

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECONFIRMATION OF FEDERAL  
JUDGES

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Newport News Times-Herald of September 9 included an excellent editorial on the proposal to amend the U.S. Constitution to provide for the periodic reconfirmation of Federal judges.

The editorial makes the point that the courts have engaged in sociological experiments and "have taken unto themselves the rights and responsibilities of a formerly free people."

I strongly agree with this statement. Reconfirmation of judges has been the policy in Virginia for many years. It has been successful, and there is no reason to suppose that it would not be successful at the Federal level. Almost every State in the Union requires the periodic reconfirmation, or in some cases the re-election, of State judges.

Only Federal judges have lifetime appointments.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial entitled "Looking At Judges" be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

## LOOKING AT JUDGES

In our concern over congressional approval of a constitutional amendment sharply restricting the lawmaking proclivities of the courts and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to bus youngsters all over the terrain, we must not overlook another proposed change in the Constitution being pushed by Virginia Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr.

Byrd, recognizing just exactly what's happening now that the judicial branch of government has emerged as an omnipotent five-man tribunal, untouchable by the people of this democracy, has sponsored an amendment that would require that all federal judges be reconfirmed every eight years as a check on their inclination to become dictators.

We have seen just about as much as we can stomach of the courts' baffling disregard of the demonstrated will of the people. We have seen how the courts have wrenched the laws which expressly forbid racial balance in our schools. We are seeing, in Norfolk, how a decree by the Chief Justice can, in effect, tell the transit company how it must regulate its business, said to be at a loss, in order to mark up even greater losses through more busing.

We have seen the President express his displeasure in speaking against busing, and we have seen the Congress surrender in cowardly retreat before the arrogance of the federal courts.

At the moment, no one can do anything against the courts' contradictory pursuit of its contrived sociological experiments, using the people and their children as pawns.

So Senator Byrd has suggested that the work of the federal judges be subjected to a thorough review every eight years, a proposal that seems eminently fair, especially when the courts have taken unto themselves

the rights and responsibilities of a formerly free people.

The other side of the coin is read by those who would say that Byrd's amendment would remove from the judiciary all their independence. Well, it goes without saying that federal judges should not be subjected to political pressures, but this nation is seeing too much independence without accountability to the people.

And Byrd has recognized one of the human weaknesses in our system today: that we put up with inefficient, often crooked public officials rather than discharge them because they're on the threshold of retirement. Byrd would retire with full pay those federal judges who are not approved when their eight year terms are completed.

He is adapting the Virginia system to the national level, for the state's judges are subject to reconfirmation every eight years. It is a largely routine process that could stand a closer examination, however, probably because so few people know that the state's judges are subject to reconfirmation.

The Byrd amendment restores some of this power to the people. It should win congressional approval.

## MINNEAPOLIS HEALTH HEARINGS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Bright Dornblaser, director of the Program in Hospital and Health Care Administration at the school of public health at the University of Minnesota, has long been involved in programs to improve the delivery of health services. In his testimony at the hearings held in Minneapolis, he listed 10 conceptual confusions that exist concerning reform of health care. In the following statement Dr. Dornblaser clarifies those conceptual problems. I commend his statement as one that provides the basic information needed when reform of the health care system is considered.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY DR. BRIGHT DORNBLASER

## INTRODUCTION

1. Appreciation of opportunity to present views.

2. The Federal Government's leadership is essential.

3. Credentials to comment include experience as:

Secretary, Board of Health, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Hospital consultant and hospital administrator.

Principal Investigator of a Minnesota Rural Health Care Study and of the Albert Lea-Austin Health Services Regionalization Study.

Advisory Committee—Cedar Riverside "new town in town" health services development program.

Immediate past chairman Health Services Development Committee, Northlands Regional Medical Program.

## NEEDS

Consumers want relief of sickness, pain and discomfort—on demand when "hurts," without obstacles and with quality services

provided in a manner which respects their dignity as individuals.

There is wide acceptance today that this public want is also a public right.

The phrase "we want a doctor in our town," symbolizes the public's demand for a comprehensive range of services as they know of them, including social health services as well as medical care services. Their doctor has provided services with continuity and with warmth and regard for personal dignity. They believe in its quality, although there is a rural recognition that quality of care can mean urban specialist care as well. The phrase symbolizes a desire for physically proximal services, financial accessibility to the services which are provided within their culture by someone who is part of it.

Providers of services with concern for quality of services, and with prevention of services, would add to the comprehensive range of benefits which should be provided.

Payers of services are for what the consumers and producers want, but have to think of keeping their costs down, whether the private sector or the government, and "in-line" with those of their competitors.

Both providers and payors of service could potentially benefit from freedom from financial pressure to place patients in hospitals so as to qualify for financial benefits.

The fragmentation and uneven distribution of health services interferes with both effectiveness and efficiency of services.

In sum, the familiar national dilemmas of improving and balancing benefits and costs and of delivery of services, are very much present in rural and urban Minnesota.

## RESPONSE

Federal government leadership is essential to resolving health care delivery and financing problems, by efforts which will:

1. Strongly encourage the development of Health Maintenance Organizations as delivery organizations, plus the option of all segments of our population to receive health services through such organizations, and with incentives for people to exercise that option.

2. Establish the minimum level of services that in the interests of public health should be provided by all payors of services—whether government, employers or employees.

3. Encourage and support demonstration health service programs in rural and urban ghetto areas that can be used also for the training of doctors and other health manpower.

4. Encourage the building of communication technology bridges, as an alternative to highways, between the haves and the have-nots—between the communities that have health care resources and those that do not.

5. Support an allied health manpower strategy, including an increase in the supply, the elimination of restrictions on the educational institutions that can train them, elimination of licensure barriers to the services they provide, and protection from the fear of unwarranted malpractice suits if such services are used appropriately.

6. Support the development of a program by which consumers of services can participate in the prevention of their own problems.

7. Continue support of the comprehensive health planning program as a public surrogate and a means for establishing and maintaining the data systems needed by HMO's, other providers, and the public to assess progress towards health goals and objectives.

8. Continue support of Regional Medical Program as a means of improving communication and coordination among health serv-

ice providers, and assuring quality of health services.

9. Support health system management training programs to prepare those needed to effectively and efficiently operate the large scale health services organizations which will deliver health services in the near future and beyond.

10. Support the financing of Schools of Public Health which serve not only the historical role as federal schools, but regional and state missions.

For developing new patterns in the organizations and financing of health care.

And for providing the University "community" outreach programs which apply an interdisciplinary basis, new knowledge and techniques, to the resolution of community problems.

11. Support the establishing, at least on a pilot basis, of organizations like the Freeborn-Mower Regional Health Services Corporations which:

Can assist the regional comprehensive health planning organizations in identifying area health services needs and goals and objectives, and apply the CHP data system and specialized planning services to assess progress in meeting local goals and objectives for the area's population.

Can assist Health Maintenance Organizations and other providers in the provision and financing of health services.

Can assist in the coordination of medical care services as provided by Health Maintenance Organizations and other medical care services, with public health and social services, for the "worried well" as those who are ill.

Can provide an organizational vehicle through which those who can identify to health services needs of the area's population, can join those who can plan, implement and finance the resolution of needs to jointly accept public accountability for the accessibility, quality, and cost of health services to all segments of the area's population.

Has comprehensive capability to respond to comprehensive responsibilities.

Can provide a demonstration setting for the effective utilization of Allied Health Manpower for demonstrating the use of multiple communications technology, and for training health manpower in a rural setting to encourage them to locate in rural settings upon completion of their training.

12. Support programs as represented by the proposed Minnesota Experimental Health Services Planning and Delivery Systems Program, which uses selected national demonstration sites such as Freeborn-Mower County, to develop future legislative program content or to develop effective methods for implementing national health legislation on a continuing basis.

In addition to federal programmatic response, it is important for the federal government to lead the way in clearing away "conceptual Confusions."

1. Health care expenditures are a cost, rather than an investment.

2. Health care is an investment in health services, rather than investment also in jobs—in the economy.

3. Medical care price inflation is bad, rather than not receiving a full return on the investment; or

Financial barriers to health services are bad; or

Financial impoverishment as a result of health services is bad.

4. Health care expenditures should not exceed "X" % of the GNP, rather than, the cost of publicly established minimum health services should not exceed "X" % of the GNP—(Leaving freedom to allocate disposable income to "non-essential" health services, as well as cars, vacations, etc., even if it exceeds a percentage of GNP.)

5. The present health service system is not perfect, therefore, it is all bad.

6. The Federal government knows how to "cure" the health system's problems with a body cast, rather than using pressure points.

7. Medical care problems should be cured at the expense of social health, by centralizing all health system management decisions, rather than permitting local communities to have some freedom for local solution of local problems.

8. Nationally embarrassing statistics on infant and maternal mortality should be cured, rather than prevented by population planning, abortion reform, welfare reform, and environmental health.

9. Monopoly in the financing of health services can be assumed by the governmental sector without significant penalties, even though the penalties of such monopoly are not appropriate if found within the private sector.

10. Providers of service do not wish to improve health services and must be forced to do so, rather than that they and others represent the countries greatest resource, the creative imagination and talent of a resourceful people, which with leadership, direction and the opening of options by the Federal government, will contribute more than their fair share to improving health services to the people.

### THE LESSON OF ATTICA

#### HON. EDWARD W. BROOKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, the uprising at Attica State Prison in New York, which was put down on Monday with such tragic and far-reaching consequences is one of those tragedies which will haunt the Nation's mind and conscience for many years to come.

As a student and practitioner of the law and as a former attorney general of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, I do not presume to judge the guilt or innocence of any of the participants. This is a matter which can and will be resolved by the courts.

But the conditions which triggered the uprising are all too common in our correctional system. Attica could have happened in almost any State. If what happened yesterday is not to be a prolog to other acts of terror and death, the American people must learn and understand the lesson of Attica.

First, the majority of those involved in the riots at Attica were black—as are the majority of prison inmates throughout our penal system. This is not because the majority of our population is black for, in fact, only 11 percent of all Americans in the Nation are black. Nor is it a fact that blacks are inherently more criminal in behavior. But, there are some facts to be remembered about blacks in America. They have less educational opportunity, poorer quality education, more substandard housing, less income, and experience greater discrimination, than have any other people in our Nation's history. These are the facts which are the root contentions of many black prison inmates when they say they are "political prisoners."

Second, prison conditions are almost universally deplorable. Far more is in-

involved than century old, draughty, leaky structures. Far more is involved than poor food, unsanitary surroundings, and generally uncomfortable conditions. What is central is the dehumanization which characterizes prison life. Because a man has committed a crime does not make him less a man. But under our system of justice, a person who has been convicted of a crime—be it petty larceny or multiple murder—is stripped of his humanity by the society he has been found guilty of offending.

Mr. President, to me the most poignant scene in the many thousands of feet of film on the Attica uprising was of a middle-aged black prisoner shouting: "I am a man." For anyone in this country in this day and age, to have to shout "I am a man" at the top of his lungs and from the depth of his soul shocks the conscience.

I have my differences with those blacks and whites who seek militant solutions. I do not support the tactics employed by the inmates at Attica. But for years these men tried to be heard, and few would listen. For years they tried to find a path of progress within the system but for the most part, they found their path blocked. They finally chose the only way that they believed was left open to them to present their grievances.

Forty-two lives have been lost at Attica. The rebellion has been suppressed. But if the conditions which caused that rebellion continue—at Attica and elsewhere across the Nation, I fear that the threat of punishment—even death itself—will not serve as a deterrent to others who, like the prisoners at Attica, believe they have nothing to lose.

Mr. President, it is time for us to take a new look—a tough look—at our whole approach to our prisons and correctional systems—at the way men are arrested, charged, and tried. We must also look at sentencing procedures. We must ask ourselves why it is that 675 men have been consigned to the relentless purgatory of death row, when the death penalty has not been carried out anywhere in the Nation for almost 4 years. Why do the majority of men who serve in prison return convicted of an even more serious crime? When we do no more than imprison those who have done wrong and assume we have thereby done our duty, we wrong the convicted and society as well.

Forty-two men are dead. Sympathy for their loved ones is not enough. Let us respond to the lesson of Attica. Let us get on with true prison reform.

### SUBSIDIZED HOUSING NEEDS OVERHAULING NOW

#### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Harvey Tribune is a publication with the interest of the community it serves at heart and, thus takes an objective, penetrating look at the effects of Federal

housing programs in the community of Harvey.

This editorial was carried in the Sunday, September 12, edition of that paper. While it relates in large part to local matters, it dramatizes the adverse effects of Federal programs maladminis-should have their share of low-income dwell-many Members have encountered similar problems and would appreciate this article.

The article follows:

#### SUBSIDIZED HOUSING NEEDS OVERHAULING NOW

The quarrel with subsidized housing in Harvey came to a head Friday night thanks to the public forum called by the Harvey Area Community organization.

Federal and local government officials met with John Q. Public for the first time to get his assessment of the housing program since its inception. Unfortunately, it took a crisis to get federal authorities to hear the people they say they have been concerned about all along.

While there was general agreement that there appears to be a need for re-evaluation of the total housing program in Harvey in relationship to overcrowded schools, lack of adequate recreational space and other necessities, there was a great amount of time spent Friday evening attempting to shift the blame instead of dealing with the problem.

The question of low-income housing has been a festering sore in this city for a long time, but it has taken a series of complaints to get the ball rolling towards facing up to the number one housing problem—relocating the inner city ghetto.

Most of the homes being constructed under Section 235 of the Federal Housing act are being built in the Black community. Because of this, our society's segregated pattern of housing, regardless of all the statutes, cuts the low-income white families out of the picture in Harvey. There certainly must be some white families that can qualify under the Section 235 program.

We agree that every individual, insofar as possible, should have the opportunity to be a home owner. The federal government financing under Section 235 now makes it possible for every individual to improve his living standard.

However, no community or any segment of the community should be burdened with the entire building program as provided in Section 235. Other communities in south Cook county besides Harvey and Markham should have their share of low-income dwellings.

The excuse for failure to extend the program to communities like South Holland and Olympia Fields and others to the south of us has been that land in these areas is inaccessible to homes under Section 235 because its value far exceeds the program guidelines.

Perhaps the guidelines should be changed to meet the requirements of these respective communities thereby insuring that no municipality is over burdened with providing space for those wishing to improve their lot.

As pointed out by the United Citizens of School District 147 Friday evening, many of the Section 235 homes have brought large families into the City of Harvey and more may be expected.

These families are looking for good, substantially built homes, a quiet community, good schools for their children and a place for accessible and decent employment as well as wholesome recreation.

One community can only accommodate so many people. We hope the Federal Housing Authority will live up to its promise of bringing a halt to building under Section 235 in the City Harvey before the land is completely exhausted. More important, we hope

the guidelines will be revamped in the immediate future so that all communities, regardless of their financial status, racial composition or creed, will share in providing for these homes.

If equality can not be established under program guidelines of the federal housing act, then the entire program should be scrapped in the interest of democracy.

#### VANDER JAGT PLAYS ACTIVE ROLE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

### HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, Representative GUY VANDER JAGT, who succeeded me as Representative from Michigan's Ninth District, was appointed 7 months ago to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

In an article published recently in the Flint Journal, reporter Robert Lewis wrote that Representative VANDER JAGT "has been a leading figure in efforts to revitalize the panel and give it a more forceful voice in foreign policy."

I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of Mr. Lewis' article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Flint Journal, Sept. 5, 1971]

#### VANDER JAGT THRIVES IN NEW ROLE

(By Robert Lewis)

WASHINGTON.—Guy Vander Jagt of Cadillac has broadened his horizons, and the House Foreign Affairs Committee may never be the same.

In his first four years as Republican representative from Michigan's 9th District, Vander Jagt was known primarily as a conservation congressman and tireless promoter of West Michigan's recreational attractions.

His 11-county district has 225 miles of Lake Michigan shoreline and tourism is a major source of income.

Since moving to the Foreign Affairs Committee seven months ago, Vander Jagt has become a leading figure in efforts to revitalize the panel and give it a more forceful voice in foreign policy.

He helped gather Republican votes for successful moves in the committee to cut off military aid to Greece and Pakistan. It was the first time in years that the committee had challenged the White House on a major foreign policy question.

Vander Jagt recently returned from a three-week trip to Africa that included a precedent-setting, nine-day tour of South Africa with Rep. Charles C. Diggs Jr., D-Detroit.

