for families headed by males; that more than doubled, to 779 persons, by January, when the strike was in its last month. The relief rolls dropped back sharply after the strike ended Jan. 25.

These and similar cases are the subject of the first comprehensive research study of the subject, currently being conducted by Herbert R. Northrup, director of the industrial-research unit at the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce of the University of Pennsylvania. Mr. Northrup, an authority on labor matters, believes that the use of public aid in strikes is "a major problem."

"We feel this is becoming a significant welfare cost and is having an impact on collective bargaining by making strikes longer and settlements higher," Mr. Northrup says. "From a public-policy point of view, we haven't really thought through the question of whether we can live with a system where strikes don't hurt one party seriously. I don't want anybody to starve, but I know collective bargaining can't work unless a strike hurts both sides."

Major employers are becoming more vocal in opposing aid to strikers, particularly since some of the biggest companies have been hit by long, costly walkouts.

Such aid "tends to encourage and prolong strikes," charges George B. Morris Jr., director of labor relations for GM. In a recent speech in New York, Mr. Morris said: "Permitting the trend toward public assistance to strikers to continue is one of the surest ways I know to destroy collective bargaining. Strikes serve the function in collective bargaining of bringing pressure to bear on management and the union to reach a settlement. In order to do this, strikes must pinch both sides."

Virgil B. Day, a GE vice president, charges that public aid in walkouts means "that the government is subsidizing strikes." He adds, "This doesn't help the anti-inflation game plan, and it can't be offset by (governmental) exhortations to negotiate lower settlements."

#### THE UNION VIEWPOINT

Labor leaders don't deny that welfare benefits make surviving a strike easier. But they contend that as taxpayers, union members on strike are as entitled to public aid as other needy people and that life isn't easy for strikers, just because food stamps or welfare checks are available.

Criticism of aid to strikers is "part and parcel of a general attack on the welfare system and on labor unions generally," contends Leo Perlis, director of the AFL-CIO's department of community services. Mr. Perlis has masterminded labor's efforts to tap public programs. Of late, he has been cranking up his defenses. Late last year, during the GM strike, he sent a letter to affiliated unions giving labor leaders suggested ammunition to "answer these attacks."

Some samples: "Taxpayers' dollars are used to feed hungry people in other countries. . . . Tax dollars feed criminals in prison. . . . Tax dollars provide food, clothing, shelter and medical care for enemy prisoners of war. Are fellow Americans engaged in industrial warfare entitled to less?"

Mr. Perlis argues that the only criterion for aid should be need, whether caused by "an act of God, an act of nature, an act of management or an act of labor." Strikers shouldn't receive public-aid benefits if they don't meet the eligibility requirements, he says, but if they qualify, they shouldn't

be discriminated against because they are on strike.

Even with public help, "everybody suffers in strikes," asserts James J. Matles, secretary-treasurer of the United Electrical Workers. "It's ridiculous to say they are on easy street" if strikers are receiving food stamps or welfare checks, he says. The idled worker "just piles up a tremendous debt that he has to pay back when he returns to work," he adds.

#### COMMUNITY SERVICE REPRESENTATIVES

Partially to aid strikers, the AFL-CIO has developed a nationwide network of 180 full-time "community service representatives" in 140 areas. These union men are designated by the AFL-CIO but are on the payrolls of the local United Fund or Community Chest—organizations in which labor has considerable clout because of its large contributions. These 180 specialists perform a coordinating role in any strike by an AFL-CIO union, helping the local involved to inform strikers about public-aid programs. They also perform many other jobs that aren't related to strikes, such as helping recruit union members for United Fund drives.

The AFL-CIO has geared up its strike-assistance mechanism to swing into action in case there is a walkout today by the Communications Workers of America against American Telephone & Telegraph.

Individual unions also have their own strike-assistance setups. To prepare for the possible steel strike, for instance, the Steelworkers Union has been holding a series of conferences around the country for local union officers. These officers are told of public-aid programs, eligibility rules and application procedures.

#### CONGRESS, COURTS STUDY ISSUE

The debate over public aid to strikers is being echoed in Congress and the courts as legislators and jurists consider the issue.

States vary considerably in the availability of public-aid benefits in walkouts. Only two states, New York and Rhode Island, permit strikers to collect unemployment compensation, and both have a waiting period of seven weeks before a striker can start collecting.

Most states permit strikers to go on welfare if they meet the normal eligibility criteria. GE says it found in its long strike that of the 33 states in which it operates, only Texas, Virginia and Wisconsin "showed any disposition to bar strikers from collecting state welfare aid."

Under federal guidelines, food stamps, which permit needy families to greatly expand their grocery-buying power, can't be denied strikers who meet normal income guidelines, for instance, a striker's family of four with no more than \$1,500 in savings and less than \$30 in current monthly income could obtain free a monthly allotment of \$108 of food stamps; if the family had \$100 monthly income coming from, say, a working wife, then the \$108 in stamps would cost \$25.

Congressional opponents of giving food stamps to strikers have made several close but unsuccessful attempts to ban the practice. Such an amendment was defeated in the House last December, and only last month an attempt to tack a no-stamps-for-strikers clause onto the Agriculture Department's appropriations bill for the current fiscal year was defeated, 225-172.

#### KEY COURT CASE

In a key legal case, the Supreme Court recently declined to review a lower court's ruling permitting strikers to receive welfare benefits. International Telephone & Telegraph Corp. had challenged the right of Massachusetts to pay welfare benefits to IIT strikers. But the battle isn't over, IIT is asking the Supreme Court for a rehearing. Significantly, a number of states are joining IIT in asking the court to reconsider. Iowa has filed a friend-of-the-court brief supporting IIT and has been followed by at least 10 other states—Alabama, Arizona,

Arkansas, Florida, Maine, Mississippi, North Carolina, Utah, Virginia and Wyoming, according to Lorna L. Williams, special assistant attorney general of Iowa.

Michigan is among the states that can attest to the high welfare costs of a big, concentrated strike. Gerald Miller, a budget aide to the governor, says the UAW strike against GM cost the state about \$25 million in added public-aid expenses, including unemployment compensation, besides costing another \$100 million in collection of income, sales and corporate taxes. The \$25 million covers benefits not only to strikers but also to those laid off because of the strike's impact on other employers.

#### ARE WORKERS ANTIWELFARE? NOT WHEN THEY'RE ON IT

Workers' attitudes toward welfare may be changing as unions increasingly tap public aid in strikes, many observers believe.

"Once the worker crosses the threshold into the welfare office," his feelings tend to change, says Herbert R. Northrup, who is conducting a major study of the subject. "Once on welfare, you lose your aversion to it," he says. "This means that many people who previously felt that welfare was demeaning now feel that it is their right."

Others agree that the stereotyped antiwelfare views attributed to workers may be incorrect. Leo Perlis, an AFL-CIO official, says that years ago "one of the toughest jobs was to convince our people that it was not a shameful thing" to accept welfare when on strike. "Now there is less reluctance. There is no longer the shame," Mr. Perlis observes.

Welfare officials say that striking workers increasingly adopt the attitude that they are entitled to their "share" of public-aid programs because their taxes support the welfare system.

#### THE ADMINISTRATION AND AN INCREASE IN TAXES OR TELL 'EM IT'S REFORM AND SOCK IT TO 'EM

### HON. RICHARD H. FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I see in the July 14 edition of the Christian Science Monitor that the administration, under the audacious guise of "tax reform," may be preparing to sock it to the American taxpayer again.

I say again because the administration's anti-recession and anti-inflation policies have been such a disaster that the taxpayer has experienced little relief. In fact, about the only thing the administration policies have achieved is a ruinous unemployment rate and continuation of a usurious erosion of taxpayer purchasing power.

The article to which I refer is entitled "Campaign Issue? Nixon Starts Wheels on Tax Reform" by Mr. Philip W. McKinsey. I include it in the RECORD at this point.

NIXON STARTS WHEELS ON TAX REFORM  
(By Philip W. McKinsey)

WASHINGTON.—The Nixon administration is pointing toward another attempt at broad reform of the U.S. tax structure—possibly as one of the major administration legislative thrusts in campaign year 1972.

No decisions have been made yet, and in fact the effort is only in the earliest stages. But tax revision was one of the assignments that President Nixon quietly gave to his Democratic Treasury Secretary, former Texas Gov. John B. Connally.

Even though Mr. Connally is deeply involved in a number of other assignments for the White House—ranging from trying to lobby the Lockheed loan guarantee through Congress to selling overall administration economic policies to the American people—he already has begun gearing up Treasury to devise an extensive tax-reform package.

As a starter, Mr. Connally is trying to reshape the structure of the Treasury's tax division. He wants to create an additional assistant secretaryship, and he plans to give the job to Deputy Assistant Secretary John S. Nolan, who had been in contention for the post of commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service.

#### FULL-TIME PLAN

Under Mr. Connally's blueprint, Mr. Nolan would take over day-to-day administrative command of Treasury's tax division. Then the current assistant secretary for tax policy, Edwin S. Cohen, would be able to function as a high-level special assistant to the secretary, devoting all his time to the problems of tax reform. Mr. Connally is high on Mr. Cohen: he considers him as imaginative a man in the field of tax policy as it is possible to find in the country.

Nothing is being ruled out for now, but some proposals clearly seem more equal than others. For example, the idea of a "value added" tax—a tax paid on a product at each stage of the production process, according to the value added at that stage—will be pushed strongly.

Such a tax would enable the United States to give U.S. exporters the same kind of tax breaks that European Common Market exporters have now; and it would enable the U.S. to levy on imports the same kind of "border taxes" that U.S. goods face in Europe.

Labor has opposed a value-added tax as a national sales tax, and there has been opposition to it even within the Treasury. But Mr. Cohen has been among its strongest adherents.

Other ideas that will get serious attention are proposals for tax credits or other incentives to ease exporters' tax loads and to spur commercial research and development. The administration is looking hard for ways to strengthen the U.S. position in world trade and to increase the productivity of U.S. industry.

No proposal for increased taxes on the oil and gas or other mineral extractive industries is likely to emerge from Mr. Connally's Treasury, however. Mr. Connally has stated flatly that he believes the oil industry was hit hard enough by the Tax Reform Act of 1969.

Chances for enactment of a startling tax overhaul would be slim in a presidential campaign year, of course, even if the House Ways and Means Committee could clear its crowded docket and get to it early in the 1972 session. But Mr. Nixon came into office determined to propose a major tax reform, and officials made clear that they did not consider that the 1969 act filled that bill. He would like at least to get a proposal on his record before he faces the voters.

#### COLLECTION-AGENCY BILL

Mr. Connally has said that the President "would desperately like to simplify the tax structure of this nation."

One tax simplification—at least affecting state and local taxes—may fall into his lap. Rep. Al Ullman (D) of Oregon plans to lay before the House Ways and Means Committee this week a bill to set Washington up as tax collector for state and local govern-

ments and give taxpayers a credit of up to 5 percent of their federal income tax.

Mr. Ullman's bill, which the committee will take up in its discussion of Mr. Nixon's general revenue-sharing proposal, would permit states and cities to impose their own income taxes, and would add a line to federal tax returns to accommodate them. This would eliminate states' needs for their own collection and enforcement agencies, would ease taxpayers' paper work, and in the bargain would base state taxes on the more progressive federal income-tax scale. And the tax-credit feature would make state imposition of income taxes relatively painless politically.

Mr. Speaker, it seems the administration is about to engage in another game of Nixonomics with the now traditional Madison Avenue-White House packaging which, when all the frosting is off the cake, leaves us not a tasty pastry, but a mouthful of mud.

To most Americans and to the party not currently occupying the White House, tax reform means closing the loopholes which favor the privileged and giving the long-suffering, wage-earning, payroll-taxed consumer a break.

But when this administration speaks of tax reform, it will do so, apparently, in its own brand of "newspeak; This is what we say. You figure out what we really mean."

The so-called value-added tax is just another way of soaking the middle and lower income people to take somebody else off the hook. If Federal funds are needed to help our exporters, and we all agree they need help, then why not just ask for a direct appropriation and an increase in tax rate? Be done with it. At least this way the taxpayer will know exactly what it is going to cost him and for what the money will be used.

There is a far better way to increase Federal revenues and give just about everybody a break. That is by an across-the-board reduction in taxes and reinstatement of the investment tax credit. This approach has proved it can stimulate the economy and increase Federal revenues. It need not be inflationary as it was not in the 1960's when we mistakenly accepted the proposition that we could have both guns and butter.

The administration may think it can fool the Congress and the people with its Nixonomics doubletalk. So be it. Let them propose their tax-raising "tax reform." It will make a delightful matter for public discussion during the latter part of 1972.

#### APPROVING THE GOVERNMENT'S NEW YORK TIMES POLICY

### HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, with so much governmental criticism abroad, the following article from the British Press approving the Government's New York Times' policy should be welcomed:

## O! LISTEN TO THE BANNED!

Our heartiest congratulations to the US Government on its swift withdrawal of the *New York Times* from Vietnam, thus achieving what Richard M. Nixon sees as his greatest victory of the war so far. He told a press conference of his wife and in-laws: "I decided that it was dangerous and wicked for the *New York Times* to involve itself in the internal affairs of foreign states, poking its nose in where it was not wanted, causing irreparable damage on an unprecedented scale, threatening the lives of innocent politicians and their families, and committing actual crimes, yes, crimes in the name of freedom." Asked by his wife's cousin whether he was considering pulling further newspapers out of S.E. Asia, the President replied that he hoped to have *Time* and *Newsweek* out within the next few months, and the remainder of editorial comment home by Christmas. "I know I have the whole nation behind me in this," he said. "It's what they want in their heart of hearts. If they weren't a silent majority, they'd tell me so themselves."

TEXAS SENATE HONORS  
LOUISE MASSEY

HON. RICHARD C. WHITE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, recently one of my constituents, Mrs. Joe Massey, of Monahans, Tex., was honored by the Texas Federation of Women's Clubs as the Outstanding Clubwoman of Texas. This is but one of many honors that have come to Louise Massey because of her outstanding service to her community, the State of Texas, and the Nation.

Her work has been particularly outstanding because of two convictions that are a part of her being. One is a belief that the senior citizens of our Nation constitute an asset in wisdom and ability to serve that should be cherished and cultivated. The other is the conviction that residents of the smaller communities of America can work together to make each of them better places to live, and thereby curb the march to the cities, which is constituting one of our major problems.

Mr. Speaker, the Texas State Senate has recognized Louise Massey's great contributions with a resolution adopted on May 27, 1971. I enter this resolution in the RECORD as an example of one woman's outstanding dedication to principles that have made our Nation great:

SENATE RESOLUTION No. 1393

*Whereas*, The State of Texas has produced many outstanding women in its long and eventful history; a name which must be added to this illustrious roster is that of Mrs. Louise Massey of Monahans, Texas; and

*Whereas*, Mrs. Massey was recently named "Texas' Outstanding Clubwoman" of the year by the Texas Federation of Women's Clubs; she was previously selected as the District's "Federated Clubwoman of the Year" and as Monahans' "Woman of the Year"; and

*Whereas*, This outgoing and gracious lady has devoted many years to the goal of making her community, her City and her State a better place to live; through her leader-

ship and dedication, the City of Monahans has reaped numerous benefits; and

*Whereas*, She has been recognized for her work with Senior Citizens in Ward County; she has served as a Member of the Governor's Committee on Aging; she served as President of the Ward County Democratic Club; she has been elected to serve as a delegate to the State Democratic Conventions and she has served as precinct chairman; she has been instrumental in bringing many local, state and national leaders to Monahans; and

*Whereas*, While serving as president of the Nu Gamma Study Club, she organized a class for instructing aliens preparatory to becoming United States citizens; she is now Home Life Affairs Chairman on the Western District Board of the Nu Gamma Study Club; and

*Whereas*, She has worked on the membership drive for the Monahans Community Concerts Association; she is a member of the Friends of the Library, the Ward Memorial Hospital Auxiliary and the Monahans Boys Clubs; she has worked with the Exchange Student Program, the Ward County Council for Retarded Children and numerous other worthwhile organizations; and

*Whereas*, Aside from her work in promoting art appreciation in the Monahans area, she is extremely talented as an artist in her own right; she has exhibited her work for the Texas Fine Arts Association; the Sands Art Association; and the Western District of TFWC; she has also assisted with the Junior Art Show; now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate of the 62nd Legislature commend Mrs. Louise Massey for her determination and efforts to make her City a better place to live; and for the recognition she has received; and, be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this Resolution be prepared for her as an expression of our respect and appreciation for this great lady.

CONGRESSMAN J. J. PICKLE ADDRESSES THE JOINT CONFERENCE OF THE TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA AND THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

HON. EARLE CABELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and able colleague, the Honorable JAKE PICKLE of Texas, recently addressed the joint conference of the Transportation Association of America and the Department of Transportation on July 6, 1971, in Washington, D.C. JAKE is not often known to mince words nor to fail to speak his mind. In his committee work he has become acquainted with the problems of our transportation industry, and any solutions that he has to offer are certainly worthy of thought and study. With this in mind, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include his remarks in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF J. J. PICKLE

I am deeply grateful to the men who made my appearance here today mandatory.

I recognize the research and marketing skills of the tops in their profession.

I acknowledge the real "pros" who called us together—gentlemen, I refer to organized crime.

A wise speaker opens up with generous and gracious remarks about his dynamic audience . . . however, the people I can really acknowledge today are the boss leaders of organized crime.

I'd like to congratulate the various governmental agencies . . . but they are so fragmented. They have such over-lapping jurisdictions. They have so many empires within bureaucracies. They have no over-all approach and I cannot in good faith say the government is doing its best.

Perhaps there is a beginning. I am encouraged by the initial study put together recently by DOT in which they recommend guidelines for theft prevention in the transportation system.

I'd like to congratulate business . . . but they are reluctant to come forth with strong policing. They are hesitant to report losses. They are afraid of insurance companies. And they are not ready for honest dialogue with unions. Perhaps this conference is a beginning.

I'd like to congratulate unions . . . but they resist screening questionable characters from union rolls. They are more concerned with make-work in opening containers than in protecting the cargo. They are frightened of reporting thefts of organized crime. They are too ready to look the other way while 40-foot containers are heisted from loading docks. Perhaps the discussions tomorrow will be a beginning.

I would like to congratulate the insurance companies . . . but they are too highly motivated by profits from low-risk policies and too willing to abandon the high-risk cargoes. They are too quick to cancel policies . . . too fast with an increase in premiums.

So you see, gentlemen, the only group that really knows its job and really does it well is organized crime.

I salute them for bringing us together.

Obviously, I am mixing silly with serious. I have outlined the extremes in every case. But it makes a point in a hurry—each of us is too ready to point the finger at someone else in the chain of responsibility. Meanwhile, the consumers are being gang raped at the loading ramp.

A truly coordinated approach is non-existent. It exists only as an idea at this stage. Senator Bible's Commission is a step into the sunshine. Although the Commission will have no teeth, hopefully it will have a voice. The Commission will be doing the homework necessary for the Secretary of DOT to change rhetoric into muscle. Secretary Volpe would have statutory authority to establish minimum security standards for all cargo carriers. I know John Volpe. I know he will do this. John Volpe isn't waiting for the legislation. He's already put a man in charge and has prepared a preliminary draft.

Plus, I know we will see much spin-off legislation recommended by the Commission.

Now that sounds pretty good. It's a strong positive step aimed at curbing billions and billions of dollars of loss.

Yet, I detect a hesitancy among this very room in discussing this Commission. I detect a "wait and see" attitude. I suspect many are putting their hands on their breast and pledging allegiance, while secretly they are afraid of government regulation.

I hope this is not so. I hope the TAA will get behind the Commission in deed as well as words.

You men represent the cream of the crop in the transportation industry. I do commend you for calling this conference. In the many days of meetings you have heard from everybody who should be heard.

By now, you are sweltering in statistics. I won't add to the numbers game. I figure you have all the statistics and all the data you could possibly need at this point.

What I will attempt to do is to put a broad brush to the over-all problems. In capsule form, I'll try to sum up. In doing so, I may bruise some people but nobody here is as black and blue as the paying public.

In headline form, let's take a quick review of some possible federal action:

**Mandatory uniform reporting**—You've got to identify the problem and its scope before you can attack it. Presently there exist no workable mechanism by which this necessary type of information can be accumulated. The problem is further complicated by the failure of carriers to report many thefts for fear that their insurance rates will increase.

A simple reporting form—hopefully, no more complicated than the IRS Form 1040—would identify high risk cargoes and crime concentration. Some carriers might not like making their performance records public, but I think the public would like to know who takes best care of their packages. Therefore, as a beginning point of recommendations today, I think there must be some kind of mandatory reporting system—to get information and to indicate the performance records of individual carriers.

**Uniform carrier liability**—we need to get rid of our leftovers from the Wells Fargo days. Airlines are perfect examples. Reimbursements of 50 cents per pound not to exceed \$50 per package is a hold-over from our early transportation days. Perhaps the liability rates should apply equally throughout the entire transportation industry. Further, the liability rate should be published on the bill of lading so shippers will know exactly how they stand. Liability and its limits should be open for full disclosure and the shippers should be alerted. Establishing uniform carrier liability is a stern challenge but carriers must admit to this deficiency.

**Enforcement**—The federal government is lax. The government should set forth exact guidelines. By its very nature, interstate commerce falls within the jurisdiction of federal, state, local, and private enforcement agencies. A first step that could be taken in this direction would be the development of guidelines to clarify the jurisdictions of enforcement agencies in the handling of various kinds and styles of cargo thefts. We should coordinate with and supplement state and local police. If need be, let's create a special transportation security umbrella to encompass the ICC, the FMC, the CAB, Customs, the Coast Guard and Treasury.

We need more FBI agents on the job—but to do so we need more FBI agents. Then perhaps we could get real interstate police action. I urge that we do away with the \$500 floor—a crime is a crime is a crime, regardless of amount. In a coordinated manner, let's bring in the federal agents, almost from the beginning.

Thus, the federal government could expand its sphere of responsibility over interstate commerce law enforcement—in full cooperation with local officials—it should begin to provide new and additional assistance to other enforcement agencies. The coordinated use of facilities, particularly information systems, should be stressed. Special training programs and refresher courses should be opened to local and even private enforcement personnel. Every effort should be made to weld the knowledge, facilities, and manpower of individual agencies into an effective crime prevention network.

**Minimum physical security requirements**—I realize the small shipper and carrier can stand just so much overhead, but I think the DOT is on target with their recommendations for security guidelines. I would rather see natural change coming about instead of forcing carriers to act, but the fact remains, security is too lax. As it is, carriers are not sufficiently motivated to increase security as long as they can write off losses as business expenses. Rather than make capital improvements such as better security measures . . . these improvements cannot justify rate hikes, but they would be profitable in the long run because better security reduces losses.

Carriers and shippers must do at least the minimum before they can expect help from the government. I realize the problem is

getting the initial capital to make these improvements. Many carriers are strapped for funds. Money is tight. But it must be done. If your home was being robbed every night, would you leave a friendly dog in the front yard and the door slightly open?

**Insurance**—When insurance companies refuse to write policies for certain cargoes this restricts free trade. This, in effect, constitutes a very real obstacle to the free flow of interstate commerce, and, therefore, cannot be rightfully permitted to continue by Congress. Obviously, the insurance companies are not entirely at fault—their refusals to insure such commodities are often precipitated by inadequate shipper and carrier security precautions. But it's a chicken and egg deal: would insurance companies write more policies if security were better? Government action is being discussed very much in this field. Insurance must be available in all instances. Right now, if you lose one dollar's worth of goods, it costs you two to five dollars in red tape to report it.

**Uniform packaging**—Another field open for increased federal activity is in containerization. I think management should encourage it and I think unions should not resist it.

Pardon the plug, but I have introduced legislation which will facilitate equipment interchange between and among the several modes of transportation. Let's get rid of horse and buggy thinking . . . it's inexcusable that we can ship people by train, by bus, by ship, and by air through a friendly travel agent, but we cannot put a bunch of goods in a big box or sack and do the same thing. The day of containerization is here—and the DOT ought not to just encourage it, but emphasize it—and not hide because a technical argument between *voluntary* and *mandatory* rates. DOT and Congress are derelict in these instances now.

**Research grants**—Such a program should not be limited to containerization, but should encompass the entire sphere of transported cargo security. Transportation security lies obscured in technological dark ages. Modern crime fighting techniques are just coming into the transportation field.

**Licensing of employees**—This is perhaps the most controversial area of possible federal participation . . . the licensing or clearance of employees to work in high security areas. Lots of ethics, lots of morals, lots of individual and union rights are at question here. But something must be done to stop theft.

I submit, therefore, that relief could come if any or all of these eight proposals were put into effect. No one of the proposals is the answer; and all of these would have to be carefully coordinated. None need go to the extreme. But I respectfully contend that what we need is action—not equivocation or alibis or an attitude of suffering understanding.

Cargo theft may be as big as the rum running days of prohibition. The blood-suckers of mass thievery are siphoning off the muscle and the profits or our transportation industry. The shame is that we permit it by timidity, economics, and even protection in gangland fashion.

In all this crime against God and the industry, perhaps it is prophetic that one possible salvation might come from the Bible bill. It is time that the Bible and the law be put to work.

However, I don't think we need to set up a two year study to determine what needs to be done. The proposed Commission could make its recommendations within six months—by the time of the next session of Congress—and while research and study continue, we could move forward with meaningful legislation. The only reason hardhitting legislation has not been introduced already—and it may still be—is that we do need to collect valuable information and statistics. We know what is happening, but because of

acquiescence or fear of profit losses, we really do not know who is doing what to whom—or for how much, except the losses go into the billions. Like a family disgrace, we have swept this stealing into our transportation closet, knowing that the items in the closet are being stolen even before the door is closed.

It is time we stopped it.

## ART MILLER AND "THE WONDERFUL WORLD OF WATER"

### HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, once upon a time, Sacramento Reporter Arthur Miller took his readers through the "wonderful world" of California water to discover why man is such a logical animal. In this "wonderful world," there existed glistening, concrete dams and shiny peripheral canals that man saw as the solution to all his problems. That was a logical conclusion, because, after all, why allow free, unhampered water to remain in its natural state? It must be restrained. But no—there were those other logical men who desired these rivers to remain wild. But who is right? Brushing those rational men aside who wanted wild rivers, the other side concluded that mother nature must be confined in man's dam reasoning. After all that is logical enough because more dams will mean that California's scenic natural resources will be covered with efficient, easy-to-care-for cement. And a peripheral canal will guarantee more housing, more development, more smog, less air, and mother nature will live happily ever after. Or will she? Read on:

[From the Antioch (Calif.) Ledger July 3, 1971]

#### LOOK AT IT THIS WAY

(By Arthur Miller)

SACRAMENTO.—Let's wander into the wonderful world of water for a study of why man is a logical animal.

First of all, we start with Southern California.

Now man, realizing that there is not very much water in the southland, proceeds to settle there in great numbers, depleting not only the water but the air as well.

So he looks to Northern California, where he finds wild and raging rivers that have plenty of water—in fact, too much water for nearby inhabitants during winter and spring floods.

So man hits upon a logical solution. Why not build a huge canal to carry the water where the people are? And the dams you use to capture the water will prevent floods at the same time.

We congratulate ourselves on the birth of the multi-purpose project, a very logical development indeed.

Then man discovers that he has a need for recreation. No one in Los Angeles, you see, likes to be there. So man develops recreation spots along the dams and canals bringing water to the area where everyone and no one wants to live.

Now in between Northern and Southern California is a stretch of desert called Kern County which hasn't much shelter from the sun but has plenty of other kinds of shelters for such oil farmers as Standard Oil and J. Paul Getty.

So man decides he can't let all that fresh water just flow by. We must help our farmer friends. We already treat them as farmers by placing their land in low-tax agricultural preserves and subsidizing them for not growing various crops, so why not give them water too?

Thus, another logical use is found in the development of our state plumbing system.

The next step for man is to stumble upon the environment.

If you take water away from a place, man reasons, that place will no longer be the same as it once was.

That and \$25 will get you into the Sierra Club.

Simple, says man—we just use some of that water we've created in those dams. Let it flow down the rivers in sufficient quantities to give the fish a place to swim and sustain all those little tiny things which are part of the food chain.

Not so simple, says the logical man—the fish don't pay taxes. They don't even vote. And what's more, we haven't enough water to go around.

So we decide to all chip in out our own pockets and pay for some water for the fish. That's logical.

And when man looks northward for it, lo and behold, there are some wild and raging rivers on the north coast running unchecked to the sea.

But hold on. Some logical men have decided to preserve those rivers in their natural state.

After all, do we want our future generations to think all rivers and lakes are bodies of water surrounded on several sides by concrete?

And even if we can't take our grandchildren up to see a real river, at least we'll sleep better knowing it's there.

At this point we leave man struggling to extricate himself from the devouring corollaries of his own logic.

Through our carefully calculated engineering we have not only subdued Mother Nature, but we have her down and are beating her severely about the head and shoulders with a blunt slide rule.

And that logic, you see, is what separates man from the lower animals.

#### MAKING DEMOCRACY WORK IN PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago I had the honor of participating in a national Conference on Public Transportation for Leaders of National Civic Organizations. The conference was organized and sponsored by a coalition of groups with a common interest in improving mass public transportation facilities and services in this country—a goal I most enthusiastically share.

The day I attended the conference, a most interesting and comprehensive statement of the purposes and goals of the meeting was presented by Hazel Henderson, a director of the Council on Economic Priorities of New York City. Miss Henderson, I might mention, is also a resident of the Bronx, part of which I have the honor to represent.

I trust that many Members of the House and other readers of the RECORD will find her statement as interesting and

relevant as I do, and I, therefore, submit it for the RECORD:

#### MAKING DEMOCRACY WORK IN PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

(By Hazel Henderson)

During this conference we have explored most of the reasons why democracy has failed to work in allocating a proper share of our nation's resources to public transportation. They add up to an object lesson concerning the snowballing effect that a group of powerful special interests can have in influencing governmental decisions, economic conditions, the shape and size of our communities, the quality of our environment and our entire culture. We have also come to see how all institutions have an inbuilt predisposition to grow and empire-build until they overstep or lose sight of their original goals, and begin operating as autonomous fiefdoms.

We see this here in Washington with some of our government agencies, but we also see it in every other large organization, whether religious, military or economic. As J. Kenneth Galbraith points out in his book "The New Industrial State" this phenomenon can now be observed in our large corporations. He believes that their power is now so great that the consumer, whom they originally set out to serve, is no longer king, but these great producing companies which can now manipulate government decisions as well as the consumer through massive advertising.

Nowhere is this state of affairs more clear than in the field of transportation, where the combined corporate power of the auto manufacturers, oil, construction and rubber companies have so dominated the market that they have almost driven out all other competing modes of transportation; and in many cases, making it all but impossible to get around without being forced to buy a car. Henry Ford's proverbial statement that the American consumer could have any color car he wanted as long as it was black, has become more prophetic than he dreamed!

This predisposition of big powerful companies to dictate what kind of products they will produce, and then use hard-sell, saturation advertising to market them is in large part responsible for the backlash of "consumerism" and rising demands for more participation in decisions that shapes our lives. We have found that our dollar is no longer enough to signal to companies what we would like to buy, because the choices have become narrower. We cannot choose to buy a pollution-free car and Henry Ford II has just pronounced on-Federal clean air goals for 1975 "impossible." We cannot even choose to walk or cycle in safety in many areas!

Economists would call such a state of affairs a "market failure" and it is just this kind of market failure that has occurred over the years in transportation. If the transportation market were operating freely according to the economic textbooks, and the consumer along were dictating the production decisions (rather than a very few huge corporations, combined with all manner of subsidies favoring automobiles) we might have a very different, pluralistic system, offering a wide range of options to the consumer. They might include safe and adequate provisions for walkers and cyclists for the short trips; quiet, non-polluting individual vehicles, more and better urban subways, buses and jitneys of various sizes for in-city transit; fast suburban-urban trains and express buses on open highway lanes for commuters; intermediate and long-range inter-city trains, as well as the conventional highways and airlines.

So we have gathered here and explored this particular "market failure" and seen how other forms of transportation gradually declined as the power of the auto and high-

way related industries grew. Gradually they were able to wring favorable subsidies, bond issues and taxes to support their further growth, while "externalizing" from their own balance sheets the increasing, but hidden, environmental and social costs, which have only recently become evident in pollution, suburban sprawl and the slow destruction of our cities. To paraphrase the elder Ford, we now find that we can have almost any kind of transportation we want, as long as it is a car!

We have all come together because in one way or another, these social and environmental costs have begun to affect the groups of citizens we represent. We know just how this automobile-dominated transportation system affects or disenfranchises the young, the old, the handicapped, the residents of inner cities, suburbs and rural areas, as well as all of the groups we represent. Other people have not found institutional voices to articulate their problems, perhaps because they merely share my fear of driving in heavy traffic, or on our super highways in between menacingly large trailers and trucks at terrifying speeds.

So how do we go about re-asserting consumer sovereignty in designing a new multi-option transportation system? Many efforts have already been mounted. Some hardy souls take the individual approach by defying city traffic and attempting to bicycle, in spite of the physical danger and overwhelming exhaust fumes. Or according to a recent *Wall Street Journal* article, many business executives have just given up on the commuting snarl and run their affairs by telephone and mail from their homes or country clubs. I'm sure many of us have wondered how many human transactions really need a face-to-face meeting, and whether we could manage as well by using the telephone and other forms of communication which might substitute on occasions for all this frenzied rushing back and forth. Unfortunately, most of us are not as lucky as those corporate executives; we have to show up on the job in spite of the traveling problems!

Some communities and cities like New York have taken the approach of trying to win back territory from the automobile by closing streets and creating pedestrian malls with varying success. Many groups have skirmished with highway engineers and insensitive city planners and managed to block construction of ill-designed freeways in such cities as San Francisco and New Orleans, and many others. Conservationists have waged a long standing war against badly-planned highways and anti-pollution groups have taken on the noise and exhaust fumes of the internal combustion engine. I think most of us feel a debt of gratitude to Ralph Nader for his tireless, intelligent efforts to improve so many aspects of the consumer's lot, particularly in auto safety.