Diggs, a Negro, was the first black foreign dignitary to be permitted to travel freely in South Africa, Vander Jagt said. Under South Africa's apartheid policy of racial separation, blacks and whites live apart and blacks need government permission to enter white sections.

For Diggs to be seen riding in white taxis, staying at white hotels, eating in white restaurants and meeting with white political and business leaders was a revelation for black South Africans, Vander Jagt said.

Diggs was mobbed by blacks wherever he went, he said. They cheered him and reached out to touch his clothing in a style which

reminded Vander Jagt of the late John F. Kennedy's crowd appeal.

It was this reception from the black majority in South Africa that caused Diggs to go through with the visit, Vander Jagt said. When Diggs learned on arrival that he could not enter South West Africa, a black colony dominated by South Africa, he canceled, then reinstated, the visit.

The trip strengthened Vander Jagt's belief that U.S. businesses should stay in South Africa. If American firms pulled out, as Diggs formerly advocated, blacks would be hurt more than others, Vander Jagt said.

"Change toward a society where human dignity for all races is fostered is in large measure encouraged by U.S. businesses," Vander Jagt said.

But he said American firms can do more. South African employers pay white workers a higher wage than black workers for the same job. American firms could give equal pay for equal work, Vander Jagt said.

This would still leave blacks at a disadvantage, Vander Jagt observed, because they lack skills to hold the better jobs. U.S. firms could help by offering blacks more vocational training.

Diggs, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs subcommittee on Africa, had long opposed U.S. investment in South Africa, but his mind was changed by the trip and he now thinks American firms can contribute to racial equality in South Africa.

Vander Jagt came out strongly against military aid to Greece in the belief that continued assistance could lead to another Vietnam.

Probably 80 per cent of the Greek people do not like the military junta headed by Prime Minister George Papadopoulos, Vander Jagt said.

"The people are convinced, rightly or wrongly, that the colonels are in power because we maintain them with our aid," he said.

"Like South Vietnam," he said, "Greece is run by a military dictatorship. Also like Vietnam, it borders Communist-controlled countries which could provide sanctuaries for an antigovernment movement."

Vander Jagt was the only Republican to participate fully in subcommittee hearings on aid to Greece. His opposition to continued aid, coming as it did from a moderate with no antimilitary bias, was credited with influencing other Republicans to vote against the administration.

As it passed the House, the measure would authorize President Nixon to continue aid if it was in the overriding U.S. interest, but this loophole might be closed by the Senate.

Vander Jagt supported cutting off aid to Pakistan because, he said, it was used to beat West Pakistan into submission.

The argument that the United States should not interfere in another country's internal affairs is not valid, he said, because the giving of aid itself constitutes interference.

Along with his new interest in foreign affairs, Vander Jagt expects to remain active in the environmental field. He is the ranking Republican on the House Government operations conservation subcommittee.

#### PRICE AND WAGE CONTROLS: A CONFESSION OR FAILURE

### HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, we are now 1 month into the first coercive peacetime price and wage controls in

American history, and for a growing number of Americans the 'bloom is off the rose' regarding this action. The initial enthusiasm for it was largely due to pentup frustration and exasperation with our numerous, long-lasting economic problems, and a feeling that, at last "sombdoy was really doing something" about them.

Now it is becoming steadily clearer that a 90-day price and wage freeze does nothing at all about any problem, but simply puts off solutions—while in the process, by the frank admission of the administration officials on the Cost of Living Council, creating severe inequities for which no remedy is available.

Wage, salary, and rent increases already agreed upon in written contracts are not allowed to take effect—though property taxes and other taxes may continue to rise. Plans and financial commitments made on the basis of those supposedly inviolate written guarantees are dislocated, often to the point of major economic hardship. The manner in which the freeze impairs the obligation of contracts is alone sufficient grounds for opposing it in a free country at peace.

At an extensive briefing for Members of Congress September 1, the best reason administration spokesmen could produce for the price and wage freeze was psychological. They said that people had been expecting rapid inflation to continue, and because of that, were raising prices and interest rates and demanding higher wages at a faster rate than actual economic conditions called for. Somehow the price and wage freeze was supposed to convince them that their expectations were wrong.

But in fact, as noted Economist Henry Hazlitt pointed out in a recent issue of *Human Events*:

The government creates inflation by permitting, encouraging or forcing an increase in the supply of money. The more dollars that are printed in relation to the volume of production, the less each dollar can bring, and the higher prices must rise.

In July of this year the expansion of the U.S. money supply peaked at 13 percent, one of the highest rates since World War II. By comparison, the money supply was expanded by only 5.1 percent in 1970 and 3.1 percent in 1969. Coupled with the continued growth of the Federal budget deficit and the refusal even to consider seriously any new legislation curbing the excessive power of labor unions at the bargaining table, this made inflation inevitable—and no 90-day price and wage freeze is going to stop it. Such controls are simply a confession of failure to establish the conditions in which our economy can function freely, fairly, and productively.

The critical decisions will be made between now and November 12, when the 90-day period of the freeze comes to an end. Many—such as Dr. Arnold Weber, Executive Director of the President's Cost of Living Council, who has predicted controls for from 3 to 4 years—will want to turn the current freeze into a total or partial system of permanent controls, which would have to be administered by a huge Federal bureaucracy which President Nixon has said he does not want, and which he should know cannot work.

There are sound and constructive elements in the President's new economic policy—notably the investment tax credit, the excise, and income tax reductions, and especially the Federal spending and hiring reductions. If it is true, despite official disclaimers, that revenue sharing and the guaranteed annual income are being downgraded or dropped as administration objectives, that would be best of all. But time will show the price and wage freeze to have been a serious mistake; and its extension, or the establishment of any system of permanent mandatory price and wage controls, would be a disaster. We must treat the causes of the economic disease of which inflationary price and wage increases are only a symptom.

LETTER TO CONGRESS FROM  
SAVAS KONSTANTOPOULOS

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. THURMOND, Mr. President, Mr. Savas Konstantopoulos, the publisher of the Athens, Greece, daily newspaper *Eleftheros Kosmos* has written an open letter to the Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

The purpose of the letter from Mr. Konstantopoulos is to recount and explain to Congress developments in Greece over the past several years and to present the writer's assessment of what the future relationship between Greece and the United States needs to be.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the *Extensions of Remarks*.

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

OPEN LETTER TO THE MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

(By Savas Konstantopoulos)

PART I: THE COLLAPSE OF DEMOCRACY

Sir: I believe it my duty to write this letter in the hope that it may help on the understanding that my views are either consistent with, or lie closer to, the facts than any assertion by anyone else, to enable you to draw an exact picture of the Greek problem. In doing so, I am interested mainly for my country, and also for the United States. Common interests link our peoples, the Greek and the American peoples. During the two world wars, we fought on the same side, and the blood of Americans and Greeks intermixed and covered the battlefields. Today, your great country is the only and last safeguard that all nations which have not been subjugated by communism still have in order to maintain their independence and continue developing their civilization based on their own traditions and will as their driving force. Americans and Greeks are indissolubly united, since both believe sincerely in the principle of the independence and self-determination of peoples. The prime care of each Nation is to insist that no foreign conqueror or influence will govern its existence, but that instead its political affairs should acquire their shape through the competition of its own internal, indigenous forces.

You certainly know, Sir, better than I do, how difficult it can be for a foreign observer

to establish the truth regarding the political affairs of a country, no matter how good his intentions may be. Today much is being said and written in your country too about Greece. However, how much of it is consistent with objective data and how much is not? In my country, we love Americans. We owe you much. We want a strong America. Naturally, our main consideration is Greece's survival. But there exists an element of interdependence between our country and the United States. Were we to commit an error or seek orientations running counter to American interests, we would be causing harm to you. Just as you would be harming both us and the United States should you commit an error of judgment in assessing the Greek problem, in spite of your good intention to serve both your country and your real friends.

On the author

Kindly permit me to brief you on the author of this letter. I shall refer to but a few incidents which will enable you to assess and make a fair appraisal for this text. It goes without saying that I feel some embarrassment in discussing my own self. It is, however, necessary to do so. I am the person, sir, who struggled to avert the army's intervention in politics in Greece. As you already know, the military revolution took place in April 21, 1967. One year before—i.e. in March 1966—I gave a series of four public lectures, which I also published as a book. I appealed to the political parties of my country. The framework of the state structure had been violated in all respects. I requested them to change tactics. Because if they continued to rock the foundations of the democratic regime, the tiny parcel of democracy still left would fatally end in ruins. I submitted two basic proposals: first, to rule out any cooperation between the democratic parties and the communists; and secondly, to neutralise party influence within the Armed Forces. That is to say, that each party would undertake not to use directly or indirectly the Army, Air Force, and Navy to airtight guarantees to this effect. I also added: "Experience, logic and instinct have led me to the conclusion that should the parties not reach a Basic Agreement on the isolation of the extreme left and the political neutralisation of the Armed Forces and the Security Corps, democracy will no longer be able to withstand the test. In politics it is impossible to make forecasts with chronological accuracy. One may not be able to specify dates; however, one can frequently distinguish the way in which things move and where they are heading. I am, therefore, convinced that unless a drastic cure is applied, Democracy will not survive. Because they all speak about it, using words, they will kill it through their acts."

Unfortunately, my voice fell on heedless ears. No one among the active politicians paid any attention to my warning. Nevertheless, I was making a statement of fact; I was ascertaining the inevitable fall of Democracy, owing to the errors of the parties, and I was also recommending ways of preventing such a development. Mr. C. Karamanlis, founder of the ERE (National Radical Union) Party and Greek Premier for eight years (1955-1963), who resides in Paris following his retirement from public life, read my book containing the lectures and wrote to me: "Your book, the Year of Dictatorship is both interesting and timely. It shows both boldness and a knowledge of problems. I cannot say whether or not it has been appreciated by the powers from which the Nation awaits its salvation, which powers have fallen into a state of serene inactivity. The undersigned who has the honour to address this letter to you, sir, believes in the democratic ideal. In his final lecture he proclaimed his wish to be the citizen of a democracy and not the subject of a dictatorship, no matter who should enforce it." You are fortunate in the United

States. As democrats, you have never had to face the dramatic dilemma of either accepting a provisional, although not so short suspension of the functioning of the democratic institutions, or rejecting it for the sake of remaining faithful to your principles, the practical outcome being the death of democracy without any chance of its revival.

After the Revolution of April 21, 1967, I had the opportunity of holding a public discussion on the above subject with the noted Spanish historian, politician and philosopher, Salvador de Madariaga. His adherence to democracy is indubitable. Yet he raised his harsh question: "What would the army do when the people are threatened by a communist or fascist coup?" In such a case he wrote: "The axiom that the army should not meddle in politics could lose its value. Such an acknowledgement would be painful to out-and-out liberals and would even sound as treason to their ears. However should they search their consciences, they would agree. In a series of specific circumstances, they should admit that they have already accepted this fact. A sense of intellectual honour imposes upon them the acceptance of this principle. It is a manifestation of forthrightness as well as duty for one to accept theoretically the possibility that military revolution against a political regime may be just."

If I remember well, intellectuals from many countries held a public discussion on the subject of democracy in the 20th century, in Berlin, in 1960. German professor Freud touched upon a view which is linked with our problem: "In 1932, he said, he wondered in Germany whether or not a military dictatorship could free our country of National Socialism. It is our last hope, because, the National-Socialist party was the only party able to seek power, since it was impossible to achieve a parliamentary majority without the National-Socialists. To save democracy, we had, therefore to use illegal means. We had found ourselves in the state of affairs which once prompted a French politician to say: "Legality is killing us". And if the Weimar Republic collapsed in 1932, this occurred not because certain ruling parties aimed at a dictatorial regime they hoped it was possible to form a normal government with the participation of the National-Socialists. I am no follower of military dictatorship, but I believe that had the German Generals taken power in 1933 the economic crisis would have been averted. Because, through an unbelievable coincidence, Hitler came to power with economic crisis, and he contained it thanks to the subsequent development of the world economy. The German Generals might have succeeded in achieving the same result within a democratic framework. There would have been a military dictatorship at the top, but the political and social life of the Germans would not have changed at its base. In my opinion, it follows that the essence of the matter lies in the fact that such a regime may again become democratic one day, even if that is difficult, when it is necessary to deem it is such.

Professor Freud is a democrat. And we should give attention to his opinion. The imposition of communism on a country destroys democracy definitely and irretrievably. Is there any country who has fallen under the communist yoke and has subsequently returned to a regime of political freedom? None. Communist governments intervene in the structure of society; they alter the social and economic edifice from top to bottom. On the other hand, as the aforementioned German professor noted, a military dictatorship remains at the top of a social pyramid, and leaves untouched the social and economic reality which prevails, and maintains an open door for a return to Democracy.

I would add another element. A discussion which took place at Heidelberg University

between Professor Themistocles Tsatsos and the late historian and Chancellor of post World War II German Konrad Adenauer. The Greek professor was an old and staunch democrat. A few months prior to the Revolution of April 1967 he analysed the internal situation of Greece to the great German statesman. He explained to him mainly how the Communist Party used deputies to infiltrate into the Center Union and influence its political line. Adenauer listened to him intently. At the end he told him: "Then there is no solution left other than the army".

#### *A faulty procedure*

Might I be permitted, on the understanding that I shall produce the necessary evidence to characterise as erroneous the way in which the Greek question is being faced by a section of Representatives, Senators, mass information media and public opinion in the United States.

Error No. 1: You view the situation in Greece through the eyes of the state of reality prevailing in the United States. You do not examine the particular features of my country. You believe that what stands in America may also be conveyed to another country, take root and flourish. I wish things were like that in fact. No one would wish it more than the undersigned. However, you overlook the historical background of political situations. Each people live within a state of reality which as a rule applies only to itself. Its historical adventures, its cultural standards, the stage of its economic development, the degree of its sense of politics, its geographic position, the friendly or hostile sentiments of its neighbouring countries, lay the foundations of its social life and political institutions. Unfortunately Greece is not America. Your standard is different from ours. And when you look upon us as America and seek that we should also have American institutions, you are led away from objective data and build your thoughts on imaginary considerations. You became an independent country in 1787. Since that time you have had only one constitution. We gained our independence, let us say, in 1821. And to this day we have had 11 Constitutions. This example should be sufficient to point out to you the existing differences.

Error No. 2: You identify Greece of the present with Athens of the 4th century B.C. We have often heard this being said in your great country. How is it possible that Greece, where the ideal of democracy was first born, should be deprived of political freedom today? Indeed the ideal of democracy, a child of Greek Thought, was first born in Athens. We feel proud as a people because our forebears conceived the system of self-government, which, by being converted into a representative system, prevailed in the developed nations of our era. But there was not only Athens in ancient times. There was also Sparta, with her own characteristic mixed and non-democratic regime. Macedonian Hellenism played a wider role under absolute monarchy. Alexander the Great conveyed Greek Enlightenment to Asia and Africa. Later, Byzantium, also under absolute monarchy, played its own role in history for a thousand years. It gave birth to priceless cultural values and thwarted after hard struggles, a serious threat to Europe, stemming from Asia and the Slavs. Since 1204, Greeks have been cruelly tried struggling against conquerors coming both from the West and East. We have suffered tyrannical persecutions, devastations, destructions and tragedies. We were finally overcome. We fell under the Turkish yoke and suffered slavery for four centuries, (1453-1821). Darkness shrouded our nation. Our cultural level as a nation was almost annihilated. In 1821 we revolted and succeeded in driving the conqueror from a part of our territory. Unfortunately, however, we have never been able to enjoy the benefits of democracy. We

lacked the necessary prerequisites. We had democracy on our lips, but never in reality.

Error No. 3: You like to discuss with persistence how we will return to democracy. Namely, how we will return to a situation which, as it will be clearly proved mathematically later in this text, was not democratic. Furthermore, those who allegedly fight in favour of political freedom, avoid explaining how the former regime fell and how the prevalence of the 1967 Revolution was made possible without the shedding of a drop of blood and without the slightest opposition. When a political system is healthy it does not collapse because of the ambition or mentality of certain officers. Something worse must be the cause. A fundamental principle of serious and scientific thinking dictates the need for an examination of the causes of the political change which came about in Greece. This is necessary not only to understand how the political situation prevailing until April 1967 was upset, but mainly in order to find the remedy, the right method to establish a well founded, free political system. But, why do those who belong to the political world of the past hide from you this side of the question, which indisputably is the most significant? There is no need for me to explain to you their attitude. The reason is obvious. They fail to mention the cause of the collapse of democracy because they have a guilty conscience. They are responsible for what happened.

#### *Permanent crisis*

I will not mention, Sir, personal concepts about the causes of political agitation in Greece. I would rather let others speak. They are reliable witnesses, and they have played an important role in the public life of the country during the last 10 years. Consequently, they are more competent than I to give you all facts useful to your thoughts on the Greek question. I shall begin with Mr. Karamanlis. He was the founder of the large E.R.E. Party and Prime Minister of Greece for eight years (1955-1963). Perhaps my view stated above, that Greece had not succeeded in gaining a normal and healthy democratic life from 1821, may seem exaggerative or even groundless. But Mr. Karamanlis confirms the assertion. Here are some of his views:

"Our people's misfortune is due to the permanent political crisis that afflicts our country.

"In our country, every Greek has a personal concept of the Constitution. And we see that the Constitution is adapted not to the needs of the nation and the mandates of the political tradition, but to our personal wishes and pursuits.

"The political leadership of the country is responsible for the lack of political tradition. No one believes in anyone or in anything in our country.

"The fact that we Greeks at times destroy what we ourselves have created with so much toil and so many sacrifices is a deplorable historic ascertainment.

"The basic cause of the misfortune of our people is the deficient organisation and functioning of our public life."

As you see, Sir, Mr. Karamanlis ascertains the existence of a permanent political crisis in Greece. This disease extends right back to the day after our national restoration in 1821, and as, we shall see, it has not been remedied as of April 1967. The statements of the former Prime Minister of Greece show the low political level of our country, due to the insufficiency both of the Greek people and their leaders. This permanent political crisis took a concrete shape after 1956. It was then that the first Popular Front was formed in Greece. George Papandreu was its originator. The communists had caused havoc from one end of the country to the other during the occupation, in December 1944, and during the

period 1946-1949. They had filled it with ruins and graves. And they had agreed to cede national territory to neighboring communist countries. Mr. Karamanlis pointed out the gravity of the fact, and warned of its consequences:

"Political leaders, he said, who slandered each other in the past, parties with deep political differences, without any logic or moral justification, formed a Popular Front in our country (during the 1956 elections, those opposing Mr. Karamanlis cooperated with the communists). It is the first Popular Front to be formed in Europe since the war, as was proudly stressed by E.D.A. (a disguise for the outlawed Communist Party) in a recent announcement. And this front was formed in our country which had a bitter and recent experience of such experiments. As it is known, the policy of cooperation between nationalist parties and communism was first tried in the Middle East, and the results are known. Because of it, Greece, instead of exploiting the victorious outcome of the war of 1940 and her national resistance, had lived 10 dramatic years. Numerically, Communism in our country is not dangerous. However, it becomes dangerous when it finds parties of lower moral resistance, willing to cooperate with it. For it obtains what the numbers do not allow it to obtain, by the falsification of our political life.

#### Three elements

You should, Sir, give special attention to the above text, for it contains the substance of the political crisis which, after passing through many stages, ended with the April 21, 1967 Revolution of the Army. You will not grasp the Greek problem, you will not conceive its significance and you will never understand events in Greece, if you do not keep three facts in view. 1. The geographical position of Greece. If you look at the map, you will find replies to many of your doubts and solutions to many queries. Greece, like a wall, blocks the descent to the Mediterranean both of Russia and other countries. Consequently, she is a permanent target of many expansionist designs and subject to almost continuous pressure. 2. During the 2nd World War, the Communist Party of Greece became very strong and armed (because of errors by our political world). It sought to gain power through a bloody and inhuman rebellion in 1944. Earlier in the Middle East it tried to disintegrate the Greek Armed Forces, which were fighting by the side of the Allies against Hitler's Germany and Fascist Italy. After the end of the 2nd World War, and from 1946 until 1949, it tried to impose itself with the aid of the neighbouring communist countries (Albania, Yugoslavia and Bulgaria). The United States Congress then accepted the Truman Doctrine on the grant of assistance to Greece and Turkey. You should add to the above that the Communist Party in Greece has always been absolutely dependent on Moscow, and has repeatedly agreed to the detachment of Greek national territory and its cession to other countries (especially Bulgaria and Yugoslavia). 3. Certain parties increased the offensive and corrosive capability of communism by agreeing to cooperate with it under various forms, sometimes overtly and covertly, but always with the obligation to give it something in return. Communism became dangerous in Greece because of the cooperation of other parties with it. And it changes tactics adapting itself to situations and fabricating on each occasion new ways of approach to power.

It will be useful for you to follow still further Mr. Karamanlis' concepts.

"Serious dangers threaten our country," he stressed in 1956. "The Greek people should unite, react and remove these dangers. The terms of cooperation are of no importance (he means with the communists), although, if they are closely examined they are considered as dangerous to

the country. The importance lies in the principle of cooperation. Even when the first EAM (an alliance between communists and non-communist elements during the occupation) was established, the terms set for the collaborators of the communists were very innocent, but in the technique of the implementation they were turned into barriers. I do not doubt that the same fate awaits those who have not been taught by their old sufferings. That these people will suffer because of their own sins is of little importance to us. We are interested in the adventure to which the country may be led by the submission of nationalist opposition to the orders of communism."

The Greeks who think coolly drew conclusions both from the political reality and the words of Mr. Karamanlis. Among these Greeks were undoubtedly the officers also. Experience was a guide and Mr. Karamanlis forecast a fatal and inevitable submission of the collaborators of the communists to the aims and pursuits of the communist party.

#### The political ethics

How to explain the cooperation with the communists of political factors of Greece, who bore in mind the bloody experience of our nation? Mr. Karamanlis attributed it to the loosening of the political ethics. He said:

"A decline in our political ethics has been noted. A slackening that leads the parties to the most unlikely compromises, which not only are at the expense of the public interest but also become nationally dangerous. This spirit of compromise has recently reached its peak. Parties of different ideological bases, with contradicting programmes and political pursuits, parties split by hatreds, even bloodshed, have formed an illicit and anti-national coalition the only goal of which is the conquest of power. In no country and at no time there appeared such a political jumble, which above all else, also shows contempt for the people. No excuse is acceptable for this grave political error . . . I am compelled to say that this phenomenon (the formation of a popular front) could be seen only in Greece, where there is an unprecedented slackening of political ethics, and where hatred and political passion often appear to predominate over the national interest. There are countries where communism has great power, but where there are also strong socialist parties at the same time. In not one of them, however, has there been cooperation with communism, for they all know that such cooperation is the main pursuit of international communism and as the past has proved, as a rule it becomes a transitory situation before Red Totalitarianism. The astonishing fact is that it happens in our country, which has a bitter and recent experience of the policy that led to the well known post-liberation drama of Greece."

#### It will collapse

Seven years later—in 1963—Mr. Karamanlis reiterated the existence of a permanent political crisis of Greece. He ascertained a malfunctioning of the form of government, violation of the rules, the rocking of democracy, and a national danger:

"The form of government of the country operates defectively under the influence of extortions . . . Demagogy places our free form of government in danger . . . Those who have repeatedly violated the form of government speak in the name of democracy, demanding its adaptations to their political needs . . . Our form of government is not functioning properly, for certain parties of the country, violate in an unabashed manner its basic principles . . . The Centre Union Party, having adopted the permanent slogans of the Left, brought Democracy is being spoken of by those who least believe in it. It is an unashamed demagogism. And if the true state of facts is not restored once and

for all, the form of government will collapse . . . The methods of political activity applied by the Centre Union Party are a threat to the nation . . . The public life of the country needs radical changes. Without them the further moral and material progress of the nation will be problematic and the security of the country will be endangered . . ."

Mr. Karamanlis ascertained certain objective facts. And what was his further forecast? Dictatorship. He did not conceal it. As early as 1963 he warned the political world and the Greek people, declaring:

"In all sincerity, I tell you that if the policy of cultivating a spirit of anarchy is continued by the Centre Union Party, there will be a need of dictatorship. However, I will not be the one to establish it. If the policy of the Centre Union Party is continued, all should know that sooner or later it will lead to some kind of dictatorship."

#### It had been assassinated

In 1964 he ascertained a "climate of political, social and moral disintegration", and expressed fear that "the normal development of our national life will be problematic". In 1967 (about a month before the military revolution), he characterised the prevailing situation in this country as deplorable and expressed the thought that "the crisis is the result of a deeper disease that cannot be remedied with compromises and half-measures". Mr. Karamanlis spoke also after the prevalence of the April 1967 Revolution:

There are two factors, he said, that led to the coup of April 21, 1967: The existence of certain ambitious officers, and the bankruptcy of Democracy. No one is in a position to overthrow a healthy regime. It may be said that democracy was assassinated in Greece under a free regime, and that the colonels did nothing more than give it the final blow.

Another danger, he indicated, was lurking political and moral anarchy. I also know that the country, shaken by savage political passions, was being led to a fratricidal rift. Greeks admit it today, even if they do not agree on the determination of those responsible for it. The greatest responsibility lies with those who brought about the passions. All could see the coup coming. It was caused by those who, had they not been blinded by their passions, could have prevented it.

#### King Constantine

King Constantine, Sir, will give you the starting point of the exact form which the permanently existing political crisis in Greece took from 1965 and which led to the April 1967 Revolution. About the end of 1964 I met the King at the Palace in Athens. I was given the opportunity to ascertain his excellent intentions towards the then Prime Minister. He used best words and there was no trace of any intention to interfere directly or indirectly in any of the sectors of government activity. In 1965 a secret organization was discovered in the Army. It was called the ASPIDA, and its aim was the overthrow of the democratic form of government. Andreas Papanreou, son of the leader of the biggest party (the Centre Union Party) and Prime Minister George Papanreou, was reported as being involved in it. An effort by the Prime Minister to conceal the case, to influence the inquiry, to prevent the discovery of all the plotters and especially not to let the competent judicial bodies discover which political persons have been involved, was immediately ascertained. Simultaneously, the government and the extreme left began an orchestrated campaign to defame and slander the King. They presented him, in fiery publications as allegedly deviating from the framework of the form of government and as unconstitutionally turning against the lawful government emanating from the public sovereignty. The King was forced to address three letters to the then Prime Minister George Papanreou. Their contents were indeed shocking. The sovereign directly accused the Prime

Minister without circumlocution of violating the form of government and stirring up people's manifestations of a revolutionary character (that is, with the participation of the communists) to enslave the Greek people and abolish popular sovereignty and individual freedoms. And just this phrase, sir, makes it clear that the reading of certain extracts from the King's letters to the then Prime Minister George Papandreou will be of informative value to us. He wrote:

The situation in the country is abnormal and disturbing, and to my opinion, there is an urgent need for radical and irreproachable measures to be taken from all sides to restore this seriously weakened rule of justice, consolidate lawfulness, and bring back the feeling of security and order.

"And the state of the nation is alarming to the utmost degree, since legality and the State of Law are being threatened with destruction, through established concrete evidence of activity on the part of the Central Intelligence Agency, which has been converted into a controller of legality, by its interference in the task of military justice to influence the course of inquiries through the exercise of psychological violence both against officers carrying out their detailed assignments and witnesses."

Unfortunately, I am in the very unpleasant position of stressing that you support and instigate these interferences.

I request—the King told him—that you immediately stop all activity which abolishes fundamental rules for the function of the form of government and causes political agitation and shakes the citizen's feeling of security.

I call upon you to publicly condemn the slander leading to campaign against me and to take concerted and prompt measures leading to the immediate dissolution of all organizations or preparations for people's manifestations or coups prepared under any pretext for the enslavement of the Greek people and abolition of the popular sovereignty and individual freedoms.

For in any case, you are aware of the lives which are written daily, raising allegedly a question as to the functioning of the democratic institutions, and the time has come, for, you as the responsible Prime Minister, not to tolerate opportunistic lies. I ascertained from your letter dated July 9 that you insist on maintaining the intention, which I pointed out to you in my letter the day before yesterday, of systematically presenting the existence of the question of the functioning of the democratic form of government, created by actions of mine, while such a question does not exist, for it has never been born.

Unfortunately, I cannot avoid the thought that the opportunistic insistence on a non-existent question is a pretext on your part to deliberately disturb our relations. Your pursuit is the creation of a constitutional question out of a non-existing one.

I refuse and in this, I defend my constitutional position and authority before unexpected pressures, to agree to exercise my duties under threats and the influence of impressions from actions not benefiting the normal functioning of the form of government. If there today exists a question, it is compounded in a crisis of confidence caused by your deliberate actions, manifestly planned to limit the unhindered exercise of my constitutional rights. Finding myself before an organized campaign of lies and deception of the citizen's, I have warned you these last few days, twice in writing and once verbally, reminding you of your great responsibilities and asking you to do your duty and dissolve the dark clouds which you allowed to be created, especially since you thickened them through official and semi-official manifestations. As you can see, Sir, from this eloquent text of King Constantine, the leader of the parliamentary majority

and Prime Minister was undermining the foundations of the democratic regime and overturning the rules of the form of government. His main goal was to overthrow popular sovereignty and abolish individual rights. A fundamental principle of Democracy is the observation of the rules connected with its meaning in carrying out political competition. First among them is respect for the minority and recognition of its possibility to claim popular confidence without hindrance and to try to become, if the people want, a majority, and as such to govern. This basic rule, without which that democracy does not exist, George Papandreou (always according to the King's opinion) conspired to destroy, thus annihilating the popular sovereignty, namely the foundation of democracy.

#### North Vietnam

Sir: As you know, Mr. Karamanlis retired from political life in December 1963 and left to live abroad, far away from Greece. He designated Mr. Panayotis Kanellopoulos as his successor in the leadership of the ERE Party. The Party fulfilling the wish of its founder, accepted him. Thus Mr. P. Kanellopoulos became the leader of ERE and of the opposition. On April 3, 1967, the King entrusted him with the Premiership, on the understanding that he would carry out elections on May 28. He was overthrown by the army on April 21, 1967. Since then Mr. Kanellopoulos has been enraged about the revolutionary regime, and does not hesitate to declare that prior to April 21, 1967, allegedly nothing unusual was happening in Greece, and that the solution to the political crisis, and the political normality, would have emerged from the ballot-boxes. Mr. Kanellopoulos, however, was giving a completely different picture of the prevailing political situation in Greece from 1964 up to and including April 1967. Mr. P. Kanellopoulos' speeches disturbed the national conscience of a great part of the Greek people. And this because he alleged that tremendous national dangers were being created for Greece. In January 1965 he said:

"And while the communist activity after the guerrilla war was never so intense as it is today, the Prime Minister appoints as Interior Minister an old collaborator with communism, who, as he himself confessed, maintains his old convictions, and K. γ. P. (the Central Information Service) of the Centre Union Party Government, by its order No. A.P. 507326, of November 4, 1964, commands all units to stop distributing and to return, anticommunist pamphlets sent to them".

On February 19, 1965, speaking at a public gathering of thousands of people in the capital, he warned of the danger: Northern Greece was about to be transformed into a North Vietnam, and the communists were penetrating from everywhere to strike the country from the rear. Listen to his voice:

"After Vitsi and Grammos, this small country had become the strongest fortress in Europe. Mr. G. Papandreou has demolished the walls of this fortress. He demolished them even on our northern borders, where only with a spirit of constant national vigilance and with strong alliances would they stand unshakable. I call on the Greek people to erect the walls of Greece once again. We will not allow northern Greece to become another North Vietnam. Resistance should be manifested in all sectors of our domestic life. The government of Mr. G. Papandreou has opened back-doors everywhere for the enemy to enter and attack us from the rear".

In Parliament, in February 1965, Mr. Kanellopoulos announced that at the Army General Staff, the brain of the national defence of the country, were serving soldiers reliably characterised as communist and nationally suspect, and he personally handed to the Minister of National Defence a list of communist soldiers stationed at the 505th Infantry Regiment camped at the outskirts of

Athens. He formulated a very grave accusation against the Prime Minister, Mr. G. Papandreou, regarding the Central Information Service (KγP) and the Army General Staff. According to Mr. Kanellopoulos the then Prime Minister was placing paid communists and officers having the mentality of the uprisings in the Middle East, that is the mentality of cooperation with the communists, tolerance of the communists, submission to the result being the dissolution of the Armed Forces. It is useful to listen to him:

"And with the good faith it (the Papandreou government) has in its supposed friends"—the then leader of ERE said—"A good faith which from bitter experience in the Middle East I know how dear it cost the nation, it accepted the penetration of paid communists in vital services, even the KγP, which has been kept completely away from its national task.