Others have joined the fight for no-fault insurance to lower rates and relieve our congested courts of millions of time-wasting, traffic-related cases, which prevent others from receiving speedy trials. Consumer groups have also worked hard for better built, longer lasting cars, without meaningless style changes and other frills.

Still other groups have pressed for special consideration of the needs of the old and young, the poor and the handicapped, in both public and private transportation. Planners have produced blueprints for dream transit systems, and whole new towns, such as Reston, Virginia and Columbia, Maryland, have tried through total design to tame the automobile. Aerospace companies such as LTV, Grumman, Rohr Aircraft and North American Rockwell are announcing in new advertising campaigns that they are eager to serve the market for public transportation, and many of them have won contracts for

demonstration projects. Other companies, such as General Electric have already helped build new systems, like the Lindenwood line which links Philadelphia with its New Jersey suburbs, and the Turbotrain and Metro-liner systems between Boston, New York and Washington.

So, with all this activity, why has there been so little progress? Could it be that up until very recently none of us was sufficiently aware of each others efforts, because we were all working in such very different ways to bring some improvement to the overall transportation system? Could it be that we never realized how many of us there were: enough of us in fact, so that if we got ourselves together we could forge a coalition with enough steam and political muscle to get public transportation up and running? Certainly the multiplicity of concerns that produced our many-faceted activities made it very difficult for us to see them as parts of an effort to solve one big problem: the overall, national transportation mess.

For example, conservationists opposing a freeway which would divide a park area in Minnesota might not instantly recognize their kinship with inner-city organizations in a city like Washington, who were opposing a freeway which would divide their community just as disastrously. Or public health groups in respiratory or heart disease prevention, who were busy fighting automobile pollution, may not have appreciated their commonality of interest with similar organizations representing the interests of victims of handicapping diseases, or blindness, in their efforts for better-designed transportation.

And meanwhile, the planners dreamed of funds to implement their blueprints, and companies waited on the sidelines to see if anyone really meant business. I believe that it is largely due to this fragmentation of efforts and lack of communication between groups, that we have never fully come together and explored the commonality of our transportation needs and defined precisely that area where all of our constituencies' vital interests overlap.

In fact we have often been somewhat suspicious of each other's interests and motives, fearing that they were irreconcilable with our own. Sometimes we have almost come to blows. A hearing in Milwaukee last year on whether to complete construction of a freeway was a perfect example. The highway construction companies and the unions demanded that the highway be completed while the homeowners in its path and the conservation groups bitterly opposed the project. Such situations are indeed complicated by the fact that vital interests of the parties are too immediate to permit assessment of the project by larger, more objective standards.

If there were time to develop feasible alternatives, perhaps another more pressing public construction project or a commuter rail line down the center of an existing highway, such as the one in Chicago; there might have been a way to avoid the clash without human disruption or unemployment. But unfortunately, there is rarely time to work out equitable solutions and often the artificial carrot of Federal funds, pre-programmed for highway spending makes reallocation of priorities all but impossible.

Certainly many group's current interests tend to be vested in an existing system as pervasive as our highway-automobile complex. They include jobs, investments, academic or professional careers, such as highway engineering, as well as all the economic dependents of this vast industrial system; dealers, spare parts and repair shops, gas station franchisees and dozens of other small businesses. But in spite of this, many of us are beginning to realize that all technologies have their own peculiar life-cycles, progressing through growth to saturation and obsolescence and that the auto is no exception.

It too is reaching the limits of its growth potential. This can be seen clearly not only in proliferating highways, traffic jams and rising pollution, but documented in respected business publications, such as the *Wall Street Journal* of April 23rd, 1971 and *Fortune* in several articles over the past year, the latest in April 1971, as well as in *Business Week* March 14 1970.

So we should now stop focusing on what past conditions prevented us from working out ancient, deeply mired conflicts and instead, begin to concentrate on watching the shape of future national priorities and how we can help shape them. If we do this we can begin sharing in the development of new projects in which we can cooperate out of new mutual self-interests. We are now beginning to watch where the new transportation growth will occur as the exponential curve of automobile growth shows the first signs of collapsing. The new growth must surely come in filling the need for fast, clean, efficient public transit systems, and in re-making our cities for more human forms of travel, including walking and cycling. Here is where the new capital must surely flow and where the new jobs will eventually be created.

But if this is to happen, we and many others like us, representing the interests of consumers, must come together and define what kind of systems we want and are willing to pay for. But the economics of this new market we are trying to create will have to be a little different from a normal market, which has failed in this area. It will be a special kind of market which economists sometimes call a "public-sector market", which occurs when normal market mechanisms have been thwarted, as they have in transportation. So we create a public-sector market when we group together in sufficient numbers, decide what we want and then buy it as a collective, or "cooperative buying group". We have hundreds of such "cooperative buying groups" today of all sizes, and their numbers are growing because most of our unmet needs are now group needs, rather than individual needs, such as clean air and water or airports and parks.

In many cases we use our municipal and state governments as our purchasing agents. They act for us in buying sewage treatment plants, schools or airports. If the item we want to buy is very large, such as a national system for old-age or disability insurance, we empower the Federal Government to act as our purchasing agent, or even set up the system itself, as in the case of Social Security or the new Environmental Protection Administration which is charged with protecting our communal drinking water and air. It's interesting to note that in the case of water, some of us are beginning to exercise our individual consumer demand too, by buying bottled water, and the ordinary market mechanism is now responding by producing an ever larger selection of bottled water from which to choose.

So our challenge now is to begin drawing together a new "consumer cooperative" to service our group consumer demand for a more varied choice of transportation, including the expensive new public systems that only our group buying power can bring into being. Now we know that our group buying power at the Federal level of taxation is enormous: big enough to have permitted our Federal purchasing agents to spend some \$70 billion a year of it on military programs and further billions on space and building more highways.

But we should not be surprised at this because we know how large institutions, such as government bureaucracies, tend to forget that they are supposed to be our purchasing agents, and in fact, under pressure from powerful lobbies, they have begun spending our money in ways we didn't intend, anticipate or consent to!

So if we want to regain control over the

spending of some of our money, we are going to have to form a coalition strong enough to convince our elected and appointed officials that they must forget some of their own pet projects, and start voting the funds necessary to start public transportation rolling. We can also make sure that they realize that as the Indo-China War is being wound down by the Administration, they must resist budget-padding by the Department of Defense, and divert some funds into public transit and other badly needed domestic programs. Furthermore, unemployment rates are high enough now, but we must impress on these officials that they should also imagine the situation when thousands of G.I.s join the unemployment lines in the months ahead.

We need to create new programs to provide jobs for all our workers, but not based on the saturated needs of the past, but the real unmet needs in our public-sector markets of the future; not only public transportation, but health care, housing, new towns and pollution control, grass-roots cable television system to help recreate electronically, the "town-meeting" style of local government, and of course, education and self-enrichment for adults as well as children.

These areas of real consumer demand will provide opportunities for the growth industries of the next decade; but only we consumers, out of our own self-interest, will have the incentive needed to organize that demand into a coherent and powerful force that can create these public-sector markets. We know we can do it, because we see that it has already happened in the pollution control and recycling field, where ordinary citizens and consumers created such a demand for environmental cleanups that an industry emerged to serve it, which is one of the fastest-growing areas of our economy and is already providing thousands of new jobs. In fact, the U.S. Dept. of Labor Statistics estimates that as of 1970, there were 655,900 new jobs created in environmental control, and that this figure would increase to 1,181,800 jobs by 1980!

We cannot expect most of our older, bigger companies to play much of a role in developing these new industries, because they have too much invested in the current and past technologies. But some of our more innovative companies as well as a host of smaller, newer firms are eagerly waiting to serve our transportation needs.

But there is also another important reason why we must take the leadership role in pressing for these new transportation systems, and that is because we represent its future consumers, and if these consumers are to remain sovereign in this new marketplace, we must help them participate in the designs, in setting standards, and only then empower our government purchasing agents to award the contracts. If we do not move soon to define these consumer needs and push for their incorporation into the designs, demonstration projects, appropriations and the contracts; then we will have ceded yet another area to the company lobbyists who are already busy trying to sell their own idea of public transit projects to government agencies at all levels.

A perfect example of a project designed by product in this to pay survey way is the SST. There was no great outcry from ordinary citizens demanding an SST, most people can't afford to fly very much in a regular plane. But the aerospace industry and a small handful of aviation enthusiasts wanted it and almost managed to impose it on us after spending millions of our taxes to pump up the aircraft industry. But the very citizens who joined together to fight the SST proved their concern for the unfortunate workers caught in the middle, by also pushing for new public works and transportation projects to cushion the blow in Seattle and other hard-hit areas.

We can avoid repetitions of such human dislocation by getting together on projects

we will all benefit from, and mass-transportation is a good area in which to begin. We can start small, hammering away at the simplest projects, such as reserving open lanes on our freeways for express buses, so that they will be able to compete with the automobile in faster commuting time, if nothing else. We can see that environmental pollution standards recently set by the Environmental Protection Administration are enforced, which will finally force municipalities to reduce automobile access to central cities, simply to meet maximum permissible carbon monoxide standards.

In the transportation vacuums this move may create, we can push for refurbishing subway and bus services to attract the new riders. During the recent taxi strike in New York, the City's bus and subways added millions in fares. If the strike had gone on for long enough, the City Transit Authority might have actually started making profits! Or consider the possibilities for minority group entrepreneurship in setting up, perhaps with Small Business Administration or MESBIC-type loans, small locally-owned and operated bus and jitney companies to take the often trapped or carless inner-city workers to the suburban industrial parks, where so many of the jobs are moving. In New York City alone, 72,000 jobs evaporated in the past year, and such bus lines could help alleviate the inner-city unemployment problems that the corporate moveouts to the suburbs are creating.

Some communities are discovering that their schools bus fleets are under-utilized. They are putting them to work during school hours for shopping runs and after school for trips to theaters, movies and evening sporting events. The revenues help fatten up the school's coffers, or help with maintenance and repairs. All the while we are testing these modest programs, we must form local coalitions to push for funding for the more ambitious projects.

If we can go forward from here, forgetting some of our past or current differences, and concentrate on working towards the positive and exciting goals put forward at this conference, we will not only help create a more human transportation system and more livable surroundings, but also a whole new industry and thousands of new jobs at all levels. We will also help prove that America can re-order her priorities with a minimum of disruption and hardship, away from the military-industrial-complex toward a more humanly-oriented "life-industrial-complex".

**DR. JAMES LIVERMAN OF AEC'S OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY CITES HUMANE OBJECTIVES OF SCIENCE**

**HON. JOE L. EVINS**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Dr. James L. Liverman, Associate Director of Biomedical and Environmental Sciences of Oak Ridge National Laboratory, recently pointed out in a scientific address:

Massive support of science can only be justified in terms of its overall and timely contribution to the goals of society.

Dr. Liverman in the paper submitted to the Fourth International Conference on Science and Society at Herceg-Nov, Yugoslavia, explains the work at Oak Ridge to improve the environment and solve problems of pollution.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important subject, I place Dr. Liverman's paper in the RECORD herewith.

The address follows:

**MAKING SCIENCE SERVE MAN**  
(Address by James L. Liverman)

(NOTE.—Tables and figures mentioned in text do not appear in RECORD.)

**INTRODUCTION**

The two questions which ultimately arise when the topic of Science and Society is considered at its most fundamental level are (a) what should and can Society expect from Science, and (b) what can and should Science expect from Society? While these questions are political, moral and philosophic rather than scientific, they are very real and very important because the ultimate fate of Society and of Science depends on how each views the other. Documented history reveals these views to be ever changing, but on balance Society has been the greatest benefactor of Science when science has served man.

The support of science in the United States during the decade of the late fifties and early sixties was so lucrative that many of my colleagues came to the erroneous view that Society owed Science, which they read "Scientists", the resources to pursue the goals of Science without concern for the goals of Society. Society's response to this myopic view was summed up succinctly by a highly respected, powerful, but also moderate Congressman as "Science should be a work horse for Man, not a scientist's own hobby-horse". In his view, the massive support of science could only be justified in terms of its overall and timely contribution to the goals of society.

The Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL) was specifically created to help achieve the goal of a truly safe atomic energy and as a result we have developed a "problem focused" research program containing a large amount of unstructured research. The methodologies and the scientific expertise developed to study problems of atomic energy have quite coincidentally equipped us in a unique way to aid in another of our Society's crisis problems—the search for environmental quality. In the remaining time, I want to introduce for later discussion three topics:

- (a) the need to "institutionalize" the problems of environmental quality,
- (b) environmental programs of ORNL, January 1970,
- (c) our new attempts to make science serve man.

I hope that this presentation and subsequent discussions suggest ways to help you solve problems of environmental quality in your own country and provide an impetus for an aggressive program to improve environmental quality on all of Spaceship Earth while there is still time.

**INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF THE PROBLEM**

The degradation of environmental quality is generally viewed as being due to the failure of Man to consider fully how his actions might affect those things which the people of the Earth hold in common—the air, the water, the soil, and the natural resources. In the beginning when man depended on Nature, he could simply move from polluted areas to those with a clean environment. Now, however, with a much larger population, with many, varied, and highly developed industries, with fast and massive transportation capabilities, and with a multitude of chemical biocides, we have begun to saturate the capacity and to thwart the ability of nature to recycle wastes at a rate adequate to maintain environmental quality. Since the particular aspect of environmental quality degraded first is very dependent upon local conditions, man created institutions to at-

tack those aspects of the problem first. As a result of the "partial problem" policy, we now find many institutions providing "partial solutions" to the environmental quality problem, but none considering all of the interconnected, mutually dependent aspects simultaneously. Only by "institutionalizing" the problem in a way that matches the scale of the effort to the size of the problem can we hope to achieve a sufficient understanding to prevent—or at least be prepared in advance to solve problems that may arise from man's past and future actions.

Our experience leads me to believe that an organization that can effectively "institutionalize" a problem must possess at least the following five attributes: It must have a group concerned with programmatic perception and planning to provide the integrative function. It must have a group to gather, process, and distribute information so the organization has a complete knowledge of the problems. It must have a systems analysis capability to aid in problem assessment and in the evaluation of alternative solutions. It must have a broad research and development capability to develop new knowledge and to experimentally evaluate alternative solutions. Finally, it must be able to have effective two way communication with various sectors of Society. Although no one has yet created such an institution, I suspect that its staff would be at least 1500 people of whom at least 300 would be professionals with competencies spanning the social and natural sciences, engineering, economics, and the professions such as law, medicine, business, and others. Such a breadth is necessary for viewing the environmental quality problem in its full context.

**ORNL ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM,  
JANUARY 1970**

As of January 1970, ORNL had a fairly broad based, but not completely coordinated environmental program aimed at (a) understanding the environment, (b) the influence of the environment on man, (c) controlling the environment, and (d) environmental information. Our programs aimed at understanding the environment were to trace radionuclides through the food chain leading to man and to develop analytical techniques for biological molecules and non-radioactive pollutants such as drugs, pesticides, and toxic chemicals. The large programs on the influence of the environment on man were centered on studies of the genetic and somatic effects of radiation and of the effects of a wide variety of other physical and chemical insults to living organisms. Our early efforts in these areas were mainly on effects at the acute dose level, but they are now almost totally on effects at levels approaching those found in the environment. The efforts in abatement of pollution and in demonstration systems grew out of our very large programs on desalting, on processing and separating radioactive materials and in waste disposal technology. Our information activities were just beginning at this time and were not centrally organized.

When we compared the nature of this effort with that required to "institutionalize" the study of environmental quality (table 2), we noted a lack of effort in three important areas: (a) programmatic perception and planning; (b) systems analysis; and (c) communication. At about this same time the National Science Foundation was expanding its International Biological Program and was beginning a new program on Interdisciplinary Research Relevant to Problems of Society. Funds granted us under both of these programs permitted us to expand two areas and to enter the other three in a meaningful way. The size of our total effort at this time is still only about one third that we believe necessary to permit us to truly "institu-

tionalize" the study of environmental quality, but progress to date has been such as to strongly encourage us to proceed. The remainder of my time will be spent on some of the activities these new funds have made possible.

#### NEW DIRECTIONS

A number of almost insuperable problems face each governmental unit charged with making decisions about resource allocation and environmental quality. Among their most urgent needs is that of having enough detailed and accurate information about a region to be able to weigh the advantages and disadvantages of proposed decisions on the future of the region. One of our first tasks under the new program was to begin the development jointly with the Tennessee Valley Authority of a computer based model of The Tennessee River Valley to include the cultural, social, economic, physical and biological aspects of the region. Such a model would be useful not only to TVA in its planning for development of an electric power grid and to ARNL in connection with a regional waste reprocessing plant, but it would be of value to the various county and regional governments in connection with their planning for economic, social and cultural development of the region. During the first year, we have accumulated extensive data on geology, soils, vegetation, hydrology, transportation, public facilities, land use, land ownership, census, business, and economic data about the region. We have established links with the U. S. Geological Survey to obtain digitized topographic data and with NASA for remote sensing data on the region. Our land use submodel of the region will be finished by mid-September. Our socio-economic submodel is about one half completed and work on the ecological-biological submodel and on the culture-community submodel is progressing. We are already working closely with the Council of Governments for this sixteen county region to help them learn to apply the model to their regional problems as soon as we are able to demonstrate its validity. We recognize the need for caution in trying to develop and apply such a complex model, but the need is so clearly evident that we must proceed with trying to make Science serve Society.

In another area we began an exploration of the environmental impact of the use of renewable and non-renewable resources which has led us in three directions. We have started to develop a materials criticality index for numerous materials which will take into account such factors as scarcity, environmental damage, and substitutability as a basis for recycling.

To assess the environmental damage function as an incentive for recycle, we have followed the flow of mercury and paper through Society. Figure 1 shows the flow of mercury and indicates the potential for recycle. Figure 2 shows the flow of paper and where the waste occurs. Exploration of the above areas led us naturally to consider the question of establishing a regional wasteplex for recycling solid wastes arising from the region along the Tennessee River between Knoxville and Chattanooga. We have taken the leadership in coordinating the efforts of two local, two regional, two state, and three federal agencies in the preparation of a proposal to do a year long study of the economic feasibility and desirability of establishing such a regional wasteplex. In all three of these cases, we have found Society eager to embrace science and use it in the service of man.

In closing, I want to mention a unique communication link which we have forged that may well serve as a model for the rest of the United States. I believe also that it is adaptable for use by any society. This link has been with a non-profit organization staffed with elementary and secondary school teachers. Its responsibility in our program was (a) to develop and maintain a relevant

communications link between the scientist and a cross section of society and (b) the provision of environmental education and training services to those involved in a broad spectrum of pre-college education.

The organization maintains a telephone-linked information system on environmental matters to every school system in Tennessee. It publishes a monthly newsletter on environmental matters which is mailed to every teacher in the State. It provides information to teachers on availability of environmental training materials, films, and organizations, and during the year has organized 28 special seminars, a series of environmental awareness conferences, and a series of environmental workshops both in Oak Ridge and in the school systems. Its biggest task was the organizing of a Volunteer Air Monitoring Project involving some 25,000 pupils and teachers. In this project, 25,000 fols were distributed all over the State where they were exposed for one month to airborne particulates. These fols were then returned to Oak Ridge for analysis. A map showing air purity throughout the State during that one month period is now being drawn and will be provided to each participating student. This group has provided a means for fast dissemination of new scientific findings as well as a feed-back loop to our program on the effectiveness of the training materials we have provided. This is a true link directly into the homes of most students in the state providing a unique interface of science with Society.

While we still have not answered the two questions with which this discussion began on the relationship between Science and Society, I have indicated ways in which one major Laboratory is trying to make science serve Man, but our true effectiveness in this regard must await the test of time.

### "OKLAHOMA: TOMORROW COUNTRY"

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the August issue of the National Geographic Magazine contains an excellent article by Mr. Robert Paul Jordan concerning the State of Oklahoma.

Mr. Jordan spent several months traveling throughout all parts of Oklahoma in preparing his story, and I believe his prediction of the great future in store for our State will be shared by all who read his very fine report.

From the Tulsa Port of Catoosa—the State's direct link to world commerce—to the lush and fertile croplands in the State's western counties, Mr. Jordan sees Oklahoma standing today at the threshold of growth and prosperity. I want to commend Mr. Jordan for his excellent analysis of the great future all Oklahomans can look forward to, and include his article at this point in the RECORD:

OKLAHOMA, THE ADVENTUROUS ONE

(By Robert Paul Jordan)

In Oklahoma City recently, I asked a man of special vision to describe the view we shared from the thirty-first floor of a downtown skyscraper. With quiet, measured words, George H. Shirk, president of the Oklahoma Historical Society and former mayor, resurrected a shimmering ghost.

"This was just a dusty depot on the sun-scorched prairie," he said, his eyes lost in a

time before his own. "A stop for Santa Fe trains. No trees. The entire water supply came from a single well, about where Broadway and Main Street meet today."

Then his reverie took speed, suddenly embroiled in one of history's great mob scenes. "On a spring day only 82 years ago, Uncle Sam held the first land opening. All about us, between noon and nightfall, erupted a tent city of 5,000 thirsty, aggressive humans. Soldiers guarded the well, rifles ready."

Now I enjoy meeting most ghosts, but Mr. Shirk's eluded me. I could see only a molling metropolis straggling to the sky's rim. Beneath me, where the city had been born, I stared at something else. Destruction. Devastation. Steel headache balls smashing the ribs of the dismal, worn-out business district.

I could see, too, another dramatic birth, in emerging downtown section as modern and sparkling as man can devise. Hundreds of acres of wide streets, plazas, malls, fountains, convention center, astonishingly unconventional theater buildings, immense medical enclave, new homes and apartments, and the soaring thousand-eyed spires of our day.

That, I thought, is Oklahoma City for you, past and present. "The City of Tomorrow," her boosters modestly proclaim.

All Oklahoma, I now submit, is like that: Tomorrow Country. I say it after months of roving this young and exuberant state (map, pages 154-5), watching today's frontiersmen striking out for new horizons.

Not long ago the world and I sailed up to Tulsa's back door. It began for me in no certain place on a still, star-cracking night. Muskogee, newly and proudly the state's first seaport, lay hours behind us.

From the towboat wheelhouse we squinted at the narrow, forbidding stream, welcoming each Coast Guard buoy as it bobbed up in our searchlights. How incongruous it seemed, bringing the oceans deep into landlocked Oklahoma by pushing a barge up the winding Verdigris River.

Intent at his lonely work, Capt. Bill Kurts, Jr., flicked steering levers and throttled back our twin engines. Gingerly we eased over a rock shelf hundreds of yards long. Two miles an hour... one... only inches from scraping bottom. "Slow boat to Tulsa," a deckhand grumbled wryly.

Then we got across and glided into normal nine-foot depths. I relaxed and the skipper grinned, coffee in hand. "First time you steer a strange river," he drawled, "you sort of feel your way along."

Strange river for him. And another bizarre beginning for this absolutely one-of-a-kind Oklahoma. Next day, cutting a bracing winter breeze, we pushed the first commercial cargo into the Tulsa Port of Catoosa, opening the last part of the 1.2-billion-dollar Arkansas-Verdigris River Valleys project (pages 156-7). Now other tows would put into Tulsa, eight-barge flotillas bearing steel, say, from Chicago, or slipping up the Mississippi from New Orleans with containerized goods from Europe, Asia, and Latin America.

Sam Frevert, the port's enthusiastic executive director, could see the bounty of that far horizon. "In ten years," he boomed, "we'll be handling more freight than St. Louis, Memphis, or Pittsburgh does today." On June 5 of this year, President Richard M. Nixon formally dedicated the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation System.

BUGLE SIGNALLED A STATE'S BEGINNING

Yet in retrospect, a seagoing Oklahoma seems a mild triumph compared to the fantastic way the state got started in the first place. The United States of America arrived on April 22, 1889, with a much bigger bang than the world and I made aboard our towboat. Here and there you can still find an oldtimer to relive that day for you.

"We milled about, waiting," recalled a peppery graybeard in his nineties, memory yesterday-bright. "People from all over the coun-

try, even women with babies. At noon a soldier standing on high ground dropped a signal flag and blew a bugle, and we tore across the line to stake our claims."

Run they did, then and many times more (page 154), hundreds of thousands of settlers whooping into the wilderness for free 160-acre homesteads and town lots, charging on blooded horses and spavined nags, buckboards and careening prairie schooners. A few rode bicycles, and some hung to the cowcatchers of snorting locomotives.

Oh, a number of wily opportunists couldn't wait, and sneaked into this new Canaan sooner than they should have. So to this day people call it the Sooner State.

Besides Oklahoma City, instant towns sprang up at Guthrie, with its railroad and federal land office, and at Kingfisher, another land office, earlier a stage stop on the Chisholm Trail when cowpokes pushed herds north from Texas to railheads in Kansas.

For the next 18 years, manifesting a Nation's destiny, homesteaders took land that had belonged to the Indians. In the runs, by allotment, and by lottery, Indian Territory and Oklahoma Territory were carved up, barbed-wired, and domesticated.

What was it like? In Guthrie, the sprightly former Cravens sisters, all widows, can tell you. Listen to Mrs. Lovenna Barnes, Mrs. Blanche Staggs, and Mrs. May Poteet:

"The family slept in the covered wagon that summer, until father built the sod house; carried water from the spring, until the well was drilled. We kept ourselves in the storm cellar every now and then—we could see the twisters following the Cimarron River. Mother planted corn and beans and pumpkins and cucumbers. She could just pick up her gun and go out across the plains and come in with rabbits, quails, or whatever it might be, because she was a dead shot.

"When we caught cold, she rubbed our chests with skunk grease and poured hot onion tea down us. Anybody who came along and wanted to preach, preached, and we all went to hear him. The first Methodist church they had down here, they had in a tent. They got lumber from the lumberyard and beer kegs from the saloon and made the seats.

#### UNUSUAL HAZARD STARTLES A GOLFER

So it went, and in 1907 statehood arrived. Oklahoma—from the Choctaw words *okla*, "people," and *homma*, "red"—was on her way. She's been moving ahead ever since, wearing cowboy hat and boots, sleeves rolled up, motivated by the pioneering spirit.

In 64 years the land of red people has grown into an agricultural and industrial empire. Between countless "Howdies" and "You come backs," I watched this dynamic evolution continuing.

Farmers and cattlemen produce a billion dollars a year in crops and livestock; some ranchers ride the range in airplanes. The forty-sixth state ranks fourth in the U.S. in petroleum output, third in natural gas.

Thousands of Sooners work in aviation and aerospace. Computer networks—for airline reservations, rental cars, gasoline credit cards—increasingly center in Tulsa and Oklahoma City. Loggers farm thick forests in the southeast, replanting after their harvest.

When these vigorous people put work aside, they swim, boat, water-ski, and fish in a new marine wonderland—along with a growing army of tourists. Like me, they vacation at attractive state-operated lodges such as Fountainhead, many to play golf. Few, however, will execute the slice as nobly as I did—but then, seldom does a deer dart across the fairway just as one swings.

I joined Oklahomans at rodeos and powwows, attended church, symphony, opera, and theater with them, admired swank rooftop clubs, dined in the hinterlands on buffalo steak (chewy) and squaw bread (crisp). Tulsa's Thomas Gilcrease Institute of Amer-

ican History and Art and the National Cowboy Hall of Fame in Oklahoma City thrilled me with their unparalleled displays of how the West was won. Sooners, it struck me, function about like the rest of us. So I asked an expert to explain what sets them apart.

I called on newly elected Governor David Hall one pleasant afternoon last January at the State Capitol in Oklahoma City (opposite). It was his first day in office. A tall, handsome man of 40, silver-haired and graced with a warm, gleaming smile, he seated me at a coffee table and came right to the point.

"We are blessed with pure air, four seasons, and plenty of space," said the governor. "We like to work. We live by three things. First, our independence. Oklahomans do not feel fettered. Second, a belief that the basic things in life are most important. Family life plays a greater role here than in many states I have visited. Third, a larger involvement in church-oriented activities."

I asked what he considered the state's biggest problem.

"Education," Governor Hall replied, leaning forward, hands on knees. "That's our first priority. We rank 45th among the states in per-pupil expenditures. We've got to spend more money on our schools. I am convinced that education is the greatest problem-solver of the 20th century."

#### TRAGIC MARCHES BROUGHT MANY TRIBES

But I wonder if education can solve the problem of the Indian. Often, sadly, the first American is last here, as elsewhere.

Red men roamed the future Oklahoma long before written history. The Louisiana Purchase in 1803 signaled the beginning of Uncle Sam's resettlement policy. In the 1830's Indians began to arrive in force—victims of white expansion in the East.

Among the first to be removed to Oklahoma were the Five Civilized Tribes—Cherokee, Chickasaw, Choctaw, Creek, and Seminole. Soldiers herded them to the rolling, wooded eastern part of the territory in dreadful marches that killed thousands.

Soon the cultured Cherokees were printing a bilingual newspaper. Well-to-do tribesmen built porticoed brick academies for their children. Many married whites. Some hacked plantations from the forest and grew corn and cotton with slave labor.

Later the Army rounded up the Plains Indians, nomadic hunters of buffalo, scalp-takers: Comanches, Kiowas, Cheyennes, Arapahos, and others. They raised their tipis and lodges on the territory's western reaches.

#### SOME RED MEN WALK BETWEEN WORLDS

Today nearly 100,000 Indians, of at least 65 tribes, dwell in Oklahoma. I doubt that any place blends the blood and civilization of redskin and paleface as does Oklahoma. You meet Indians in every walk of life: professional men, businessmen, scholars, politicians' wives, painters, sculptors, ballerinas. Rich one, bankbooks fat with mineral royalties; many more poor ones, some curst with alcoholism. Christians, some praying and singing in their native tongues.

And red men so close to the hallowed land and mystic fires of their forefathers that they cannot hear the white man's drum, nor do they wish to. They drift between two worlds.

In a small, personal way I glimpsed this dilemma on a night of half-moon and scudding clouds, in a fallow field rimmed with woods in Seminole County—two hours' drive and a century distant from Oklahoma City.

"You have traveled far to see one of our customs," said my Creek-Seminole host Johnson Scott. "Before the stomp dance can begin, the sacred fire must be lit. Will you let us honor you? Will you start it?"

Facing east in homage to the sleeping sun, giver of life, I set a match to a pile of leaves and twigs, and, when it took, added branches. It must not die out. It did not, and just so

did these proud people adopt me into their tribe.

Round and round the fire they danced for hours—men, women, and children, rattles on their legs, happiness on their faces, hand in hand, singing, chanting, bowing to the blazing altar, livelier and livelier. After a time, Johnson Scott kindly led me aside, a weary paleface with smoke in my eyes.

"The fire symbolizes life," said the slim, erect Indian, a boyish 34, artist by profession, wearing eagle feathers in his hat. "The fire keeps you like a wild horse, frisky and free. This is our spirit. This is our beauty. This is our home."

The sound of oil pumps suddenly intruded. I recalled that we stood on the Greater Seminole field, once the Nation's biggest.

"Where is the Indian today?" I asked him.

"Nowhere," he slowly replied, face in shadow. "But we've got something others don't have. Others have worries. We are free. We care only for our families, our kinkfolk, and our land. We try to be a friend to all."

My friend Johnson Scott gave me a gift, as a token. It hangs in my study, his brooding painting of a solitary eagle feather. On it, these words are written: "I was borned alone—I buddy up with nobody."

#### CHEROKEE CHIEF LEADS A GIANT COMPANY

Not long after I became an adopted Indian, I pointed my car into the gentle green hills of the northeast, into Bartlesville, skyscraper city with one of the state's highest per-family incomes—\$10,234 in 1970.

Soundlessly an elevator whisked me to the 18th-floor executive suite of one of the foremost U.S. oil companies, Phillips Petroleum: a quiet place, opulent, impersonal. There I met W. W. Keeler, chairman of the board, and also principal chief of the Cherokee Nation (right).

"As an Indian," said this man of Cherokee extraction, "I realize that the more we are pushed, the less we are willing to go." He smiled. "I think the Irish are similar."

My wife, I replied, would agree.

The plain-suited, plain-spoken executive glanced out the wide windows of his office to the Osage Hills on the west. He said, "The Indian often has little sense of time. Youngsters are chronically late for school, and many drop out, most in the eighth, ninth, or tenth grade. The Indian isn't competitive by nature, or acquisitive. He is creative, artistic, and intuitive. He is the original conservationist. He has a lot to give, and he wants to express himself. We've got to stop saying 'they' and start saying 'we.'"

All kinds of approaches are under way to improve opportunities for Indians, one learns. The challenge, after a century and a half of exploitation, remains formidable.

Challenge, I thought as I left, really amounts to a synonym for Oklahoma. Strolling about Bartlesville, I remembered that the challenge of black gold arose here when the state's first commercial oil well, the Nellie Johnstone, came in on an April day in 1897. Tulsa's Glenn Pool arrived in 1905.

Field after field followed: Cushing, Healdton, the Burbank field in the Osage Nation in 1920—and Osage Indians became the richest people in the country, per capita, for a time. Still the strikes came—the spectacular Seminole field in 1926, the mighty Oklahoma City pool in 1928.

Oil built Oklahoma. Today, 80,000 oil wells and 8,000 natural-gas wells flow in 72 of the 77 counties. A dozen refineries hum around the clock: pipelines carry their products throughout the Midwest. I looked long at a well drilled in 1941 on a slant beneath the State Capitol (page 158). Sooners love it—and 17 others on the capitol grounds, about half of them still producing.

Unfortunately, oil and gas wells eventually play out, depleted. New reserves must be found. In Tulsa, I talked with Marion Cra-

craft, the gracious, respected oil and finance editor of that city's *Tribune*.

"A few years ago," he told me, "some 150 rigs were drilling in Oklahoma. There are 80-odd now. The plain fact is that the financial return on oil and gas as it comes out of the earth isn't attractive enough. Oilmen aren't going to put money down a hole if—should they hit—they can't make a profit."