"I have experience of the Middle East. I paid dearly for good faith in dishonourable so-called antifascist officers. But I was taught a lot. Does Mr. Papandreou not intend to be taught anything?"

"But why now, that is as of last year, when he became again Prime Minister, does he choose and place officers having the mentality of the uprisings of the Middle East in critical confidential posts in KYP and the Army General Staff? Here is the proof that he has not been taught anything . . ."

#### Dangerous indeed

In September 1965, following the resignation of George Papandreou as Prime Minister because of his clash with the Throne, a Council of the Crown convened under the presidency of the King. All former Prime Ministers and the leaders of the parties participated in it. During discussions, the leader of ERE with a thunderous voice, spoke of the already existing substantial abolition of the democratic institutions. What was said then, Sir, before the King and the other participants by Mr. Kanellopoulos constitutes a picture and an X-ray of the Greek reality, and you cannot possibly think correctly on the Greek question, if you are not briefed on it. What exactly was happening in Greece? Here are Mr. Kanellopoulos' words at the time:

"In most of the villages of Greece"—he said—"if not in all of them, in all the rural country, there are organised gangs of Lambrakides (striking forces of the communist party). These gangs intimidate and threaten the inhabitants, whom they keep under the influence of fear. The communists possess a great weapon, the weapon of threat. And the even greater weapon they have in their hands is this: That they use threat under democratic cover. This is what is dreadful and renders communism dangerous indeed. The big problem is the existence of these groups and gangs of the "Lambrakides", which render the normal functioning of the democratic form of government impossible. In many villages, even in the villages of my own prefecture, the prefecture of Ahaia, and especially in the province of Aigialia, only two newspapers circulate, Avgi and Vima, because of the interference of the "Lambrakides". These things are happening in many villages of Greece at this moment. It is not possible for the E.R.E. followers to breathe freely. The newspapers of E.R.E. cannot reach the villages of Greece, and if they reach them they are not sold easily or if they are sold, he who buys them is in danger of suffering the consequences. The communists have acquired weapons. And they should not have acquired them. The communists, or the followers of another party, procure weapons. This should be prohibited. There should be a state machinery that will render the countering of this danger possible, not just afterwards, but also by forestalling the danger.

The existence and the authority of the state in the provinces have become nothing.

The Gendarme is hiding instead of being present. There are one or two in each village. The one or two Gendarmes should be present when an irregularity, an indecency, a black-mail by the Lambrakides is noted, instead of disappearing. He is not in a position to interfere, for he is alone against 20 or 30 at least. The big terrorist groups are the state today. The Gendarmes have ceased to protect the citizen.

#### *The leader is obstructed*

"I think that the leader of a party"—said the then leader of E.R.E.—"and any citizen, but mostly the leader of a party, who represents at least one third of the Greek people, is entitled to move freely in the centre of Athens. I went, as I have the habit of doing, to the 'Byzantium' after a serious parliamentary struggle after the vote against the government of Mr. Elias Tsirimokos. There were already there about 50 youths who on my arrival began to shout. And of course the signal was the name of the leader of the Centre Union Party. Despite this I sat down. But I was warned by a police officer that I had better leave, because buses and cars with hundreds of other night rioters were to arrive. Someone was informed of my presence there, and gave the order for reinforcements to be sent against one man, me. I did not leave immediately. I waited. When I finally withdrew, and the same youths were cheering Mr. Elias Eliou of EDA, who left with me, without any longer calling out the name of the leader of the Centre Union Party, the delayed reinforcements arrived. The leader of a party that represents a force greater than one third of the Greek people is obstructed from moving freely in the centre of Athens.

In all the youth organizations of the Centre Union Party—he said before the Council of the Crown—these Lambrakides have penetrated and given the tone. The Centre Union Party has undergone adulteration. There are its followers as well as communists. Most of the transfers of Gendarmes during the past 18 months have been made on the strength of denunciations made by communists, who have trapped deputies of the Centre Union. They have indeed trapped some, while others have not been trapped but, because they owe their election to premium—benefits, agreed to conceal the fact that the informant was a communist.

"EDA" Mr. Kanelopoulos stressed, "will appear as withdrawing from coalitions in 30 or 40 districts. It will appear both strategically and tactically as achieving a task the originality of which will rouse admiration throughout the world. And it will do that. I am certain it will. The majority party (the Centre Union) is being helped against the will of its leader (he meant Mr. Papandreou) by E D A.

#### *Communists set the pace*

"EDA", he said, "will regulate, undermine, and mastermind the further development of our political affairs; in spite of its absence from a standpoint of essential numbers in Parliament, and owing to its presence within a national party, of the size of the Centre Union. To my mind this will definitely happen. And the leader of the Centre Union will be unable to do anything about it, in spite of his wish to the contrary, in a position to direct the Centre Union.

"If Greece", Mr. Kanelopoulos added, "were menaced with spectacular collapse, as was the case when the guerrilla-bandit war started, I would have felt no fear, because in that case all nationally-minded Greeks, would have rallied before the menace looming before them. Today, however, the menace does not appear in that spectacular and impressive form. This is the very reason why it is even greater, because the indispensable rallying of forces is not taking place, and even cases of corruption of consciences have been reported. And corruption of conscience

is what I most fear. And Mr. Papandreou, will become, against his will, the agent of a movement which will not be his own. And that movement will invade Parliament, it will invade Greek history, and the invasion will be deceptive. If the Centre Union were to launch the invasion, this would not be a dangerous invasion, as we would rather call it a democratic victory, a democratic triumph. But now, it would neither be a democratic victory, nor a democratic triumph. It would mark the beginning of the end of both Democracy and Greece.

"We have reached the limit of our era," he said. "Should we fall to stay within that limit, we shall begin slipping and falling: Greece, the Throne, everything. Everything is interwoven. And everything will, therefore, collapse. And this will not happen in a very manifest or outstandingly spectacular manner."

#### *Revolutionary hysteria*

Commenting on Mr. G. Papandreou's resignation, which, may I remind you occurred on July 15th, 1965, Mr. Kanelopoulos on December 3, 1966, reiterated that had the Centre Union government remained in office for a few more months, the Greek Armed Forces would have disintegrated, the Nation would have been faced with a grave menace, and democracy would have disappeared.

"It is now clear to everyone,"—he said—"that as in the case of departments of public administration, so 16 months of Centre Union administration proved sufficient to set off a spirit of disintegration in the Armed Forces. Had Mr. Papandreou's government remained in office for a few more months, the Greek Army would have again experienced lamentable days, reminiscent of the days when Greece was a republic after 1924, that is to say the period of military associations of many names, cliques and putschists, as well as, and in particular, of the Middle East which was marked by cooperation between alleged democrats and communists and which undermined the nation. July 15th, 1965, the date of Mr. Papandreou's resignation, was therefore a day that warded off a great danger to the Nation, and a day marking the salvation of Democracy . . ."

It is necessary, Sir, that you keep in mind the entire span of the views which Mr. Kanelopoulos proclaimed in all directions up to the eve of the Revolution of April 21, 1967. On December 24, 1966, he addressed National Radical Union ERE Deputies. He explained why to them, in his opinion, it was necessary to have a government under Mr. J. Paraskevopoulos! His speech contained an ominous warning, when he said:

"Gentlemen, should grave conditions become even graver, because of others and not of us, and this is the historical significance, it is certain that the present government will not face the situation".

Three months later, Mr. Kanelopoulos requested and was granted a Royal mandate to form a government. He became Prime Minister. What did his gesture mean? Please read again the passage quoted above in his speech before the ERE Deputies.

Mr. J. Paraskevopoulos was cast aside because conditions had become graver, in Mr. Kanelopoulos' words. That is to say, the situation had deteriorated. The internal crisis had worsened. P. Papaligouras, a leading member of ERE, on March 2, 1967, proclaimed that a section of the Centre Union was carrying out a policy aimed at driving Greece behind the Iron Curtain.

"In such circumstances", he said, "and unless these conditions change from top to bottom, ERE's further insistence on a policy of detente would constitute childishness. The leader of ERE has therefore warned that we are on the eve of reconsidering our policy. Democracy has the right and the obligation and the legal means to defend itself. We therefore warn that neither will the regime

be left defenceless, nor shall we allow the exalted section of the Centre Union to lead us through anarchy and mob rule, which it so impudently and overtly prepares, to the Iron Curtain".

Towards the end of that month, Mr. Kanelopoulos, referring to the intensifying campaign of the Centre Union against the King, declared:

"ERE denounces to the Greek people the undisguised attack against the supreme ruler as depicting the intention to undermine the peace of the people and to spread unrest in the land. It follows that Mr. Papandreou has violated the fundamental unwritten but self-evident conditions, on which, naturally without any written agreement between the two parties, had been based my initiative after December 24 . . . Regardless of how much I try to explain the psychological need which drove Mr. Papandreou into these rhetorical ventures, I believe that it is precisely through them—and the way in which such explosive slogans are being accepted by a section of the people, among which EDA's followers have the main say—that the nation runs the danger of entering a state of anomaly of unpredictable consequences."

The leader of ERE drew attention to two facts: first that the communists played the main role among the masses, and secondly that the nation was being threatened with anomaly of unpredictable consequences.

On April 3, 1967, a government was formed headed by Mr. Kanelopoulos. Internal acuteness had reached a peak. The Centre Union and the communists had raised the banner of revolution. Mr. Kanelopoulos told public opinion that the Centre Union was 1) trying to intimidate the King, 2) making threats against the organs of Public order, and 3) together with the Extreme Left had set up anarchist groups. This is the text of what is said:

"But I have a few other things to tell Mr. Papandreou. It is high time that he put an end his revolutionary proclamations. He knows that he is in no position to proclaim a revolution. There are laws in this country, and powers capable of imposing these laws. It is ridiculous, and equally it is inadmissible, for him to embark upon an attempt to intimidate the Supreme Ruler or threaten the organs responsible for Public Order, Mr. G. Papandreou's revolutionary hysteria, is an indication of a weakness which he can no longer conceal. I warn him that the anarchist groups acting under his or EDA's orders will be met with promptly and with the utmost harshness by the forces of the State, as well as the people themselves."

This is what the Greek people and officers heard from Mr. Kanelopoulos' own lips. They were being drawn a vivid picture of the past as well as of the immediate future. The danger in Mr. Kanelopoulos' words, had not been confined to the political sector, and did not concern democracy alone. They extend to even the most fundamental interests of the Nation. According to the Prime Minister in office on April 3, 1967, Greece was faced with a national menace.

#### *The two Papandreous*

Sir, George Papandreou has been our opponent. In the elections of 1963 his party, the Centre Union, emerged as the leading party but failed to gain an absolute majority. Yet he became Prime Minister on the strength of a vote of tolerance given to him by EDA, i.e., the Communist Party. The extreme left had helped him in his electoral struggle. J. Passalidis, EDA chairman, had disclosed this before Parliament on a later occasion. During a debate on June 24, 1965, he had this to say on the elections of 1963:

"I am speaking candidly. When the question was raised, on July 13, as to what we should do, since the Centre Union is running on its own, I frankly told my colleagues: We cannot rid the country of the Right single-handed. It is necessary that we

find ways and means of making the Centre Union self-reliant. We gave our political struggle an ideological form: Karamanlis must fall. And we achieved it. If you refuse to acknowledge this, then so much the worse for you."

Elections were held again on February 16, 1964. The communists' support of Mr. Papandreou was manifest. EDA (communist party) abstained from drawing up lists of candidates in certain districts. Its followers voted for the Centre Union. The size of the help was considerable. Mr. Kanelopoulos analysed it before Parliament in 1965:

"Mr. Papandreou's 'Inexorable Struggle' had opened the hatch through which the forces of communism forced themselves, with as milestones November 3, 1963, February 16, 1964, and municipal elections. The three percent (EDA's premium benefit that went to the Centre Union) in 23 prefectures, was the official contribution. Characteristically, EDA received 54,380 votes or 17 per cent, in Athens on February 16. In the municipal elections the EDA list of candidates received 89,762 votes or 30.6 per cent. In Partas, EDA received 8,921 votes or 18.9 per cent, on February 16. In the Municipal elections, however, it received 14,888 votes, or 34 per cent of the total."

Mr. Kanelopoulos' inference was clear. The communists' actual help to the Centre Union was much greater than what appeared officially as 3 per cent. George Papandreou acknowledged and proclaimed that Greece was undergoing a deep crisis. When he ceased being Prime Minister, in July 1965, after the King's disclosure that he was working for the overthrow of the regime, he said:

"There has not only been the violation of the regime, but sepsis as well. At no time did the political life of the nation sink into such decadence. All institutions have declined."

"Today, there is no longer any public life. There is a tower of Babel. And a general corrosion of values and the Greeks."

It is necessary to recall previous statements made by G. Papandreou in Parliament; he had described ERE as fascism. Two years before that, he had called it a gang and Mr. Karamanlis a moral accessory, under Penal Law, in the murder of Deputy Gr. Lambrakis. Yet, in 1960, he had a meeting with Mr. Karamanlis at the home of the then Interior Minister, Mr. D. Makris. G. Papandreou had proposed to Mr. Karamanlis to cooperate politically and "hold elections with Gendarmes and at gunpoint". Such instances show the low standard of the democratic conscience of the Greek politicians.

I now come to the case of Andreas Papandreou. As a student he was a communist. He was arrested by the police and betrayed his fellow-fighters. He was then granted leave to go abroad. He settled and built a career in the United States. He returned to Greece in 1960. Following a request by G. Papandreou to the then Prime Minister, Mr. Karamanlis, the latter agreed to use him at the Bank of Greece. He had not been invited to the Greek capital because his contribution to the effort of national economic development had been considered useful and necessary. Mr. Karamanlis had simply given in to George Papandreou's pressure. As soon as Andreas settled in Athens, he called at his own request on the then Prime Minister, Mr. Karamanlis. During the meeting, he stated: "I did not come to Greece for my father's sake, but for you. I want to help you in your effort."

A. Papandreou did not involve himself in politics until the elections of 1963. He did not take part, because he could not foresee their outcome. Only when as a result of the popular mandate it became evident that there was a trend in favour of G. Papandreou, and that he would win the next elec-

tion, did Andreas Papandreou decide to play it safe and enter politics. He appeared as an extremist from the very beginning. He restored extremely close and constant cooperation with the communists, he became involved in a military conspiracy and turned against the Throne. He had no popular backing of his own. He was elected a deputy solely on account of his father. He drew his stature from his father. Yet, in spite of this, he lost all self-control and mental balance. His father had an experience of half a century, and finally succeeded in gaining 53 per cent of the vote, regardless of the means he used. But Andreas, in a fit of extreme selfishness and megalomania, sought to impose himself over his father, to rule the party and inspire its political line. If, Sir, you should read the book written by his wife, Margaret, you would find ample material on the bickerings between father and son. G. Papandreou is depicted by Mrs. Margaret Papandreou as feeling nothing short of loathing for his son. In her opinion, G. Papandreou was a father envious of his son's ability to conquer power, his youth, his male outlook, and creative energy. . . . His father considered Andreas as ungrateful, impetuous and disrespectful. As these feelings grew stronger, he began to express them to me in the hope that I would act as a barrier to what he used to term irresponsible activities. . . . My reply was stereotyped: Why don't you call your son more often and discuss strategy with him?—Because he never seeks my advice before doing something—was his reply,—he is secretive,—his father would say about Andreas—He is also impetuous, and these are Mineiko's traits.

Sigmund Mineiko was Andreas' grandfather on his mother's side. . . . I was disturbed, I felt sick and disgusted. My anger was turned mainly against one man whom I bitterly called "the enemy from within"—George Papandreou.

After George Papandreou's resignation (July 15, 1965), successive attempts followed in Parliament to form a government. Finally, a government was formed under Mr. Stefanopoulos, which was brought down by Mr. Kanelopoulos. The Premiership was entrusted to a figure independent of parties, Mr. J. Paraskevopoulos, with the mission of holding elections on May 28, 1967. George Papandreou agreed. Andreas was against. This was creating problems for him. It created turmoil for him within the party. It brought him into a difficult position. There was no difference between them as to the aim of cooperation with the communists, or on the essential dissolution of the democratic regime through the imposition of popular antagonism. Divergence existed on the line to follow.