#### TRY FOR THE DEEPEST HOLE YET DRILLED

In the face of all this, I found a young oilman who must rank among the most optimistic of all time.

On the western plains near Elk City, I arched my neck at drilling rigs that soared as high as seventeen stories overhead. They looked like launch pads.

"That's exactly right," calmly asserted Robert A. Hefner III, 36, managing partner of the Glover Hefner Kennedy Oil Company. "Only these launches go downward—some of them toward record depths. We expect to discover gas between 24,000 and 28,000 feet. We're shooting for man's deepest penetration of the earth."

A 25,600-foot Louisiana well holds the depth record; it proved dry. Bob Hefner's firm participates in five ultradeep wells, two already producing, in the Elk City area. One, being drilled by Lone Star Producing Company, aims for 28,000 feet.

The average Oklahoma gas well comes in at 8,000 feet and costs \$125,000. "How much money are you sinking down these shafts?" I asked Bob, glad not to be answering.

He winced slightly. "To go more than five miles deep requires drilling night and day, seven days a week, for as long as 500 days," he replied. "Each well costs three to five million dollars."

Where does the money go? More than 2,000 tons of steel pipe, worth a million dollars at least, must be threaded together. To seal the casing, roughnecks—as drill-rig workmen are called—pump a minimum of 20,000 sacks of cement down the hole. Equipment at the well-head can cost \$125,000. An analog computer records the drilling operations.

#### FUTURE MAY HINGE ON THE PRICE OF GAS

One has to wonder what makes a wild-catter risk everything he has on each turn of a drill bit, and I did, aloud.

Bob swung an arm around, sweeping the flat land. "This is a frontier, like the North Slope of Alaska," he said. "And it's just as unexplored. At least two billion dollars ought to be spent here in the next ten to twenty years to develop these reserves."

"Our country has to provide itself with more energy. That energy waits beneath our feet. But the price of natural gas must be raised to stimulate exploration. If a well is going to cost five million bucks, you have to produce a lot of gas to earn enough to drill another hole."

He smiled, another Oklahoman with a vision. "We're betting on the future," he said softly. "You start out with a dream, and you just keep on until it comes true or it doesn't. It's like goin' to the moon. There's a lot of reliability, but anything can happen."

Elk City, population 7,300, senses what may happen as surely as it certifies each dusty red sunset and savors the sweet song of the rising wind. Oklahoma's biggest gas strike in decades may lie captive deep in the earth. The key turns, a diamond bit on its tip. People talk of 6,000 new jobs in the area.

All over Oklahoma I listened to talk about gas and oil, crops, work, the day's events. One subject always overrode the rest: weather.

In the state capital last September I waited a day and a night for the rain to stop, and woke to stare from my hotel room at a metropolis in flood. Nearly eight inches had fallen.

Early in October, in east-central Oklahoma, a tornado twisted through Shawnee and other communities (left, lower). It took the lives of four persons and injured scores.

Three days later, a freak storm buried much of the Panhandle under seven inches of snow. And on December 2, the thermometer climbed to 75° in Oklahoma City.

These represent extreme extremes, of course. But why such awesome variety? Oklahoma happens to be the place where—particularly in fall and spring—warm, moist air from the Gulf of Mexico collides with cold, dry arctic air.

#### A STATE'S VISION: WATER FLOWING UPHILL

Sooners can't do much about that. On the other hand, what they are doing about their water is monumental. With dams on most of her rivers, Oklahoma has become a land of lakes; 48 reservoirs have been authorized, and 24 completed. One of the first, Lake O' The Cherokees, built by the state thirty years ago, extends 66 channel miles and has 1,300 miles of shoreline. Federal agencies constructed virtually all the other dams and impoundments. The largest, Eufaula, covers more than twice the area of Lake O' The Cherokees.

Now, planning engineers forecast a four-billion-dollar outlay in the next two or three decades to bring east Oklahoma's surplus water to the west. Federal and local engineers propose to build 69 additional multipurpose reservoirs—to provide water for cities and industries, hydroelectric power, flood control, irrigation, and recreation.

Oklahoma tilts upward from 287 feet above sea level in the southeast to 4,973 feet in the Panhandle. Annual rainfall ranges from 54 or more inches in the east to a scant 16 inches in the northwest. Water thus must be conveyed uphill for hundreds of miles across the state by a series of pumping stations and canals.

"Within 15 years," declares Forrest Nelson, executive director of the Oklahoma Water Resources Board, "Oklahoma City must have more water. Parts of the west need more right now. We are studying plans for an open-ditch canal system, concrete lined, to carry water from the southeast to Oklahoma City, and out to the southwest. Most of the system will probably be 9 feet deep and 26 feet wide. We'll bridge it over rivers and tunnel it under highways."

This positive, "can do" attitude also manifests itself in education and research. At Oklahoma State University in Stillwater, I glimpsed it on a worldwide basis. President Robert B. Kamm spoke with quite pride of OSU's efforts to assist emerging countries.

"College of Agriculture faculty members worked for 16 years in Ethiopia," he said. "We've served in Brazil. OSU experts in many fields are presently in Colombia, Guatemala, Thailand, Pakistan, and other lands."

I came upon some different international implications at the University of Oklahoma School of Medicine in Oklahoma City. Dr. Allan J. Stanley and Dr. Laurence G. Gumbreck held up rats and stroked them as if they were kittens. Dr. Stanley said, "We believe animals like these eventually can control the world's rat population."

Physiologists Stanley and Gumbreck have crossbred two strains of rats to create a large colony of sterile but highly aggressive male offspring, identifiable by their white markings. Ultimately, the scientists told me, an unlimited number can be raised. Introduced to wild females, they will displace the wild males; eradication will follow in time.

"This is a breakthrough that could yield undreamed-of results," said Dr. Stanley. "It represents a new approach to our environment—genetic control of adverse species."

I never thought the day would come when I could give a rat an appreciative pat.

#### TULSA WASHES DOWN BY NIGHT

Oklahoma's boosters like to boast of her accomplishments in gaudy phrases—"from tepees to towers," and "from arrows to atoms." Her cities mirror the manner of her men.

Fair Tulsa, cosmopolis on the sandy Arkansas River, by day builds gleaming skyscrapers and high-speed expressways, and lives from aviation and aerospace as well as oil (pages 162-3). American Airlines, the city's largest employer, keeps some 5,000 persons busy at its maintenance and engineering center. By night, progressive Tulsa washes down her sidewalks—to help back her claim as "America's Most Beautiful City."

Oklahoma City, amiable giant, sometimes unkindly called the world's biggest cow town, ambles over 636 square miles. Oil wells stalk across the city. At Tinker Air Force Base, more than 25,000 persons work in a vast aircraft-maintenance and supply setup. A few miles to the west, the Federal Aviation Administration's Aeronautical Center keeps tabs on every aspect of civil aviation (pages 172-3). There I saw Charles A. Lindbergh's application of April 26, 1927, for an airplane license; his *Spirit of St. Louis*, it stated, was to be used in a "Transatlantic Flight." And there dedicated aeromedical researchers seek to help today's pilots—men of exactly the same model as Orville and Wilbur Wright or Lindbergh—adapt to aircraft that fly faster and higher all the time.

Oklahoma's capital is the largest U.S. city ever to elect a woman mayor—Mrs. Patience Latting. It also can claim a more mundane achievement. Back in 1935 the first parking meter was installed here; a nickel bought an hour's time. At Will Rogers World Airport, I paid grudging tribute to progress—a quarter to let my car rest for 30 minutes.

#### "DON'T LIKE METERS OR TAXES"

The parking meter's victory is not yet complete. To my surprise, I saw that Oklahoma's third largest city, Lawton, eschews them on its streets—a kindness to recall as one woos sleep amid night-firing Army artillery practice at neighboring Fort Sill.

And at tidy, hard-working Prague, population 1,800, about 50 miles east of Oklahoma City, I learned that parking meters and city taxes alike are as welcome as the measles. I dropped in on Mayor L. B. Drury, owner of Drury's Variety Store, and asked why.

"Don't like meters," he said, sitting back in a swivel chair. "Or taxes. We don't need them. This is a real thrifty town. Our treasury's got a surplus of about \$334,000. We pay off a bond issue by adding \$1.50 each month to everybody's water bill."

Prague was settled by a few Czechs in the Run of 1891. Others followed. Today farmers bring peanuts, alfalfa, and wheat to market here; cattle, dairying, and oil wells bolster the economy. Prague's two banks each boast assets of more than \$10,000,000—largest in Oklahoma on a per capita basis. And the community owns its water and power lines.

I strolled Main Street's two business blocks, munching delectable kolaches—fruit-filled sweet rolls—from the Prague Bakery. In the pool hall, old men played dominoes and cards. I drove along quiet back streets, past trim white frame dwellings with neat yards shaded by elms, junipers, oaks, and maples. New one-story houses dotted "Mortgage Hill." In a large park on the west side of town, people gathered pecans.

"Life is good here," said Frank Sefcik, a friendly, soft-spoken native son, vice president of the Prague National Bank. "We're very conservative. Everybody goes to church. A few of us still speak Czech, but a lot of old ways are gone. We have a very active Lions Club and Chamber of Commerce."

#### GLORY DIMS AS WELLS GO DRY

It was time to move on. I cruised north along State Highway 99, and turned off to Shamrock, a town with no future, a desiccated present, and a tumultuous past.

During Shamrock's heyday, in World War I, with black gold flowing from hundreds of wells, 10,000 people lived in the area. Tip-

perary Road, three-quarters of a mile long, was appropriately lined with green-fronted businesses. The town had two banks, two newspaper plants, three movie houses, five lumberyards, and enough saloons to slake the thirst of a rolistering oil camp. Three doctors and two dentists helped ease her pains.

Perhaps 200 people live in Shamrock today, and some remember. One of them told me, "Why, the pipeline from this field ran all the way to Houston. They shipped the oil to Europe to fight the Kaiser. You should have been here when the war ended. Everybody was shootin' it up."

Only a few months before he died, I walked along Tipperary Road with tall Eric E. Ferren, Shamrock's mayor for 32 years and a Creek County deputy sheriff. Most houses had rotted away; foundations were overgrown with brush. The old fire bell, a rusty sentinel, hung over the firehouse entrance; the rest of the firehouse had vanished.

Strong sunlight washed a few pallid, sagging buildings, their paint long since flaked away. We stopped before a concrete block-house with a man-size hole hacked in one wall.

"The First State Bank stood here," Deputy Ferren said, unconsciously easing his holster. "That's the vault. It's the only thing left. Why the hole? Bank robbers made it."

By 1920 Shamrock's oil boom had burst, and the roughnecks headed for a strike at Whizbang, over in Osage County. Whizbang soon fizzled out.

A gentle melancholy tugs at one in ghost towns, like haunting peace of ancient battlefields. Let Oklahoma's motto—*Labor Omnia Vincit*—serve as their benediction: "Labor Conquers All Things."

I drove away, glad to be transient, wanting to watch today's Sooners at today's work. In Sapulpa, at Frankoma Pottery, I discovered more than a hundred craftsmen handily turning out nearly 30,000 pieces a week.

White-haired, jovial John Frank escorted me through his pottery, as proud of it as a man should be whose business succeeds on the fifth try. "Any piece of pottery is merely the right mud in the right shape," Mr. Frank declared. "Its value lies in what it's worth to live with, for this is the true value of art."

Last year 120,000 passersby turned off Interstate 44 to tour the plant. John Frank sometimes puzzles over the influx.

"I guess they just want to come," he muses. "My daughter Joniece and I design every piece; my wife Grace Lee runs the showroom. We are Frankoma. People come because they like what we create. It's our greatest compliment."

#### ARDMORE CATERERS TO WESTERN CRAZE

All over Oklahoma I saw this story repeated. In the south, at Ardmore, I caught up with the Western-clothing boom.

"It's the only kind of apparel that is America's own," said shift-sleeved John C. Simpler, general manager of Corral Sportswear. "My father and mother formed this business in 1953, and it's been growing ever since. People are identifying with the West, with the old, solid, traditional values. Demand for leather-wear is fantastic. We've been operating nine hours a day, six days a week, for months."

A family man in his mid-thirties whose hobby is flying, John Simpler often visits New York City on business. He said, "Some youngsters there have never seen open country." A frown. "They've never seen a cow or ridden a horse. I'm always glad to get home." His face brightened. "You can't beat Oklahoma."

As we walked to my car, a small boy galloping a large pony suddenly bore down on us, and we leaped from the sidewalk. "See what I mean?" demanded my host happily.

You can bump into enterprising businessmen and horses elsewhere, too. On a cool cloudy morning I drove through the undulating green country of the east, a hunter's and fisherman's paradise, and onto the north-

east's Ozark Plateau. In Commerce, where baseball's Mickey Mantle grew up, I found George Newman busily building the fine boats that bear his name, and I knew better why Oklahoma highways are thronged with cars towing sleek inboards and outboards.

"We're making about 1,500 runabouts a year now," Mr. Newman said, "and I can't see anything but growth ahead. Boating's great for families, especially fathers. No traffic lanes. No traffic lights. No traffic jams. They can unwind and relax."

A short drive away I pulled up at the Bar 20 Ranch. "Be glad to show you what a trained cow pony can do," said Max Blue. Spurs jingling, he took me to the corral.

There I sat with his charming Quapaw Indian wife, Jean Ann, and her sister, Geneva Ramsey, and watched a cowboy cut a cow from a milling herd. Then the rider gave his mount free rein. No matter which way the cow turned to rejoin the herd, the pony anticipated her. Stop. Start. Hesitate. Run this way. That way. Try here. There. A duel to the finish. At last the cow quit, motionless, head down. Without guidance, the pony had won.

Max and Jean Ann breed and train registered quarter horses and run about 500 cows. They hope for an annual calf drop of about 90 percent; most calves, said Max ruefully, seem to be delivered in freezing weather at midnight, with snow on the ground. After the calves are weaned and have grown to some 450 pounds, they are sold. Eventually they arrive at a feedlot, fatten, and go to market.

The Blues raise quarter horses for love and calves for profit. I asked if they had any trouble with rustlers. Max jumped as if he'd heard a rattlesnake.

"There's rustlin' goin' on, you bet! We're short four head right now in that pasture across the road. One feller, he even used his private plane to spot bunches of cows. If no people were in sight, he'd radio his waiting trucks. They finally caught him."

#### "SHED NOT FOR HER THE BITTER TEAR"

Oklahoma tallies a long and bloody account with badmen. Back in territorial times, dozens of U.S. deputy marshals were gunned down here by desperadoes.

I have seen their lairs. Just a six-gun shot from the Tulsa Port of Catoosa, outlaws skulked in a pecan grove called Rascal Flat. Atop a rocky robbers' roost in the Panhandle, bandits kept vigil over the Santa Fe Trail's Cimarron Cutoff, and galloped out to prey on passing wagon trains. Yes, and the vengeful Daltons rode through the land of the red man, and the train- and bank-robbing Doolin gang, the vicious Buck gang, the Starrs.

I know where pistol-packing Belle Starr rests in eerie loneliness, though her epitaph adjoins one not to weep. She died with her boots on, this formidable horse thief and consort of renegades, friend of the James brothers; someone shot her in the back. They buried her on her own land, not far from Porum in eastern Oklahoma.

The grave lies past a plum thicket, beyond an alfalfa patch, through a grassy field fringed with sycamores, to a forgotten and scrub-tangled knoll above the Canadian River. I could find no trace of the old log cabin, though it had stood within feet of her tomb. Ah, Belle, I thought, lying amid weeds and wild flowers, do you know? Do you know the words they buried you with?

*Shed not for her the bitter tear.*

*Nor give the heart to vain regret.*

*'Tis but the casket that lies here,*

*The gem that filled it sparkles yet.*

I returned to the dirt road where my car waited, and plunged with a will back into the real world. I spent the night in Oklahoma City, and the next day pressed west.

Back in the 1930's, when dust hid the sun and drought strangled the Great Plains, a people in flight moved along Route 66, California-bound. The western half of the state

remembers Dust Bowl days vividly. To some Sooners, even the tag "Okie" causes pain.

These days, Interstate 40 bisects Oklahoma, unfurling over some of old 66's roadbed, and, by and large, better times have come. I say this, and qualify it immediately. Farmers and ranchers still scan the heavens for rain. In 1970 a prolonged dry spell in the south led to the state's smallest cotton crop of this century. This year severe drought ruined southwest Oklahoma's wheat crop and shriveled pastures, bringing cattle to near starvation. When I drove past Lake Altus, this large irrigation source had shrunk to a fourth its normal size.

Yet soil-conservation practices and irrigation have paid off handsomely. The fertile red-earth fields that flow upward from the state capital to the western High Plains yield mountains of wheat and grain sorghums. Cattle cluster thickly on the ranges. In northern Oklahoma, Enid's towering grain elevators seemed to me from afar like a castellated alabaster kingdom.

To the northwest, near the town of Freedom, I did walk deep into such a realm: Alabaster Caverns State Park, its high-domed tunnels and rooms agleam with white gypsum, sparkling selenite crystals, and many shades of softly glowing alabaster.

Bats make their home here by the untold thousands, I saw. So could a finite number of people. Far down in the cavern a small sign caught my eye: "Fallout Shelter, Capacity 3,080." What inexorable formula produced that precise figure, I wondered.

#### SOD HOUSE STARTS A CATTLE EMPIRE

People become scarcer the farther one climbs northwest. In the three-county Panhandle, 34 miles wide and 167 miles long, dwell fewer than 27,000 Oklahomans, nearly half of them in the county seats of Beaver, Guymon, and Boise City (map, page 154).

No Sooners are more sturdily independent than these. In the Panhandle, one's word usually suffices; a handshake often supplants written contracts. Before 1890, when it became part of Oklahoma Territory, this was "No Man's Land" to its scattered settlers, and "Public Land Strip" on maps. The six-shooter governed. An attempt to launch the Cimarron Territory failed.

Many homesteaders gave up. Those who hung on left us a little "how to" poem:

*Picking up bones to keep from starving,  
Picking up chips to keep from freezing,  
Picking up courage to keep from leaving,  
Way out West, in No Man's Land.*

They hauled buffalo and cattle bones to the railroad at Liberal, Kansas, and got \$5 a load. They burned buffalo and cow chips for warmth—the price of life when blue northers swooped down out of Canada. For courage, they took after a blue-eyed, black-haired Tennessean named James K. Hitch.

Jim Hitch built a sod house 12 miles southeast of the future Guymon in 1884—one man against an infinitude of yucca and soapweed and buffalo grass. He dug the first well, put up the first drift fence, housed the first preacher, erected the first windmill, planted the first alfalfa, and helped establish Guymon. His son, Henry C. Hitch, added to his holdings by buying up small ranches until, before he died in 1967 at 83, he could stand on the site of his father's soddy and see his own land to the limits of his vision. He could see, as well, great changes.

A fourth-generation Hitch piloted me over that 30,000-acre empire—tall, slim, 28-year-old Paul. His father, H. C. "Ladd" Hitch, Jr., and he operate huge feedlots in one of America's most productive beef-raising centers. They grow much of their own feed on 9,000 irrigated acres. All this marks a development of less than twenty years.

"A fifth of the beef this country eats comes from within a 200-mile radius of us," the flying cattleman yelled. He dipped the Cessna's wing at a sprawling lot where 20,000

head of cattle were confined—each gaining about three pounds a day. Beside this richly brown patch of earth nestled watered fields and native-grass pastures, a pastiche of dark and light greens.

#### CATTLE FATTEN FROM BUNTAN-SIZE BIN

Paul Hitch leveled off, and soon we landed on a grass strip beside ranch headquarters. "Out here," he said, "the word is 'water.' No water, no feed. No feed, no feedlot."

In a good year, 16 inches of rain will fall, enough to sustain one cow every 20 acres. Last year, less than 13 inches wet parts of the Panhandle. But deep irrigation wells, tapping the extensive aquifer beneath this region, produce astonishing results. Winter wheat thrives and corn grows as high, if one may be pardoned, as an elephant's eye.

To turn crops into sirloin, the Hitches and other feedlot operators serve cattle regulated diets of chopped ensilage and ground grain, plus protein supplements. Paul showed me a year's supply of grain. It filled a bin half as wide as a football field and half again as long, to a height of 12½ feet. Larger bins exist.

"What we do," my host summed up, "is simple, though not easy. We buy little cattle and sell big cattle. Without irrigation we'd still be alive, but not very prosperous."

For farmers and bankers, irrigation can be a chancy proposition. "When you see an irrigation well here," Fred Huffine, Texas County extension agent, told me, "you're seeing a \$30,000 investment. We have 877 wells now in this county, against a capacity of perhaps 2,000. To finance his well, a farmer needs a sizable net return immediately. The banker has to look very closely."

#### CHANGE ARRIVES IN LITTLE DIXIE

From the parched mesa and canyon country of the Panhandle's northwest tip to the bayous of the sultry southeast, a crow flies 530 miles. I sped across Oklahoma easily in two days, and reached a dramatically different world called Little Dixie. McAlester serves as its unofficial capital. Carl Albert, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, went to school in a nearby hamlet called Bug Tussle, whose name is now Flowery Mound.

Valuable reserves of coal wait in this region. But mostly Little Dixie belongs to nature. I parked high on the Talimena Skyline Drive and drank in the brooding beauty of the Ouachita Mountains, with their dark valleys and clear swift streams. On the Red River lowlands, looking into Texas and Arkansas, I saw cypress knees poking from swamps, sycamores garlanded with mistletoe, and hawks sailing high overhead.

Everywhere I found trees. Forests cover a fourth of Oklahoma. They dominate here: shortleaf and loblolly pine, post oak, red oak, white oak, hickory, sweet gum, black gum, cedar, holly. Off one-lane dirt roads I caught the pungent perfume of woodsmoke; peckerwood mills were burning scraps. In Wright City a sawmill belched steam; nearby a huge container-board plant was going up.

I wandered back into the hills, where isolated families scratch a living from little plots, run a few cattle, and poach an occasional deer. Along the creeks, dilapidated houses perched on concrete blocks. Towns were sunning amidst the clatter of pickup trucks, and people nodded to me on the sidewalks. I dined on fried chicken, gravy, and hot biscuits, and dropped off some dry cleaning at a place that advertised "To know us is to love us."

#### TIMBER CUTTERS LOOK TO THE FUTURE

Some of all this—how much, no one knows—soon must change. In Broken Bow, headquarters for the Weyerhaeuser Company's Oklahoma timberlands, I learned why.

A giant among the Nation's timber firms, Weyerhaeuser had recently purchased 1.8 million acres of forest in southeast Oklahoma and adjacent Arkansas for more than \$300,000,000. New mills and equipment were

costing \$200,000,000 more. Some 1,200 new jobs would be created, and several hundred more would result indirectly. Prosperity was coming to the depressed southeast.

"Within 30 years," said Joseph C. Brown, Jr., Weyerhaeuser vice president for the area, "the demand for wood products is going to double. We have to help meet that need. We figure on being here forever, which means that we're planting as we harvest. Timber, like corn, is a crop. It is renewable."

Weyerhaeuser means to be a good neighbor, Mr. Brown told me. People can roam the forests and streams for hunting, fishing, and camping. There are no fences. They can browse cattle in some areas and cut marked trees for firewood, at no cost.

Woods Manager Dale C. Campbell took me to a pine-seed orchard and jabbed a finger at row after row of two-year-old pines standing two feet high.

"Ever see 19,000 trees like that before?" he asked. "They are pine-root stock. From them we'll take seeds, which we'll plant in a nursery for a year. As we log each 300-acre setting, we plant the seedlings 700 to the acre, spaced six or seven feet apart with nine feet between rows."

"I look at it this way. I'm nearly 50 years old. I'll be too old to harvest the trees I set in the ground today. But someone will 30 years from now. What I do affects the next generation very directly."

I thought about that early next morning, riding a logging train's jouncing caboose miles into the forest. Strong sunlight filtered through the endless woods; serene brooks sparkled and disappeared. Here indeed stood a slice of the country's future—lumber, window sashes, plywood, utility poles, fence posts, fiberboard, container board.

I headed back to town in a car driven by 37-year-old Bob Hyndman, Weyerhaeuser's Oklahoma raw-materials manager and a devoted amateur archeologist. While he one-handedly rolled a cigarette at 50 miles an hour, I made nervous conversation.

"Long before the Choctaws came here over their 'Trail of Tears,'" he replied, "Indians lived in these woods. See that clearing? I know they camped there. Give me a few minutes, and I bet I can find an arrowhead."

"Take your time," I replied grandly, a skeptic from suburbia.

Bob walked briskly about, bending down, tossing stones aside. "There!" he declared. I studied the ground and saw nothing.

"Got to know what you're looking for," he said, handing me a stone object the same color as the earth, a perfect point.

He walked on, and soon knelt again. "Here's a pretty good spearpoint," he said, "but it's broken in half."

When he reads this, Bob will learn that he was right about the arrowpoint. Indians chipped it out of chert about 1,000 years ago, according to archeologists at the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D.C. But he may be surprised about the broken spearhead. I regret having only its top half, but I prize it immensely all the same. The Smithsonian judges that it could be 4,000 years old.

#### NEW WORD FOR THE OK STATE

I returned to Broken Bow, checked out of my motel, and drove west through rolling, wooded country to Antlers. There I picked up the Indian Nation Turnpike and headed north, aiming for Oklahoma City and an airplane ride home to the crowded East.

After an hour or so I pulled into a rest area, wanting to stretch. I walked along the right-of-way. A covey of quail rose from the brush at my approach, wings whirring. Back at my car, I glanced idly at the license plate. OKLAHOMA IS OK, it assured me. All of the license plates say it. OKLAHOMA IS OK.

No, I said, it is not. Not at all. Oklahoma is tremendous. Put that on your license plates.

#### ANOTHER VIEW

### HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the membership a most interesting and very scholarly paper relative to constitutional powers entrusted to both the Chief Executive and the legislative branch. The author of the article entitled "The President as Commander in Chief: Another View," is Charles B. Blackmar. We were former classmates at the University of Michigan Law School and graduated together. Mr. Blackmar, in addition to being a professor of law at St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo., also is a special assistant attorney general of Missouri and a member of the Missouri Bar. Mr. Blackmar's article, which appeared in the April, 1971, edition of the American Bar Association Journal, is one not arguing the merits of our involvement in Southeast Asia, as he states, or its possible extensions, but rather to discuss the constitutional problems presented by such proposals as Cooper-Church, McGovern-Hatfield, and other proposals as congressional intent and involvement now become a greater issue.

Mr. Blackmar's excellent presentation follows:

#### THE PRESIDENT AS COMMANDER IN CHIEF: ANOTHER VIEW

(By Charles B. Blackmar)

For more than a decade the United States has been involved in armed combat in Indochina. Several Presidents have dispatched hundreds of thousands of men, many of them involuntary inductees. There have been aerial bombing and naval operations, and these have been directed in several countries in support of strategic or tactical objectives.

Our forces first entered the Republic of Vietnam (South Vietnam) at the request of its government to aid in the suppression of an insurrection. It was evident that the insurrection was heavily supported by troops and materiel supplied by the Democratic Republic of Vietnam (North Vietnam) and, through that conduit, by other Communist nations. President Johnson ordered strategic bombing operations deep inside North Vietnam. These were suspended in the hope of facilitating the pending peace negotiations in Paris, but with reservation of the possibility of renewal if the negotiations did not proceed in a satisfactory manner. The Nixon Administration has asserted the authority to engage in aerial operations wherever these are considered necessary for the protection of American forces, and the President has directed bombing missions in North Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia.

North Vietnamese forces had made free use of the territory of Cambodia, which had a "neutral" government lacking either the force or the will to inhibit the operations. Then there was a change in the government of Cambodia, and the United States embarked on ground operations in "sanctuaries" along the border between Cambodia and South Vietnam. The new government apparently felt that it could not express approval of the operations, but it certainly did not protest. President Nixon stated that his purpose was to protect American forces in Vietnam, so that they could continue in the Vietnamization program and be withdrawn sooner. He

promised a strict limitation on the venture, with obvious deference to American public opinion, but made it clear that the limitation was a voluntary one and that he might resume operations or probe more deeply if he thought it necessary.

The entire venture in Indochina has proceeded without any express declaration of war. The Presidents have taken the initiative. There have been consultations with Congressional leaders and committees, but the Presidents usually have been in the position of telling Congress what they are going to do rather than of seeking advice. Congress has shown virtually complete acquiescence, especially in the earlier stages of the operation. It has appropriated money and enacted draft laws and other supporting legislation, and at times it has prescribed severe penalties for unlawful manifestations of dissent.<sup>1</sup> The 88th Congress adopted the now repealed Tonkin Gulf Resolution, giving the President very broad authority for the use of ground and air forces in Southeast Asia.<sup>2</sup> Until late in 1967 the overwhelming weight of public opinion seemed to be behind the Indochina operations.

Then there was a dramatic change. The expected military successes did not materialize. Opposition to the war grew, both inside and outside Congress. Dissent became respectable. The war situation was surely the predominant factor in President Johnson's decision in 1968 not to seek another term. President Nixon promised the total withdrawal of American forces, while declining to specify a detailed timetable because of his fear of interfering with the Paris peace negotiations. Vocal opposition to the war became less intense, until the tranquility was shattered, at least temporarily, by the entry of American ground troops into Cambodia in May of 1970.

Cambodia gave rise to a series of Congressional proposals designed to limit the scope and duration of operations in Indochina. For almost the first time in history there was substantial Congressional support for the enactment of restrictions that would affect the President in his direction of military operations. Defenders of Presidential authority not only challenged the merits of the restrictive proposals but asserted that they would amount to an unconstitutional interference with the authority conferred upon the President by Article II, Section 2, of the Constitution:

"The President shall be commander in chief of the army and navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several states when called into the actual service of the United States. . . ."

My purpose is not to argue the merits of our involvement in Southeast Asia, or its possible extensions, but rather to discuss the constitutional problems presented by such proposals as Cooper-Church,<sup>3</sup> McGovern-Hatfield<sup>4</sup> and other proposals that surely will be presented so long as American involvement in Indochina continues. The specific occasion for my writing is Eberhard P. Deutsch's scholarly article, "The President as Commander in Chief", in the January, 1971, issue of this *Journal* (page 27), in which he expresses the following conclusion:

"Whenever a state of war exists—whether declared or undeclared—the President of the United States has, under the Constitution, as commander in chief, full and plenary power to conduct military operations in prosecution of the war, unhampered by anything in the nature of strategic restrictions." (Emphasis supplied.)

Mr. Deutsch suggests that attempted limitations by legislative action and similar proposals that may be made in the future are in derogation of the President's constitutional authority. His analysis necessarily

gives rise to corollaries, as follows: (1) The President may order the Armed Forces into action in any part of the world, in support of his conception of the national interest; (2) He may extend the scope of operations by means of aerial bombing, naval bombardment, firing of missiles or other means; (3) Congress is without power to restrict the President in the exercise of his powers respecting the deployment and operations of the Armed Forces, except by disestablishing the forces or failing to furnish necessary material and supplies.

These broad propositions are contrary to the concept of popular government. The legislature has a proper concern with any sustained military operation. Congress would be acting within the scope of its authority in proscribing operations in a particular nation or area. It would have the power to specify a date for the cessation of a particular military involvement. It could properly limit the dispersal of the Armed Forces and, especially, could restrict the areas in which drafted soldiers could be compelled to serve. The power to appropriate connotes the power to place restrictions on the appropriations in a manner designed to give effect to Congressional policies. Future debate over measures on the order of Cooper-Church or McGovern-Hatfield should deal with the merits of continuing, extending or restricting operations and not with fine points of constitutional authority or doctrine.

#### THE "INTENT OF THE FRAMERS" BALANCES PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS

Discussion of problems of constitutional interpretation logically begins with the language of the document and the available evidence about the intent of the members of the Constitutional Convention.

It perhaps proves too much to suggest that the framers would be horrified at the suggestion that the document they proffered would give the President the power to conduct a sustained military operation in a distant land, using what is essentially a conscript army, and without any authority in Congress to limit the scope or duration of the operation short of disestablishment of the Armed Forces, the framers had no conception of a situation in which there could be a military position bearing resemblance to Vietnam.

We must always remember, however, that the framers sought to design "a constitution, intended to endure for ages to come, and consequently to be adapted to the various crises of human affairs".<sup>5</sup>

The constitutional language is quite emphatic in stating that there is a distribution of power between the executive and the legislature with regard to military matters. The "executive power" (Article II, Section 1) and "commander in chief" (Article II, Section 2) provisions are balanced by the language of Article I, Section 8, which give Congress basic and substantial authority over military matters. Of prime importance, of course, is the express power to declare war. The power "to raise and support armies" is qualified by the injunction that "no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years". No other power of Congress is restricted in this manner. The restriction, interestingly, does not apply to the provision giving Congress power "to provide and maintain a navy". The two-year restriction necessarily means that Congress was expected to exercise surveillance over the Army in operation and, inevitably, over the President's stewardship in his capacity of commander in chief. Congress would not be able, at the commencement of a President's term, to appropriate funds for Army purposes for the duration of that term. Nor could one Congress bind a future Congress to a program of appropriation for maintenance and support of armies.

The essential purpose of specifying that

the President is to be commander in chief of the Army and Navy is to maintain civilian control over the military. The clause also prevents Congress from investing a rival to the President by designating some person other than the President as commander of the military forces. Nothing in this particular clause, however, may be construed as a limitation on Congress in the exercise of its express powers, nor does the language of the clause give the President the authority to determine the scope and extent of military operations free from Congressional limitation or control. The Constitution says, in effect, that Congress may determine the ends of military operation and that the President has control of the means. Available contemporary authority seems to support this conclusion.<sup>6</sup>

#### "COMMANDER IN CHIEF" IN HISTORY AND OPINION

The interpreters of a viable constitution must give account to history as well as to language. The expectations of the framers have not always worked out in practice. The elite electoral college, for example, became a puppet body, and any elector who departed from his voting pledge would surely be subject to severe criticism. President Washington made one futile attempt to secure the "advice" of the Senate in the negotiation of a treaty, and since that time he and his successors have done the negotiating themselves, through their chosen agents, and have then submitted the completed document for ratification.<sup>7</sup> Prescription plays an important role in constitutional history and constitutional interpretation.

History shows many instances in which Presidents have directed the Armed Forces to engage in hostile operations, without prior Congressional authorization. Such uses of force have generally been approved by Congress, by public opinion and by historians. There are cases in which advance approval is impracticable and is not a condition precedent. (Whether the use of force is justified, of course, is a question of judgment.) The historical incidents do not support the claim that the Presidential authority must necessarily be free from Congressional limitation. It will facilitate analysis to classify the several incidents.

1. *Limited Operations.* Presidents have often directed the use of armed force for specific and limited purposes. In the early days of our history there were incidents arising from the Napoleonic Wars, with attendant threats to American neutrality, and also the operations against the Barbary pirates.<sup>8</sup> During the first three decades of the twentieth century our forces were dispatched to Latin American countries with some regularity.<sup>9</sup> More recently, in 1962, President Kennedy proclaimed the missile blockade of shipments to Cuba, and President Johnson directed troops into the Dominican Republic in 1965 to maintain the status quo during a revolutionary uprising. The incidents in this category did not result in prolonged military operations, and there were no substantial attempts at restriction through Congressional action.<sup>10</sup>

2. *Resistance to Invasion.* It is evident that the President may use forces under his control to repel an invader. The Pearl Harbor raid is the prime example of hostile attack against American territory, but it furnishes little in the way of precedent since a declaration of war by Congress followed almost immediately and came before effective resistance could be offered to the invader. President Polk asserted hostile invasion as the occasion for commencing hostilities against Mexico.<sup>11</sup> The power to repel invasion undoubtedly includes the power to pursue the invader or to attack his homeland, especially under modern conditions. The President is not limited to beating the enemy forces back from our shores. But this

Footnotes at end of article.

is not the same thing as extending and maintaining foreign operations, when our country has not been invaded.

3. *The Civil War.* The Civil War, from the federal point of view, was an insurrection, which developed into a war. The courts have had difficulty with the resulting legal problems, and their answers have not been wholly consistent.<sup>23</sup> An insurrection is a treasonable act, but if it becomes widespread, then the rebels are normally accorded some of the rights of belligerents.<sup>24</sup> President Lincoln felt that his oath of office imposed the duty to preserve the Union and to use the Armed Forces in the discharge of this duty.<sup>24</sup> Although there was substantial contemporaneous opposition to his theory and practice, there are few today who would disagree with his conception of the Presidential duty. It is not helpful, however, to try to translate domestic precedents into authority for foreign operations.

4. *Recent Undeclared Wars.* President Truman ordered American troops into Korea in 1950 without prior Congressional authorization, and Congress never entered into a subsequent declaration of war. President Johnson likewise directed massive ground forces to South Vietnam and instituted the bombing of military and industrial targets deep inside North Vietnam, without declaration of war.<sup>25</sup> Both the Korean and Indochina conflicts have all the external indicia of war. In both instances operations have been limited by barriers that may seem to be artificial from the military standpoint, but these have been imposed by Presidential decision rather than because of legislative restriction. Congress has generally acquiesced in whatever the Presidents in charge have thought necessary in these operations and certainly has not objected to the state of *de facto* war. Even though there was no advance approval, there has certainly been ratification of the situation which developed. There may be a state of war in fact without formal declaration, and Congress may effectively recognize the existence of a state of war by legislating in aid of the operation, although it makes no formal declaration. Under these circumstances, the President may direct operations as commander in chief, on the basis of implied Congressional approval.

#### CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL IS EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED

Incidents of the types described above have been the subject of litigation at various times. There have also been theoretical debates in Congress over the nature and extent of Presidential power. The general tendency of the judicial opinions and legislative discussions has been to support executive action. In almost all instances, however, there has been express or implied Congressional approval. There have been criticisms over details, but seldom has Congress sought to place restrictions on the President with respect to operations in progress. In recent years, particularly, the President has taken the initiative and Congress has usually acquiesced.<sup>26</sup> There is a dearth of authority about what Congress may lawfully do to restrict the President in the maintenance and extension of military operations. The problems that could arise, moreover, might not lend themselves to adjudicatory settlement.

It is clear that the President does not acquire power simply because he believes that a particular course of action is necessary or desirable in the efficient conduct of current hostile military operations. The Steel Seizure Cases arose in the setting of the Korean War. Steel production was interrupted by a labor dispute, and the President directed the Secretary of Commerce to take possession of the steel mills involved so that production would not be interrupted while Congress was considering possible legislative solutions to the problem. The majority of

the Supreme Court (six to three) held that the President had acted in excess of his authority, since there was no legislative authorization for the seizure.<sup>27</sup> The several opinions spoke in eloquent terms about the division of governmental power as set out in the Constitution and about the binding effect of the separation of powers under all conditions. Even Chief Justice Vinson's dissenting opinion emphasized the authority of Congress and sought to justify the seizure on the basis of other expressions of Congressional intent. None of the Justices would have sustained the seizure in the face of an express Congressional prohibition.

There is neither legal nor historical support for the proposition that Congress would be trespassing on the Presidential prerogative if it should assume to forbid sustained military operations in particular areas or to direct that a specific military venture be brought to an end.

#### PRESIDENTIAL AUTHORITY SUBJECT TO LEGISLATIVE RESTRICTION

Questions of Congressional power to delimit or to terminate a war, declared or *de facto*, are not foreclosed by prior authority. They are open for consideration and should be considered in the light of the principles underlying the Constitution. It is fundamental that our government is a popular government, with power distributed among the several branches and with the legislature as repository of the public will.

The Nixon Administration opposed the Cooper-Church amendment on the claim that it interfered with the Presidential prerogative. It has sought, however, to comply with the literal terms of the inhibition against use of ground forces and advisers in Cambodia.<sup>28</sup> If this resolution were in violation of the Constitution, there would be no need to observe it. The attempts at compliance indicate the legitimacy of the exercise of Congressional authority.

The Nixon Administration sought to justify the initial entry into Cambodia on the ground that it protected American troops in South Vietnam, and it indicates that it might take similar action in the future for this same purpose, if necessary. If a military operation were in progress with the express or implied consent of Congress and if American troops were threatened by hostile forces in a neutral nation, then the President undoubtedly would have the authority to direct operations against these forces, in the absence of legislative restriction. He, of course, would have to weigh the dangers of violating neutrality, but this is irrelevant in a discussion of the extent of Presidential power.

In Cambodia, however, the President could have eliminated any threat to the American troops by withdrawing them. The danger was not directly to the troops but to the "presence" which the administration considered it desirable to maintain. If the presence were lawful, then the President would have the right to protect that presence. It by no means follows that he would have the authority to maintain the presence in the face of a contrary Congressional direction.

Why should Congress not be able to say to the President: "We do not want any ground operations by American forces in Cambodia. If our troops in Vietnam are threatened by hostile forces in Cambodian sanctuaries, then you should withdraw them to safe positions, but should not go into Cambodia"? If Congress does not have authority to give this direction, then the President may sustain hostile operations in a remote theater in derogation of the popular will.

Congress, furthermore, should be able to direct the President to bring hostilities in a particular theater to an end, either immediately or within the confines of a specified schedule. Why should the power to de-

clare or to recognize war not connote the power to call for the end of a conflict? The President has no inherent power to direct that a conflict be continued until it is "won"—in the sense that American objectives are fulfilled.

Nor would the presence of a treaty obligation inhibit Congress in the exercise of its authority. Treaties along with statutes are the "law of the land", but a treaty may be abrogated by legislative enactment.<sup>29</sup> The President may have the power to use military force to effectuate the obligation of an existing treaty, but his authority is clearly subject to legislative restriction.<sup>30</sup>

#### COMMANDER'S AUTHORITY IS NOT ALWAYS EXCLUSIVE

No war, declared or otherwise, may be maintained without Congressional support. There must be provision for men and materiel. Congress may necessarily use its appropriation power in the control of military involvements and commitments. It may say that certain funds are to be used for urban renewal rather than for armament, and the President must comply with the instruction. It may forbid the use of an appropriation for a particular item of materiel, and the President could not violate the instruction even though he thought it unwise. It follows that Congress may say in so many words that its appropriations are not to be used for operations in specified nations or for operations in a particular theater beyond a designated date.

The decision to make and to sustain declared or undeclared wars is one properly referable to the popular will and to the legislature as the agent of the popular will. The President may direct operations as commander in chief, and Congress may not ordain or establish a rival. The commander's authority, however, does not connote exclusive power to determine the extent and duration of operations.

A conclusion that this authority is lodged in the President free from legislative control is inconsistent with the nature of popular government, and a power so maintained in the face of Congressional inhibition could be challenged as illegitimate.

#### FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> See, e.g., 50 App. U.S.C. § 462(b), prescribing a sentence of up to five years for burning or mutilating draft cards.

<sup>2</sup> This resolution, adopted August 7, 1964, because of information about attacks against attacks on American warships in the Gulf of Tonkin, gave the President the authority "to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression".

<sup>3</sup> The ultimate form of this proposal is embodied in the Special Foreign Assistance Act of 1971 and reads as follows: "[Federal funds are not to be used] to finance the introduction of United States ground combat troops into Cambodia, or to provide United States advisors to or for Cambodian military forces in Cambodia."

<sup>4</sup> The purpose of this proposal, which assumed several forms in the 91st Congress, was to set a date for the termination of the involvement of American forces in Vietnam.

<sup>5</sup> *McCulloch v. Maryland*, 4 Wheat. 316 (1819).

<sup>6</sup> THE FEDERALIST No. 69 (Hamilton) states that the Presidential power is less substantial than the power of the British Crown because it does include the power to "declare war" or to "raise armies". THE FEDERALIST No. 74 (Hamilton) emphasizes the need for unitary command of operations, as justification for the power.

<sup>7</sup> See CORWIN, THE PRESIDENT: OFFICE AND POWERS 209-211 (4th ed. 1957).

<sup>8</sup> See 1 MORRISON and COMMAGER, THE GROWTH OF THE AMERICAN REPUBLIC, 373-374, 388-389 (3d ed., New York, Oxford, 1942).

<sup>9</sup> HERRING, A HISTORY OF LATIN AMERICA, 429-432 (1961), 429-432 (Haiti), 464-466 (Nicaragua), 473-478 (Panama).

<sup>10</sup> See *The Constitution of the United States of America, Revised and Annotated*, 540-542 (G.P.O., 1963).

<sup>11</sup> Corwin, *op. cit.* note 7, at 200-201. Congress declared that "by the act of the Republic of Mexico, a state of war exists between that Government and the United States". Morrison and Commager, *op. cit.* Note 8, at 592.

<sup>12</sup> In the *Prize Cases*, 2 Black 635 (1863), the Court recognized a right of "prize and capture" appropriate under the laws of war, saying: "As a civil war is never publicly proclaimed, *eo nomine*, against insurgents, its actual existence is a fact in our domestic history which the court is bound to notice and to know. . . ." In *Texas v. White*, 7 Wall. 700 (1869), the Court held that Texas had never truly left the Union, and that the acts of its legislature in attempting secession were "absolutely null".

<sup>13</sup> See 2 WARREN, THE SUPREME COURT IN UNITED STATES HISTORY 485-487 (1929). Case of Jefferson Davis, 7 Fed. Cas. 63 (No. 3621d.). Davis was never brought to trial on the charges against him.

<sup>14</sup> Corwin, *op. cit.* note 7, at 228-234.

<sup>15</sup> There is merit in Mr. Deutsch's suggestion that a declaration of war may be omitted because Congress does not want to indicate total commitment. As to North Korea and North Vietnam, moreover, there are theoretical problems because the United States does not recognize the existence of either as a separate nation.

<sup>16</sup> Corwin, *op. cit.*, note 7, at 171, 184-193, 201-204.

<sup>17</sup> *Youngstown Sheet & Tube Company v. Sawyer*, 343 U.S. 579 (1952). The Court gave substantial attention to the failure of Congress to include seizure authority in the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947, in spite of suggestions, and to the President's failure to make use of the methods provided in the act for avoiding strikes.

<sup>18</sup> It has been suggested that the administration has made use of legalism and subterfuge in trying to assist the Cambodian government, while maintaining apparent compliance with the restrictions on American ground forces and advisers. See Dudman, *U.S. Deception in Cambodia*, St. Louis Post Dispatch, January 28, 1971, at 1-C. As to the use of American troops in Laos, see TIME, February 22, 1971, page 24.

<sup>19</sup> *The Constitution of the United States of America, Revised and Annotated* (G.P.O., 1963), at 470-473; *Whitney v. Robertson*, 124 U.S. 190 (1888).

<sup>20</sup> It is going too far to assert that the President is necessarily bound to use military force in support of another nation pursuant to a treaty obligation. Surely he has the authority to consider the situation as it is presented at the time decision is necessary. Might he not conclude that available forces are inadequate in view of other commitments, or that conditions had changed since the adoption of the treaty so that intervention would not be in the national interest, or that the use of force should be considered by Congress?

THOSE WHO CANNOT LEARN FROM HISTORY ARE DOOMED TO RELIVE IT

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, someone has written that those who cannot learn from history are doomed to relive it.

In this spirit I offer a copy of a resolution passed by the House and Senate on December 9, 1861. I plan to introduce a similar resolution relating to the war in Southeast Asia and urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring it. The resolution to which I refer passed December 9, 1861, and is as follows:

*Resolved, By the Senate, (the House of Representatives concurring), that a joint committee of three members of the Senate and four members of the House of Representatives be appointed to inquire into the conduct of the present war, that they have power to send for persons and papers, and to sit during the sessions of either House of Congress.*

#### PING-PONG DIPLOMACY

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, there has been too much dreaming and not enough hardheaded analysis of Red China's ping-pong diplomacy. Therefore, I am pleased to note an article in the Joliet, Ill., Herald-News of July 1, 1971, by Dumitru Danielopol, the distinguished international correspondent for the Copley Press, which I insert into the RECORD:

IT DOESN'T SOUND LIKE "PING-PONG"  
(By Dumitru Danielopol)

LONDON.—Ping-Pong is about as typical of the Red Chinese as badminton would be in the Soviet Union—whether you are talking about Communist ideology or foreign policy. Butchers who count victims in the tens of millions should hardly be judged by rec room or garden games.

A recent intelligence report published here shows that in the 20 years between 1949 and 1969 the Red Chinese killed at least 39,040,000 people under one pretext or another.

The figure doesn't include those killed during the "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution" initiated and personally conducted by Chairman Mao Tse-Tung in late 1966.

Most China watchers say the London figures are "conservative."

What does China look like after the cultural revolution?

Ian Brodie reports from Peking to the London Daily Express a pretty grim picture of Mao's "cultural" slaughter.

Fearing a number of Red Chinese were getting wise to Communist ineptitudes and reverting back to a more workable system, Mao decided to stop the rot.

"He called on the masses to rise up and drive out all who were guilty of bourgeois thinking," Brodie says.

Bands of hoodlums, the "Red Guards," were unleashed on each and all who were treated as "class enemies."

"... nearly everyone in China, a quarter of mankind, was called upon to examine his soul."

Brodie writes that Mao has done his best to destroy every vestige of the old culture. Education has been turned upside down. It is now almost impossible to go from high school to university. Students chosen by fellow students are sent to learn skills. Others are sent to work in the fields.

"Art faculties remain closed," he writes. "There are no new books, no new paintings other than those of Mao and the only feature films are of five approved operas and two ballets."

Doctors have been sent to work as hand laborers "to understand the problems of the workers."

Enormous emphasis is placed on Mao's leadership and wisdom.

"There must be other opinions," remarks Brodie, "but in China today you never hear them."

Mao's little red book is the mainstay of political thought, a kind of bible and testament. Here are just two simple thoughts:

The United States is the most dangerous "imperialist" country and must be destroyed. "U.S. imperialism has not yet been overthrown. . . . I believe it will be overthrown. . . . It is a paper tiger."

Of course, some will say Mao wrote this before the "Ping-Pong" encounter a few months ago.

To them, I suggest this excerpt from Radio Peking on June 14:

"The people of various countries have learned from their experience in struggle that to achieve peaceful coexistence, they must frustrate the partnership advertised by Nixon and his ilk, and thoroughly frustrate U.S. imperialism's policy of aggression and war and overthrow the U.S. aggressors and all their running dogs."

It doesn't sound like Ping-Pong to me.

KIPLING WAS WRONG—REV. GEORGE PHILLIPS AND THE ALDERSGATE "PILGRIMAGE"

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, Rudyard Kipling once wrote a poem entitled "The Ballad of East and West," in which he said that the two were irreconcilable. A recent case in my own commonwealth of Kentucky has proved the poet wrong.

A few days back, 25 young city folk from Aldersgate United Methodist Church in Louisville, located in the westerly part of the State, made a pilgrimage to the east—to east Kentucky. They went to talk to the mountain folk. From all I read, east and west, city folk and mountain folk, managed to get together.

Rev. George Phillips, who is pastor of Aldersgate church, originated the idea of sending some young people from his church to mountain communities in east Kentucky to talk to the young people there about the Bible and teach handicrafts.

Team leaders like Mrs. Betty Bowles and Stuart Royster, both of Louisville, led the Aldersgate crew in their efforts to talk with the mountain people about Christ. By the time they left, some of the supposed communications barriers between people of different backgrounds had fallen. If they had only had longer, Reverend Phillips said, "we could've taken the mountains for Christ."

Mr. Speaker, I think the work of the young people from Aldersgate United Methodist Church offers not only a heartening example of selfless service to church and community, but also proof positive that if they just try, people can reach out to each other. I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point the text of an article by Becky Homan in a recent edition of the Louisville Times:

## TWO WORLDS MEET IN EAST KENTUCKY—CITY YOUNGSTERS MOVE MOUNTAINS

(By Becky Homan)

City folk and mountain folk got together last week in the Kentucky communities of Thousandsticks and Grassy Fork, Stoney Fork and Elk Creek.

According to the city folk, about 25 young members of the Aldersgate United Methodist Church in southern Louisville, the result was "a blessing."

"The mountain people had the idea that city people couldn't relate to them," said Stuart Royster, a young leader of one traveling team. "But before it was all over, the city people and the mountain people opened up to each other."

It was the first pilgrimage into Southeastern Kentucky mountains for the Aldersgate people.

Their plans were coordinated with the Methodist Red Bird Mission of Beverly, Ky., and included a Bible school for mountain children and visits and services with the older mountain folk.

The idea was that of the Rev. George Phillips, pastor at Aldersgate. He submitted it to the young people of his church about a year ago. They were "turned on to Christ," he said, and accepted it eagerly.

"We realized the mountain people were different," said Royster, whose group went into Elk Creek, a stretch of houses along one main paved road in Clay County.

The people there were either coal miners, truckers or welfare recipients, Royster said. They all had a deep sense of pride.

"They didn't want to talk at first. They were reserved. They didn't trust us too much."

On Monday, the first day of Bible school, the young Aldersgate teachers realized a structured lesson plan wouldn't reach the mountain children.

Instead, they talked with the children about the Bible and organized sessions for handicrafts.

The children made drawings and a mural. They glued beans and colored glass onto paper. Some of them made piggy banks out of bleach bottles. Others collected flowers for another craft.

The most popular project was making "the wordless book," a collection of sheets of colored paper, each representing a different Biblical concept: gold for heaven, black for sin, white for salvation, red for the blood of Jesus, green for growth.

"We are refreshed by just being there," said Royster. "In the afternoons we'd visit. It was great to go up to a door, knock and hear a lady from the back of the house yell 'Come on in.'"

Royster and other Aldersgate youths played basketball with the teens of Elk Creek and swam in their swimming hole.

"It was important for us to tell them how much we enjoyed being there," he said. "It gave them a sense of contribution."

"We received far more than we gave."

At Stoney Fork in Leslie County, the teens were more of a problem. They stood outside the schoolhouse during a Bible lesson, throwing small rocks into the building. But that didn't deter the Aldersgate people.

"When you've found the Lord, the main thing is to tell other people," said Mrs. Betty Bowles, a team leader.

By the end of the week, her Bible school class had grown from five to 15.

"They saw that we were genuinely taking an interest in them," she said.

One boy brought his brother to the schoolhouse on Friday, sat him down and gave him instructions on the wordless book.

Others consented to spoken prayer.

"At first it was hard for them to thank the Lord out loud," said Mrs. Bowles. "They have a lot of pride. But towards the end, they would do it, gritting their teeth a little."

The experience of living and working together was a "beautiful" part of being at Elk Creek, said Royster. The young Aldersgate people slept on the floor of the schoolhouse, did all their own cooking and took "baths" in the swimming hole.

"We developed real community spirit," he said. "To leave was very hard. All the kids want to go back next year."

One elderly mountain woman was so delighted with the young city people that on the last day she gave them a hard-to-come-by dollar bill.

"The old people were so happy with us," said Royster, "because, for a change, there were some young mountain people in their evening church services."

By the end of the pilgrimage, the visitors felt they were just beginning to break down communications barriers.

Said Mr. Phillips, confident in the evangelism of his young flock, "If we'd had a summer, we could've taken the mountains for Christ."

policy of the United States. It has been our mobilization of Jewish anger and unity on this issue that has made Von Hoffman uncomfortable and has made the Kremlin embarrassed. That our work is having results is evident day by day; let Von Hoffman show one instance in which the humility of Jews has been more effective.

SAN FRANCISCO.

FRANK KURTZ.

## REPUBLICAN HOUSE LEADER ADDRESSES AMERICAN LEGION

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, July 16, 1971, in Pittsburgh, Pa., the U.S. House of Representatives Republican leader GERALD R. FORD delivered an address before the annual convention of the American Legion Department of Pennsylvania.

It is a pleasure to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpts from my distinguished Republican colleague's speech. The excerpts follow:

EXCERPTS FROM AN ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE GERALD R. FORD

There must never be another Vietnam. It was George Santayana who said, "those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it." I am sure none of us will ever forget Vietnam. We are all determined never to repeat it.

The best way to avoid another Vietnam is to develop mechanisms that will bring the people into Executive Branch decision-making—and the best way to do that is through the people's chosen representatives, the Congress of the United States.

The Constitution clearly grants to Congress the power to declare war. But we are now living in a world where wars are fought but not declared. We are living in an age of limited and undeclared wars. This circumstance has stripped Congress of its war-making power and delegated it solely to the Executive. It is this which makes a tragedy like Vietnam not only possible but likely.

This is a situation which should be corrected at the earliest possible moment. I therefore urge that Congress approve legislation which would create a new and meaningful role for Congress in limited war or undeclared war situations.

Under terms of this legislation, a military action by the President would have to be approved by the Congress within 30 days or U.S. troops dispatched to a foreign station would have to be withdrawn.

This legislation also would create a new Joint Congressional Committee on National Security which would consult with the President and his national security advisors on military decisions.

This joint committee would include the majority and minority leaders of both houses of Congress and the chairmen and ranking minority members of the House and Senate committees directly concerned with foreign and military policy.

Prior to military action or no later than 24 hours subsequent to it, this Joint Committee on National Security would consult with the President or his advisors and obtain information on the circumstances surrounding the military action.

The Joint Committee would then transmit reports to the appropriate committees of both houses of Congress, and those commit-

## TREATMENT OF SOVIET JEWS

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 16, 1971

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. President, I feel that a dialog is always helpful. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter to the editor of the San Francisco Chronicle, a letter by Mr. Frank Kurtz in response to a recent article by Nickolas von Hoffman. I share Mr. Kurtz' hope that a breakthrough will occur soon in the treatment of Soviet Jews and I believe that continued pressure by the United States and its citizens is important in this regard.

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

### MORAL IMPERATIVES

EDITOR: In his column "A Humble Idealism" April 11, Nicholas Von Hoffman addressed himself to those striving for the liberation of the Jews of the USSR. He counsels that greater humility and understanding of the interests of the United States will avoid such undesirable consequences as prompting a flood of other national minorities out of the USSR and endangering the detent between the superpowers.

It is distressing to read the fundamental lack of Von Hoffman's understanding of the moral imperatives which impel us to respond to the cries for help from Soviet Jews. Unlike the Estonians, Tatars, and Ukrainians, each living in their own homelands, educated in their own histories and cultures in their own native languages, the Soviet Jews appear to us as a people apart—severely oppressed for the same expressions of national identity vouchsafed to all others in the Soviet Union. Those who wish to leave the USSR for Israel are only demanding rights endorsed by the USSR through the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights. We respond to their demands as one people with the knowledge that history compels us to work unceasingly and to do more than plead for sympathy. We respond as individuals or as groups, and not only through the Jewish Defense League, as Von Hoffman implies. Locally, the Bay Area Council on Soviet Jewry constitutes the most effective action organization on this issue.

What might also be news to Von Hoffman is that very few of us are under the illusion that our actions will influence the foreign

tees would draft and send to the House and Senate legislation to ratify or alter the President's action.

This legislation would not tie the President's hands. He still would have the freedom to act promptly in an emergency situation. But his action would be subject to immediate review by the Congress—and this is as it should be. This would bring the Congress into the decision-making process in all military actions involving the dispatch of U.S. troops into any foreign theater of operations.

This would be a responsible way for Congress to exercise its power over the deployment of U.S. troops abroad and could help guarantee that the United States will not again be drawn into an undeclared war without the support of the American people.

The legislative branch of the Federal Government must play a larger role in decisions of war and peace—the role clearly delegated to the Congress by the Constitution of the United States.

I would also emphasize this. In situations where the Congress endorses a military action taken by the President, the Congress should set forth the United States commitment in precise terms—not hand the Executive a blank check of the Tonkin Gulf variety.

Currently there is another policy resolution pending before the Congress—the so-called Mansfield resolution adopted as an amendment to a draft extension bill in the Senate. This resolution or amendment would declare it the policy of the United States to withdraw all of its troops from Vietnam within nine months, contingent on release of American prisoners of war.

I endorse the goal of total withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam. The President has set that goal for the Nation. But I do not think it serves a useful purpose at this time to set a date definite for the withdrawal of all U.S. troops. This is a matter for negotiation, not a matter for Congress unilaterally to make a judgment on.

We want to withdraw all of our troops from Vietnam. And the goal is to withdraw them by the earliest practicable date. We should give the President that kind of flexibility. He needs it to negotiate the best possible agreement with the other side.

I am heartened by the latest North Vietnamese offer at Paris. It provides a basis for negotiation if the other side will follow it up with private talks. It indicates some movement by the other side. However, in my view, some items are non-negotiable at Paris. I am opposed to leaving South Vietnam to shift completely for itself, without arms or logistical aid. This would be to abandon South Vietnam to Communist conquest. Even with the withdrawal of all U.S. troops from Vietnam, other forms of aid to South Vietnam must continue. We must leave behind a South Vietnam which has a chance to survive as an independent, non-Communist nation.

#### MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

### HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 16, 1971

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

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,600 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

#### UNITED STATES, THE SOVIETS, AND SALT

### HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, July 13, I placed in the RECORD—page 24772—the conclusion of the Adelphi paper, "Soviet Attitudes to SALT," by Lawrence T. Caldwell. The Adelphi papers are published by the Institute for Strategic Studies in London.

Coincidentally, on July 14, Prof. Marshall D. Shulman, director of the Russian Institute at Columbia University, testified before Senator MUSKIE's Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Arms Control, International Law, and Organization.

Professor Shulman's statement before the committee is a fine complement to the Caldwell essay. It analyzes Soviet internal decisionmaking concerning SALT. It is an excellent and concise summary of the Soviet approach to SALT, an aspect of the SALT negotiations too frequently ignored in Congress. His conclusions are especially sound:

#### CONCLUSIONS

1. It is worth noting that in the internal debates on SALT within the Soviet Union, such U.S. efforts to force the pace of the strategic competition as the deployment of Safeguard and MIRV have had the effect of weakening the case of those in the Soviet Union who have argued that arrangements with the United States for the stabilization of the strategic arms competition are possible. It has forced them into elaborate explanations and defenses of their proposed dealings with the "imperialists."

2. It is also clear that the effect of the "bargaining chip" rationale for further armament measures by the United States has been the opposite of what was intended. Although it is true that these measures have put before the Soviet leadership the prospect of a further expensive round in the arms competition as the alternative to a SALT agreement, what is more significant is that the Soviet leadership feels itself obliged to match each step with comparable measures, for it cannot allow itself, for both domestic and international reasons, to be pressured into an agreement on unfavorable terms. Perhaps the "bargaining chip" theory may be sound diplomacy under some circumstances, but it is clear that in the strategic weapons field it provides dynamism for the arms race. Moreover, when a measure such as Safeguard or MIRV is defended in this country on the grounds that it is necessary to increase our bargaining pressure, rather than on the intrinsic merits of the measure proposed, the argument is known and discounted on the Soviet side as a transparent device.

3. Over the long run, it would seem more effective for the United States to base its negotiating tactics and its military procurements on the principle that security in the realm of strategic weapons is best served by a stable equilibrium at as moderate a level as can be managed through explicit or tacit agreement with our adversaries. To achieve this will require us to break the cycle of interaction between the two countries by the exercise of political leadership, deciding policies in terms of this conception of security rather than leaving them to be decided by the pressures of the military services, the upward tug of technology, the overreaction of military planners, or the mis-

guided rationalizations of self-deceptive bargaining techniques.

This is important testimony. It deserves to be read and acted upon.

The complete statement follows and in addition I include Shulman's July 1971 Foreign Affairs article "What Does Security Mean Today?":

#### STATEMENT BY MARSHALL D. SHULMAN

Mr. Chairman: I appreciate your invitation to testify before this Subcommittee in the course of its hearings on the relationship between the deployment of weapons systems and arms control.

In the effort to increase our security by stabilizing the strategic arms competition, technical aspects of weapons systems have been in the forefront of the discussion. But SALT is more than a purely technical matter; like deterrence itself, it requires political insight and political judgments. I do not believe that we have sufficiently appreciated how deeply SALT involves internal political processes in both the Soviet Union and the United States, nor how sensitively these processes interact with each other.

What I propose to do in this brief statement is to bring to bear, from the study of the Soviet Union, some insights into the Soviet approach to SALT which I believe relevant to the present hearings. I will sketch the evolution of the Soviet position since SALT began, and will describe how that position appears to have been affected by tugs and hauls within the Soviet Union. In particular, I will try to deal with the effects upon the Soviet Union of the "bargaining chip" theory and the deployment of Safeguard and MIRV.

#### BACKGROUND OF SOVIET POSITION

In the four and a half years that have passed since the idea of SALT was first proposed, there has been a considerable evolution in the Soviet approach to the subject. For the first year and a half, there was no Soviet reply to the proposal, and during this period, there were some indications of sharp internal debates which involved fundamental questions of resource allocation and relations with the United States. Among the special difficulties involved was the extreme compartmentalization of Soviet life, as a result of which few persons outside the professional military services were in a position to discuss military technology; there was not a widespread familiarity with arms control matters, nor a preparation of the political leadership for the complexity of the task of thinking about how the strategic arms competition might be stabilized. From the outside, it appeared that the main lines of the debate were drawn between those who were concerned with the economic costs of the strategic competition and, on the other side, the various military services powerfully supported by the orthodox wing of the Communist Party bureaucracy, deeply committed to an expectation of unremitting conflict with the United States.

By the Spring of 1968, it appeared that a compromise had been reached which would permit at least exploratory participation in SALT, but in the meantime the intervention in Czechoslovakia and then the change of Administration in the United States delayed the opening of talks until November, 1969.

As a result of the first rounds of SALT at Helsinki and Vienna, there was manifested a widening competence and sophistication in Soviet discussion of arms control matters. There also appeared to develop an intensification of the internal debates as concrete substantive issues came under consideration. In the course of 1970, the Soviet leadership began to make it clear that it was prepared to try for "practical steps in the direction of disarmament." Speaking in Kharkov in May, 1970, Brezhnev signalled this intention, indicating that it was not

inconsistent with the "conditions of an acute political and ideological struggle between socialism and capitalism in the international arena." He went on to declare that the Soviet Union had achieved an adequate deterrent, but would continue to build its military forces if the United States did so. "The Soviet Union would welcome a reasonable agreement in this field. We have created strategic forces that are a reliable means of deterring any aggressor. We will respond to any attempts by anyone to gain military superiority over the USSR with the requisite increase in military might, thereby guaranteeing our defense. We cannot act otherwise. However, if the United States government really desires an accord on checking the strategic arms race, if the American public succeeds in overcoming the resistance of the arms manufacturers and of the military, then the prospect for the talks could be asserted as positive. In any case, the Soviet Union will do everything in its power so that these talks will prove useful."

At the Party Congress in March and April of this year, which was heavily preoccupied with the improvement of the Soviet economy, Brezhnev made the point that "the favorable outcome of these talks [i.e., SALT] would make it possible to avoid another round in the missile arms race and to free substantial resources for constructive purposes." He went on to add the following condition, which has become a standard formulation in recent Soviet press commentaries: "However, we should like to emphasize that disarmament talks in general, and especially the discussion of highly delicate military and technical aspects, can be productive only if the interests of the parties' security are given equal consideration and no one seeks unilateral advantages."

An improvement of relations with the United States was possible, Brezhnev said, "but we have to consider whether we are dealing with a real desire to settle questions at the negotiating table or with an attempt to pursue a 'positions of strength' policy." "Let no one try to talk to us in the language of ultimatums and force."

In June of this year, in an election speech in Moscow, Brezhnev asked himself the rhetorical question whether it was unrealistic to consider the limitation of the arms race while capitalism still existed. His answer—and presumably it was addressed to those who did not consider the question rhetorical—was that it was not unrealistic, because of the "changed balance of power in the world—both sociopolitical and military power." He went on to say that the Soviet Union could afford both a reliable defense and the development of its economy, although, he added, "of course without large defense expenditures we and our economy would move ahead far more quickly."