On the first day of the Revolution of April 21, 1967, both George and Andreas Papandreou were arrested. Father and son met at the Pentagon, where they had been taken. This is the exchange between them, as reported by Andreas Papandreou in his book:

"I told you so, remember," he said to me. "The Paraskevopoulos Government was our last hope of averting a military coup. Your polemics against it, your incendiary statements against the King, the doubt which you bred among local American circles, made all this inevitable. And remember, the Kollias-Papadopoulos combination is difficult to beat. They will stay in power for a long time."

Four elements are indispensable to form an exact idea of the way the Centre Union viewed the political situation in Greece, how it was being shaped through the tactics of Andreas and George Papandreou, and how they were leading it to a deadlock: 1) Andreas Papandreou's concepts, 2) George Papandreou's ideas, 3) The confidential report drawn up by A. Anastassiou, George Papandreou's confidant when he was Prime Minister, and 4) General Archimedes Argyro-

poulos' plan to organise bloody clashes during the pre-electoral period.

1) Andreas Papandreou's views may be summarised as follows:

"Today, we live in an area in which nihilism and lack of principles threaten the nation, threaten all of us, irrespective of party or side.

"It has become manifest for quite some time that an oligarchy, after ensuring possession of weapons and the uncontrolled handling of the national wealth in all its forms, has been trying to subdue the Greek people, stem their spiritual and material progress, and convert them into a docile instrument of continuous and limitless exploitation. Nothing has obstructed the successful course of this effort: Neither laws, because they had been appropriately engineered, nor the State, because it is being adulterated and violated in accordance with the views of the oligarchy.

Today, the police state established by the extreme right, the nucleus of which is composed of groups of huge vested interests, has been restored with strength and an inclination towards duress which is even harsher than that which it had shown during the worst days of Papagos and Karamanlis.

The weeks lying ahead of us will be crucial for the nation's institutions. The King has completed the coup. He has become the leader of E.R.E. He has become a party leader. And precisely because E.R.E. is his party, and equally because the government belongs to him personally, he will sit for his final examinations. And these examinations are the elections. What kind of elections will they hold? Their outcome will be the deciding factor governing the final fate of the institutions. . . .

The E.R.E. leadership is not in Paris, but instead in the Psychico and Tatoi palaces. For by his act, the King has shown that he is the leader of the Right. . . .

Andreas Papandreou was relying on cooperation with the communists. This is a confirmed fact. Leonidas Kyrkos was the link between him and the Communist Party. They were in almost daily contact with each other either through personal meetings, telephone calls, or intermediaries. When Andreas was held in the Averoff Prison, after the Revolution of April 21, 1967, he was visited by the SISCAMAN mission, and a discussion took place at which Ambassador Mr. Kalamidas was present. Referring to cooperation with the communists, he said that he approved of it. He agreed that there had been joint action between the Centre and EDA in the elections of 1966 (as you already know, it was then that the first Popular Front had been set up). Cooperation did not occur in 1963. However, we know, from the aforementioned statement before Parliament, by the Chairman of EDA, Mr. Passalidis, that the communists had given their votes to the Centre Union. During the discussion, Andreas Papandreou agreed that there had been cooperation between the Centre Union and the communists in the elections of 1964. He explained that this had been effected in two ways: a) Leftist candidates were accepted on Centre Union lists of candidates, and b) EDA had not drawn up its own lists in certain electoral districts. When Mr. George Papadopoulos' Revolutionary Government granted an amnesty to Andreas Papandreou and allowed him to leave the country, he hastened to declare that he would cooperate with communists in organising civil war. A report published in the U.S. magazine Newsweek agreed that there was a great possibility that the communists would gain the upper hand through a civil war. In August 1968, he entered into an agreement with the communist leader, A. Brillakis, which aimed at preparing and waging civil war. He had, therefore, always been in favour of an alliance with the communists. This is definitely established, with mathematical accuracy.

2. George Papandreou was an unstable politician, who changed orientations and moved in various directions without any qualms. In 1956 he set up the Popular Front. He cooperated with the communists at a time when Greece's wounds had scarcely healed after the frightful ordeal of the communist war of 1946-49, a war waged by the communists with the help and interference of neighboring communist countries. In 1952, he collaborated with Field Marshal Alexander Papagos, "Leader of the Rights" as he was called by Centre parties and the Extreme Left, to be elected deputy, having failed to be returned in the elections of 1951. In 1960, as already mentioned, he asked Mr. Karamalis to cooperate politically and hold elections under violence, thus forging the public opinion. Later, he established a tactic of permanent cooperation with the communists, thanks to which he won the elections of 1963 and 1964. When he clashed with the Throne and was about to resign, he told his then Foreign Minister, Stavros Kostopoulos: "With the torch of EDA (i.e. the Communist Party) we shall spread the blaze throughout the country." This sentence is the summation and reflection of his intentions. To an EDA committee which visited him at the time, he declared: "Help me, so that I may help you in turn." His whole line of tactics was incendiary, conducive to passion and fanaticism, revolutionary and irresponsible. He insistently declared that ERE was his sole opponent. He kept EDA to one side, because EDA was not an opponent but instead his ally. When Mr. Kanellopoulos formed a government on April 3, 1967, G. Papandreou questioned the results of the elections due to be held on May 28. He termed the formation of the Kanellopoulos Government a coup. He charged that there was an intention to violate the popular will. He described the King as a party leader who had violated the spirit of the democratic regime. Here are the pertinent statements:

"I denounce to the Greek people another coup. The King has unfortunately chosen to become a party leader. ERE, in spite of having been voted out and being the second largest party, has nonetheless formed a government, thanks to Royal favour. It follows that the spirit of the democratic regime has been violated again, and the dignity and pride of the Greeks slighted.

"Our reply to this is: We shall not tolerate this coup. And we call the democratic world to a universal rally of alert. We enter the struggle with an indomitable spirit. And in spite of deals and violence, ERE will be smashed and the Centre Union will win a great victory. The flow of the river cannot be reversed, and it will sweep away all our opponents. Elections will return us triumphant, and we shall create a new Greece. Democracy will win again."

The new government threatens to violate the will of the People. This is inferred from the statements made by competent ministers. And the text of Mr. Kanellopoulos's declaration contains nothing but threats. He refers to "the State", "laws", "police orders". So far, so good. But the word "Freedom" is nowhere to be seen. Freedom is not mentioned even once, as also is not mentioned the provision of guarantees ensuring the free expression of the people's will. Freedom, the free will of the people, was mentioned in the Royal proclamation. A promise of free, unrigged elections was contained in Mr. J. Paraskevopoulos's statement. But freedom is not mentioned even once in Mr. Kanellopoulos's statement.

This is the point to which the Circe of power reduces people.

3. Mr. A. Anastasiou was a personal friend of George Papandreou, who, when he became Prime Minister, placed him at the head of the Information and Enlightenment Service. Mr. Anastasiou submitted two reports to him. In the first of them, he wrote:

"The undoubted dependence and cooperation between EDA and the Greek Communist Party emerges from crossed-checked motion. A full plan to prevail in Greece has been put into application by the above, with the support of all the Eastern Bloc countries, and especially the Soviet Communist Party. I consider it necessary to report, without being possessed by anti-communist hysteria, that the danger from the entire communist activity, as it is presented today, is exceptionally significant".

Another report of Mr. Anastasiou, dated July 30, 1964, mentions the following disturbing ascertainties:

"There is no doubt that, under various pretences and conditions, the communists had the exceptional opportunity to penetrate the most confidential positions of the state machinery during the 40-day administration (November 8-December 24, 1963). Top-secret documents of NATO, everything sacred to our national security, were at the disposal of the leaders and theoreticians of the Greek Communist Party. For those familiar with events of the time, the situation presented itself as tragic, and any detailed description of it would be unbelievable. Communist exploited the suitable opportunity with the well-known method of penetration. Labour associations, universities and youth in general, societies and then municipalities and communities, were as a rule the first target of the communist ally. The formation and activity of the Lambrakides as of March 1964 permitted the drawing of gloomy prospects regarding the development and further activity of this new E.P.O.N. A wound started to bleed, and I think that much blood will be shed before it is healed".

"Still more disturbing, however, is the complete isolation of H.E. the Prime Minister, whom I believe to be ignorant of the real situation and the looming dangers, and for whom deceptive impression are systematically created.

"Nationally suspect persons have penetrated exceptionally important positions. Spying is rampant and easily extends to ministerial offices. Organs of public order and officers of the Armed Forces face a sense of insecurity. It may in general be considered certain that we are on the eve of disturbing internal events, with unforeseeable consequences for the future of the country, even though, mainly as a result of a specific plan, calm prevails for the time being.

"It is an urgent necessity that H. E. the Prime Minister be informed of the true situation. This will not be possible unless all nationally-suspect elements, irresponsible politicians, opportunists in quest of temporary success, and spineless sycophant singing daily praises to the Prime Minister, are removed.

"I think that indubitably there is a great danger. Precious ground and precious time has been lost. I believe that, despite the danger, everything is possible. On the other hand, if the present inertia continues, it may be considered certain that Greece is moving progressively, surely and steadily towards the repugnant embrace of international communism, and probably, without any spectacular revolutions. I appeal to the Cabinet to weigh its responsibilities towards the nation and take concerted action with the Prime Minister, because, without being pessimistic, I foresee that the situation will deteriorate daily".

4. General Archimedes Argyropoulos, retired, a personal friend of George Papandreou, on April 15, 1967, drafted a plan of action during the pre-electoral period. It was a programme for carrying out a civil war. He wrote:

"The militant manifestations will be organized and coordinated, ranging from peaceful but intensely aggressive ones by the intellectuals, through the press and proclamations, including rallies and protests by every

professional class, organization, association, society, etc. to militant demonstrations by the youth of all classes, climaxing if necessary in bloody hand to hand encounters between the organized popular masses in the main streets, squares, neighborhood, against the organs of reactionary oligarchy, whether they be called state or parastate".

"The confrontation must have a more dynamic manifestation. For such a contingency, the increase of the striking groups, under the name "Reserve Striking Groups", should be provided for from now.

"The protest gatherings, as in Contingency A, will be more massive, first with gradual participation of the professional classes and organisations, and then with the forces united in uniform manifestations but with intense militancy and supported by united striking groups that could eventually reach the stage of bloody clashes".

"The organisation of special striking groups, equipped with the necessary means and arms that will make possible the neutralisation or destruction of the motorised armour as well as the chemical means of the opponent, should be provided for from now".

It is of special significance, Sir, to study the intentions and plans of the Extreme Left (the Communist Party appearing under the misleading denomination of EDA) during the period which ended with the intervention of the Army. It has already been mentioned in this document that it was granting its support to the Centre Union, first, so as to prevent ERE from coming to power, and also to impose upon G. Papandreou concessions to it, that would create the prerequisites enabling it to seize power. How did international communism view the situation in Greece after the resignation of G. Papandreou on July 15, 1965? You may consult the review "Problems of peace and Socialism", which is published in Moscow. In chapter X it wrote:

"The government crisis which broke out in Greece has shown that the old political organisation existing there no longer meets the needs of the present political situation of the country. Lenin wrote in 1913 on Russia. The nationwide crisis prevailing in Russia is such that it affects precisely the roots of state structure and not some of its details, it affects the foundations of the edifice, and not some section of it or other, not anyone of its floors or other. (Collections; Vol. 19, p. 195, Russ. Edit.) Events in Greece are developing in the direction which points to a political crisis of exactly this type".

Lenin characterised the crisis in Russia in 1913 as revolutionary. This then was the characterisation applied by international communism to Greece. In other words, according to the assessment made by the communist side, Greece was undergoing a revolutionary crisis, which paved the way for an almost certain radical overthrow of the existing social and political regime.

On February 16, 1967, i.e. two months prior to the military Revolution, the following entries were made in the minutes of EDA:

"A bold push from the bottom (by setting up barricades), through trade-unionists, local administration, lawyers, youth, middle aged groups, etc. . . . deprecating of bourgeois parties, institutions, ideas, persons, etc. . . . Considerable erosion of all social layers and institutions. All the strongholds of reaction are being struck at their foundations and their great weakness to govern, as before, as always . . . Erosion of everything, deprecating of bourgeois parties, ideas and persons who will cash in on all this, dictatorship or us?"

"Extremely sharp contrasts are noted among the political forces of the bourgeoisie, "chasm". These jolts and the prevailing intensity are unprecedented: You are fascists, a past memory, internal disintegration and crisis".

The significance of the aforementioned assessments of the Greek Communist Party is evident. The political regime and the social system had collapsed and been reduced to naught in the conscience of the public. Political parties were considered unable to cope with the situation and to hold in check the completion of destruction. There were two solutions in the mind of the communist leadership: either the prevalence of the Communist Party, or the intervention of the Army. The conviction is summed up in the question, whether overall erosion would pay "dictatorship or us (communists)".

After the Revolution of April 21, 1967, the Central Committee of the Greek Communist Party (which had been abroad since 1949, held a plenary meeting in February 1949). At the meeting, a member of the Central Committee said the following:

"In my opinion, the main reason which led local and foreign (American) reactionary circles to the military-fascist coup, was their deep concern stemming from the ascertainment that the crisis of the regime of subservience had grown to such an extent that it would be leading sooner or later to a state of revolutionary crisis; which would jeopardise their rule itself.

"The crisis of the regime of subservience had pervaded all sectors and manifestations of public life, it had profoundly rocked and eroded institutions themselves (parliament, parties, the palace, etc.), the political, state and other sections of the system of authority and administration of the ruling classes."

How was the communist party meeting what it considered as the existing revolutionary crisis? It could not wage any armed struggle as yet. It therefore drew up a new tactic. It had to reach power through a combination of manoeuvres and dynamic pressure, from the bottom, with its organised forces. This meant that ERE should not win the elections, and the Centre Union should win instead. Manolis Glezos (he had been proclaimed No. 1 hero of the Extreme Left, because, together with Apostolos Sandas, at a time when he was still not a communist, he had torn down the flag which the German forces of invasion had on the Acropolis of Athens in April 1941), in a secret speech to the EDA leadership in May 1961, not published at the time, he outlined the plan of the Extreme Left:

"Phase No. 1 Back the Government.

"Phase No. 2 Participate in the Government.

"Phase No. 3 Become the Government, with others joining in.

"Phase No. 4 Become the Government as such.

Manolis Glezos affirmed that if the Centre Union were in danger of losing the elections, the Extreme Left would give it all the support it needed to gain a majority in Parliament. The Extreme Left had ascertained the universal and catalytic crisis which Greece was passing through at the time. After the Revolution of April 21, Mikis Theodorakis, EDA deputy and leader of the "Lambrakides" acknowledged that the intervention of the Army was a fated outcome of the disintegration of our political situation. In an interview to the Italian magazine "EUROPEO" on July 3, 1969, he said: "It was certainly not Colonel Papadopoulos who had created this chaotic and catastrophic situation: We Greeks, all of us, without exception were truly responsible. And those especially responsible, are the parties, intellectuals, and those who, so to speak, belong to the ruling class.

Now, it would be wrong to trade accusations and seek particular responsibilities. Let us, for instance, examine the three main political forces in Greece, in turn. Let us begin with the Left. Its responsibilities primarily date back to the period from 1943-1949. At the time, the Left had committed a succession of grave blunders.

They were blunders that in a way formed the root of the present break-up. The Right follows. It ruled alone from 1952 to 1963 without solving any of the major national problems. Its only reply to growing popular demands was barren anti-communism and police repression. Thus, in Greece, we come to that outburst between 1963 and 1964 that brought the Centre Union government. But that party too, although it received 53 per cent of the votes in the elections of 1964, proved unable to govern.