These quotations illustrate two important factors underlying the decision of the Soviet leadership to accept the possibility of some limitation of the arms competition through SALT. One is the growing concern of the Soviet leadership with the economic constraints under which it is operating, particularly in the realm of advanced technology. The Russians clearly wish to avoid giving the impression of unilateral weakness on this score; Brezhnev in his election speech also dwelt on the economic effects of the arms race to the United States. There is no indication that the Soviet leaders would not or could not continue to maintain a high level of military expenditure if necessary, but they clearly have reached a decision that their country would be better off if expenditures for strategic weapons by both countries could be scaled down, particularly because the alternative is now seen as another upward bound in the arms competition.

The second factor in their decision is the recent build-up of Soviet strategic weapons to a level of approximate parity with the

United States. The Soviet leadership is no longer inhibited by a concern that an agreement would perpetuate Soviet inferiority, as might have been the case when SALT was first proposed in 1967. Perhaps one reason for the delay in the Soviet response was the desire to wait until deployments then planned had made their appearance, so that negotiations could be conducted on the basis of equality.

#### MAIN ELEMENTS OF PRESENT SOVIET POSITION

It may be useful to highlight the following elements in the present Soviet approach to the SALT negotiations:

1. *Insistence upon "equal security."* The Russians have made it clear that they will not accept any agreement that gives the United States any "unilateral advantage." They want SALT to codify parity. They have lectured their own military on the futility of superiority, but they are obliged to demonstrate that SALT will not mean a return of the Soviet Union to the position of inferiority under which they smarted for so long.

2. *"Playing it cool."* The Soviet leaders learned the lesson, during the early months of the Nixon Administration, when they were pressing the United States to begin SALT negotiations, that this display of eagerness led many in the United States to argue that the Soviet Union needed an agreement more than the United States did, and should therefore pay a price for it. Since that time, Soviet representatives have been at pains not to show undue public concern about the arms race or about such weapons systems as MIRV, lest they confer a bargaining advantage upon the United States. The result has been to make signalling between the two powers more difficult.

3. *Begin with ABM.* Partly because ABM systems appeared to be a relatively finite and manageable segment of the arms competition, compared with the enormous complexities of offensive systems, Soviet protagonists of SALT have favored beginning with an ABM agreement. Moreover, as an authoritative article in Pravda argued one week ago, ABMs stimulate the deployment of offensive missiles: "Action is met by counter-action. If one side strengthens its defense, then the other feverishly looks for new, more powerful means to pierce the defensive shield of the opponent."

4. *SALT does not imply a political truce with the United States.* The Soviet leadership has made it clear that it does not regard a SALT agreement as a signal for a political reconciliation with the United States, an end to "ideological struggle," or to the campaign against "American imperialism." When he spoke of the "normalization" of relations with the United States at the XXIV Party Congress, Brezhnev indicated that he had in mind possible progress in SALT, some trade, correct relations at moderate levels of tension, possibly talks to settle disputes, but not an embrace of friendship. Echoes of the internal debates may be heard in an article in Pravda May 4 by Georgi Arbatov, director of the Institute on the USA, in which he defends responding to "realistic tendencies" in the United States as representing "forced concessions," which "objectively can have consequences that correspond to the peoples' interests." He reminds his readers that peaceful coexistence and political detente do not "abolish the struggle between the two systems itself but moves it into channels in which this struggle does not lead to military conflict." Distinguishing a proper "class approach" from that of revisionists and reformers, he writes that it does not mean the "accommodation of the workers' movement to present-day imperialism and a reconciliation with it." The message is a reminder of the still powerful force in Soviet politics of Party orthodoxy, which takes a dark view of U.S. intentions, is skeptical whether the

U.S. will negotiate seriously in SALT, and which continues to interpret the United States in terms of imperialism and conflict.

Although the various groups in the Soviet leadership see the United States in varying shades of darkness, they appear to share at best an uncertainty whether the U.S. is prepared to accept a SALT agreement on the basis of parity. The protagonists of SALT have sought to explain to Soviet hardliners why the United States, after initially proposing an ABM limitation, then seemed reluctant to accept such an agreement; why the U.S. pushed through Safeguard as SALT was opening in 1969, and Phase II during the talks in 1970; why the U.S. pushed rapidly ahead with the deployment of MIRV in 1970; why successive "gaps" appear during each appropriations cycle, to justify new bombers, new re-entry systems, new underwater launch systems.

The explanation adduced by Soviet analysts is that there are two tendencies in American political life: that of the militarists and their supporters, and that of the anti-military "realists." The result, as they see it, is a "zig-zag" policy, reflecting the requirements of domestic politics. It should be added that "realism," in the Soviet usage, means not only an acceptance of a stabilization of the strategic arms race, but more: an acceptance of the Soviet position of equality in the world, of the Soviet position in Eastern Europe, and other Soviet political objectives. This view is based upon an assessment that there has been a "change in the alignment of forces," and it implies a graceful acceptance by the United States of Soviet efforts to increase its political influence around the globe at the expense of the United States. This is the operative significance of Arbatov's argument to the hardliners in the Soviet Union that a positive response to "realism in capitalist policies" is justified because these "forced concessions" are objectively in Soviet interests.

It should be added that most Soviet analyses of American policy these days end on an interrogatory note: which tendency will prevail in the U.S.? It is interesting to observe a kind of reverse containment policy now emerging in the Soviet Union: it declares itself ready to reach business-like arrangements with the U.S. if it is realistic, but to resist manifestations of U.S. imperialism ("a principled line of rebuff to aggression and to the intrigues of the imperialistic forces.")

#### SOME CONCLUSIONS

1. It is worth noting that in the internal debates on SALT within the Soviet Union, such U.S. efforts to force the pace of the strategic competition as the deployment of Safeguard and MIRV have had the effect of weakening the case of those in the Soviet Union who have argued that arrangements with the United States for the stabilization of the strategic arms competition are possible. It has forced them into elaborate explanations and defenses of their proposed dealings with the "imperialists."

2. It is also clear that the effect of the "bargaining chip" rationale for further armament measures by the United States has been the opposite of what was intended. Although it is true that these measures have put before the Soviet leadership the prospect of a further expensive round in the arms competition as the alternative to a SALT agreement, what is more significant is that the Soviet leadership feels itself obliged to match each step with comparable measures, for it cannot allow itself, for both domestic and international reasons, to be pressured into an agreement on unfavorable terms. Perhaps the "bargaining chip" theory may be sound diplomacy under some circumstances, but it is clear that in the strategic weapons field it provides dynamism for the arms race. Moreover, when a measure such as Safeguard or MIRV is defended in this coun-

try on the grounds that it is necessary to increase our bargaining pressure, rather than on the intrinsic merits of the measure proposed, the argument is known and discounted on the Soviet side as a transparent device.

3. Over the long run, it would seem more effective for the United States to base its negotiating tactics and its military procurements on the principle that security in the realm of strategic weapons is best served by a stable equilibrium at as moderate a level as can be managed through explicit or tacit agreement with our adversaries. To achieve this will require us to break the cycle of interaction between the two countries by the exercise of political leadership, deciding military policies in terms of this conception of security rather than leaving them to be decided by the pressures of the military services, the upward tug of technology, the overreaction of military planners, or the misguided rationalizations of self-deceptive bargaining techniques.

#### WHAT DOES SECURITY MEAN TODAY?

(By Marshall D. Shulman)

We have been accustomed, during most of the past 25 years, to think of our security in terms of the containment of Soviet expansionism, relying largely upon a comfortable superiority in military power. A number of developments now call into question the adequacy of this conception and of our understanding of the nature of effective power in the modern world.

Among these developments have been changes in the military balance. Our strategic superiority over the Soviet Union was first constrained by the emergence of a condition of mutual deterrence, and more recently by the growth of Soviet strategic forces to a level of approximate parity. Coincidentally, there has been a substantial increase in Soviet conventional military capabilities with a global reach.

What effects this change in the military balance may be expected to have upon political developments is made more difficult to calculate by the evidence paradox of our unprecedentedly large military power and our declining political influence in the world, a paradox which points up the limitations of arms as a source of effective power.

Since the end of World War II, events have pushed us toward a less Soviet-centric view of our security problems. Against a background of rapid and uncharted political changes in the world, the Soviet problem is perceived less in terms of expansion through the territorial control of contiguous areas than as a competition for political influence on a global basis. One effect of qualitative changes in weapons technology has been to make the strategic competition into a closed game, somewhat apart from the competition for political influence. Concurrently, the accelerated pace of technological change has altered the geography of politics, bringing distant areas within reach; it has given greater significance to forms of power based on new industrial technology; and it has resulted in profound upheavals in the domestic social orders of nations.

The persistent strength of nationalism as the most potent single force in international politics has fragmented the two-color maps of the world of a quarter-century ago; new nations and new political forces have with stubborn autonomy resisted the illusions of omnipotence of the two giant powers. Clearly, power in terms of capacity to exert one's will over other people is more variegated and limited than it appeared to be immediately following World War II.

The pace of change in the world has made it difficult to define the nature of the international system in which we find ourselves, and still more difficult to describe the kind of international order toward which we

would like to move, in which we could improve our security and protect the values we hold important. Without such an effort, however, our actions lack direction.

The present climate of opinion, veering toward a withdrawal from international involvement and not yet prepared to sort out the lessons of the Vietnam experience, is not an auspicious one in which to reflect upon changes in the nature of power and the meaning of security. But if we are not to surrender to the drift of events, we must resist the vice of wide amplitudes of mood changes around stereotyped images to which democratic societies are prone. We need to re-think fundamental aspects of our foreign policy, bringing to bear more differentiated analyses of present problems and a sense of future direction.

#### II

In retrospect, it is now clear that the Soviet Union entered upon a new phase in its foreign policy in the mid-1960s. During the preceding decade, Khrushchev had moved out from the Soviet periphery to a first pass at Africa and southern Asia. Accepting the concepts of nuclear deterrence and "peaceful coexistence," he began the modernization of strategic capabilities while greatly reducing Soviet conventional forces. In the competition with America, he put his reliance upon the anticipated economic superiority of the Soviet Union and the myth of a "shift in the balance of power" based upon the symbolic impact of the first Sputnik.

But the shortcomings of the Soviet economy made hollow his boasts of outstripping the United States, and the net effect of his efforts to gain political advantage from Sputnik was to stimulate higher American defense budgets, with the result that the Soviet strategic inferiority was in fact further deepened. The Congo crisis of 1960, in which the Soviet Union was unable to reach and support its chosen allies; the Cuban missile crisis, and the American naval blockade which capped it; and the powerful arsenal of U.S. conventional weapons brought to bear upon Vietnam after 1964—these were among the painful lessons experienced by the Russians during this period.

The result was a determination by the Soviet leadership which followed Khrushchev to acquire more rapidly the sinews of actual rather than symbolic military power, at whatever cost to the economy. Within a few years, there began to appear the various attributes of a diversified military capability. Rates of deployment of nuclear missiles rose steeply, and for all practical purposes the strategic inferiority under which the Soviet Union had labored was overcome, although qualitative improvements on the American side meanwhile made parity a dynamic condition rather than a plateau. Soviet conventional forces were now restored and modernized to play a wider and more flexible role. During this period, accelerated support for the navy achieved the historical transformation of the Soviet Union from a continental to a maritime power, capable of deploying its fleet in all the world's oceans. Concurrent improvements in mobile forces, including the Soviet "naval infantry," in firepower and in air and sea logistic capabilities, have given the Soviet Union the means of reaching distant local conflicts—whether to check anticipated American interventions or to bring military pressure to bear upon politically unstable trouble spots remains to be seen.

Economic and military aid programs, highly focused on a limited number of countries (about 70 percent of the economic assistance goes to Afghanistan, India and the U.A.R., and the latter two are the main recipients of military assistance), continue to be of significant scale. In Eastern Europe there has been a reorganization of the Warsaw Pact forces to improve mobility and firepower, together with a continued effort to integrate

the economies of the East European states, manifesting a primary Soviet concern with consolidating its control over that area.

That the central concept of this acquisition of power is to increase Soviet political influence on a global basis relative to that of the United States is underlined by the directions of an intensified and more sharply focused diplomatic effort since the mid-1960's. The most striking diplomatic moves have been the enlargement and greater flexibility of bilateral dealings with Western Europe and with the Federal Republic of Germany in particular. The purpose is multiple—to encourage neutralist trends in Europe (which is to say to reduce American influence in Europe); to gain juridical recognition for the German Democratic Republic and the Soviet position in Eastern Europe ("the acceptance of the realities of World War II settlements"); to inhibit West European integration and the dominance of the Federal Republic in that grouping; and to increase trade and technological borrowing from the Western industrialized states. The proposal for a European Security Conference has been a feature of this diplomatic campaign, directed alternately at containing the Federal Republic and at isolating the United States from Western Europe as circumstances have required.

The most specific objective of near-term Soviet diplomacy has been to achieve a decisive influence in the Arab Middle East, both for its oil and other resources and as a gateway to the Indian Ocean and Africa. As an adjunct to this, the Soviet naval presence in the Mediterranean serves to neutralize the U.S. presence there and to symbolize Soviet power and interest.

The level of diplomatic effort in Africa and Latin America suggests longer-term aspirations, depending upon local opportunities. In Asia the Soviets have a dual objective: to contain the expansion of Chinese influence and to replace the British and American presence which they anticipate will be withdrawn from the area. Pragmatically, the Soviet Union, has eschewed revolutionary movements (except in Vietnam) and cultivated its relations with established governments in order to influence their orientation in world politics. While courting Japanese businessmen, for both economic and political reasons, the U.S.S.R. has hammered away at Japanese security agreements with America and the growth of Japanese defense capabilities. On the subcontinent, Russia has become the principal external influence. It is a major arms supplier to India, and has begun to develop military sales to Pakistan and Ceylon. It has been negotiating shipping and air access to Singapore and has become the largest buyer of Malaysian rubber. It is becoming a naval presence in the Indian Ocean, growing by unobtrusive steps.

Paralleling the European Security Conference proposal, the Soviet Union has put forward a plan for a new collective security system in Asia, with itself as guarantor. So far, the proposal has not been enthusiastically received, although a few countries, notably Malaysia, have indicated interest in the plan as a hedge against the day when U.K. and U.S. withdrawal from the area might leave the way open to greater Chinese pressures.

It may be noted that these efforts are not inconsistent with long-term evolutionary trends toward traditional power policies and a diminished emphasis upon revolutionary transformations, at least in the near term. What have been added are a stronger military base and a global presence, orchestrated into a total effort to gain access and influence around the world. While the United States tends to think of its military, economic and diplomatic instrumentalities separately and to permit them a certain life

of their own, the more fundamentally political outlook of the Soviet Union serves to harness them to specific political objectives. These different approaches may also to some extent reflect differences in governmental structure, with the more fully coordinated and centrally controlled Soviet apparatus better adapted to focus military, economic and diplomatic means toward political ends.

In the past, there has been a tendency to attribute a high degree of planning to Soviet policy, but more sophisticated and realistic recent studies suggest that Russian behavior in the world may be better understood as the resultant of three factors: a rather general long-term design, an interplay of bureaucratic pressures and interests, and a response to external opportunities. Although the design continues to be expressed in categorical ideological language, it reflects a general aspiration rather than a detailed prescription—perhaps with about the force of *Avis*' expressed determination to become "No. 1." The role of competing interests and bureaucracies in determining Soviet foreign policy is difficult to document, but there can be little doubt that it is an important factor, varying according to the particular issues involved, and that it has to be taken into account in understanding the mechanism by which Soviet behavior interacts with roughly similar mechanisms on the American side.

Finally, it is abundantly clear that a major factor in the emergence of a new phase of Soviet policy in the mid-1960s was a response to the perceived decline in U.S. prestige and influence around the world as a result of Vietnam. The first effects of the involvement of the United States in Vietnam in early 1965 were to raise apprehensions about U.S. bellicosity and its buildup of conventional capabilities. The second wave of effects stemmed from the indirect consequences of our involvement: the domestic disturbances, the tide of anti-militarism and anti-involvement in world affairs, the decline of confidence among our allies in the judgment of the American leadership. From Moscow, it became plausible to anticipate a reduction in the political influence of its major rival on every continent, and this anticipation encouraged a more active effort to increase Soviet political influence wherever opportunity presented itself.

For the most part, the effort to build the sinews of power was carried forward at moderate levels of tension, applying a lesson learned from the postwar period, i.e. that higher tensions simply mobilized and united the Western alliance. The *détente* policy has been on a country-by-country basis. It has proved most difficult to apply in the case of the United States, where the appeal for "normalization" of relations is undermined by the "anti-imperialist" campaign directed against the American presence around the world, and also by the insistence of the Soviet leaders on continuing the "ideological struggle" in harsh and uncompromising terms. Also, having smarted for so long under what they felt as the "arrogance" of American strategic superiority, the Soviet leadership is in a chesty mood, prepared to enjoy the advantages of a rising power position.

What are the prospects for the success of the Soviets in increasing their political influence in the world? One problem in answering is that the mixture of strengths and weaknesses in the Soviet position makes it difficult to characterize the fundamental power relationship between East and West. On the strategic military dimension, the condition called "parity" in fact reflects an asymmetrical balance, with some advantages on each side. The political effect of such a balance may depend largely upon subjective factors: the will and confidence of the respective leaderships, the mythology of power among the people. On conventional military capabilities outside Europe, the balance re-

quires a region-by-region breakdown: compared to American, Soviet power is weaker but growing in the Mediterranean, stronger in the Indian Ocean and on the subcontinent, but relatively weaker in the Pacific and in Southeast Asia. The most serious Soviet deficiencies appear in the economic realm: institutional limitations, particularly in advanced technology. There are also serious economic limitations on the Western side: inflation, unemployment and growing competitive conflicts, but the strength of Western technological growth is increasingly recognized as a factor of effective power.

In political power, the comparison is between relative weaknesses—what someone has characterized as "competitive decadence." The internal strains in Western societies are painfully evident. Over the long run, creative processes may be at work, but at present the West European nations, struggling with domestic upheavals, do not find in the American experience any inspiration or source of confidence. For its part, the Soviet Union faces the prospect of continuing turbulence in Eastern Europe, a running conflict with China and its fragmenting consequences in the international communist movement, systemic rigidities at home, and not much luster in the Soviet model to attract emulation from abroad. This brief balance sheet illustrates the difficulty of weighing the effectiveness of various forms of power, in terms of political influence.

A further difficulty arises in assessing the prospects of the Soviet drive from the demonstrated resistance of smaller states to the subjugation of their will to the great powers. The transformation of military or even economic power into political advantages and influence has proved more difficult than the Soviet leadership had hoped when it first began to reach toward the underdeveloped nations in 1955.

"All trees do not grow to the sky." It would be an error to assume that the Soviet Union will automatically translate power into ever-spreading access and influence; recent Soviet gains have owed more to Western ineptitude than to Soviet effectiveness.

### III

To the extent that the Soviet Union does succeed in expanding its role in the world, how much should this be a source of concern to us? In the past, we have been prone to assume that every gain for the Soviet Union, or for "world communism," was a loss for us, if not a threat. But have we not reached a point where we need to redefine our conception of the nature of the international system, and of our vital interests within that system?

It is evident that Russia is entering upon a phase of national growth like that which many other great nations experienced in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and is now pressing outward for a role commensurate with its status as one of the two superpowers in the world. But there are two levels of Soviet conduct: one represents an effort to bring about a change in power relations within the present international system in fairly traditional power-politics style; the other—if one takes seriously the residual ideological commitment of the Soviet Union—is to work toward a change in the nature of the international system itself, the rules and practices that govern international relations and the internal structure of societies. The former is an anachronism in a day when imperialism—in the sense of a dominion over other people—is increasingly difficult to maintain. The latter is of diminishing relevance in a world in which revolutionary change is everywhere in process, but for which the storehouse of Soviet Marxism has little to offer as a guide to the future.

In the international system as it is, and as it is becoming, change itself must be the fundamental starting point for any effort to

codify relations among nations. No longer is it possible for nations to define their interests or seek their security in terms of hegemonial control over territory. The alternative to international anarchy requires the acceptance of two principles which grow out of the new physical and political conditions of international life: one is the right of free access, and the other is non-interference by force in processes of internal change.

The principle of free access reflects the fact that political control over territory is not necessary for economic access; it is not in fact a condition of successful and productive economic relations. This has been amply demonstrated by the decay of imperialism of the kind described by Lenin, and is being demonstrated today by the experience of the Soviet Union in Eastern Europe. The principle of free access permits nations to compete, not for the control of territory but for the establishment of mutually beneficial and non-exploitative relations, and thereby for political influence.

The notion of free access need not be in conflict with the vital security interests of the Soviet Union and the United States in territories where the establishment of hostile forces would be regarded as threatening, but it requires the acceptance of a distinction between security and hegemony. For the United States to define its vital interest in the Western Hemisphere, in Western Europe and in Japan means that it would feel a direct threat to its national security if these territories should come under the control of military forces hostile to the United States. It would hope for more—that relations with these countries would be amicable and productive, but it would seek that result by its diplomacy against competing influences, not by the exclusion of Soviet economic and political access to these areas.

Similarly, the Soviet Union would regard its vital interests as jeopardized by the establishment of hostile forces in Eastern Europe, but this legitimate security concern does not justify, and does not require, hegemonial control over the area. The establishment of productive relations between East and West Europe, far from being in conflict with Soviet interests, can make for a more stable and secure relationship, if Russia construes its interests in broader and less rigid terms than it now does.

Of course, it is understood that at the present time the Soviet leadership is far from prepared to accept such a distinction; any increase in external influences in Eastern Europe would now be regarded as an historical and ideological retrogression. The present Soviet outlook is in the other direction: toward obtaining from the West recognition of a Soviet sphere of influence in Eastern Europe. Perhaps time will be required to make it clear that spheres of influence, even if granted, cannot under modern conditions provide the basis for stable and productive relations.

Within these two vital zones, certain tacit rules of engagement have developed. The United States has made it clear, through a series of crisis situations, that it would not intervene by force in territory regarded by the Soviet Union as vital to its security interests. For its part, the Soviet Union has, since the days of the Berlin blockade, recognized certain less well-defined rules of engagement in Western Europe and the Western Hemisphere, with the partial and ambiguous exception of Cuba. Contrary to some popular misunderstanding, this mutual acceptance of tacit rules of conduct in security matters does not constitute a spheres-of-influence agreement, since it does not exclude the effort to extend political influence in each other's security sphere.

Outside these two vital zones, however, there is a need to work toward rules of engagement that shall apply in contested

areas, if the competition for political influence is to be kept within reasonable and safe bounds. It is not a matter for conferences and treaties. Rather, these rules will evolve through the tacit codification of experience, a practical recognition of the restraints that each side comes to expect of the other; and their sanction will derive from the self-interest both nations have in avoiding direct involvement with the other in local conflict situations.

The Soviet Union is not, and the United States should not be, committed to the defense of the status quo. It would in any case be a vain quest. Our interests are best served if the processes of change can take place in an orderly way, with a minimum of violence, responsive to the wishes of the people involved, free of external compulsion. Perhaps the most that one can realistically hope for now is some increase in sober restraint where, as in the Middle East and in Vietnam, the forces of the two giant powers are partially engaged. Over a period of time, as a result of living through a number of such conflict situations, a codification of the common law of experience will define recognized limits of engagement for the conduct of our competition for political influence. As a concomitant development, the United States and the Soviet Union may resolve their dispute over the use of U.N. peacekeeping mechanisms, and develop a range of ad hoc techniques for containing and pacifying local conflict situations.

In a period of shifting relations and the emergence of some form of balance among the five major powers—China, Japan and West Germany (or Europe), in addition to the Soviet Union and the United States—what is required is an acceptance of a process of accommodation to relative degrees of political influence, in a post-imperial order committed to the fundamental independence of its constituent parts.

Progress in these directions is not likely, however, if we neglect the present relationship between force and politics. Much current discussion on this point appears to be polarized between preserving the faith in military superiority as the guarantor of our security, and a strong tide of indiscriminate antimilitarism. What is needed—although admittedly difficult in the present acerbic climate—is a more measured judgment of our military needs, both nuclear and conventional, in the light of a broader conception of our true security interests.

For more than a year and a half, the Soviet Union and the United States have been engaged in Strategic Arms Limitation Talks—but meanwhile, the nuclear arms competition has continued to spiral upward, into new and more unstable weapons systems. The fault lies in the absence of an effective political leadership in either Russia or America capable of presiding with common sense over the pressures of military services and new war technologies. In the absence of a political judgment to cry enough, military procurement in both countries tends to be determined by interservice competition, compounded by misplaced prudence and bargaining zeal on the part of civilian planners. A continuation of the nuclear competition means less security for both nations, since many of the weapons now coming into sight are less stable, more costly and more tension-producing.

One barrier to a leveling off and reduction in the strategic competition is the argument—perhaps rationalization would be more accurate—that further strengthening of our military position improves our bargaining position, increasing the incentive for the adversary to negotiate an agreement. The effect, on the contrary, has been to provide dynamism for the military competition.

It has been psychologically difficult for the

United States to accept the loss of its accustomed nuclear superiority, and its West European allies wonder aloud whether the American guarantee will be effective under conditions of parity. The mythology of nuclear weapons has not yet absorbed the realization that superiority has no practical meaning in any real context. The argument that parity would increase the Soviet propensity to take additional risks, or diminish the American resolution in responding, ignores the fundamental inhibitions of mutual deterrence, which are not substantially changed by disparities in the respective arsenals. The technical advantages of one system against another can be argued, but to allow these technical arguments to dominate policy-making in this field is to lose a sense of proportion about the limited usefulness of nuclear arsenals, however sophisticated.

In any rational perspective, security in the realm of strategic weapons would be best served by a stable equilibrium at as moderate a level as can be managed through explicit or tacit agreement with our adversaries. On this point, the interests of the two countries are not opposed, but on neither side is this fact yet fully appreciated.

Because conventional weapons are more closely related to political effects, the competition in this field is even more difficult to regulate. The hard question posed by the growth and global deployment of Soviet conventional forces, particularly at a time when the British military presence in Asia and in the Indian Ocean is being contracted, is whether an imbalance may develop in the next few years which will tempt the Soviet Union to use its forces in unstable and conflicted parts of the world to influence the outcome of political processes, whether by indirect pressure, military assistance or direct involvement.

If there is to be any possibility of moving toward moderating rules of engagement in the intermediate zones, rather than toward international anarchy and unbridled competition, as suggested earlier, it is evident that sanctions must be present in the form of military equilibrium in the regions involved. Only if the forces in the area are reasonably in balance, preferably at the lowest levels possible, are they likely to perform the function of negating each other—an extension to the conventional field of the balance of mutual deterrence.

What this implies is a more differentiated approach to the problem of conventional military capabilities than is now represented in the domestic debates. Military means cannot be our main reliance in seeking to maintain the non-hostile world environment necessary to our own security; other forms of power—diplomatic, cultural, political, economic, the successful resolution of our domestic problems—are more effective means of creating a favorable world environment. But in the present international system, military equilibrium, both general and local, is a necessary condition for the free and non-violent unfolding of processes of change. If we wish to move toward a world in which force does not dominate politics, a world of free access and nonintervention, we cannot escape the painful conclusion that a balance of conventional forces is needed.

The question that the United States faces is not whether to be a presence in the world but what kind of a presence. The values we wish to realize in our society will not maintain their vitality if we allow ourselves to become isolated in a hostile world. This can result as much from the neglect as from the abuse of power. What is required is restraint and wisdom in the use of power, toward ends consistent with the international order toward which we would like to see the world evolve.

## THE FINANCIAL CONDITION OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 16, 1971

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the June 28 edition of the Bangor, Maine, News included a fine editorial concerning the financial condition of the Federal Government.

The editorial makes the point that fiscal responsibility is missing in Washington, and has been missing for many years.

Economy in Government, the editorial notes, is not a glamorous issue. That is too bad, because, until the Government sets its financial house in order, the people of this country are going to continue to feel the squeeze of inflation.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial, "Fiscal Brinkmanship," be included in the Extensions of Remarks. The editor of the Bangor News is Richard K. Warren.

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

### FISCAL BRINKMANSHIP

The federal government ends its current fiscal year Wednesday with a deficit that will amount to about \$23 billion. Observers insist a deficit of about the same figure is inevitable for the next fiscal year.

All this red ink makes the Nixon administration red-faced, the President and the Republican party having campaigned on a platform calling for balanced budgets. Yet Nixon cannot be blamed much, if at all. Events beyond his control have distorted the fiscal picture in Washington.

Inflation continues and so goods and services are costing the government more, just as they cost the individual citizen more. Pay raises are given federal employees to compensate for rising living costs—adding to government spending.

The effects of the recession are on the other side of the coin. The federal tax take is running billions of dollars behind estimates. On the other hand, the government is under pressure to pump additional billions into the sagging economy and create jobs for the millions of jobless workers.

Then there is the towering national debt, now at about the \$400-billion mark. The government must pay out \$21 billion just to meet the annual interest charges. It must be maddening to the administration to know that without this unavoidable expenditure, the budget would come very close to being in balance. Instead, more deficit spending and another layer added to the debt and, barring a miracle, to be matched again a year hence.

What is missing in Washington, and has been for many years, is a sense of fiscal responsibility. It is pleasant to spend; painful to tighten the belt. Pressure groups whose members pack a powerful wallop at the polls, keep asking for more money, and scream at even a hint of a cut-back. The ponderous bureaus of the government put in their pitches at budget-making time and resist efforts to economize.

"It is depressing," Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr., of Virginia, one of the few watchdogs for the taxpayers in Congress, recently said, "That there is so little interest in Washington in putting the government's financial house in order."

Yet it must be put in order, lest it topple. The value of the American dollar must be protected from continuing depreciation as a result of the government's spendthrift ways.

As a political issue, economy in government lacks glamor, yet it should rate top priority. One of these days—we hope not too late—the issue must be faced, for not far ahead lies the brink of fiscal disaster.

### COMBATING DELINQUENCY AT THE ROOTS: THE RUSSELL AREA YOUTH SERVICE BUREAU

**HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI**

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, we are all concerned with the problems of crime and law enforcement. But often by the time the police are called, the damage has already been done. It is too late. Especially in the area of juvenile delinquency, it is important to reach a potential offender before he goes wrong—both for his sake and the sake of the community.

That is the purpose of the Youth Service Bureau of the Russell Area Council, which aims at preventing juvenile delinquency by helping young people before they get in serious trouble. According to Mrs. Carole Mayo, the social worker at the youth service bureau, the important thing is relating to the young people, aged 10-17: "We just get to know them."

A key part of relating to the youths are the two field workers, Aaron Smith, and Irvin Williams. Mr. Smith and Mr. Williams try to establish an informal and sympathetic rapport with the young people of the Russell community. They hang out where the kids are—on the basketball courts and gathering places. This way, they establish the vital element in any counseling effort, trust.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Mayo, Mr. Smith, and Mr. Williams are taking a constructive effort to reach the root of the problems of crime and delinquency among the young and they deserve the thanks and recognition of the people of our community.

For the information of my colleagues, I insert in the RECORD at this point the text of an article in a recent edition of the Courier-Journal by Charitey Whitfield:

#### HELPING YOUTHS BEFORE TROUBLE IS GOAL OF DELINQUENCY PROJECT (By Charitey Whitfield)

There was nothing extraordinary about the gathering. It was like a backyard club meeting with a group of young people sitting in the evening shade of a pleasant summer day.

They exchanged jokes with each other, took amused interest in a nearby group of three little girls playing pat-a-cake and discussed "club" business.

However, when phrases like "diagnostic social worker" and "cultural enrichment program" began to creep into the youths' conversation one sensed that this wasn't just an ordinary club meeting.

It's one of two group meetings held weekly at the Russell Area Council, 2521 W. Chestnut, as a part of the council's federally-financed pilot project to prevent juvenile delinquency. The project is known as the Youth Service Bureau.

More is involved in the bureau than just bringing a group of young people—those who have had at least minor brushes with authority—together once or twice a week.

Since the bureau concentrates on helping youths before they get into serious trouble, a diagnostic social worker and two detached or field workers with the bureau try to positively motivate the young people.

"We just try to get to know them . . . the family's strengths and weaknesses," said Mrs. Carole Mayo, the social worker.

Approximately 40 young people, ages 10 to 17, have been referred to the bureau since it began operation in March. While most of the youths are referred from the Louisville public schools, Louisville Police Department's Youth Bureau and the Russell community, a few have come to the bureau on their own.

Some of the referrals have been involved in serious offenses like armed robbery and car theft. But the Metropolitan Social Services Department eventually will assign someone in court service to work with these offenders, Mrs. Mayo said.

"I'd say that the more serious offenders are in the minority. A lot of children in the community are picked up for truancy or loitering," she said.

Little motivation for education is one cause of truancy. Mrs. Mayo said another factor in truancy is inadequate clothing which may cause embarrassment over not having the latest dress styles to wear to school.

Finding out what will motivate the young people is a task which includes job hunting, discussions with the youths and their parents and group meetings where the youths, along with the detached workers, plan activities that range from speak-out sessions to a skating party and camping trip.

With the tight employment market, job hunting is one of the bureau's hardest, and probably most important, tasks.

"That's one of the things parents are most interested in, especially for the guys. I think they think that if they (the boys) can find a job, they'd stay out of trouble," Mrs. Mayo said.

She finds that the delinquent is more difficult to motivate than the other referrals.

"They think, 'You can't do nothing. You can't fight the man.' When they find out that you are in a position to help them, they trust you more," Mrs. Mayo said.

Counseling and group therapy are not enough by themselves. "This is not purely a therapeutic group or a social group. . . . They've had that before. If you can help them get out of a scrape, that builds their confidence in you," she said.

Aaron Smith and Irvin Williams, the workers, agree. Smith said that the youths have vetoed having professionals work with them by saying they're "not ready for that yet."

"We're not trying to identify ourselves with the system," said Smith, a former probation officer. "What we're doing is not semi-formal nor formal," but it is meaningful.

Smith, 29, and Williams, 22, were chosen for their positions because of their ability to relate to youths, knowledge of the Russell community and a sincere interest in the work.

These abilities are important as Smith and Williams frequent basketball courts, teen-age hangouts and other places where young people often can be found. In this way they contact youths other than those who already have been referred to the bureau.

Smith tries to set up a pattern by which youths can find him when they need to.