*Mrs. Helen Vlahou*

Sir: You know that Mrs. Helen Vlahou former publisher of KATHIMERINI and MESSIMVRINI, is moving actively in the international stage against the political regime prevailing in Greece today. In April 1967, Mrs. Helen Vlahou claimed that there was no reason for the Army intervention in politics. There was neither a communist menace nor was the internal situation in Greece showing the slightest symptom of any ailment. I regret to say, Sir, that because she is a woman I am prevented from characterising her behaviour the way I should. I will only tell you this. No one else, convinced Greek officers that the country had reached the edge of a precipice more than Mrs. Vlahou did. You are a man of good faith, Sir, and you wish to be told the truth. It is not my intention to influence your judgment. I shall, therefore, lay before you some of Mrs. Helen Vlahou's writings, so that, with your characteristic sense of responsibility, and on the basis of what you will read, you may form your own opinion. Mrs. Helen Vlahou's campaign dates back to 1965. For us Greeks, there is no period presenting a worse nightmare than December 1944 when the communists, in their attempt to seize power, embarked upon unprecedented atrocities, crimes and tortures. On August 1, 1965, Mrs. Helen Vlahou's "KATHIMERINI" wrote: "The country lives through days like those of December 1944; it remembers and worries . . ." That is to say Mrs. Helen Vlahou informs you, since 1965, that Greeks have been moving in an atmosphere of communist terror.

Prior to this, on February 18, of the same year, the newspaper Kathimerini wrote:

"And it (the work of the G. Papandreu Government) lies in the fact that all government bosoms have become greenhouses of a size unprecedented since 1944—harbouring the communist movement to the point of allowing communism to become once again a deadly menace to Hellenism. To begin with, numbers speak for themselves: 17 per cent of the votes went to EDA in the general elections of 1964 and 30 per cent in the municipal elections of that same year within just a few months of one another. EDA members, the "organized" ones, increased by 100 per cent between July 1963 and July 1964. Its leading members, which were called "basic organisational elements", rose from 1,324 to 2,600, i.e. by 100 per cent in this case too. The "Lambrakides" organisation, with the blessings of the Leftist Leadership of the Ministry of Education—or at least with its benevolent tolerance—placed the pupil and student youth under its control. In the Armed Forces, Mr. Kanelopoulos supplied figures to the National Defence Minister, communists are active. The texts, EDA's official texts, praise the assistance given them by the Papandreu Government and underline the need to avoid having it overthrown until its task is completed, i.e. the handing over of the nation to communism . . ." (Extracts from Kathimerini, 18-2-1965).

A few days before G. Papandreu's resignation, on July 11, 1965, Mrs. Helen Vlahou was saying: "The nation has now entered the zone of great danger. The large mass of the people sense it and is naturally anguished. And even the most indifferent citizen is beginning to wonder, and ask: 'Where are we going? Where are we being led to?'" Mrs. Helen Vlahou did not confine herself to

underlining the extent and weight of the communist menace. She was raising a broader issue involving the political backwardness existing in our country. On August 12, 1965, she wrote the following:

"When are we going to pull ourselves together?"

When will someone among the leadership of the Nation acquire a sense of responsibility, seriousness and honesty such as is found among the simple, common shopkeepers? Will this tragic phenomenon of underdeveloped leadership eventually arouse the sensible public? Will the time come when public opinion will demand to be respected, taken into account, and intimidate them?

Messrs politicians of Greece, this may be the last chance. You must pull yourselves together, evolve, and stop presenting, as a whole, that lamentable, hopeless spectacle. Among all phenomena of underdevelopment which Greece has to show, do not deceive yourselves, Parliament is the most impressive. Parliament and its deputies, who yesterday, today and tomorrow have always been studying with care which leader, which party, what situation will ensure them more votes for re-election. This is what really interests the 300 . . . (How many shall we exempt? Fifty at most? and the rest . . .)

She was describing George Papandreu as the deliberate organ of communist conspiracy, which aimed at converting Greece into a satellite of the Soviet Union (February 20, 1966). And she added on the 9th of the following month: There exists a frightful danger from the continuing activity of the Lambrakides and the illegal machinery of the KKE which has officially acknowledged that it is directing EDA.

Prior to this, on May 25, 1965, when G. Papandreu was still Prime Minister, she formulated against him a charge of attempting to lull public opinion with assurances that communism is not following an upward trend, but instead is declining. In 1966 (June 16) she wrote on the communist "Lambrakides" task force: EDA has ordered the "Lambrakides" not to display their strength or their insolence. Because it wants to lull the Government into believing that they are no menace and should not, therefore, be disbanded. It is preparing them for the surprise of the Big Day.

The power of the Communist Party, appearing under the mask of EDA was growing at whirlwind speed, and was concurrently accompanied by State disintegration. Mrs. Helen Vlahou drew attention to this in the most categorical terms:

"According to official figures published yesterday, EDA, which in November 1963 numbered 23,000 organised members, today, numbers 100,000. The numbers are of special importance, for they do not relate to the followers of Communism but to its mobilised and disciplined forces. The importance of the organised members has been stressed by Lenin himself, who wrote: "One thousand organised communists are worth more than 100,000 simple followers. We should take advantage of all the special conditions for us to expand and closely knit our organisation to the masses. It was exactly these special conditions that Mr. G. Papandreu granted to EDA between 1963-1965 for it to increase its organised force by 450 per cent. And at the same, while he was granting "these special conditions, he disrupted the state also, making it incapable of reacting to the communist army. Namely, he disrupted the Security forces, education and the administration, undermined Justice and prepared the disruption of the Army. . ." (Excerpts from "Kathimerini", 17-2-1966).

The Centre Union Party announced in August 1966, "that it would organise the defence and self-protection of the democratic citizens". Mrs. Helen Vlahou characterised the Centre Union Party's announcement as follows: "It means that he (G. Papandreu) will organise what the Communist Party

calls "self-defence", that is, groups for armed activity. Consequently, it becomes obvious that we are facing one of the most dangerous stages of the revolutionary activity of the popular front. In reality, it is a pretext for the organisation of armed revolutionary groups. With his statement, Mr. G. Papandreou offers EDA the necessary shield to present the organisation of "self-defence" as an organisation of the "democratic" people and not the communists. The popular front is proceeding to the extreme measures". ("Kathimerini" August 21 and 23, 1966).

In March 1966, she warned that the machinery of the Communist Party was in position "to move within the basin of Attica an organised and militarily disciplined force of 30,000 to 40,000 persons at all hours of the day and nights".

We were, Sir, in the year 1967. In February, Mrs. Helen Vlahou was interested in recalling the general insufficiency of the political world of this country. This is her sermon:

"There are times when the Greek people, astonished, ask themselves if, perhaps, among their representatives, are also included persons with special reasons to desire the irreparable destruction of the parliamentary system, the diminution of all the essential institutions, and the humiliation of all office holders? It is a reasonable question, for in no other period of our modern national history have so many cases of cheap nihilist attitude been gathered as during recent years".

What impact would an eventual victory of the Centre Union Party in the May 28, 1967 elections have had? Mrs. Helen Vlahou replies without hesitation: Greece would have been withdrawn from NATO and dragged behind the Iron Curtain.

"It should be clearly understood that the May elections will, among other things, determine also the change in national policy in regard to the foreign relations of this country, namely the position of Greece within the system of her alliances. For the son, A. Papandreou, on this point was not secretive. By requesting the balance of the so-called "foreign influences", in essence he asks for withdrawal from NATO, no matter how much he wished to conceal it. What is suggested, that is to say, unreservedly is a fundamental change of the Greek policy, and naturally this satisfies the Extreme Left, which no longer needs any Trojan horses in order to enter the national stronghold. The Centre Union Party is already appearing bolder than EDA in claims which have always been considered as exactly opposite to the national interests. "Let us accept reality as it is; namely, that we have to deal with a political world whose aim is to seize power, all power, and whose motto is that the end, no matter how low it might be, "justifies the means". Possibility of a break up of the Centre Union Party, or possibility of a disagreement of any kind in its cooperation with EDA (KKE), does not exist, since in essence, by the well-known Royal Decree, the date for the elections has more or less been set".

On February 23, 1967, Mrs. Helen Vlahou, in a dramatic warning to the Greek people and the Armed Forces, wrote of what was certain to happen on the night of the elections. It is an alarming text. I would beg you, Sir, to read it carefully, for its repercussion in the Army was very deep:

"The important thing, however, is that if, God forbid, the Centre Union Party emerged from the elections as the leading party, or together with EDA became the party with the majority, then that same night of elections the two people's parties, by setting into motion the revolutionary machinery of EDA and creating with its protection mob demonstrations, would abolish the regime, become masters of the government, or rather of authority; and to remove them from it, it would be necessary to call out the Army,

and even then it is doubtful whether it could succeed in moving amidst the confusion, and open fire on a popular gathering of the "Lambrakides", before which the people's Papandreou-Passalidis government would take the oath of office. And all this would certainly create an impression of revealing some secret only to idiots or simpletons. Those who do not wish to seem like ostriches hiding their heads before danger have long since been aware of the menace, of which many have spoken recently."

The Greek officers, Sir, were informed by Mrs. Helen Vlahou that on the night of the elections the Centre Union Party and the communists would seize power through a revolutionary process and abolish the form of government. In this case, it would have been necessary for the Army to intervene, and inevitably we would have ended with bloodshed, although it was doubtful (always according to Mrs. Helen Vlahou) whether the Army would have been able to face the organised forces of attack of the Communist Party, supported by a significantly sizeable part of the popular mass of the Centre Union Party.

So far I have given you a picture of the internal situation of my country as it was seen by basic factors of Greek public life. I think that it will be of great importance to your effort to seek the truth about Greece if I add one more element. As you probably know, there operates in the French capital a research company called SEDEIS, supported by the Ford Foundation. It has issued a series of studies on various countries. Among them is a study entitled "The political future of Greece", which was published in the FUTURIBLES magazine, issue No 65, as supplement No 866, dated October 20, 1963. The author of this work is unknown. It is signed by three "Xs". His findings agree with the view that the Greek regime was then subject to "the most serious political crisis since the guerrilla war". However, the forecasts of this investigator on future developments are of greater importance. He wrote:

"As for the rest, the future to Greece has a big unknown "X" that applies a break to forecasts: the role of the Army. It is by nature determinedly opposed to the parliamentary system. The officers who, in their majority, come from the lower classes of society, form a small or medium-sized bourgeois class, consequently not dedicated to the conservative Rights, onto which, however, they have hurled themselves because of their fundamental and fanatical anti-communism, due to the role of the Army during the civil war against the communists and the clumsy attacks of the non-communist opposition, which sees in it the partial support of the Right. Out of its anti-communism, the Army openly supported the Government of C. Karamanlis in the recent elections. But the attacks of the opposition, to which the Government had left it exposed, without protecting it, led to a never-growing rift between it and Mr. C. Karamanlis. Disgusted, as the majority of the country is, with the political disputes, it has the advantage of being the sole organised formation that had kept clear of parties, and maintains amidst the waves of doubts and questions a spirit of cohesion and unsullied pride based on a glorious past. Growing rapidly conscious of its strength before the speedily-advancing deterioration which crisis unfailingly carries in its path, being spurred and strengthened when attacks are directed against it, it is steadfastly determined not to allow the fate of the nation to be staked without its having a role, if not the main one. Should there be any ties between the Army and the King, that might delay its intervention; it will nevertheless go ahead, and it will do so regardless of the King, towards whom its affection is directed but whose political weakness prevented him from being shielded from criticism, and whom it knows to be little

inclined, if not incapable, of leading the action which he wants to claim as his own. The Army can survive with or without the Sovereign, and it will act without him. The problem facing the man or men who will stage the coup is another unknown factor. They will not be mobilised among the highest-ranking officers, who are far too exposed today. The officer or officers who will establish the military dictatorship are today living in the dark, if they exist at all.

That is, the Army will intervene, it will do so without the knowledge of the King; the revolution will not be led by the highest-ranking officers, and any elements of the Army that might undertake this initiative remain unknown. That is what happened.

#### PART 2: THE PHASES OF THE NEW REGIME

Sir: In the first part of this letter you were given the objective facts of the Greek political crisis during the period 1965-1967. Thus you have the causes for the Army's intervention in politics and the motives of the officers. Elements of the Armed Forces who could think and judge were informed by the King, the leaders of the Parties and the newspapers that:

The country was suffering a protracted political crisis. It was the responsibility of all the parties. The political world in this entirety was decayed. An unprecedented slackening of political morality was noted. The phenomenon of the underdeveloped leadership was tragic.

In essence there was no democracy. It had been abolished. Decay was turning into a fatal gangrene. All the institutions had declined. Complete erosion of all values.

According to the King, the Prime Minister had in mind to enslave the people, abolish the popular sovereignty and revoke personal rights. George Papandreou was characterised as a conscious organ of a communist plot, for Greece to become a Soviet satellite.

The Communist Party matured. There was danger of Northern Greece becoming another North Vietnam. The enemy penetrated, to attack from the rear. He seized the most confidential positions. There was cooperation between the Centre Union Party and the Communist Party. The Centre Union Party had been adulterated at the level of the people. The communists assisted it. It was certain that they would have done the same in the next elections, also. EDA (the Communist Party) would direct the Centre Union Party and become the regulator of the political life of the country. The communist danger was even more serious because it was not presented in a manifest and striking manner. It tried to lull the national conscience of the Greek people. And it was successful.

A victory of the Centre Union Party in the elections, with the assistance of the communists, would have been the beginning of the end of Democracy, as well as of the independence and territorial integrity of Greece. Consequently, there was a national danger, a fatal danger, an immense danger. Greece had entered a minefield.

Creation of a transitory political situation, with cooperation between the Centre Union Party and the Extreme Left constituted the bridge to communism. It would have transformed the country's foreign policy, and tied Greece to the chariot of Russian policy. The Centre Union Party, at the beginning of April, had been swept by a revolutionary hysteria. E.R.E. prepared to carry out rigged elections. Greece was being led to fratricidal convulsions. It was foreseen that on the night of the elections, the joint popular forces of the Centre Union Party and the communists would revolt. The Army would be called in to intervene. Bloodshed was certain.

All parties wanted to use the Armed Forces, each for their own benefit. They looked on them as instruments of party dictatorship.

Certain officers decided to act. First in order to prevent a civil war. Second, not to allow

the communist threat to the democratic regime and the independence and territorial integrity of Greece to take on flesh and bone. Third, to prevent the dictatorship of one party. Fourth, to set aside those responsible for the collapse of Democracy already accomplished. And fifth, to find solutions to the long existing problems of the modernisation of the country, which had prevented its acquiring the presuppositions of a real Democracy. The officers who took action expected that the King would take the initiative. In parallel, brought pressure to bear on the highest leadership of the Armed Forces. The need for the Army to undertake the political responsibility of governing the country matured in the conscience of the Army. A proof: The Chief of the Army General Staff was Lieutenant General Gregory Spandidakis. In effect, he was selected by the King, who had absolute faith in him. General Spandidakis claims that he had taken the decision for the army to intervene. He would inform the King accordingly, but was set on taking action on his own responsibility even if the Sovereign were to disagree. The military revolution took place, and prevailed, during the night of April 20-21, 1967. In this letter, Sir, I shall summarise the main stages the revolutionary regime has passed through since its birth.

Phase one: The preparation, manifestation and prevalence of the Revolution. Leading personality of the undertaking was Mr. George Papadopoulos. There was absolute secrecy. The action surprised all, and succeeded easily. The main concern of the leader of the Revolution, Mr. G. Papadopoulos, was to see that no blood was shed. This required a series of measures, among them arrests on a large scale. Thus, bloodshed was averted. Simultaneously, a relief and lack of reaction of the people was ascertained by impartial observers. The second element of this phase was the compromise of the Revolution with the King. The action of the Army was not turned against the Crown. This was proved by the events that followed. When the King went to the Pentagon from the Tatoi Palace, the question of the formation of the new government was brought up. The Revolution wanted it to include only military men, with the Chief of the General Staff, Gen. Spandidakis, as Prime Minister. The King objected to this. He suggested the use of non-military men also, and proposed the then prosecutor of the Arios Paghos (the Supreme Court), Mr. C. Kollias, for the Premiership. The Revolution agreed to this. The first revolutionary government, with Mr. Kollias as Prime Minister, took the oath of office in the afternoon of April 21, 1967, at the Athens Palace. Mr. G. Papadopoulos, as leader of the Revolution, showed a mood of conciliation and moderation towards the King. Third element of this stage was the definition of the aims of the Revolution. This was accomplished through the broadcast of the Prime Minister, Mr. Kollias, to the Greek people. The aim of the new regime was to cure the rottenness that endangered the country, prevent a civil war, and prepare an orthodox and healthy parliamentary form of government.

Among other things, Mr. Kollias said in this message:

"People of Greece, we have for a long time now been witnessing a crime that was being committed against society as a whole, and our nation. The unhesitating and miserable party bargaining, license on the part of a large section of the Press, the methodical attack against all institutions, complete slandering of all institutions, their erosion, the utter deprecation of Parliament, complete slandering of everything, paralysis of the State machinery, a complete lack of understanding of the burning problems of our youth, ill-treatment of our students and pupils, and ethical decline confusion and obscurity, secret and open cooperation with those aiming at subversion, and finally, ex-

plosive slogans used by demagogues lacking conscience, have destroyed the peace of the land, have created an atmosphere of anarchy and chaos, have cultivated conditions of hatred and dissent, and have led us to the brink of national disaster. There was no way of salvation left to us other than the intervention of the Army. The elections which had been proclaimed could not have offered a solution to the stalemate which had been created. First, because under the present circumstances it was impossible to hold them in normal conditions, and second, because no matter what their result would have been they would have inevitably led us to bloodshed and chaos".

The new government promised a radical change in all sectors of State activity and a series of other measures aimed at creating the suitable conditions for a return of the country to the parliamentary system on a healthy basis." It was stressed from the first moment that the intention of the Revolution was to create "a genuine, orthodox parliamentary life", to which the country would be led "as soon as possible". What was the social and economic philosophy of the new regime? It was set out clearly and unreservedly by the responsible Minister, Mr. N. Makarezos, on April 26, 1967, that is to say five days after the Revolution had prevailed, through the following statement:

"Greece belongs, and no one should have any doubt of this, to the Western World. It follows that the cosmotheoretical basis of its social and economic problems cannot differ in substance from those of Western nations. Specifically, with regard to the cosmotheory governing the economic life of the Greeks, the Government declares categorically that it stems from a positive exploitation of private enterprise. We believe that the individual both as a unit of production and as a unit of consumption, should act freely on the basis of the greatest lawful increases of lawful benefits resulting therefrom. It follows that the Government lays down as its aim the encouragement of private enterprise through suitable public financial and credit incentives. The aim of profit through lawful means, as a propulsive factor of development of the nation, is considered by the Government as the basic element in applying its economic policy".

The foreign orientation of the Revolutionary regime was also expressed, without ambiguity, on April 21, 1967. It was announced in this connection at the time, in the statement setting out the programme of the Government:

"The Government will seek to remain steadfastly devoted to the idea of peace and freedom, in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. In this sense, Greece, as a free and proud Nation, aims at the faithful fulfilment of her obligations to NATO and her Western Allies, but at the same time asserts its rights as a member on an equal footing of these alliances. Furthermore, the Government will try to maintain and develop friendly relations with all foreign countries without exception".

What is the inference to be drawn from the above texts, Sir? First, that the new political situation did not consider itself static, unchanging and undeveloping. It characterised itself as having as its aim the creation of a healthy democratic and parliamentary system. It did not blame democracy as such, but it did attribute responsibility to the political world of Greece on the grounds that, owing to its shortcomings and decline, it had brought about the collapse of the existing, albeit partially existing, democratic institutions, thus bringing Greece to the brink of the abyss. The new regime preached its gradual self-catalysis, and from the first moment it directed the thoughts of the Greek people towards the idea of healthy democracy. Second, from the point of view

of social and economic policy, the new regime had proclaimed its devotion to the principles of a free economy which prevail in all countries of the West. The basis of its economic policy would be, as it said, private enterprise and economic freedom. The new regime has fulfilled that proclamation without the slightest deviation, to this day. Third, we finally come to the question of the foreign orientation of the Revolution. On this subject, too, the new Government stated in its programme, in the most categorical manner, that it would remain devoted to the idea of peace and the freedom of peoples, and would also faithfully fulfil its obligations towards NATO and its Western allies, and would also aim at developing friendly relations with every country without distinction. It follows that from the first moment, there has been no fascist ideology in organising the internal political life of Greece, no hostility to the principle of economic freedom, no sign of neutralist tendencies in her foreign policy, and no intention to create misunderstandings with other countries. This general attitude, Sir, has been up to now the axis of activity of the new regime.

I shall occupy you, Sir, with two subjects which touch upon our political conscience and our sense of human conception. The first concerns the Press, and the other the arrests made. As I have already mentioned to you, the main care of the leader of the Revolution, Mr. G. Papadopoulos, was at all costs to avoid bloodshed during its outbreak. It had been deemed wiser to deprive a few persons temporarily of their freedom than to have killings and the digging of graves. On the night of the Revolution, from April 20 to 21, 1967, 6,338 persons were arrested. They consisted mainly of the basic elements of the Extreme Left which were capable of causing incidents leading to fratricide. The number of arrests might seem high at first glance. However, in January 1968 the number of detainees in various displaced persons camps had dropped to 2,625. The principle of displacements was not established by the Revolution of April 21, 1967. It had existed long before that. It had been established by Alexander Papanastassiou in 1924. The new regime was, therefore, applying a principle which already existed and had been most extensively used by previous administrations, in fact by democratic ones. We shall revert to this subject.

As soon as it prevailed, the Revolution imposed preventive censorship on the Press. With the exception of two communist newspapers, it suspended the publication of no other paper. Mrs. Helen Vlahou fell victim to a faulty assessment that the revolutionary regime would last only a few months, and on the strength of this impression stopped publishing her newspapers. Likewise the newspaper "Eleftheria" also stopped appearing of its own free will. All Revolutions suspend Press freedom at their initial stages. It should be noted, however, that the control exercised over newspapers was so slack that some had found it possible to hint indirectly, but nonetheless very clearly and in a manner fully intelligible to public opinion, their opposition to the new political reality. It will hardly be possible for you to form a true opinion of matters regarding the Greek Press unless you become familiar with the state it had reached on the eve of the intervention of the Army in politics. Greek newspapers no longer fulfilled their purpose. They did not show respect for events. They strangled the truth, deliberately. They cultivated hatred among the people, including fanaticism and dissent. They drew a false picture of reality, and refused citizens the right to be kept informed on what was happening and to draw the correct conclusions. In a letter to the undersigned, Mr. Karamanlis wrote:

"The problem of democracy in Greece is a Press Problem". In other words, he considered it impossible for democratic institutions to

function with the existing license of newspapers, an assessment which had also been made by a considerable number of foreigners prior to the Army takeover of the country, as well as after it. Since the Revolution of April 21, 1967, had set as its aim the cleansing of public life, it had, therefore, to discover the ways and means of keeping newspapers within the framework of their mission as an honourable medium of keeping the public informed.

Phase Two: The second stage in the development of the revolutionary regime was to face the armed rebellion of the King on December 13, 1967. I need hardly repeat the absence of any feeling of enmity or other form of bad intentions on the part of the leader of the Revolution, Mr. G. Papadopoulos, toward the Royal Institution of the King. Officers believed that the Army intervention in politics should have been effected by the King. The lack of action on the part on King Constantine compelled them to undertake the initiative, first. They believed that in so doing, they were helping the Throne, because they thought that by acting in this way they were facilitating the Crown, because the King would not be held responsible for a violation of the Constitution. They even thought they were offering the Crown a service, for they freed it from siege, blackmail and subversive intentions of the parties. Unfortunately, the King became a victim of bad advisers. Certain high-ranking military men, and some politicians also, systematically pressed on him the idea of an armed uprising against the new regime. Information on subversive movements of the Palace reached the leader of the Revolution, Mr. G. Papadopoulos, from many sources. He rejected it, and took no measures, so as not to offend the King in any way. At the beginning of October 1967, I called on Mr. G. Papadopoulos at his office. He was then Minister to the Prime Minister. He asked me if I had seen the King. I told him that I had not contacted him since April 21. He recommended that I meet him. He told me: "It is reported that the Palace is planning bloodshed. It would be a crime. Does the King not realise that we have acted for the sake of the Crown, in addition to other reasons." Information on the preparation of a coup on behalf of the Crown increased as time passed. The King, a few days before December 13, assured leading elements of the Revolution of his satisfaction with the Government and his intention to assist the Revolution in fulfilling its mission.

On December 13, 1967, a rebellion broke out under the leadership of the King. Both military men and politicians had assured him that he had only to express his opposition to the Revolution by deeds for the Armed Forces and the people to stand united by his side. The opposite happened. The Armed Forces refused to follow him. And the people showed frosty indifference toward the Royal initiative. The revolt failed and the King left Greece and settled in Italy.

How did Mr. Papadopoulos react to the royal coup?

1. He remained absolutely calm during the stage of uncertainty. Uppermost his mind was the thought of avoiding bloodshed.

2. He tried to mitigate the King's action. He did not hold him responsible, but attributed the action to the influence of bad advisers.

3. Following the departure of the King abroad and his abandonment of the Throne, he did not declare him deposed. He continued to recognize him as King of the Hellenes, being in a special situation on his own initiative and responsibility.

4. He provided all living expenses of the Royal family abroad from public funds.

5. He maintained in the country all the symbols of the Royal authority laws, and court decisions are delivered in the name of the King, all civil servants take the oath to

the King, the photographs of the King and Queen are displayed in all public buildings, the special hymn for the King, the Queen and the Queen Mother is sung in churches, etc.

6. He applied no bloody reprisals against those officers who played a leading part in the Royal revolt. No one was brought before a military court, nor was anyone sentenced. As was natural and inevitable, certain of them were retired and others were confined to specific villages in Greece.

7. Mr. G. Papadopoulos granted a general amnesty.

Phase III. During this phase the revolutionary regime drafts a new Constitution. The need to reform the regime had been ascertained and proclaimed long before the outbreak of the Revolution of April 21, 1967. The Constitution had to be adapted to new needs. The existing Constitution of 1952 no longer met prevailing conditions. A motion to revise the Constitution had already been tabled in Parliament as well. It follows that Mr. G. Papandreou's decision to proceed with a renewal of the Constitution was in accordance with a need which was both objective and had been ascertained for a long time.

A large committee composed of eminent jurists had been set up. Its work had begun officially on December 16, 1967, that is to say only a few days after the armed rebellion of the King. Mr. Papadopoulos could have taken advantage of the Royal coup of December 13th to postpone indefinitely the question of the Constitution—had he had an intention of doing so. But he had no such intention. In March, 1968, a committee elaborated the draft of the new Constitution. It was published and citizens were called to state their views, criticize it, and indicate amendments, and even demand the removal of certain provisions. Discussion was absolutely free. The Government did not interfere to prevent the publication of any view in the Press. When the public critique ended, the Government, after taking into account the recommendations which were made, announced the final draft of the Constitution on August 16th, 1968.

The people were called either to approve or reject it through a referendum held on September 29th, 1968. They voted for it almost unanimously.

It has been claimed that psychological pressure had been brought to bear on the voters. I shall confine myself to informing you of what happened in Athens, Thessaloniki and Piraeus, where there was a large number of foreign journalists, who had seen for themselves that the voting was carried out with absolute freedom, without the slightest attempt to intimidate the citizens of the State. In Athens, the Constitution received 74.2 per cent of the votes, in Piraeus 83 per cent, and in Thessaloniki, 82.9 per cent.

The democratic character of the new Constitution cannot be questioned. Its preamble states the following: "The people of Greece, being fully aware of its responsibility toward future generations, faithful to the values of Greek and Christian civilisation and the principles of national sovereignty, democracy, peace and progress, and imbued by the will to enhance the regime of Crowned Democracy in freedom, equality and justice, to reform the political and parliamentary life . . . approve of the present Constitution by referendum". Article 2 establishes the principle of popular sovereignty which, as is known, constitutes the foundation and prime prerequisite of Democracy: "All powers stem from the people, they exist for the people and the Nation, and shall be exercised in such manner as provided for in the Constitution."

The Constitution is composed of 137 articles. None has been specifically criticised and responsibly described as unconstitu-

tional. It is fair and necessary, Sir, to gather our thoughts, first on the elaboration and the voting of the new Constitution, and second, to its democratic content. Mr. Papadopoulos was under no obligation to elaborate a new Constitution. And no one could have prevented him from postponing this matter indefinitely. Yet, he accelerated it. The political consequences of his decision are clear.

First, he has bound himself by the Constitution through a Covenant with the Greek people to work toward the materialisation of democratic ideals which are expressed in the text of the Constitution. Second, he has proclaimed to the Greek people through the text of the Constitution that citizens should remain devoted to the democratic regime, and remove from their thoughts any other ideology. Third, he has undertaken the obligation to proceed with the gradual implementation of the Constitution and to complete this process when he shall deem that circumstances allow this without any jeopardy to national interests, and without the threat that democracy would not exist, and that the political life would be elevated.

I have already informed you, Sir, in the first part of this letter on the political course which was plaguing Greece for about one and a half centuries, since the time of the national revolution of 1821. Our country was suffering from chronic political crisis. Rarely were free elections held. Democracy was in essence a dead letter. Political reality was along way from the constitutional texts. Who was to blame? For one thing the low standard of the political sense. For another, the low standard of our political leaders. Public men (intellectuals, scientists, and even distinguished politicians) stressed, at various times, the need for a political upbringing of Greek citizens. I would like to inform you Sir, that the first Prime Minister of Greece who has taken the first practical step in this direction is Mr. G. Papadopoulos. On February 10th, 1969, he declared publicly: "I wish to stress the need for giving Greeks a political upbringing. Greeks should learn their responsibilities as members of a democracy, because it would be tragic to put the Constitution into full effect should citizens continue to act as before by throwing their ballot paper into the ballot-boxes with as sole criteria which candidate will serve best their personal needs. We should, therefore, make an effort to educate Greeks politically, and this effort should be carried out in an intensive manner and as soon as possible."

He did not continue himself to mere words. He entrusted the elaboration of a textbook on civic training. He gave orders that it should be published as soon as possible. This was done in 1970. It was published in thousands of copies. It was distributed free.

Since you wish to have a true picture of events in Greece, you should give the book on civic education written on Mr. Papadopoulos' instructions to be translated. It is the book which serves to give Greeks a political training. You would then see that the civic training given is a hymn to democracy. It goes so far as to withhold and omit certain shortcomings of the democratic system which have been ascertained in practice.

A few extracts will give you the substance of the system of political training of Greeks which is included in the said book and is being implemented by the Government:

"The democratic system of principles has as its epicentre the value and dignity of the individual. Each individual has the rights of freedom and development of its personality. The second fundamental condition of democracy is equality. Democracy does not deny the differences existing among men, but it considers similarities to be of much greater importance. Personal freedom and the free exercise of civic rights by every individual are the substance of democracy. Hence, no

dictatorial regime, even if it proclaims principles of equality or humanitarian aims, may be democratic."

"The most important civic right which stems from the aforementioned liberties is the right of every citizen to participate in the administration of the land. All power is based on the people (dogma of popular sovereignty), and it is expressed through elections. Democracy is based on optional administration. Elections should be held with reasonable frequency and regularity.

"Every citizen should have the right to vote, and elections should be free and unadulterated. Candidates should not be limited to those who are acceptable to the government. The ballot should be carried out secretly, so that the voter can be secure from all threats."

"Democracy demands the existence of many (at least two) political parties. The one-party states (that is, the countries where only one party is authorized to exist) are not democratic even if they ostentatiously employ the democratic technique: elections, parliamentary balloting, referendums. The existence of a legal and recognised opposition is a necessary presupposition for and guarantee of democracy. The governing party, or the governing coalition of parties, should be ready at any time to withdraw from power in favour of the opposition, when the opposition gains the majority and becomes entitled to govern. The formation of a free and uncoerced public opinion, is a vital necessity for the functioning of democracy and requires freedom of information and discussion and certain cultural level.

"Democracy in general is based on the principle of the majority. However, it respects also the principle of the minority. The principle of consensus, although it seems to be more democratic, is rejected by most of the theorists of democracy, for in practice it would lead to a dictatorship of the minorities or persons, who could veto any decision.

"We should always bear in mind that democracy is not only a question of institutions, no matter how important and sound they may be. Democracy requires a continuous effort. It presupposes a certain position on behalf of those who rule and those who are governed, and a decisiveness in maintaining certain rules based on the freedom and dignity of the individual. Being a gain of human struggle it requires continuous endeavour for its preservation."

"Freedom is the only basis of a healthy society. A nation in which a free society carries out its organized existence is usually called a democratic nation, and consequently democracy may be defined as the political and social formation of a society based on the principles of freedom. Descriptively, democracy may be defined as the political system in which there is universal suffrage, elections are held periodically, various political parties function, freedom of speech prevails, and justice is administered by an independent judiciary. Democracy is the implementation of the principle of human rights.