"They recognize me from being seen with a lot of young people. They'll approach me asking for a job, ride . . . (and they'll) begin to talk. One time a kid said, 'I want to join the group. Do I have to be in trouble to join?'" The answer is no.

From such informal talks the detached workers get an insight into the youth's background and problems he may be having.

However, all the youths are not as verbal

nor can all problems be so easily discussed. During the group meetings, Smith said he has had occasionally to make some of the youths angry before they would open up to him.

Should Smith or Williams, a sociology major at Jefferson Community College, encounter a case that neither can handle Mrs. Mayo, who makes the initial home visit on all referrals, meets with the individual for counseling.

If more expertise is required, the bureau receives consultation and other services from specialized agencies such as the Family and Children's Agency and the Kent School of Social Work.

The project is scheduled to run for three years pending evaluations that will be made at the end of each year. As to the project's effectiveness, Mrs. Mayo said, "We can't really tell yet since we're only getting involved with the ones who've been in trouble."

One addition to the bureau that she would like to have is more Negro male volunteers to work with the referrals. Only five of the 40 Negro youths served by the bureau are females.

For the Russell Junior High counselor and the few parents who have noticed improved or changed attitudes in the youths whom the bureau assists, the project is evidently effective.

"The only tedious part is the paperwork. Working with the kids is great," said Mrs. Mayo.

### THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NAVY'S BLUE ANGELS

**HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 16, 1971

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a poem by a fine newspaper-woman, Mrs. Nettie Brown of El Centro, Calif. The poem was written to commemorate the 25th anniversary of the U.S. Navy's flight demonstration team known as the Blue Angels, who make their winter training home in El Centro. During these 25 years, 105 million people have thrilled to the precision flying of the Blue Angels. I salute them on their 25th anniversary.

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

TO THE BLUE ANGELS  
ON THEIR 25TH ANNIVERSARY  
(By Nettie Brown)

Angel pilots in Navy blue  
Flying their planes so true.  
Highest standards in the air;  
Finest examples anywhere  
Of America's power on high  
As they flash across the sky.  
In close formations, daring, true  
Demonstrations of what pilots can do.

Blue Angels, perfection in truth  
Who demonstrate to America's youth  
That life is still adventure thrilling  
To those who prove they are willing  
To study and practice and learn  
Until they too their wings earn.  
Then believe, and dare, and work to  
Emulate the Navy's Angels Blue.

Valleyites watch in pride and wonder  
As overhead the Blues' jets thunder  
Above Imperial Valley desert land  
Known as the Hollow of God's Hand—  
"La Palma de la Mano de Dios"—

We are glad that you are with us.  
Blue Angels you're proud to be called.  
Your shows leave the people enthralled.  
Your mission is demonstration  
Of precision Navy aviation  
As you practice in our clear air  
Blue Angels, we breathe a prayer  
That you are safe, and happy, too.  
That Imperial Valley's skies so blue  
You call home; and here you'll return,  
Because we love you, every one.

D. A. "ANDY" ANDERSON

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks, I wish to include an article which appeared in the Bryan Pictorial Press having to do with a distinguished public servant, Mr. A. D. Anderson who has served as mayor of my hometown, College Station, Tex. for the past 5 years. Mr. Anderson had previously served with distinction on the City Council, and I am proud to say that he was a good friend of mine.

A GREAT MAN STEPS DOWN

College Station Mayor D. A. (Andy) Anderson has ended more than a decade of service in city government.

In a surprise move Monday night, Anderson resigned during a city council meeting. He said his resignation came on the advice of his lawyer.

Anderson, Joe McGraw, Dan Davis, C. H. Ransdell, Cecil B. Ryan and Jim Dozier were defendants in a suit questioning their right to hold elective office and receive state pay as employees at Texas A&M University. A special election was held only last week to fill the positions left vacant by the resignations of Ransdell and Ryan.

Dozier who is also acting as the city attorney in the suit is the only defendant still in office. He could not be reached for comment on whether he will continue to contest the suit.

Anderson said he made his decision late Monday afternoon after his legal counsel advised him that completing his term of office "may be to my detriment. Therefore, I have no recourse but to resign at this time."

"The resignation has not been an easy choice for me to make, especially with the love I have for my city," he said. "In making this announcement I feel as though I am letting the city council and people who elected me down. My wish is that you, and they, will understand my position and reasons for my action. To say the least, the suit has been a most trying period to me and my family.

"I am not unmindful that my decision will necessitate the calling of another special election," he continued. "This I regret very much. For this I am sincerely sorry. I had definitely planned to at least complete my term of office through April 1972 and then consider other alternatives.

"My deepest regret is to admit defeat to A. P. Boyett Sr. and others," he said. "Yet, I carry no hatred in my heart of them. They are, rather to be pitied. He who is greater than I will be their judge.

"It has been a privilege working with each of you, and I wish you well in the decisions you make for our city in the future," he said. "Above all, it has been an honor and privilege to have served our citizens as a public servant. I tried, honestly and faith-

fully, to uphold the trust they placed in me in working toward making our city a better place in which to live."

Elected mayor in 1966, Anderson was a city councilman from 1957 to 1963. He then served on the Planning and Zoning Commission for three years, before his election as mayor.

During his five years as mayor, Anderson guided College Station through an unparalleled period of growth and has stood for the development of the city in an orderly manner.

His concern for the future was demonstrated on Monday when the city's 1970 annual report was issued. He predicted the 1971 council will pass a new zoning ordinance enabling the city to control its growth pattern and said the council would update the Brazos Area Plan if federal funds were available. He also announced another first for the city—a National Emergency Phone Number 911. He said equipment was to be installed by September.

Under his guidance the new city hall and police-fire complex were constructed and the street improvement program was initiated. Looking to the future, Anderson has pushed the expansion of electrical, water and sewage systems to meet the city's future needs. Anderson also insisted on a sound fiscal policy while carrying out these plans.

The Mayor's Special Committee—an innovation under Anderson—has greatly improved city council-minority group relations. In 1970 the committee conducted the most comprehensive study by any community in Texas of the city's Black areas. The information is now being used for the "Workable Program" and other federal programs.

A source close to Anderson noted that he has "devoted every waking moment to the affairs and concerns of the city."

His philosophy of government might be summed up by the concluding words of his introduction to the annual report:

"The best, we should seek to make better; the worst, we should strive to improve. All in all, the city is yours and mine, and it is entitled to the best that is in all of us. It is you, the citizen, however, who will have the final say as to the type of community you want.

THE 1971 4-H CITIZENSHIP COURSE

HON. WILLIAM R. ANDERSON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in the early 1900's a group of organizations emerged in this country whose purpose was to make the best better, to learn by doing. These individual groups soon became known as the 4-H Clubs of America, 4-H meaning head, heart, hand, and health, each used in the best possible way to help the community.

During the early years, 4-H membership included only a few thousand. Today there are 4 million 4-H members.

In the early days, highly motivated schoolteachers remained after school to teach boys the advantages of crop rotation, fertilization, and other types of improved farming methods. Local county agents offered them assistance to add to the professionalism of courses. Girls were taught improved methods of cooking and preserving food, sewing, and homemaking.

As 4-H Clubs matured and expanded,

their central theme became increasingly clear—building good citizenship. The objective was not necessarily to win each blue ribbon at the fair, but it was what one learned in the process of getting there.

Today's 4-H membership is about equally divided among farm and urban communities.

Recently, a number of 4-H delegates, leaders, and agents, were individually honored with a trip to Washington, D.C., for a short course on citizenship. Seminars on such subjects as changing life styles, the dangers of drug abuse and the need for increased knowledge on nutrition were held. Those representing District II from the State of Tennessee deserve congratulations as highly motivated young citizens. I place the names in the Record along with my personal commendation for the excellent work which they are doing.

Delegates to the 1971 4-H citizenship short course:

DELEGATES TO THE 1971 4-H CITIZENSHIP SHORT COURSE, WASHINGTON, D.C., JUNE 12-20, 1971

Name, Address, and County

David Shearin, Rt. 3, Shelbyville, Tenn. 37160, Bedford.  
Jim Troupe, Rt. 1, Normandy, Tenn. 37360, Bedford.  
Andrea Troupe, Rt. 3, Wartrace, Tenn. 37813, Bedford.  
Melody Mallard, Rt. 3, Shelbyville, Tenn. 37160, Bedford.  
Melody Womack, Rt. 4, Shelbyville, Tenn. 37160, Bedford.  
Wanda Barber, 222 Dellrose Dr., Nashville, Tenn. 37214, Davidson.  
Becky Sullivan, Rt. 2, Gower Rd., Nashville, Tenn. 37221, Davidson.  
Beverly Hill, Box 406, Pettus Road, Nashville, Tenn. 37013, Davidson.  
Wanda Dodge, Rt. 1, Pulaski, Tenn. 38478, Giles.  
Beverly Pratt, Rt. 1, Pulaski, Tenn. 38478, Giles.  
Steve Robinson, Rt. 1, Cornersville, Tenn. 37047, Giles.  
Lynne Tune, Rt. 3, Centerville, Tenn. 37033, Hickman.  
Teresa Rochelle, Rt. 1, Nunnally, Tenn. 37137, Hickman.  
Russell Brown, Rt. 1, Only, Tenn. 37140, Hickman.  
David Spears, Rt. 2, Centerville, Tenn. 37033, Hickman.  
Deborah Largent, Erin, Tenn. 37061, Houston.  
Rita Smithey, Erin, Tenn. 37061, Houston.  
Tracy McCaulay, Stewart, Tenn. 37175, Houston.  
Bill Warden, Jr., Tennessee Ridge, Tenn., 37178, Houston.  
Steve May, Hurricane Mills, Tenn. 37078, Humphreys.  
Vickie Ross, Box 223, New Johnsonville, Tenn. 37134, Humphreys.  
Melissa May, Hurricane Mills, Tenn. 37078, Humphreys.  
Glenda Hooper, Route 2, McEwen, Tenn. 37101, Humphreys.  
Deena James, Box 43, Summertown, Tenn. 38483, Lawrence.  
Barbara Rosson, c/o H. E. Rosson, Rt. 1, Leoma, Tenn. 38468, Lawrence.  
Jean Kerstiens, 1217 Poplar Dr., Lawrenceburg, Tenn. 38464, Lawrence.  
David Henson, c/o Ross Henson, Rt. 2, Etheridge, Tenn. 38456, Lawrence.  
Dusty Jordan, c/o Jim Jordan, Rt. 1, Leoma, Tenn. 38468, Lawrence.  
Vernon Sides, c/o Harlie Sides, Rt. 3, Leoma, Tenn. 38468, Lawrence.

Marsha Smith, Swan Ave., Hohenwald, Tenn. 38462, Lewis.

Roger Pennington, Rt. 2, Hohenwald, Tenn. 38462, Lewis.

Connie Taylor, Rt. 2, Chapel Hill, Tenn. 37034, Marshall.

Sandra Jordan, Rt. 4, Lewisburg, Tenn. 37091, Marshall.

Martha Gilliam, Rt. 4, Lewisburg, Tenn. 37091, Marshall.

Ray Wakefield, Rt. 2, Lewisburg, Tenn. 37091, Marshall.

Gordon Corder, Rt. 5, Columbia, Tenn. 38401, Maury.

Janet Sewell, Rt. 2, Santa Fe, Tenn. 38482, Maury.

Edward Harlan, Rt. 4, Columbia, Tenn. 38401, Maury.

Susan Sparkman, Rt. 8, Columbia, Tenn. 38401, Maury.

Frank Jones, Rt. 1, Box 280, Columbia, Tenn. 38401, Maury.

David Rankin, Rt. 3, Columbia, Tenn. 38401, Maury.

Ronnie Southall, Rt. 4, Linden, Tenn. 37096, Perry.

Greg Garcia, Flatwoods, Tenn. 38458, Perry.

Nathan Lee, Linden, Tenn. 37096, Perry.

Bill Bates, Lobelville, Tenn. 37097, Perry.

Ben Mitchell, Linden, Tenn. 37096, Perry.

Nancy Turner, Rt. 3, Linden, Tenn. 37096, Perry.

Brenda Roach, Box K, Linden, Tenn. 37096, Perry.

Jean Lyon, Linden, Tenn. 37096, Perry.

Janice Long, Rt. 4, Linden, Tenn. 37096, Perry.

Terrle Dabbs, Rt. 1, Lobelville, Tenn. 37097, Perry.

Nancy Walling, Rt. 4, Springfield, Tenn. 37172, Robertson.

Mary Alice Yates, Cross Plains, Tenn. 37049, Robertson.

Mark Lowe, Cedar Hill, Tenn. 37032, Robertson.

Barbara Gourley, Rt. 2, Smyrna, Tenn. 37167, Rutherford.

Karen Franklin, P.O. Box 160, Dover, Tenn. 37058, Stewart.

Darlene Hall, 112 Earl St., Gallatin, Tenn. 37066, Sumner.

Deborah McDearman, Hwy. 109 S., Portland, Tenn. 37148, Sumner.

Jerri Driver, 801 Peninsula Dr., Gallatin, Tenn. 37066, Sumner.

Donna Cron, 924 Spencer St., Gallatin, Tenn. 37066, Sumner.

Jim Donoho, Box 33, Portland, Tenn. 37148, Sumner.

James Palmer, Rt. 1, Mitchellville, Tenn. 37119, Sumner.

Ralph Herbert, Box 500, Franklin, Tenn. 37064, Williamson.

Phillip Carter, Rt. 1, Franklin, Tenn. 37064, Williamson.

Gail Dickens, Rt. 7, Lebanon, Tenn. 37087, Wilson.

Douglas Eskew, 602 Castle Hts. Ave., Lebanon, Tenn. 37087, Wilson.

## LEADERS

Claude DePrest, Rt. 2, Linden, Tenn. 37096, Perry.

Mrs. Joe McKenzie, P.O. Box 314, Waverly, Tenn. 37185, Humphreys.

Mrs. Joe Oliver, Rt. 3, Lewisburg, Tenn. 37091, Marshall.

Mrs. Fred Long, Jr., Rt. 4, Linden, Tenn. 37096, Perry.

## AGENTS

Joe McKenzie (Group Coordinator), P.O. Box 314, Waverly, Tenn., Humphreys.

Fred Long, Jr., Rt. 4, Linden, Tenn. 37096, Perry.

Mrs. Bettye Griffin, Huddleston St., Centerville, Tenn. 37033, Hickman.

Mrs. Barbara Carrick, P.O. Box 100, Lawrenceburg, Tenn. 38464, Lawrence.

## REPORTING BOTH SIDES

## HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 16, 1971

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, last March, Daniel Moynihan criticized the press for bringing people bad news. Unfortunately, Mr. Moynihan picked the wrong culprit. Instead of condemning the transmitter, he should have aimed his accusations at the ones who create the mistakes. The newsmen are not at fault; the newsmakers are. Max Frankel of the New York Times answered Mr. Moynihan's piece in Commentary. Frankel, a veteran of Washington reporting, asserts that the press is legitimately skeptical. From the days of the U-2 incident, when a President told the Nation the plane was just monitoring weather patterns, I think it is safe to say that the press has good reason to be skeptical. The Pentagon papers is just the most recent and most dramatic demonstration of Government duplicity. Mr. Moynihan protests the habit of bureaucratic leaks which he says are purely motivated to embarrass the President. What would Mr. Moynihan call the same process the administration pursues when it leaks information to discredit some opponent?

At this point, I am inserting Mr. Moynihan's article and Mr. Frankel's letter so I will not risk Mr. Moynihan's charge of being less than objective in reporting:

[From the Commentary magazine, March 1971]

## THE PRESIDENCY AND THE PRESS

(By Daniel P. Moynihan)

As his years in Washington came to an end, Harry S. Truman wrote a friend:

"I really look with commiseration over the great body of my fellow citizens, who, reading newspapers, live and die in the belief that they have known something of what has been passing in the world in their time."

A familiar Presidential plaint, sounded often in the early years of the Republic and rarely unheard thereafter. Of late, however, a change has developed in the perception of what is at issue. In the past what was thought to be involved was the reputation of a particular President. In the present what is seen to be at stake, and by the Presidents themselves, is the reputation of government—especially, of course, Presidential government. These are different matters, and summon a different order of concern.

There are two points anyone would wish to make at the outset of an effort to explore this problem. First, it is to be acknowledged that in most essential encounters between the Presidency and the press, the advantage is with the former. The President has a near limitless capacity to "make" news which must be reported, if only by reason of competition between one journal, or one medium, and another. (If anything, radio and television news is more readily subject to such dominance. Their format permits of many fewer "stories." The President-in-action almost always takes precedence.) The President also has considerable capacity to reward friends and punish enemies in the press corps, whether they be individual journalists or the papers, television networks, news weeklies, or whatever these individuals work for. And for quite a long

while, finally, a President who wishes can carry off formidable deceptions. (One need only recall the barefaced lying that went with the formal opinion of Roosevelt's Attorney General that the destroyer-naval-base deal of 1940 was legal.)

With more than sufficient reason, then, publishers and reporters alike have sustained over the generations a lively sense of their vulnerability to governmental coercion or control. For the most part, their worries have been exaggerated. But, like certain virtues, there are some worries that are best carried to excess.

The second point is that American journalism is almost certainly the best in the world. This judgment will be disputed by some. There are good newspapers in other countries. The best European journalists are more intellectual than their American counterparts, and some will think this a decisive consideration. But there is no enterprise anywhere the like of the New York Times. Few capitals are covered with the insight and access of the Washington Post or the Washington Evening Star. As with so many American institutions, American newspapers tend to be older and more stable than their counterparts abroad. The Hartford Courant was born in 1764, twenty-one years before the Times of London. The New York Post began publication in 1801, twenty years before the Guardian of Manchester. What in most other countries is known as the "provincial" press—that is to say journals published elsewhere than in the capital—in America is made up of a wealth of comprehensive and dependable daily newspapers of unusually high quality.

The journalists are in some ways more important than their journals—at least to anyone who has lived much in government. A relationship grows up with the reporters covering one's particular sector that has no counterpart in other professions or activities. The relationship is one of simultaneous trust and distrust, friendship and enmity, dependence and independence. But it is the men of government, especially in Washington, who are the more dependent. The journalists are their benefactors, their conscience, at times almost their reason for being. For the journalists are above all others their audience, again especially in Washington, which has neither an intellectual community nor an electorate, and where there is no force outside government able to judge events, much less to help shape them, save the press.

That there is something wondrous and terrible in the intensities of this relationship between the press and the government is perhaps best seen at the annual theatricals put on by such groups of journalists as the Legislative Correspondents Association in Albany or the Gridiron in Washington. To my knowledge nothing comparable takes place anywhere else in the world. These gatherings are a kind of ritual truth telling, of which the closest psychological approximation would be the Calabrian insult ritual described by Roger Valland in his novel *The Law*, or possibly the group-therapy practices of more recent origin. The politicians come as guests of the journalists. The occasion is first of all a feast: the best of everything. Then as dinner progresses the songs begin. The quality varies, of course, but at moments startling levels of deadly accurate commentary of great cruelty are achieved. The politicians sit and smile and applaud. Then some of them speak. Each one wins or loses to the degree that he can respond in kind; stay funny and be brutal. (At the Gridiron John F. Kennedy was a master of style, but the piano duet performed by Nixon and Agnew in 1970 was thought by many to have surpassed anything yet done.) A few lyrics appear in the next day's papers, but what the newspapermen really said to the politicians remains priv-

ileged—as does so much of what the politicians say to them. The relationship is special.

How is it then that this relationship has lately grown so troubled? The immediate answer is, of course, the war in Vietnam. An undeclared war, unwanted, misunderstood, or not understood at all, it entailed a massive deception of the American people by their government. Surely a large area of the experience of the 1960's is best evoked in the story of the man who says: "They told me that if I voted for Goldwater there would be 500,000 troops in Vietnam within a year. I voted for him, and, by God, they were right." The story has many versions. If he voted for Goldwater we would be defolating the countryside of Vietnam; the army would be sending spies to the 1968 party convention; Dr. Spock would be indicted on conspiracy charges; and so on. By 1968 Richard Rovere described the capital as "awash" with lies.

The essential fact was that of deceit. How else to carry out a full-scale war that became steadily more unpopular with none of the legally-sanctioned constraints on the free flow of information which even the most democratic societies find necessary in such circumstances? This situation did not spring full-blown from the involvement in Southeast Asia. It was endemic to the cold war. At the close of World War II official press censorship was removed, but the kinds of circumstance in which any responsible government might feel that events have to be concealed from the public did not go away. The result was a contradiction impossible to resolve. The public interest was at once served and dis-served by secrecy; at once dis-served and served by openness. Whatever the case, distrust of government grew. At the outset of the U-2 affair in 1960, the United States government asserted that a weather plane on a routine mission had been shot down. The *New York Times* (May 6, 1960) reported just that. Not that the U.S. government claimed it was a weather plane, but simply that it was. Well, it wasn't. Things have not been the same since.

But there are problems between the Presidency and the press which have little to do with the cold war or with Vietnam and which—if this analysis is correct—will persist or even intensify should those conditions recede, or even dissolve, as a prime source of public concern. The problems flow from five basic circumstances which together have been working to reverse the old balance of power between the Presidency and the press. It is the thesis here that if this balance should tip too far in the direction of the press, our capacity for effective democratic government will be seriously and dangerously weakened.

## I

The first of these circumstances has to do with the tradition of "muck- ing"—the exposure of corruption in government or the collusion of government with private interests—which the American press has seen as a primary mission since the period 1880-1914. It is, in Irving Kristol's words, "a journalistic phenomenon that is indigenous to democracy, with its instinctive suspicion and distrust of all authority in general, and of concentrated political and economic power especially." Few would want to be without the tradition, and it is a young journalistic of poor spirit who does not set out to uncover the machinations of some malefactor of great wealth and his political collaborators.

Yet there is a cost, as Roger Starr suggests in his wistful wish that Lincoln Steffens' *The Shame of the Cities* might be placed on the restricted shelves of the schools of journalism. Steffens has indeed, as Starr declares, continued "to haunt the city rooms of the country's major newspapers." The question to be asked is whether, in the aftermath of

Steffens, the cities were better, or merely more ashamed of themselves. Looking back, one is impressed by the energy and capacity for governance of some of the old city machines. Whatever else, it was popular government, of and by men of the people.

One wonders: did the middle- and upper-class reformers destroy the capacity of working-class urban government without replacing it with anything better so that half-a-century later each and all bewail the cities as ungovernable? One next wonders whether something not dissimilar will occur now that the focus of press attention has shifted from City Hall to the White House. (And yet a miracle of American national government is the almost complete absence of monetary corruption at all levels, and most especially at the top.)

The muckraking tradition is well established. Newer, and likely to have far more serious consequences, is the advent of what Lionel Trilling has called the "adversary culture" as a conspicuous element in journalistic practice. The appearance in large numbers of journalists shaped by the attitudes of this culture is the result of a process whereby the profession thought to improve itself by recruiting more and more persons from middle- and upper-class backgrounds and trained at the universities associated with such groups. This is a change but little noted as yet. The stereotype of American newspapers is that of publishers ranging from conservative to reactionary in their political views balanced by reporters ranging from liberal to radical in theirs. One is not certain how accurate the stereotype ever was. One's impression is that twenty years and more ago the preponderance of the "working press" (as it liked to call itself) was surprisingly close in origins and attitudes to working people generally. They were not Ivy Leaguers. They now are or soon will be. Journalism has become, if not an elite profession, a profession attractive to elites. This is noticeably so in Washington where the upper reaches of journalism constitute one of the most important and enduring social elites of the city, with all the accoutrements one associates with a leisured class. (The Washington press corps is not leisured at all, but the style is that of men and women who choose to work.)

The political consequence of the rising social status of journalism is that the press grows more and more influenced by attitudes genuinely hostile to American society and American government. This trend seems bound to continue into the future. On the record of what they have been writing while in college, the young people now leaving the Harvard *Crimson* and the Columbia *Spectator* for journalistic jobs in Washington will resort to the Steffens style at ever-escalating levels of moral implication. They bring with them the moral absolutism of George Wald's vastly popular address, "A Generation in Search of a Future," that describes the Vietnam war as "the most shameful episode in the whole of American history." Not tragic, not heartbreaking, not vastly misconceived, but *shameful*. From the shame of the cities to the shame of the nation. But nobody ever called Boss Croker any name equivalent in condemnatory weight to the epithet "war criminal."

## II

An ironical accompaniment of the muckraking style directed toward the Presidency has been the rise of a notion of the near-omnipotency of the office itself. This notion Thomas E. Cronin describes as the "textbook President." Cronin persuasively argues that in the aftermath of Franklin Roosevelt a view of the Presidency, specifically incorporated in the textbooks of recent decades, was developed which presented seriously "inflated and unrealistic interpretations of Presidential competence and beneficence," and which grievously

"overemphasized the policy change and policy accomplishment capabilities" of the office. Cronin cites Anthony Howard, a watchful British commentator:

"For what the nation has been beguiled into believing ever since 1960 is surely the politics of evangelism: the faith that individual men are cast to be messiahs, the conviction that Presidential incantations can be substituted for concrete programs, the belief that what matters is not so much the state of the nation as the inspiration-quotient of its people."

In his own researches among advisers of Kennedy and Johnson, Cronin finds the majority to hold "tempered assessments of Presidential determination of 'public policy.'" Indeed, only 10 per cent would describe the President as having "very great impact" over such matters.

Working in the White House is a chastening experience. But it is the experience of very few persons. Watching the White House, on the other hand, is a mass occupation, concentrated especially among the better-educated, better-off groups. For many the experience is one of infatuation followed much too promptly by disillusion. First, the honeymoon—in Cronin's terms, the "predictable ritual of euphoric inflation." But then "the Camelot of the first few hundred days of all Presidencies fades away. . . . Predictably, by the second year, reports are spread that the President has become isolated from criticism." If this is so, he has only himself to blame when things go wrong. And things do go wrong.

If the muckraking tradition implies a distrust of government, it is nonetheless curiously validated by the overly trusting tradition of the "textbook Presidency" which recurrently sets up situations in which the Presidency will be judged as having somehow broken faith. This is not just the experience of a Johnson or a Nixon. Anyone who was in the Kennedy administration in the summer and fall of 1963 would, or ought to, report a pervasive sense that our initiative had been lost, that we would have to get reelected to get going again.

Here, too, there is a curious link between the Presidency and the press. The two most important *Presidential* newspapers are the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post* (though the *Star* would be judged by many to have the best reporting). Both papers reflect a tradition of liberalism that has latterly been shaped and reinforced by the very special type of person who buys the paper. (It is well to keep in mind that newspapers are capitalist enterprises which survive by persuading people to buy them.) There is a "disproportionately" well-educated and economically prosperous audience. The geographical areas in which the two papers circulate almost certainly have higher per-capita incomes and higher levels of education than any of comparable size in the nation or the world. More of the buyers of these two papers are likely to come from "liberal" Protestant or Jewish backgrounds than would be turned up by a random sample of the population; they comprise, in fact, what James Q. Wilson calls "the Liberal Audience."<sup>1</sup> Both the working-class Democrats and the conservative Republicans, with exceptions, obviously, have been pretty much driven from office among the constituencies where the *Times* and the *Post* flourish. It would be wrong to ascribe this to the influence of the papers. Causality almost certainly moves both ways. Max Frankel of the *Times*, who may have peers, but certainly no better as a working journalist, argues that a newspaper is surely as much influenced by those who read it as vice versa.

The readers of the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post*, then, are a special

<sup>1</sup> See his article, "Crime and the Liberal Audience" in *COMMENTARY*, January 1971.

type of citizen: not only more affluent and more liberal than the rest of the nation, but inclined also to impose heavy expectations on the Presidency, and not to be amused when those expectations fail to be met. Attached by their own internal traditions to the "textbook Presidency," papers like the *Times* and the *Post* are reinforced in this attachment by the temperamental predilections of the readership whose character they inevitably reflect. Thus they help to set a tone of pervasive dissatisfaction with the performance of the national government, whoever the Presidential incumbent may be and whatever the substance of his policies.

## III

A third circumstance working to upset the old balance of power between the Presidency and the press is the fact that Washington reporters depend heavily on more or less clandestine information from federal bureaucracies which are frequently, and in some cases routinely, antagonistic to Presidential interests.

There is a view of the career civil service as a more or less passive executor of policies made on high. This is quite mistaken. A very great portion of policy ideas "bubble up" from the bureaucracy, and just as importantly, a very considerable portion of the "policy decisions" that go down never come to anything, either because the bureaucrats cannot or will not follow through. (The instances of simple inability are probably much greater than those of outright hostility.) Few modern Presidents have made any impact on the federal bureaucracies save by creating new ones. The bureaucracies are unfamiliar and inaccessible. They are quasi-independent, maintaining, among other things, fairly open relationships with the Congressional committees that enact their statutes and provide their funds. They are usually willing to work with the President, but rarely to the point where their perceived interests are threatened. Typically, these are rather simple territorial interests: not to lose any jurisdiction, and if possible to gain some. But recurrently, issues of genuine political substance are also involved.

At the point where they perceive a threat to those interests, the bureaucracies just as recurrently go to the press. They know the press; the press knows them. Both stay in town as Presidential governments come and go. Both cooperate in bringing to bear the most powerful weapons the bureaucracies yield in their own defense, that of revealing Presidential plans in advance of their execution. Presidents and their plans are helpless against this technique. I have seen a senior aide to a President, sitting over an early morning cup of coffee, rise and literally punch the front page of the *New York Times*. A major initiative was being carefully mounted. Success depended, to a considerable degree, on surprise. Someone in one of the agencies whose policies were to be reversed got hold of the relevant document and passed it on to the *Times*. Now everyone would know. The mission was aborted. There was nothing for the Presidential government to do. No possibility of finding, much less of disciplining, the bureaucrat responsible. For a time, or rather from time to time, President Johnson tried the technique of not going ahead with any policy or appointment that was leaked in advance to the press. Soon, however, his aides began to suspect that this was giving the bureaucracy the most powerful weapon of all, namely the power to veto a Presidential decision by learning of it early enough and rushing to the *Times* or the *Post*. (Or, if the issue could be described in thirty seconds, any of the major television networks.)

What we have here is disloyalty to the Presidency. Much of the time what is involved is no more than the self-regard of lower-echelon bureaucrats who are simply flattered

into letting the reporter know how much they know, or who are just trying to look after their agency. But just as often, to repeat, serious issues of principle are involved. Senator Joseph McCarthy made contact with what he termed "the loyal American underground"—State Department officials, and other such, who reputedly passed on information to him about Communist infiltration of the nation's foreign-policy and security systems. President Johnson made it clear that he did not trust the Department of State to maintain "security" in foreign policy. Under President Nixon the phenomenon has been most evident in domestic areas as OEO warriors struggle among themselves to be the first to disclose the imminent demise of VISTA, or HEW functionaries reluctantly interpret a move to close some fewer hospitals built to accommodate an 18th-century seaport as the first step in a master plan to dismantle public medicine and decimate the ranks of the elderly and disadvantaged.

It is difficult to say whether the absolute level of such disloyalty to the Presidency is rising. One has the impression that it is. No one knows much about the process of "leaking" except in those instances where he himself has been involved. (Everyone is sooner or later involved. That should be understood.) The process has not been studied and little is known of it. But few would argue that the amount of clandestine disclosure is decreasing. Such disclosure is now part of the way we run our affairs. It means, among other things, that the press is fairly continuously involved in an activity that is something less than honorable. Repeatedly it benefits from the self-serving acts of government officials who are essentially hostile to the Presidency. This does the Presidency no good, and if an outsider may comment, it does the press no good either. Too much do they traffic in stolen goods, and they know it.

This point must be emphasized. The leaks which appear in the *Post* and the *Times*—other papers get them, but if one wants to influence decisions in Washington these are clearly thought to be the most effective channels—are ostensibly published in the interest of adding to public knowledge of what is going on. This budget is to be cut; that man is to be fired; this bill is to be proposed. However, in the nature of the transaction the press can only publish half the story—that is to say the information that the "leaker" wants to become "public knowledge." What the press never does is say who the leaker is and why he wants the story leaked. Yet, more often than not, this is the more important story: that is to say, what policy wins if the one being disclosed loses, what individual, what bureau, and so on.

There really are ethical questions involved here that have not been examined. There are also serious practical questions. It would be my impression that the distress occasioned by leaks has used up too much Presidential energy, at least from the time of Roosevelt. (Old-time braintrusts would assure the Johnson staff that nothing could compare with FDR's distractions on the subject.) The primary fault lies within government itself, and one is at a loss to think of anything that might be done about it. But it is a problem for journalism as well, and an unattended one.

## IV

The fourth of the five conditions making for an altered relation between the Presidency and the press is the concept of objectivity with respect to the reporting of events and especially the statements of public figures. Almost the first canon of the great newspapers, and by extension of the television news networks which by and large have taken as their standards those of the best newspapers, is that "the news" will be reported whether or not the reporter or the editor or the publisher likes the news. There

is nothing finer in the American newspaper tradition. There is, however, a rub and it comes when a decision has to be made as to whether an event really is news, or simply a happening, a non-event staged for the purpose of getting into the papers or onto the screen.

The record of our best papers is not reassuring here, as a glance at the experience of the Korean and the Vietnam wars will suggest. Beginning a bit before the Korean hostilities broke out, but in the general political period we associate with that war, there was a rise of right-wing extremism, a conspiracy-oriented politics symbolized by the name of Senator Joseph McCarthy, and directed primarily at the institution of the Presidency. There was, to be sure, a populist streak to this movement: Yale and Harvard and the "striped-pants boys" in the State Department were targets too. But to the question, "Who promoted Peress?" there was only one constitutional or—for all practical purposes—political answer, namely that the President did. McCarthy went on asking such questions, or rather making such charges, and the national press, which detested and disbelieved him throughout, went on printing them. The American style of objective journalism made McCarthy. He would not, I think, have gotten anywhere in Great Britain where, because it would have been judged he was lying, the stories would simply not have been printed.

Something not dissimilar has occurred in the course of the Vietnam war, only this time the extremist, conspiracy-oriented politics of protest has been putatively left-wing. Actually both movements are utterly confusing if one depends on European analogues. McCarthy was nominally searching out Communists, but his preferred targets were Eastern patriots, while his supporters were, to an alarming degree, members of the Catholic working class. The Students for a Democratic Society, if that organization may be used as an exemplar, was (at least in its later stages) nominally revolutionist, dedicated to the overthrow of the capitalist-imperialist-fascist regime of the United States. Yet, as Seymour Martin Lipset, Nathan Glazer, and others have shown, its leadership, and perhaps also its constituency, were disproportionately made up of upper-class Jewish and Protestant youth. By report of Steven Kelman, who lived as a contemporary among them at Harvard, the SDS radicals were "undemocratic, manipulative, and self-righteous to the point of snobbery and elitism." Peter Berger, a sociologist active in the peace movement, has demonstrated quite persuasively—what others, particularly persons of European origin like himself have frequently seemed to sense—that despite the leftist ring of the slogans of SDS and kindred groups, their ethos and tactics are classically fascist: the cult of youth, the mystique of the street, the contempt for liberal democracy, and the "totalization of friend and foe [with] the concomitant dehumanization of the latter," as the Nazi use of "*Saujuden*" ("Jewish pigs").

In any case, the accusations which have filled the American air during the period of Vietnam have been no more credible or responsible than those of McCarthy during the Korean period, and the tactics of provocation and physical intimidation have if anything been more disconcerting. Yet the national press, and especially television, have assumed a neutral posture, even at times a sympathetic one, enabling the neo-fascists of the Left to occupy center stage throughout the latter half of the 60's with consequences to American politics that have by no means yet worked themselves out. (It took Sam Brown to point out that one consequence was to make the work of the anti-war movement, of which he has been a principal leader, vastly more difficult.)

Would anyone have it otherwise? Well, yes.

Irving Kristol raised this question in an article that appeared before the New Left had made its presence strongly felt on the national scene, but his views are doubtless even more emphatic by now. He wrote of the "peculiar mindlessness which pervades the practice of journalism in the United States," asserting that the ideal of objectivity too readily becomes an excuse for avoiding judgment. If McCarthy was lying, why print what he said? Or why print it on the front page? If the SDS stages a confrontation over a trumped-up issue, why oblige it by taking the whole episode at face value? Here, let it be said, the editorials of the *Times* and the *Post* have consistently served as a thoughtful corrective to the impressions inescapably conveyed by the news columns. But the blunt fact is that just as the news columns were open to astonishingly false assertions about the nature of the American national government during the McCarthy period, they have been open to equally false assertions—mirror images of McCarthyism indeed—during the period of Vietnam. And although it is impossible to prove, one gets the feeling that the slanderous irresponsibilities now being reported so dutifully are treated with far more respect than the old.

The matter of a policy of "genocide" pursued by the national government against the Black Panthers is a good example. By late 1969, preparing a preface to a second edition of *Beyond the Melting Pot*, Nathan Glazer and I could insist that the charge that twenty-eight Panthers had been murdered by the police was on the face of it simply untrue. Yet in that mindless way of which Kristol writes, the *Times* kept reprinting it. Edward Jay Epstein has brilliantly explained the matter in a recent article in the *New Yorker*. What he finds is an immense fraud. No such policy existed. There was no conspiracy between the Department of Justice, the FBI, and various local police forces to wipe out the Panthers. Yet that fraudulent charge has so profoundly affected the thinking of the academic and liberal communities that they will probably not even now be able to see the extent to which they were deceived. The hurt that has been done to blacks is probably in its way even greater. None of it could have happened without the particular mind-set of the national press.

If the press is to deserve our good opinion, it must do better in such matters. And it should keep in mind that the motivation of editors and reporters is not always simply and purely shaped by a devotion to objectivity. In the course of the McCarthy era James Reston recalled the ancient adage which translated from the Erse proposes that "If you want an audience, start a fight." This is true of anyone who would find an audience for his views, or simply for himself. It is true also of anyone who would find customers for the late city edition. T. S. Matthews, sometime editor of *Time*, retired to England to ponder the meaning of it all. In the end, all he could conclude was that the function of journalism was entertainment. If it is to be more—and that surely is what the Rosenthals and Bradlees and Grunwalds and Elliotts want—it will have to be willing on occasion to forgo the entertainment value of a fascinating but untruthful charge. It will, in short, have to help limit the rewards which attend this posture in American politics.

The final, and by far the most important, circumstance of American journalism relevant to this discussion is the absence of a professional tradition of self-correction. The mark of any developed profession is the practice of correcting mistakes, by whomsoever they are made. This practice is of course the great invention of Western science. Ideally, it requires an epistemology which is shared by all respected members of the pro-

feffion, so that when a mistake is discovered it can be established as a mistake to the satisfaction of the entire professional community. Ideally, also, no discredit is involved: to the contrary, honest mistakes are integral to the process of advancing the field. Journalism will never attain to any such condition. Nevertheless, there is a range of subject matter about which reasonable men can and will agree, and within this range American journalism, even of the higher order, is often seriously wide of the mark. Again Irving Kristol:

"It is a staple of conversation among those who have ever been involved in a public activity that when they read the *Times* the next morning, they will discover that it has almost never got the story quite right and has only too frequently got it quite wrong."

Similar testimony has come from an editor of the *New York Times* itself. In an article published some years ago in the *Sunday Times Magazine*, A. H. Raskin had this to say:

"No week passes without someone prominent in politics, industry, labor or civic affairs complaining to me, always in virtually identical terms: 'Whenever I read a story about something in which I really know what's going on, I'm astonished at how little of what is important gets into the papers—and how often even that little is wrong.' The most upsetting thing about these complaints is the frequency with which they come from scientists, economists and other academicians temporarily involved in government policy but without any proprietary concern about who runs the White House or City Hall."

This is so, and in part it is unavoidable. Too much happens too quickly: that the *Times* or the *Post* or the *Star* should appear once a day is a miracle. (Actually they appear three or four times a day in different editions.) But surely when mistakes are made they ought to be corrected. Sometimes they are, but not nearly enough. It is in this respect that Kristol is right in calling journalism "the underdeveloped profession."

Assertions that the press has a flawed sense of objectivity, or that it enjoys too cozy a relationship with the civil service, are not easily proved or disproved. But to say that mistakes are repeatedly made and not corrected is to say something which ought to be backed up with specific instances. Let me, then, offer two, taken from stories which appeared in the *New York Times* during the second half of 1970. (I was serving in the White House at the time, though I was not directly involved in any of the matters to be described.)

The first of my two examples is a long article which appeared in the *Times* on Sunday, November 15, 1970 under the headline, "Blacks Seek Tougher Equality Standards for Federal Hiring and Promotion." This story was not hostile to the administration; rather the contrary. It noted that the President had earlier signed an executive order requiring each department and agency to maintain an "affirmative" equal-opportunity program, and that the number of blacks in the top grades of the civil service had gone up almost by half under the "low-key approach of the Nixon Administration." The number of black lawyers in the Justice Department had declined somewhat. There were said to have been 61 (out of a total of 1,900 to 2,000)

<sup>2</sup> It should not, of course, be supposed that people inside government "know" what happens. The *Rashomon* effect is universal. It is, moreover, not uncommon for men in government to be doing something quite different from what they think or intend. In such cases, the more accurate the press reporting, the more baffled or enraged the officials will be. Still, the judgment Raskin reports is near universal.

under the Democrats. This figure had dropped under the Republicans to 45, but it also appeared that the difference was to be made up by new recruits. In the meantime the Department of Transportation was promulgating new rules, the Bureau of Prisons had eliminated the written test for correction officers, and similar activity aimed at increasing the number of blacks in the higher levels of the federal government was to be encountered elsewhere. All this, however, was going on in the context of a federal employment system whose patterns of practice were lamentably at odds with its profession of being an "equal-opportunity employer," to use the federal phrase. In the words of the *Times* story:

"The most recent figures show 137,919 blacks among the 1,289,114 Government employees covered by Civil Service regulations. That is about 10.7 per cent, less than the black proportion of the population, estimated in the 1970 census as 12.9 per cent."

The story went on to note that a number of black activists doubted that the federal government ever had been an equal-opportunity employer. One was particularly skeptical of executive orders: "This friendly persuasion thing has never worked in the history of our Government." Next came the question of quotas:

"Although little support for a formal quota system is evident, there is a widely held belief that Presidential statements of policy should be supplemented by more detailed instructions as to how the policies should be implemented."

There is little to take exception to in the foregoing. The official census figures for 1970 show blacks to be 12.4 per cent of the population, not 12.9 per cent, but newspapers routinely make such mistakes. It should also have been pointed out that blacks constitute only 10.9 per cent of the civilian non-institutional population of sixteen years of age or older, which is to say the population available for employment. In that sense, even accepting the figures used by the *Times*, blacks might be seen as having almost exactly "their" proportion of government employment, although an inadequate number of top positions.

The difficulty in this instance lies not with what was in the story, but what was not. What was not in the story was the fact that the category of federal worker—"General Schedule"—of which Negroes do indeed comprise 10.7 per cent is only one of three categories. In the other two categories of federal employee, the Postal Service and Wage System employees, Negroes made up 19.5 per cent and 19.7 per cent respectively. In rough terms, federal jobs are about equally divided among the three categories.<sup>3</sup> Small wonder, then, that the *Times* reported an absence of much discussion about establishing racial quotas for federal employment. Altogether, blacks have more than 15 per cent of federal jobs. If quotas were established according to the black proportion of the adult population, almost a third of black federal employees would have to be fired!

What all this comes to is that the very considerable achievement of blacks in qualifying for federal jobs, and getting them far in excess of their proportion in the work force is in effect concealed and a legitimate source of black pride thereby denied. So too we are denied a legitimate sense of national progress

<sup>3</sup> These are, by the way, good jobs. In 1970, mean annual earnings of year-round full-time workers in the economy as a whole were \$8,496. The average earnings of General Schedule federal employees in that year were \$11,058; of Postal employees, \$8,770; and of Wage System employees, \$8,159. Washington, D.C. has a much higher per capita income than any state in the union for the reason that it has so many federal employees.

in combating discrimination. And thus we are fed the tendentious allegations of those who wish to discredit the American "system" as inherently and irrevocably racist.

With respect to the role of the *Times* reporter, it must be said that it is simply not possible for him to have gotten the data on Classified Service employment from the Civil Service Commission releases on the subject without knowing that this is but one of three categories of employment, and that in the other categories blacks do exceptionally well. The truth would have made things look better than the reporter wished them to look. One fears it is as simple as that.

The second instance is rather more complicated. On September 14, 1970 a front-page story was published in the *Times* under the headline, "Negro College Heads Say Nixon Ignores Their Plight." The lead paragraph declared: "The presidents of nine financially troubled Negro colleges accused the Nixon Administration today of intensifying racial tensions by failing to support black education." The presidents felt that massive grants were needed and one was reported as saying that "It's five minutes before doomsday in this country." Dr. Vivian Henderson, president of Clark College in Atlanta, was reported as notably disturbed, asserting that "the Nixon Administration's utter lack of sensitivity on this point, purposeful or otherwise, is feeding the flames that already roar in the hearts of many black students."

All this seemed routine enough. From the onset of mass urban rioting in the mid-1960's all manner of requests for federal funds have been backed up by not especially subtle threats of violence. Nor was it unfamiliar to learn a few weeks later that the tactic had worked. On October 2, the front page of the *Times* carried a story from the Associated Press which began: "The Nixon Administration responded to complaints that it is insensitive to Negro education by announcing today a 30 per cent increase in Federal aid for predominantly black colleges." The next paragraph explained: "The Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Elliot L. Richardson, said in a statement the \$30 million increase was ordered by President Nixon after he heard appeals from Negro educators."

The story bumped around in the press for the next few months, culminating in a way on January 3, 1971 when another *Times* story reported that the Negro colleges were not finding it possible to draw on all of the additional \$30 million. Some college presidents were reportedly angry to have learned that the law provides for a 30-per-cent matching requirement for construction aid, which made up \$20 million of the additional \$30 million. But the basic theme of the *Times*'s coverage of this episode remained the same. The January 3 story began: "For two years Negro colleges called on the Nixon Administration for substantial financial help. Last September, the Administration responded, releasing \$30 million for use by the schools." There are problems of detail here. The Nixon administration had not been in office for two years in September 1969; the first *Times* report of an appeal appeared (as best I can determine) that very month, and the response came a month later, in October. Be that as it may, the January 3 story declared: "Black educators have severely criticized President Nixon for allegedly ignoring the plight of their schools. The educators charged that black schools have not shared in the money and grants that go out to American educational institutions."

To repeat, a familiar theme. The way to get something out of the federal government is to blast it out. Left to itself government would never have given these financially weak institutions a break. If you want action—especially if you are black—raise hell. Right? Wrong.

At least wrong in this instance. The true sequence of events which made up this story was turned literally upside down by the *Times*. The initiative to aid black colleges had been voluntarily taken by the administration a year before the *Times* got on to the issue. The increased support was announced months before the *Times* reported it. Far from having denounced the administration, the black college presidents had been praising it. And, for good measure, far from getting less than their share of federal aid, the black colleges had all along been getting rather more.

There are 124 "predominantly black colleges" in America, most of them small, and most in the South. They enroll somewhat more than 2 per cent of the college population, but this includes more than half of all black undergraduates.<sup>4</sup> They live with many difficulties, of which the most important—as is true of almost all colleges, large and small—is money. In 1969, they organized themselves as the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education and set out, as well they might, to get more federal funds. On October 23, 1969 a meeting on this subject was held in the Executive Office Building presided over by Robert J. Brown, a Special Assistant to the President, who as a Southern Negro was much interested in the problems of the predominantly black colleges.

As a result of this meeting the Federal Interagency Committee on Education (FICE) was directed to find out what was already being done for these colleges by the considerable array of federal agencies involved in supporting education and what plans existed for the future. A preliminary report was sent to the White House in February 1970, and in June a 45-page document entitled "Federal Agencies and Black Colleges" was printed. It was a good report, full of information concerning what was being done and of recommendations for doing more. (One does not commission such reports with the expectation of being advised to do less.)

In the meantime, on May 25, 1970, the President had met with a group of black college presidents, apparently the first such meeting ever to be held. In the aftermath of the Cambodian invasion Dr. James Cheek, president of Howard University, which is basically a federal institution, served temporarily in the White House as an associate of Chancellor Alexander Heard. During that time he made recommendations directly to the President on the subject of the black colleges. Much attention, then, was being given to this matter in the White House.

On July 23, 1970, a White House press conference was held by Brown and Robert Finch, formerly Secretary of HEW, now Counselor to the President. The main purpose of the occasion was to release a statement by Heard on the completion of his advisory work on campus unrest. Obviously seeking to strike a positive note about the Heard-Cheek effort, the two White House men also brought up the subject of black colleges. The FICE report was given to the press, and Finch announced that on departing Dr. Cheek had filed a "separate document" on this "very unique" problem. He continued: "That just came in today. The President read it today. The President asked him to write such a report, and I am authorized to say, after discussing it with the President, that in HEW . . . we are going to increase [aid] . . . from \$80 million to \$100 million." Finch's numbers were somewhat garbled. HEW aid to black colleges at the time was \$96 million for the fiscal year. The additional

<sup>4</sup>In 1969 there were 171,339 students in black colleges, or 2.14 per cent of the national junior- and senior-college gross enrollment. Problems of definition complicate the statistics.

sum now being reallocated was between \$29 million and \$30 million. In any event, the *Times* report of the press conference did not mention this subject.

On July 31, Dr. Herman R. Branson, president of Central State University in Wilberforce, Ohio, and the new head of the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education, wrote the President expressing appreciation for his move. On August 10 the President replied:

"The present financial plight of many of our small and the overwhelming majority of our black colleges clearly demonstrates to me that the Federal Government must strengthen its role in support of these institutions.

"I have committed this Administration to the vigorous support of equal educational opportunity. At the same time, we are encouraging excellence in all of our institutions of higher education."<sup>5</sup>

In a release dated August 11, 1970, the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education formally responded to the administration's move. In the accepted and understood manner of interest groups, the Association expressed gratitude for what it had got, but assured the government that it was not, of course, enough. On the other hand, it was confident that more would be forthcoming:

"We do not view this excellent first step as adequate to all our needs but rather as a model of what all agencies can do. . . . With the forthright statement of the President in his letter to Dr. Branson, we are very much encouraged and heartened about the future."

The *Times* reported nothing of this statement, as it had reported nothing of the original announcement from the White House that an extra \$30 million or so was being made available to black colleges. White House announcements, Presidential letters, Washington press conferences—all were ignored. The subject was not dealt with at all until the following month when, as noted earlier, a story depicted the black college presidents as denouncing the administration's "utter lack of sensitivity" on this matter. This story made the front page.

The day after it appeared Dr. Vivian Henderson, of Clark College in Atlanta, to whom the remark about "utter lack of sensitivity" had been attributed, sent the following unequivocal denial to the *Times*:

"I am deeply disturbed by the inaccurate reporting of the conference of Presidents of Negro Colleges that appeared in the September 14 issue of the *New York Times*. The following statement is attributed to me: "Instead the Nixon Administration's utter lack of sensitivity on this point, purposeful or otherwise, is feeding the flames that already roar in the hearts of many black students." This is a gross error and misrepresentation of what actually went on at the meeting. To be sure, we were concerned with the limited response of President Nixon to our problems. The fact is, however, that President Nixon has responded. He has not been silent with regard to concerns expressed by the Presidents in the meeting with him last May. Since the meeting with Mr. Nixon, about \$27 million additional funds have been made available to black colleges. It would be unfair on our part not to recognize this response, limited though it is.

"I did not make the statement your reporter attributes to me. I do not recall such

<sup>5</sup>The President was referring to his message to Congress on Higher Education of March 1970, which proposed a system of student aid by which the federal government would concentrate assistance on low-income students. A proposal to establish a National Foundation for Higher Education specifically referred to the problems of black colleges.

a statement being made during the course of the conference. . . ."

The *Times* did not print this letter. Instead it went on to repeat the theme of the original story and gradually to establish it elsewhere as truth. In the end a small bit of history had been rewritten: even the wire services followed the *Times's* version. No one intended this. That should be clear. It is simply that the journalistic system preferred a confrontation-capitulation model of events and there was no internal corrective procedure to alert the editors to the mistakes being made.

There are true social costs in all this. For one thing, a paper like the *Times* is a prime medium for internal communication within the government itself. Any Washington official following this story in the *Times* would have had to assume that the administration's attitude toward black colleges was just about opposite to what in fact it was. Such a reversal of signals can have serious consequences. Similarly there are consequences to the principals involved, in this case the college presidents who had been acting with skill and discipline and reasonable success (most notably in having gained access: within hours of the appearance of the first *Times* story a black college president was in the White House seeking reassurance that the \$27-30 million had not been jeopardized) but who found themselves represented as stereotypical confrontationalists. Everyone in a sense lost because the *Times* got the story wrong.

## VI

In the wake of so lengthy an analysis, what is there to prescribe? Little. Indeed, to prescribe much would be to miss the intent of the analysis. I have been hoping to make two points—the first explicitly, the second largely by implication. The first is that a convergence of journalistic tradition with evolving cultural patterns has placed the national government at a kind of operating disadvantage. It is hard for government to succeed: this theme echoes from every capital of the democratic world. In the United States it is hard for government to succeed and just as hard for government to appear to have succeeded when indeed it has done so. This situation can be said to have begun in the muckraking era with respect to urban government; it is now very much the case with respect to national government, as reflected in the "national press" which primarily includes the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, *Time*, *Newsweek*, and a number of other journals.

There is nothing the matter with investigative reporting; there ought to be more. The press can be maddeningly complacent about real social problems for which actual counter-measures, even solutions, exist. (I spent a decade, 1955-65, trying to obtain some press coverage of the problem of motor vehicle design, utterly without avail. The press, from the most prestigious journals on down, would print nothing but the pap handed out by the automobile companies and wholly-owned subsidiaries such as the National Safety Council.) The issue is not of serious inquiry, but of an almost reckless hostility to power.

The second point is that this may not be good for us. American government will only rarely and intermittently be run by persons drawn from the circles of those who own and edit and write for the national press; no government will ever have this circle as its political base. Hence the conditions are present for a protracted conflict in which the national government keeps losing. This might once have been a matter of little consequence or interest. It is, I believe, no longer such, for it now takes place within the context of what Nathan Glazer has so recently described in these pages<sup>6</sup> as an "as-

sault on the reputation of America . . . which has already succeeded in reducing this country, in the eyes of many American intellectuals, to outlaw status. . . ." In other words, it is no longer a matter of this or that administration; it is becoming a matter of national morale, of a "loss of confidence and nerve," some of whose possible consequences, as Glazer indicates, are not pleasant to contemplate.

Some will argue that in the absence of a parliamentary question-time only the press can keep the Presidency honest. Here we get much talk about Presidential press conferences and such. This is a serious point, but I would argue that the analogy does not hold. Questions are put in Parliament primarily by members of an opposition party hoping to replace the one in office. Incompetent questions damage those chances; irresponsible questions damage the office. Indeed, British politicians have been known to compare the press lords to ladies of the street, seeking "power without responsibility." It would, of course, be better all around if Congress were more alert. Thus the *Times* has reported that the GNP estimate in the 1971 Budget Message was not that of the Council of Economic Advisors, but rather a higher figure dictated by the White House for political purposes. This is a profoundly serious charge. Someone has a lot to explain. It could be the administration; it could be the *Times*. Congress should find out.

Obviously the press of a free country is never going to be and never should be celebratory. Obviously government at all levels needs and will continue to get criticism and some of it will inevitably be harsh or destructive, often enough justifiably so. Obviously we will get more bad news than good. Indeed the content of the newspapers is far and away the best quick test of the political structure of a society. Take a morning plane from Delhi to Karachi. One leaves with a sheaf of poorly-printed Indian papers filled with bad news; one arrives to find a small number of nicely-printed Pakistani papers filled with good news. One has left a democracy and has entered a country that is something less than a democracy.

Nonetheless there remains the question of balance. Does not an imbalance arise when the press becomes a too-willing outlet for mindless paranoia of the Joseph McCarthy or New Left variety? Does it not arise when the press becomes too self-satisfied to report its own mistakes with as much enterprise as it reports the mistakes of others?

Norman E. Isaacs, a working journalist, has written thoughtfully about the possibility of establishing a "national press council." This, in effect, was proposed by Robert M. Hutchins's Commission on Freedom of the Press in 1947: "A new and independent agency to appraise and report annually upon the performance of the press." There are press councils in other democratic countries which hear complaints, hand down verdicts, and even, as in Sweden, impose symbolic fines. There is a case to be made here, but I would argue that to set up such a council in this country at this time would be just the wrong thing to do. There is a statistic about many of the press councils abroad: often as not they appear to have been set up to ward off direct government regulation. Freedom of the press is a constitutional guarantee in the United States: how that freedom is exercised should remain a matter for the professional standards of those who exercise it. Here, however, there really is room for improvement. First in the simple matter of competence. The very responsibility of the national press in seeking to deal with complex issues produces a kind of irresponsibility. The reporters aren't up to it. They get it wrong. It would be astonishing were it otherwise.

Further, there needs to be much more awareness of the quite narrow social and intellectual perspective within which the na-

tional press so often moves. There are no absolutes here; hardly any facts. But there is a condition that grows more not less pronounced. The national press is hardly a "value-free" institution. It very much reflects the judgment of owners and editors and reporters as to what is good and bad about the country and what can be done to make things better. It might be hoped that such persons would give more thought to just how such elitist criticism is good for a democracy. Is this a shocking idea? I think not. I would imagine that anyone who has read Peter Gay or Walter Laqueur on the history of the Weimar Republic would agree that there are dangers to democracy in an excess of elitist attack. A variant of the Jacksonian principle of democratic government is involved here.

Whether or not ordinary men are capable of carrying out any governmental task whatsoever, ordinary men are going to be given such tasks. That is what it means to be a democracy. We had best not get our expectations too far out of line with what is likely to happen, and we had best not fall into the habit of measuring all performance by the often quite special tastes, preferences, and interests of a particular intellectual and social elite. (Perhaps most importantly, we must be supersensitive to the idea that if things are not working out well it is because this particular elite is not in charge. Consider the course of events that led to the war in Indochina.)

As to the press itself, one thing seems clear. It should become much more open about acknowledging mistakes. The *Times* should have printed Dr. Henderson's letter. Doubtless the bane of any editor is the howling of politicians and other public figures claiming to have been misquoted. But often they are misquoted. At the very least, should not more space be allotted to rebuttals and exchanges in which the issue at hand is how the press performed?

Another possibility is for each newspaper to keep a critical eye on itself. In the article previously cited which he did for the *Sunday Times Magazine*, A. H. Raskin called for "a Department of Internal Criticism" in every paper "to put all its standards under re-examination and to serve as a public protection in its day-to-day operations." The *Times* itself has yet to establish such a department but the *Washington Post* has recently set a welcome example here by inaugurating a regular editorial-page feature by Richard Harwood entitled "The News Business." Harwood's business is to check up on what his paper runs, and he is finding a good deal to check up on. (To all editors: Please understand there is nothing wrong with this. It is a routine experience of even the most advanced sciences. Perhaps especially of such.) Harwood has made a useful distinction between mistakes of detail—the ordinary garbles and slips of a fast-moving enterprise—and mistakes of judgment about the nature of events:

"The mistakes that are more difficult to fix are those that arise out of our selection and definition of the news. Often we are unaware of error until much time has passed and much damage has been done.

"In retrospect, it seems obvious that the destructive phenomenon called "McCarthyism"—the search in the 1950's for witches, scapegoats, traitors—was a product of this kind of error. Joseph McCarthy, an obscure and mediocre senator from Wisconsin, was transformed into the Grand Inquisitor by publicity. And there was no way later for the newspapers of America to repair that damage, to say on the morning after: 'We regret the error.'"

Which will turn out "in retrospect" to seem the obvious errors of the 1960's? There were many, but they are past. The question now is what might be the errors of the 1970's, and whether some can be avoided. One Richard Harwood does not a professional

<sup>6</sup> "The Role of the Intellectuals," February 1971.

upheaval make, but he marks a profoundly important beginning. All major journals should have such a man in a senior post, and very likely he should have a staff of reporters to help him cover "the news business."

As for government itself, there is not much to be done, but there is something. It is perfectly clear that the press will not be intimidated. Specific efforts like President Kennedy's to get David Halberstam removed as a *Times* correspondent in Vietnam almost always fail, as they deserve to do.<sup>7</sup> Non-specific charges such as those leveled by Vice President Agnew get nowhere either. They come down to an avowal of dislike, which is returned in more than ample measure, with the added charge that in criticizing the press the government may be trying to intimidate it, which is unconstitutional.

What government can do and should do is respond in specific terms to what it believes to be misstatements or mistaken emphases; it should address these responses to specific stories in specific papers and it should expect that these will be printed (with whatever retort the journal concerned wishes to make). Misrepresentations of government performance must never be allowed to go unchallenged. The notion of a "one-day story," and the consoling idea that yesterday's papers are used to wrap fish, are pernicious and wrong. Misinformation gets into the bloodstream and has consequences.

The *Times* ought by now to have had a letter from the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission pointing out the mistakes in the November 15 story on minority employment, and the even more important omissions. If the first letter was ignored, he should have sent another. Similarly the *Times* ought long since have had a letter from an HEW official exposing the errors of its coverage of federal aid to black colleges. Failing that, someone should have called in the education writers of the *Times* and asked why they let other men misreport their beat. Etc. Hamilton's formulation has not been bettered: the measure of effective government is energy in the executive.

In the end, however, the issue is not one of politics but of cloture. The culture of disparagement that has been so much in evidence of late, that has attained such an astonishing grip on the children of the rich and the mighty, and that has exerted an increasing influence on the tone of the national press in its dealings with the national government, is bad news for democracy. Some while ago the late Richard Hofstadter foresaw what has been happening:

"Perhaps we are really confronted with two cultures (not Snow's), whose spheres are increasingly independent and more likely to be conflicting than to be benignly convergent: a massive adversary culture on the one side, and the realm of socially responsible criticism on the other."

But given what has been happening to the press in recent years and what is likely to go on being the case if current trends should continue on their present path, where is such "socially responsible criticism" to come from? Or rather, where is it to appear in a manner that will inform and influence the course of public decision-making?

[From Commentary Magazine, July 1971]

LETTERS FROM READERS: THE PRESS AND THE PRESIDENT

TO THE EDITOR OF COMMENTARY:

Daniel P. Moynihan was most kind and generous in his reference to me in "The Presidency & the Press" [March]. But the more I studied the article, the more troubled I became by his rather sweeping and unpleasant generalizations. And the more

<sup>7</sup> See Halberstam's account of the incident in "Getting the Story in Vietnam," COMMENTARY, January 1965.

I studied his particular complaints against the *New York Times*, the more I found him to be confusing a most serious and difficult problem with trivial, inadequate, and basically unfair criticism. My first impulse was to ignore him—benignly.

But others found the specific charges against the *Times's* performance to be so serious that they required either public confession or rebuttal. This led to a most wasteful examination of the more frivolous aspects of the indictment. If, in what follows, the more substantial parts of Mr. Moynihan's essay are not treated as fully as I would like, we at least share the blame.

First, about the two horror stories from the *Times*.

The story on November 15, 1970, about blacks seeking tougher equality standards in the Civil Service, was by no fair standard a crusade for the blacks, an attack on the Nixon administration, a campaign for racial quotas or for anything else. As Mr. Moynihan himself noted, the story was in fact friendly to the administration. It recorded the blacks' complaints about jobs and promotion to senior jobs "under either party." It said that few critics of hiring and promotion practices would have the government establish formal racial quotas and found most of them acknowledging that movement, although slow, is occurring under the present system. If that was the work of a reporter who wished to make things look worse than they are, as the article suggested, then I am naive and Mr. Moynihan is clairvoyant.

The only concrete complaint here was that our reporter did not choose to write about something she was not writing about—the Postal Service and non-Civil Service categories of federal employment. Adding those statistics, it is argued, would have shown blacks occupying a relatively larger share of all government jobs. I believe they also should have shown blacks getting a still smaller share of senior and supervisory positions. To pick that fault in one sentence of a long and commendably judicious article suggests to me that Mr. Moynihan wants not only reasonably sophisticated renderings of a situation but positive help in defeating all complaints from blacks, militant or otherwise. If we erred at all, it was in accepting the employment figures of several departments that we now have reason to believe exaggerated the status of blacks. (The further petty complaint that our reporter had the black population "estimated in the 1970 census as 12.9 per cent"—whereas Mr. Moynihan knew the "official census figures" to have shown 12.4 per cent—deserves a petty answer: both numbers are wrong, but at least our reporter properly labeled hers as an estimate. The "official" figure, when finally produced, was 11.2 per cent. In Mr. Moynihan's language, this would justify the scoffing remark that nagging academicians "routinely make such mistakes.")

In any case, I fail to understand what place this story and critique has in what attempts to be a serious and broadly philosophical discussion of journalism. It proves nothing about our business, good or bad, not even that our reporters are more vulnerable to one type of propaganda and statistical juggling than another. Ideally, of course, every such story is not a matching of claims and complaints, charges and responses, but a scientific and independent analysis of a question. It could be argued that we should never report either what critics say or what defenders retort, but only what we ourselves have established to our own satisfaction as irrefutably true, not only in fact but in spirit. We would have a very thin newspaper; perhaps none at all.

The second complaint about the *Times* is more complicated and points to some interesting sins of commission and omission both at the *Times* and in the administration.

Overall, I will let others decide which are the more serious.

The criticisms, in chronological order:

(1) That we did not report the "somewhat garbled" numbers Robert Finch disclosed on July 23, 1970 at the briefing on the Heard report, about some additional aid for black colleges.

(2) That we did not carry the press release dated August 11, 1970, in which the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education welcomed this "excellent first step," termed it not adequate, but looked hopefully for more in the future.

(3) That on September 14, 1970 we did carry and feature on page one a story about the presidents of nine Negro colleges charging the administration with neglect and insensitivity.

(4) That we did not print a letter from one of the above presidents complaining that he had been misquoted in the "lack of sensitivity" remark, commending the President for responding with \$27 million in additional funds, and describing that response as "limited."

(5) That we carried another front-page story from the Associated Press on October 2, 1970, reporting that HEW Secretary Elliott Richardson disclosed a \$30-million increase in aid as Nixon's response to appeals from Negro educators.

(6) That we again referred to the blacks' complaints and criticism of the President in a story on January 3, 1971, reporting their inability to draw on much of the new aid because they could not meet the matching requirement.

In order:

(1) Bob Semple's superb story on the Heard report did not include the sneaky and "garbled" announcement of some new aid for black colleges, even though it dealt with the report's discussion of black colleges by Alexander Heard and James Cheek. Why not? Semple does not know. He suspects that when the 40-page Heard report was dumped on reporters at 4:30 that afternoon, he felt compelled to delve into it so quickly that he either ran off to the office or sat through the briefing without really listening to the addenda.

Let us be very straight here about the order and magnitude of sins. The Heard report was not to the liking of the administration and it was shoveled out late one afternoon to complicate the life of any reporter who might wish to deal with it in a big or careful way. As Mr. Moynihan remarks, the news about some new money for black colleges was thrown in "to strike a positive note about the Heard-Cheek effort"; or, as I would have put it, thrown in to undermine even further the attention that might be given to Heard's major conclusions. It was thrown in hastily and sloppily, not for the purpose of informing the public in a careful way but to serve the propaganda purposes of the White House. And the figures given out were not "somewhat garbled." They were wrong.

I can regret Semple's oversight without in the slightest faulting him.

Had Mr. Moynihan chosen to list his complaints against us in a straightforward chronological order, *the entire episode*, and all the stories that troubled him would have been seen to follow from this very cheap stunt. (In truth, I did not expect, in looking into his complaints, to find such a good example of the reasons for our mistrust of government, and of the White House in particular.)

But let us also tally up our mutual sins of omission.

I can find no evidence that Ziegler, or Finch, or anyone else at that meeting set out the next morning to call our attention to the fact that we had missed what the White House regarded as an important story. Indeed, I find no evidence that anyone apolo-

gized for issuing the wrong figures or tried to set the record straight. (The wrong Finch figures remain wrong in the weekly compilation of Presidential documents.) What a lovely opportunity to summon the reporters and apologize for misleading them, cheering the good fortune that they had overlooked the garbled announcement, and inviting them to treat it fully and accurately on the second bounce! Should I conclude that hardly anyone gave a damn now that there was no longer any need to deflate Heard?

If the White House felt it important to get the story into print, it surely did not lack the means or know-how.

Later that year, in ignoring Heard's very explicit advice and setting out to make political capital of campus disturbances, the President and his aides showed themselves to be very skillful indeed in getting their message across. And when two stones were thrown in the direction of the President's car in Vermont—out of sight of most of the reporters in his party—Ziegler and Company showed extraordinary zeal and imagination in making certain that the news reached the nation, over and over again. My point is—and it relates to the essay's larger question about the balance of forces between press and government—that a President demonstrably has no difficulty publicizing any news or attitudes about which he feels strongly.

(2) I do not know anything about the press release of August 11, 1970, except Mr. Moynihan's brief quotation from it. In a sense, I am glad we did not encounter it, for the chances are fifty-fifty that a story about the reaction of the black educators would have combined their expression of gratitude with their complaints of inadequacy, and only deepened Mr. Moynihan's anger.

He may feel free to run down the group's motives by suggesting that their verdict of insufficiency was delivered not from the facts but from "the accepted and understood manner of interest groups." But we usually feel compelled to stop short of such a public judgment. (Should we have reported the famous Moynihan farewell address as a statement "in the manner of departing White House officials who want to retain some influence with the boss"? I thought it more than that, but others clearly did not.)

Anyhow, two days before the distribution of that press release, on August 9, 1970, the *Times* devoted one-and-a-half columns, which were featured with a picture on page one, to an interview with Robert Brown, the only black aide on the White House staff. The story, by Paul Delaney, covered Brown's review of the full range of Mr. Nixon's relations with blacks. Brown said things were getting better, both because the President had become "much more sensitive" to the problems of blacks and because he had decided to do something about it. Brown said Mr. Nixon was especially stung by some of the harshest charges of Negro leaders. (He was, as portrayed by his aide, *responding!*)

And lo, the last third of the story dwelt on the President's "immediate concern" for getting more federal money for black colleges. And at the very end of the story—appropriately for the kind of story it was, though not the kind of headline announcement the White House could have fashioned—was the news that the Department of Health, Education and Welfare had increased the allocation for black schools. The figures were there, though still not clearly enough, because it was a little hard to tell whether the administration was redirecting \$120 million in new aid or merely redirecting some money to raise the total from \$87.2 million to \$120 million. But the ambiguity was in the administration's favor, and as far as I can tell we still did not receive a clarifying call from the White House.

Nor have we had any complaints about our willingness to feature Mr. Brown's representation of Presidential attitudes about blacks. His account was not "balanced" in every other paragraph with demands for courtroom evidence, nor with recollections of the Carswell episode and other relevant clues to policy. It was not a definitive study of Nixon-Negro relations. The only detours from Brown's comments, after he talked of "more and more" meetings with blacks, were to cite the case of the rebuffed black Congressmen and to record the President's two visits to black communities. All in all, a very one-sided account that neither brought nor merited any complaint.

It might have had a small mention, however, in Mr. Moynihan's review of our coverage last summer, though I suspect it would have virtually exploded his whole argument with us. Here we were doing for his side of the case exactly what he deplored our having done for the other side.

(3) The story about the charges by nine presidents of Negro colleges, by James Wooten from Chicago, was by all accounts a fair and accurate rendering of the mood and substance of their meeting. I gather Mr. Moynihan does not dispute this. They were complaining about the federal government, about the churches, about American society, about the inadequacy of financial help, and about the inappropriateness of the help that was available. They used strong language. If they had mentioned the increased aid offered them by the administration, they would clearly have denounced it as inadequate and in no way erased the effect of the story. I do not know how much of their rhetoric came from a feeling of genuine despair and how much was meant merely to earn credentials among more militant constituents. I would guess that both motives were involved.

The fact that they chose to speak in that fashion, justifiably or not, is legitimate news. At least as legitimate as the Brown interview. News, as treated in our society, is not the same as *truth*, though it should always be *true*. The truth is cumulative and rarely discernible on any given day; it embraces motivation and consequence. Newspapers should cumulatively test the news for truth, but they cannot reasonably do so every day and with every story. We are, alas, a forum, not an almanac.

We could argue whether the Wooten story deserved to be on page one. Perhaps not, although this raises a still further question of distortions due to the relative value of any day's developments. These are all profound and difficult questions that our craft must face, and in some cases is facing most seriously.

But when all is said and done we must make value judgments. Mr. Moynihan's logic propels him to the claim that a black man yelling "help" in America today should be treated journalistically as we all now wish we had treated a demagogic Senator yelling "traitor." He is saying that his every assertion should be drained of its emotional purpose and forced to meet the standards of courtroom evidence, or else be played down or even ignored.

Philosophically and politically, he is wrong. A pressure group for neglected citizens, even when it demands exaggerated attention and reparation, is not the same as an organized and officially protected goon-squad attacking individual liberties. The balance of power between the heads of black colleges and the Nixon administration is not the balance that prevailed between Joe McCarthy and his victims. (There is, alas, more similarity between the latter and what many blacks did to my friend Pat Moynihan a few years ago. He was a victim of McCarthyism. But not Nixon. I would hope that despite Mr. Moynihan's wounds he could still recognize the difference.)

It all really does come down to his enormous pity for our poor and enfeebled Presidency! How glad I am that he will now have a chance to observe it from the outside and to amend his thoughts of who is strong and who is weak in our society.

(4) We did not print Vivian Henderson's letter complaining about misquotation because of our certainty that he had not been misquoted and the further judgment that he was trying to attribute error to us so as to ameliorate the morning-after consequences of his remark. (The story, in any case, and even by Henderson's testimony, would not have been altered by the omission of his remark.) He did not press us to print the letter and has told Wooten he didn't care whether we printed it or not.

Here again there lies a larger question for the press that touches on the wider meaning of the essay. We do need to provide more space where readers and persons in the news can extend, explain, and correct views and facts attributed to them in the news columns. Slowly, our profession is moving in that direction. But I fear the judgments made in this case will still have to be made in that new space. And once again we would face the question of relative power—whether the President's claim on such space, considering his opportunities to make known his views and propaganda, should be equal to the claims of weaker groups and citizens. I don't think so.

(5) The AP story about Richardson's "disclosure" of \$30-million more in aid for black colleges did, finally, get that fact out on page one. I cannot locate the material on which the story was based, but I doubt that Richardson clearly explained that the new money had actually been made available and announced *ten weeks earlier*. The administration was not responding to the Chicago complaints but it *was* responding, as the story said, to the appeals of blacks.

(6) The final story, by Paul Delaney of the *Times'* Washington bureau, reported that the new money did not, after all, do much to meet the needs of the colleges. It does not accuse anyone of perjury or trickery. It cites a sad misunderstanding about what the new money could achieve. And it reports the black educators still dissatisfied with the amount of help they have been given.

Mr. Moynihan may have a quarrel with their view. He doesn't have much of a quarrel with that story, nor should he have.

What, then, are we really dealing with here? By his own account, a group organized (early?) in 1969 and received at the White House in October 1969, asked for urgent help. A study was commissioned and a preliminary report was delivered to the White House in February 1970. A fuller report was "printed"—though not publicized?—in June, by which time, Cambodia being Cambodia, and Kent and Jackson State being what they were, there had been another meeting between the President and black college presidents and James Cheek, working with Heard, on temporary White House assignment. And it was when *their* reports, so disappointing to the President and others, had to be published in July that there was rushed out an announcement about some more money for the black colleges, which we were late to report but which in the end, or at least so far, hasn't helped them very much. And the *Times*—no, the whole system of journalism—is roasted by Mr. Moynihan for not dealing intelligently with the issue!

Now to the central point, which I take to be Mr. Moynihan's anguish about a reversal in the "old balance of power" between President and press. He thinks the press is well on the way to upsetting that "balance" to the detriment of effective government.

I found it odd, and negligent, that he never even attempted to define either the *old* balance of power or *any* balance that he deems desirable. This makes it a rather difficult thesis to rebut, especially after he gets

through conceding the President's "near limitless capacity" to make news, to dominate events of public concern, to reward friends and punish enemies (and not only in the press corps), and to carry off "formidable deceptions." He can, of course, do much more. He can exhort, rally, and inspire. He can ruin and degrade. He can breathe life into American attitudes and, often, institutions. Or he can distort and discard them. And surely at the apex of anyone's list of Presidential powers is the power to make war, nuclear war, ten-year war, undeclared war, unchecked war, unpopular war, holy war, or pointless war. (If some of our historians are correct in suggesting that the Hearst and Pulitzer press were once able to goad or frighten the country and its President into war, then it would seem that there has been, indeed, a most remarkable shift in the balance of power, though hardly in the direction Mr. Moynihan suggests.)

But if I read the story correctly, he is not even talking about the collective, though incoherent, power of the press and the television. He is talking largely about the dangerous power of the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post*. This is flattering, but hardly persuasive. The great majority of black citizens, whose thoughts he wishes to protect from their own leaders and agitators, do not read either of those newspapers. The papers that they read, across the country, would probably score quite well on his special loyalty test. As for television, I will let him decide, after some months in civilian life, whether it favors the champions of the space program or its critics, whether it is dominated by the ethics of our President or those of his critics, whether on balance it proclaims the old American and governmental virtues, or the virtues of what he calls, in Lionel Trilling's phrase, the "adversary culture."

But all right. It is the *Eastern* press that is threatening us. How?

Point one is that our muckraking tradition has fallen into the hands of a new breed of reporter of middle- and upper-class background, Ivy League, elitist. In Washington, this group constitutes a *social elite*, "with all the accoutrements one associates with a leisured class." We are not leisured, he quickly notes, but our "style is that of men and women who choose to work." And the political consequence of this social status is that "the press grows more and more influenced by attitudes genuinely hostile to American society and American government." And the evidence for this is that we have been brainwashed by the "moral absolutism" of George Wald!

Others have taken this absurd standard of pedigree and tallied the preponderance of non-Ivy degrees in the upper reaches of the Washington press corps. Still others, indeed, have noted with a little more relevance that the upper reaches are, in fact, dominated by the "silent generation" that was allegedly cowed into docility in the era of Eisenhower and Joe McCarthy. As for the "charges" of social elitism and our "style of leisure"—these really would have been better expressed if he had simply repeated, "effete snobs."

But how very odd that, in a paragraph devoted to the debunking of moral absolutism—in which Mr. Moynihan complains that people call the Vietnam war shameful instead of tragic, heartbreaking, or misconceived—he would dare to characterize the attitudes of reporters in the press not as wrong, or tragic, or misconceived, but as "hostile to American society and American government." Wow! Let's make it effete and un-American snobs.

We are, of course, guilty of having switched, over the last generation, to a more educated corps of reporters, if only to keep up with the credentials and footwork of the holders of public office (and our new critics). The

fact is that we are not nearly smart enough yet to cope with the scientific, technological, pseudo-sociological expertise that is peddled to the public by both the government and its critics. And it is a further fact, and perhaps one of the most enduring attractions of our business, that any bright lad of proletarian or other origin can rid himself of the social and hierarchical pressures of our society to participate, as a journalist, in the political process of our country.

(I found it quaint, by the way, that the witnesses summoned against our new elitists were of such clearly non-Eastern and proletarian pedigree as Roger Starr, Lionel Trilling, Thomas E. Cronin, James Q. Wilson, Seymour Martin Lipset, Nathan Glazer, Irving Kristol. Shouldn't we all start printing our colleges beside our names, to facilitate such analysis?)

It is also true, and more relevant to the essay's point, that there are among some of the newest recruits to our business young men and women who are impatient with the "objective" or, more accurately, "neutral" standards of journalism to which their elders aspired. Some of them share Mr. Moynihan's sense of that standard's inadequacy and wish to adjust it. A few of them are impatient with any standard that would prevent them from placing their own views before the public. It is an important subject and an interesting debate that news writers have conducted periodically over the decades. More of this in sequence.

Point two suggests that along with hostility toward the Presidency we purvey an absurdly inflated picture of the President's importance and ability to influence events, thus setting a tone of pervasive dissatisfaction with the performance of government, under any President. The *Times* and the *Post* are particularly guilty here, it is argued, because Mr. Moynihan agrees with my contention that a newspaper is as much influenced by those who read it as vice versa.

This is apples and oranges.

We Americans do have an exaggerated expectation of our Presidents and only a handful of them ever fulfill their own promise and boast, even in hindsight. Such is the power and aura of this office that a politician, no matter how poorly regarded over the years, how often suspected and vilified and run down, can assume the office and earn at once not just what you call a "honeymoon" period of grace but a new reputation for nobility and intelligence. And when he begins in lofty manner, promising to heal some of the nation's wounds and to lower his voice, he is made to feel welcome and given the chance to appear as he wishes to appear before his countrymen. The press reflects these expectations of the public and records the efforts of our Presidents and Presidential candidates to nurture them. This faith is either an element of Presidential power, to be cherished and applied with skill by those who can, or it is a terrible burden, as Mr. Moynihan would have it.

If it is a burden, then only a President who insists from the start that he does not know everything, cannot change too much, and will aspire only to a modest program of action can correct the nation's view. How about a President who will work for a year of peace at a time, instead of a generation? Or one who begins by saying that a new Attorney General will not solve much of our crime problem? Or one who tells us how many loafers there really are on welfare and how much more sophisticated he has become once in office, about the "welfare mess"?

We do try to match promise against performance and cumulatively we manage, I think, to draw a pretty good portrait of the strengths and weaknesses of the Presidency and any particular occupant thereof. But those who find the underlying truths obscured, must begin by noting not the power

for occasional deception in the White House but the *habit of regular* deception in our politics and administration.

By and large, it is the President and the federal government who establish the agenda of public discussion and they must choose whether their purpose shall be uplifting and educational or merely manipulative. It is the damnable tendency toward manipulation that forces us so often into the posture of apparent adversaries.

We have indeed progressively lost our naïveté about the truthfulness of Presidents and government, starting with the U-2 affair a decade ago. A. J. Liebling found the awakening after U-2 to be the "beginning of wisdom" in the country and in the press. We lost the habit of reporting as fact what was only a contention or claim of our highest officials. And there is nothing in the record of the current administration, ten years later, to break us of the new habit of treating virtually every official utterance as a carefully contrived rendering that needs to be examined for the missing word or phrase, the sly use of statistics, the slippery syntax or semantics. Planes fly to "interdict supplies" but not in support of combat infantry, until such support becomes an "ancillary" benefit and until, finally, it becomes exposed as the real purpose of the flights. Troops do not engage in "ground combat" as long as they hover *two feet above the ground* in helicopters. Estimates of the gross national product turn out, within weeks, to be only targets.

If this shift from simple credulity to informed skepticism is the change of balance Mr. Moynihan deplures, then I plead guilty.

He will have to take it on faith that we practice this skepticism not in the spirit of persecution or prosecution, but from a sense of wishing to serve our readers with reports of what is really going on. I will not deny that, once discovered, governmental trickery in and of itself often becomes more "newsworthy" than the report itself. But a President or government dedicated to truth-telling and eager to inform the public could very rapidly turn the wolves of the press into lambs.

My contention that readers shape a newspaper as much as it shapes them bears on this, but only indirectly.

Our skepticism *does* reflect that of our readers and it is mutually reinforcing. As George Reedy so wisely reflected in thinking back on his tour as President Johnson's press secretary, "The reality is that a President has no press problems (except for a few minor administrative technicalities), but he does have political problems, all of which are reflected in their most acute form by the press."

A few more excerpts from Reedy's *The Twilight of the Presidency*:

"There is a deep-seated human tendency to confuse unhappy news with unhappy events and to assume that if the news can be altered, so can the events.

"In reality, the problem of a President in dealing with the press is precisely the same as his problem in dealing with the public at large. But no President can find it within his ego to concede that he has failed in any degree with the public. It is far more satisfying to blame his failures on the press because his problems then can be attributed to a conspiracy. He can blame the "Eastern press," the "Republican press," or the "liberal press." He then does not stand indicted within his own consciousness (the most terrible court of all) as having failed."

We reflect, or refract, but we do not simply create skepticism or dissatisfaction.

But I was speaking in a still larger sense. What is it, I asked, that makes newspapers accept some value judgments and not others? Why do we write in a different spirit about

one kind of crime, say simple murder, than we do about another, say civil disobedience? Why do Northern and Western newspapers write, unquestionably, from the point of view of those who regard official segregation as not only illegal but also wrong, while some Southern newspapers give the racist equal standing in the court of opinion?

This is how I came to my answer that we are mutually influenced by the attitudes and values of our communities. The newspaper that is candidly written from the viewpoint of the home folks finds nothing wrong in sports coverage that is candidly partisan for the home team. But when the teams in contention are from the same community, the coverage suddenly turns "neutral." Why? Because the community is divided. We covered World War II from the partisan viewpoint of the Allies. Not so, by and large, the war in Vietnam. We did not, on a large scale, question or ignite debate on the crossing of the 38th Parallel in Korea in 1950, but we did examine and feed controversy on the bombing across the 17th Parallel in Vietnam. Not because we alone decided that one war was more clearly just than another, or one frontier more inviolate than another, but because the communities to which we reported were divided on the issue of Vietnam in sufficient degree to alter our perspective.

If I am right, then the interconnection is quite different from the one Mr. Moynihan suggests. A President does not enhance his power to govern by converting a few reporters or selling them on his point of view. He will more likely gain the trust—if not always the active support—of the press by gaining the trust and confidence of the community.

Point three is that we are "fairly continuously" involved in the receipt of information passed to us by disloyal bureaucrats. Mr. Moynihan terms this as something "less than honorable" on our part, though he implies that receiving special information from bureaucrats who are "loyal" is okay. He says no one knows much about the process of "leaking" and that it has not been "studied."

Well, I know a great deal about it. The first thing that needs to be said is that the deliberate disclosure of information for the purpose of injuring the President is relatively rare. But what is rarer still is that such information finds its way into print without "the other side," whatever that may be in our judgment, being questioned about the matter and given a chance to discuss the deeper issues and even the motives of those who may have done the leaking. The great majority of deliberate "leaks" are not secret documents and papers, but guarded suggestions that a reporter look into a matter that he might otherwise neglect. More often than not, he is not even told what he will find.

And the absolute majority of unwanted "leaks" are not deliberate at all. They result from a diligent study of public papers and diligent inquiry among dozens of officials, with reporters carefully playing one set of clues against another, until they find a part of what they seek. Most of these officials make themselves available not because they wish to abet the effort but because over time they have found their accessibility to be desirable for loyal purposes. It is true that in this process, when reporters have some interesting facts, but by no means all the facts, and find themselves shut out by government, they will then publish what they know for the purpose of lighting a fire that will smoke out a good deal more. For even when a first, unwanted story is incomplete or superficial, if it touches on an important subject, it will almost always arouse the attention and curiosity of other reporters who will, together, move it much closer to the essence of the tale.

Yet even if deliberate "leaking" were as harmful as Mr. Moynihan suggests, is it his contention that the press should ignore such information and pretend it was never received? That would be an interesting discussion indeed.

Point four deals with the "rub" that he finds adhering to our concept of objectivity. It comes, he observes, "when a decision has to be made as to whether an event really is news, or simply a happening, a non-event staged for the purpose of getting into the papers or onto the screen." (I note that television has been allowed back into the defendant's box.)

It is not the experience with Joe McCarthy that should be used to instruct us on this point. We were deficient in treating him—in part because we reflected and responded to the deficiency and gullibility of our communities—but as long as men who remember that experience are alive, we will probably apply the lessons learned.

The difficulty comes in the way in which Mr. Moynihan states the problem: "simply a happening, a non-event staged for the purpose of getting into the papers." A quarter of a million persons marching on the White House? A series of "teach-ins"? An agitator yelling "burn"? A Vice President attacking the papers (and the screen)? Lee Harvey Oswald? The quest for recognition, to be heard, to be noticed, to be heeded—it often takes the form of a happening staged for the purpose of getting into the papers, but it is rarely "simply" that in either motivation or consequence.

The problem for thoughtful journalism is that we can never be sure about motivation and we certainly cannot know consequence. And in some small measure, at least, we know that we contribute to consequence. These are horrendous problems and we lose sleep over them, but they are not solved by the automatic assumption in our editorial suites of the absolute power to decide that Moynihan deserves to be heard, and another man does not. And has he thought about the agitator who may be encouraged in his extremism because he finds it to be "newsworthy"? What would he do to project his cause and gain attention for himself if he were shut out of the news? Burn, perhaps, instead of only shouting "burn"?

Point five raises the "absence of a professional tradition of self-correction." In one sense, of course, we correct ourselves every morning, a requirement and an opportunity that most other institutions, including the Presidency, lack.

Mr. Moynihan's evidence does not make this point very well, but there is need, in another sense, for more correction or expansion and amendment of what we report. Persons who figure in our news coverage do occasionally need more space to explain their points of view or involvement in affairs than is provided in existing columns for guest-writers and Letters to the Editor. And clearly the need is greater in some papers than others. But as I suggested earlier, such opportunity for correction is rarely denied to the White House men of power—or presumed power—are able to make their views known, almost by definition. It is ordinary citizens, sometimes, of late, including the editors of the Eastern press, who require an outlet.

If our Presidents are seriously concerned about "protracted conflict" with a large enough segment of our population and genuinely believe, with Mr. Moynihan, that they are steadily losing that conflict, they had better look well beyond the bearers of the bad news and certainly well beyond the morning paper. They might even look in a mirror.

MAX FRANKEL,  
The New York Times.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

MR. PETE BARKER—THE ICEMAN  
STILL COMETH

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 16, 1971

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, not all of the changes that come under the heading of "progress" are necessarily improvements. Sometimes we miss some of the institutions of the old days that disappear with passing time—like the iceman.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that in my home city of Louisville, there is still an iceman. Mr. Jess D. Barker, whose friends call him Pete, still makes his rounds in his truck as an independent iceman, as he has since 1939. "Long as people want to buy ice," he says, "I'm ready to give it to 'em."

Eugene O'Neill wrote a play a few years back entitled "The Iceman Cometh." In Louisville, at least between Oak and Main and Jackson and Seventh Streets, the iceman still cometh.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point an article by Bill Holstein of the Louisville Times, entitled, appropriately, "Still Chipping Away."

The article follows:

[From the Louisville Times, July 7, 1971]

RANKS OF THE ICEMAN ARE MELTING, BUT  
HERE'S ONE—"STILL CHIPPING AWAY"

(By Bill Holstein)

The iceman, who used to deliver ice to nearly every home and business before the advent of refrigeration, is a passing phenomenon. There are only a handful of independent icemen left in Louisville.

Jess D. (Pete) Barker, a wiry 55-year-old bachelor, is one of them.

He has been delivering ice most of his life and has been an independent iceman since 1939 except for a six-year stint in military service.

Barker, an emphatic, talkative man, covers his territory between Oak and Main streets and between Jackson and Seventh streets with hustle and amiability.

"Hey buddy, how are ya?" he often greets customers.

"I'm hot," one replies.

"Yeah," Barker says, "but it makes good business."

The pre-World War II days were the heyday of the independent delivery iceman, he says. Since then, the ice companies have emphasized delivering prepackaged bags of cubed or crushed ice with refrigerated trucks to vending machines—not homes or businesses.

Barker delivers ice in quantities ranging from 25 pounds to more than 300 pounds to his customers—corner grocery stores, restaurants, bar and grills, the haymarket, factories, construction jobs, florists and even a few homes.

STARTS AT 7:30 A.M.

His day starts about 7:30 a.m. at the Grocer's Ice & Cold Storage Co. at 609 E. Main, where he loads his open pickup truck with five 300-pound blocks of ice. The ice begins to melt soon after he puts it on the truck with the water trickling off. Later in the day, he comes back to pick up a bigger load of both cubed and block ice.

When he makes a stop, Barker jumps into the back of the truck with an ice pick and ice hooks. With the sharp point of his ice

hook, he marks off a 50-pound section of the block and with deft jabs of his ice pick separates the two pieces.

Barker, 5-foot-8 and 125 pounds, drapes a canvas over his shoulder and lugs it through the side or back entrances of the businesses he serves. He hustles past signs that read, "Employees only—all others please keep out."

"I do damn near what I please in these places, don't I?" he quipped.

Barker stops at factories where the heat inside makes them 15 or 20 degrees warmer than the 90-degree weather outside. He packs 25 or 30 pounds of ice around the coils of the water coolers, insisting that the ice-cooled water stays colder longer than the water in the electrically-cooled fountains.

#### SEES HIS ICE USED

He sees the behind-the-scenes activity of the businesses he serves. He sees the waitresses put his cubed ice in the water glasses for customers. He sees the florist use the ice to keep rosebuds from blooming too soon.

"But it's like anything else. You do anything every day and it's just routine. That's all," he said.

The area that Barker serves has changed. Where mostly apartment buildings, homes and small factories once stood, high-rise buildings and expressways have changed the landscape considerably.

"Now, of course, they all have refrigerators—the houses that are still standing, that is," he said.

But ice is still being bought in quantity. Barker sold about 3,400 pounds of ice one day last week even though business was slightly off for this time of year considering the 90-degree weather.

Even though the haymarket is one business area that's declined in recent years, that's the stop where Barker says he does the most business.

Barker chipped ice with his pick and spread it over corn that was stacked in burlap bags waiting to be sold, to keep the kernels soft and fresh. The rest of the ice was put in coolers to chill watermelons—and a bottle of raisin jack wine.

#### LOOKS AT THE FUTURE

He talked about the future of the ice business.

"Let's put it this way, buddy. As long as I can make a decent living out of it and don't have no doggone boss or anything, I'm satisfied," he says.

And, too, he's not about to quit.

"Long as people want to buy ice, I'm ready to give it to 'em," he says.

But his customers back him up. They can call him at the ice factory in the afternoon if they need ice. Even the customers who have ice machines say they need the quick, dependable service that Barker provides.

"Whenever my ice machine breaks down, I always call him because I know I can get service just like that," I. H. Moore, food service director at Medcenter, said, snapping his fingers.

Moore's ice machine had overheated in the warm weather and had broken down. He called Barker.

"Aren't many places in town you can get service like that?"

### FEDERAL FINANCES AND PROPOSALS FOR REVENUE SHARING

#### HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 16, 1971

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the June 29 edition of the Tulsa, Okla.,

World included an excellent editorial on the subject of Federal finances and the proposals for revenue sharing.

The editorial cites my recent comment that there is a major unanswered question in connection with revenue sharing; namely, where is the revenue to come from?

For the 2 fiscal years 1971 and 1972, the total deficit in Federal funds will be—by the administration's own admission—in excess of \$55 billion. Both the Federal funds deficit for 1972 and the total deficit for the 2-year period are at an all-time high since World War II.

In this situation, I do not see where the revenue for sharing with the States and localities is going to come from.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial, "What 'Revenue' Sharing?" be printed in the Extensions of Remarks. The editor of the Tulsa World is Jenkin Lloyd Jones.

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

#### WHAT "REVENUE" SHARING?

Is the volume of pro-and-con rhetoric over the revenue-sharing proposals before Congress so much wasted effort?

As a matter of fact, will there be any revenue to share?

This last question has been raised by Sen. HARRY BYRD, D-Va., a supporter of the programs. He says: "Amid all the talks of revenue sharing, I would like to have someone answer the very pertinent and crucial question of where the revenue is to come from. The plain and grim fact is the Federal government does not have any revenue to share. It is greatly in debt. It is in the hole by \$25 billion in this fiscal year, and headed for an estimated \$25 billion deficit in the coming fiscal year.

"And, on top of that, the government has a national debt approaching \$400 billion. On that debt alone, the American taxpayers are paying interest at the rate of \$21 billion a year. It is also very relevant to point out that from May 1970 to May 1971, a one-year period, the national debt increased by \$25 billion."

The \$21 billion in annual interest on the national debt is approximately one-tenth of the budget. Actually, this item is a giant debt within an astronomical debt.

#### REPRESENTATIVE CHARLOTTE REID IS A GOOD CHOICE FOR THE FCC

#### HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, President Nixon named our colleague, Representative CHARLOTTE REID for a 7-year term with the FCC.

Although my fellow colleagues of the Illinois delegation and I are sad to lose our most glamorous Member, we are sure that her appointment will be a valuable addition to the Federal Communications Commission.

Since first coming to Congress in 1962, the gentlewoman from Illinois has proven herself to be a first-rate legislator and a untiring Representative for the residents of Illinois' 15th District. I am confident that she will carry enthusiasm and know-how to her difficult new assignment.

With permission, I would like to enter the following radio editorial into the RECORD, WBBM Newsradio—Broadcast July 10, 1971:

#### WBBM NEWSRADIO BROADCAST

President Nixon's choice of Congresswoman Charlotte Reid of Illinois to serve on the Federal Communications Commission seems to us to be a good selection. Mrs. Reid has served in Congress since 1963, representing the 15th District. She is now in her 5th term and has done a good job.

We think Mrs. Reid is a good choice because in 1965 she helped to lead a fight to open all government records to the public except those which deal with national security. And Mrs. Reid suggested that the security label be limited rather sharply.

Mrs. Reid has said for the record that she holds no preconceived stand on the broadcast media. Her mind is open. That is a good sign, because all too often people are appointed to the Federal Communications Commission with their minds already made up on controversial issues. In particular, Mrs. Reid is ready to hear both sides of the dispute between CBS and Congress.

The fact that Mrs. Reid hasn't made up her mind one way or the other on controversial broadcast issues is to be welcomed. It means she is ready to try and determine the truth in those matters.

WBBM supports the nomination of Mrs. Reid to the Federal Communications Commission. We believe her appointment would be a good thing. We hope that the Senate will act soon to confirm her appointment.

#### THE AMERICAN'S CREED

#### HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, since we have recently celebrated America's July 4 Independence Day with appropriate patriotic observances throughout the Nation, I think it fitting at this time to discuss what I consider to be one of the most significant contributions to America's patriotic heritage—"The American's Creed."

"The American's Creed" was written in 1917 by William Tyler Page as a contest entry. It was the winning entry of a widely advertised countrywide contest designed to promote the writing of a national creed which would briefly summarize American political faith and also embrace the fundamental things most distinctive in American history and tradition.

"The American's Creed" condenses into 100 words the concepts which have made America great and for which America stands. It is a concise and meaningful summary of the basic principle of American political faith as set forth in its most important historical documents, its worthiest traditions, and by its most respected national leaders. To me and to countless others who have received joy and inspiration through the mere reading of "The American's Creed," it truly condenses the substance of what being an American citizen really is.

Because, in my judgment, "The American's Creed" can never be repeated too often, I would like to share it with my

July 16, 1971

colleagues in the House at this point and before proceeding further:

I believe in the United States of America as a Government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign Nation of many sovereign States; a perfect union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it; to support its Constitution; to obey its laws; to respect its flag, and to defend it against all enemies.

Those of us in the U.S. House of Representatives can take particular pride in the fact that "The American's Creed" was written by a man who devoted 61 years of distinguished public service to the House of Representatives. William Tyler Page began his career with the House of Representatives in 1881 as a congressional page. After serving 5½ years as a page he became assistant file clerk in 1887. From that position he advanced to the positions of bill clerk in 1892, clerk of accounts in 1899, and pair clerk in 1913. In 1919 he began 13 years of service as the Clerk of the House.

During his 61-year career in the House of Representatives, William Tyler Page worked under 11 Presidents and 15 Speakers of the House. He earned the sincere respect of those he served and in the words of one of his biographers, Myrtle Cheney Murdock, "he became almost a legend of ability, courtesy, loyalty, and intellect among the Members of Congress."

Since 1917 William Tyler Page's Creed has instilled an historic perspective and love for country in countless American citizens. This has been accomplished largely through the commendable efforts of a number of patriotic organizations which have officially adopted "The American's Creed," recited it as part of their exercises, and worked toward its wide dissemination. Among these organizations, the Daughters of the American Revolution has officially designated the 3d day of April in each year to be known and observed as "American's Creed Day" among its chapters throughout the country.

One group which deserves particular recognition for its efforts in championing and furthering "The American's Creed" is the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America. The members of this fine organization, who bravely fought for their country so many years ago, give continuing evidence of their patriotism.

Through the World War I Veterans' American Creed program, copies of "The American's Creed" and its history have been made available to countless educational, civic, and other organizations throughout the country. As a Representative in the Congress from Alabama I would like to call particular attention to the fine efforts in this program of another Alabamian, Col. Henry C. Wood. Colonel Wood, of Birmingham, Ala., is chairman of the World War I Veterans' Americanism and Defense Committee and has devoted particular time and attention to the organization's American Creed program.

Colonel Wood was also involved in a further effort to focus the attention of more citizens on "The American's Creed." This particular effort involved the introduction in the State of Alabama House of Representatives of a resolution formally requesting "the President and the Congress of the United States of America to declare an American Creed Week, during which all citizens may be encouraged to examine, study, and abide by the tenets of the American Creed."

The above resolution was sponsored in the Alabama House by Representatives Raymond Weeks, Quinton R. Bowers, and Richard S. Manley. Through the commendable efforts of these three legislators, the resolution was adopted by the Alabama Legislature on April 27, 1971.

The Alabama resolution was brought to my attention by Colonel Wood in May of this year. Sharing his conviction, and that of the Alabama Legislature, regarding the meaningfulness and desirability of an American Creed Week, I was happy to follow through on May 26 with the introduction of appropriate legislation (H.J. Res. 667) in the U.S. House of Representatives.

This resolution authorizes the President to designate the first week in July of each year as "American Creed Week," and to urge all Americans to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

I commend House Joint Resolution 667 to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives and strongly urge its adoption.