"A democratic society is a society of free, equal, active and rationally thinking citizens, where each chooses his own way of living for himself and accepts that the others choose theirs."

"The functioning of democracy is based on the people, all the citizens of the nation. Under democratic forms of government, the citizens are not only the human element of a state, on which its authority is exercised, but also the source of the state authority. This principle is also underlined by Article 2, par. 2, of the Constitution in force, which defines that all powers originate from the people and exist for the people and the nation."

This is the ideology of the revolutionary regime. The book on political action was not only distributed free of charge to tens of thousands of citizens, but is also taught in

the public schools. High school students of the 3rd and 6th grades pass examinations and are graded on the subject of civic training. More specifically, a contest was held recently for the writing of a simpler textbook on civic training to be used in the 3rd grade of the high school. The relative announcement was published in the Government Gazette, Issue No. 130 (supplement). In it, we read inter alia that the book should include a chapter "on the structure of modern societies, social and political systems (national-socialism, communism, and the dangers deriving from them), the democratic system, parliamentary system, political parties, fundamental institutions of the democratic nation".

Namely, Mr. Papadopoulos daily drives the democratic concept in to the conscience of the Greek citizens. The schoolchildren learn from early age the superiority of Democracy to other political systems, and are informed that Greece should be ruled under a democratic form of Government and have a democratic constitution. And I ask you, Sir, does this attitude of the Prime Minister of Greece not have some political significance? Does this systematic cultivation of a democratic sense in the Greek people not finally become a driving force leading to the full functioning of Democracy? What politician in Greece has made such an extended and great effort in the past? I believe none. Mr. G. Papadopoulos has never maintained that the present government system of the country is final. He has always considered it as temporary and transitory, as a procedure toward the foundation of a real and healthy democracy, which as I will never tire of reiterating to you, Greece never had. There is another characteristic manifestation of the Prime Minister of Greece. He proclaimed his abhorrence to any eventual transformation of the present political situation into a regime, and implacably condemned all cases of tyranny, in a public speech (on January 22, 1971). And what if, despite the attitude to the contrary of Mr. G. Papadopoulos, such a trend were to develop? He himself gave the answer to this question. It is recourse to elections, even prematurely which is to say before the basic aims of the Revolution are fulfilled:

"For as I said above" he said, "handling Greeks is difficult, for power is exercised through Greeks. As they have the inclination to give themselves wholeheartedly when they feel that the law applies equally to everybody, in the same way they have the inclination when they exercise authority to tend to place themselves above the law. But this is no longer the situation which meets the aims I referred to and on which we all agree. It is a state of affairs, a regime which would impose tyranny of the few over the many; but this has never been, nor in any case will be, the objective of the April 12 Revolution.

"I shall alternate the reassignable or on service high-ranking civil servants at fixed time intervals so as to allow more people to take part in public affairs, and on the other hand to deal with this tendency which exists as a weakness, to create a regime . . . "You Greeks who believe in the Revolution give special attention to this position. There are two prior conditions for us to begin moving towards changing the constitutional state order: The fulfilment of the objectives of the Revolution and the danger of imposing a regime. Only when the aims of the Revolution are fulfilled, or there should be ascertained a weakness to avoid conditions of a regime, in spite of all the efforts made, will I take the necessary steps leading to a full implementation of the Constitution so that the Greeks as a responsible people may receive treatment worthy of their fate."

A few days ago, the Prime Minister announced the abolition of the certificate of social beliefs. Many Greeks have been taken in by the Communist Party in the past. The Communist Party depends on another country. It is aimed at the imposition of a dic-

tatorship and the splitting up of the country, because it was bound to cede Greek territory to other countries. The issue of certificates by the police verifying that an applicant has never been a member of a communist organisation and is not charged with Communist activity had therefore been established as a requirement for the appointment of a person to various positions. Mr. G. Papadopoulos kept the certificates of social beliefs only for those wishing to become officers of the Armed Forces or to join the Security Corps. He abolished them for other Greeks. And he did it in the hope of facilitating the reconciliation of those who had been taken in by Communism and the state, the idea of equality and the principles of democracy.

Certain institutional laws necessary for the implementation of specific articles of the Constitution have been prepared. The most important ones include: 1) "On the right to report", 2) "On public gatherings", 3) "On commissions of inquiry of Parliament", 4) "On transgressions", 5) "On the secrecy of letters, etc.", 6) "On the commissioner of Parliament", 7) "On mixed criminal courts", 8) "On the institution of Regency", 9) "On the state of siege", 10) "On the Constitutional Court", 11) "On the responsibility of Ministers", 12) "On the state of the employees of the Secretariat of the courts and public prosecutor's offices", 13) "On political parties", 14) "On expropriations", and 15) "On the National Council of Education".

#### *The personification of authority*

Stage five: It is the so-called personification of authority, the power to decide and impose decisions. The political authority has been consolidated in one person. Prime Minister Mr. G. Papadopoulos. This phenomenon is not antidemocratic as it may, appear from a wrong first impression. Theoretic discussion is not the aim of this letter, sir. I should, however, remind you what modern political science professes on this subject. In addition to other works, I have in mind discussions on the matter carried out under the auspices of the University of Dijon. They maintained that "from Moscow to Washington" authority is personified. This phenomenon is noticed in democratic regimes also and has the tendency to perpetuate.

In the specific case of Mr. G. Papadopoulos, the democratic significance of the gathering of authority and the power of imposition is obvious. The people know who the real agent of authority is. There are no forces behind the scene holding the strings and directing he who rules. The people are aware of the aims and intentions of he who exercises authority. They control him and point out his responsibilities. The person who rules, on the other hand, does not have the opportunity to blame other factors in case of an error. In every revolution, many political tendencies are developed. One of them prevails. The personification of authority in Mr. G. Papadopoulos has the political significance that the principles and pursuits he proclaims have prevailed. The Revolution from the viewpoint of political orientation and power has been concentrated on the person of Mr. G. Papadopoulos.

The present Prime Minister of Greece supports his political existence on two bases. First, the public mandate was given to him (with the 1968 referendum) to rule and implement the Constitution in stages according to his judgment. Second, the revolutionary power has been absorbed in the person of Mr. G. Papadopoulos, expressing the aim of the Revolution to lead the country to democracy according to his absolute judgment of conditions. What Mr. G. Papadopoulos' goals are has already been analysed at the beginning of the second part of this letter.

Sir, democracy is no mere word. It is not enough to utter it, in order to have it. It is

a reality. Greece has not achieved it yet in this sense. The basic aim of Mr. G. Papadopoulos is to create the necessary conditions, from which the possibility for the functioning of a real democratic regime will arise. Greece was deficient in all areas. This was evidenced from the post-war era until April 1967. While she realised a significant economic development, her political life declined. Instead of having political stability, the country plunged into chaos. The intervention of the Army was a necessity in avoiding destruction. Whatever the politicians of the past may say, the people fear lest we return to the pre-revolutionary disorder.

Mr. G. Papadopoulos' aim is to obtain a symmetrical and parallel development of the economy, the modernisation of the state machinery, the evaluation of education and the democratic cultivation of the political conscience of the Greek citizens, so that the full implementation of the 1968 Constitution will be realised. Namely, the functioning of democracy. This deep and broad transformation cannot be achieved through the democratic way. As an experienced politician, you know the weaknesses of democracy. Democracy is often hindered by taking measures seemingly in the public interest. Popular notions are often formed with motives of personal interest, disregarding the vital needs of the masses. If a bad situation develops in a socially and economically advanced country which has people with a mature democratic conscience, you can imagine how tragic the situation is when neither the social and economic progress nor the mature political conscience exist.

#### *What did the others do?*

The old parties that existed in Greece which destroyed any semblance of democratic institutions, as I think I have proved to you in the first part of this letter, persistently call for elections. They are corpses awaiting to rise from their graves with the setting up of ballot-boxes. But what have they done to contribute to the pursuit of democracy? You know their responsibilities, and they have never accepted them. They never confessed to their errors. They remained unrepentant and unchanged. They learned nothing and they thought of no one. It is like a person who has directed a financial business and led it into bankruptcy, to ask the owner to entrust him with the business once again so that he may direct it with the same methods with which he destroyed it. They followed a policy of hatred. They tried to assassinate the Prime Minister, and they resorted to terrorism, spreading explosive devices which injured and killed innocent people. On this subject, I should mention that when the would-be assassin of the Prime Minister was sentenced to death, Mr. G. Papadopoulos, ordered that his sentence should not be carried out.

Those responsible for the political disorder in Greece encouraged interference by foreigners and governments which turned against the Greek people. They tried to stop the tourist movement to Greece, to have an economic boycott applied against the country, to have its national defence weakened, so that the Greek peoples would suffer. They cooperated with the communists. The old political parties brought communism to the threshold of power. The 1967 Revolution broke it up. The political parties were already cooperating with all communist groups. Mr. G. Mavros, presenting himself as the leader of the Centre Union Party and as being moderate, did not dare censure cooperation with the communists, nor to criticise Andreas Papandreu, who presented himself abroad as the leader of the Centre Union Party also, and in cooperation with the Communists.

Certain former deputies and Ministers belonging to the old political parties have contacted Mr. G. Papadopoulos and dis-

cussed with him various procedures by which, in their opinion, Greece could reach a free political life. It was a constructive political meeting. However, the political leaders turned against him, insulted and slandered him. For they have hoisted the flag of implacability, hatred, blood, revenge and blind obstinacy, and adhere to ideas and methods which almost caused Greece irreparable damage.

Sir, I should also give you certain assurances. The prevailing regime in Greece will not be toppled either by internal forces or foreign pressures. At home no one advocates unrest. The people do not want the past to be restored. They are afraid of it. Today they enjoy political calm and internal peace. They ascertain stable economic progress and very broad modernisation of the institutions of the country. The restrictive measures are continuously being lifted and have been limited to a minimum. Only professional political agitators, not the large, popular mass of people are disturbed by the regime.

The revolutionary regime, therefore, is not in any danger from the inside, and neither is it from abroad. Contemporary Greece is different than Greece in the first postwar years. International conditions have changed. The country now has the ability to confront both the bad intentions of its enemies, and the wrong decisions of its friends and allies. I should also add that foreign interference delays the road to democratisation. No one wants other countries to manage our internal affairs. Propaganda often exploits many of the measures of normalisation as victories for outside pressures.

Thus it is only natural to have delays from now on, so that there will be no freedom for dishonest and politically harmful exploitation of decisions made in the interests of the regime, and not to satisfy foreign factors. The transformation of the revolutionary regime to the full function of democracy in stages will be accomplished in the interests of the nation. If you pause to reflect upon events in Greece from April 21, 1967, until the present, you will ascertain that the country is in a state of continuous development. This development will be accomplished orderly and solely according to the needs of Greece.

Phase four: Represents the procedure for a gradual normalisation of affairs and drawing nearer in stages toward the full implementation of the Constitution. This procedure has a series of specific manifestations: As already mentioned, the Revolution imposed initially preventive censorship upon the press. In January 1968, newspapers and magazines were allowed constructive and responsible criticism made in good faith, in reporting news and other subjects, according to their judgment.

Early in September 1969, the Prime Minister, Mr. Papadopoulos announced the lifting of all restrictions on press freedom. Censorship and any other preventive interference in the issue of newspapers and periodicals ceased to exist. As of January 1970, the new law on the press came into force.

I shall cite certain examples of the operation of press freedom. The Minister of Social Services (who has meanwhile been replaced following the government reshuffle on August 26, 1971) announced a series of measures regarding insurance organisations. The question is important and concerns hundreds of thousands of working people. An absolutely free discussion followed in the columns of newspapers, without the slightest interference on the part of the Government. The organisations concerned expressed their disagreement without obstruction. Another case is the law on the journalistic profession. This law too was discussed in the columns of newspapers with unlimited freedom. All sorts of views were heard and supported, the majority being against the Government bill. The third case concerns the testimonies

concerning Greece given before the Subcommittee and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the U.S. House of Representatives. You know, Sir, that the testimonies in question contained slander, insults and groundless accusations against the Regime prevailing in Greece today. Yet, all these texts were published in full in all Greek newspapers. The first to start, was the undersigned, and other newspapers followed.

The question of displaced persons falls within the framework of the normalisation of the situation. As I have already mentioned to you, in order to avoid bloodshed, the Revolution was forced to arrest and hold 6,338 persons in various places. In January 1968, those held numbered 2,625. In January 1969, they fell to 1,889. In January 1970, they numbered 1,678 and in January 1971, 353. In April 1971, there were only 58. I repeat the last number, 58. Displacement camps have been abolished. The 58 persons on question live in various parts of the country, not under arrest, but instead under supervision. They are considered to be extremely dangerous to public order. Some of them would threaten openly and directly, assassinations and all sorts of terrorist acts, if set free.

#### *The Advisory Committee*

An Advisory Committee has been created. It is in the form of a small advisory Parliament. Professional organisations and regional administrations have chosen persons from whom the Prime Minister has formed the Advisory Committee. Bills are submitted to it. It elaborates them, discusses them publicly, and amends them when it deems it necessary, and returns them to the Cabinet.

This institution is of a democratic nature. The bills sent to the Advisory Committee are made known to the people beforehand. Public opinion is thus given the possibility of expressing its reactions, either through the press, or memoranda to the Advisory Committee. Besides, public discussion within the Advisory Committee affords citizens the opportunity to judge which provisions of laws are right which of them are not.

On September 29, 1968, the Greek people voted in favour of Article 138 of the Constitution by a majority of 92.2 per cent. Article 138 reads as follows: "The present Constitution, after its approval by the Greek people through a referendum. It will be signed by the Council of Ministers and published in the Government Gazette will come into effect with the exception of the provisions of Articles 10, 12, 13, par. 1, 14 par. 1-3, 18, 19, 25 par. 1-3, 58 par. 1-2, 60, 111, 112, 121 par. 2, which the National Revolutionary Government is authorised to put into effect through acts to be published in the Government Gazette." Since that time, Articles 13, 18, 19 and 10 of the Constitution have been put into effect. They read as follows:

Article 10. "1. With the exception of persons caught in the act of committing an offence, no one shall be arrested or imprisoned without a judicial warrant stating the reasons, which must be served at the time of arrest or remand in custody pending trial.

2. The person caught in the act or held on a warrant of arrest, is brought before the competent examining magistrate not later than 24 hours from the time of the arrest, and if the arrest is made beyond the seat of the examining magistrate, then within the time absolutely necessary for his conveyance before said magistrate. Within three days of the time of presentation, the examining magistrate is obliged to either release the person arrested or issue a warrant for his imprisonment. This delay can be extended by two more days at the request of the person arrested in the event of force majeure which must be attested forthwith by a decision of the competent judicial council.

3. Should both the aforementioned delays expire without any action, every jailer or other officer, whether civil or military, in charge of the arrested person, must release

him forthwith. The violator of the above provisions, shall be punished for illegal confinement and shall be obliged to make good all damages sustained by the injured party and, in addition, to give satisfaction to said party by such a sum of money as provided by law.

4. The maximum term of custody pending trial provided by law cannot exceed one year for criminal charges and/or six months for misdemeanour charges. In completely exceptional cases these maximum time limits can be further extended by six and three months respectively, by virtue of a decision of the competent judicial council.

5. The law defines the conditions under which, through judicial decision, the State indemnifies those unjustly imprisoned or convicted."

Article 13. "1. The home of each person is inviolable. No house search can take place except at a time and manner provided by law.

2. The violators of the above provision shall be punished for violation of the sanctity of the home and shall be obliged to fully indemnify the injured party and to give him further satisfaction through the payment of a monetary sum, as provided by law."

Article 18. "1. Greeks have the right to assemble peacefully and unarmed as provided by law.

2. The police may be present only at public gatherings. Public gatherings must be duly notified to the police authorities forty eight hours prior to their being held. Open air gatherings may be prohibited if they endanger public order and security."

Article 19. "1. Greeks have the right to form associations with due adherence to the laws of the State, which, however, shall under no circumstances subject this right to prior permission by the Government.

2. Every union of persons, the purpose or the activity of which, are directed against the territorial integrity of the State, or the regime or the social order or the security of the State, or the political or civil liberties of the citizen shall be banned. It is disbanded by Court decree.

3. Co-operatives are disbanded, because of violation of law or their statutes, by Court decree. By decree issued by the chief judge of the district Court the operation of a cooperative or union may be suspended temporarily, if at the same time proceedings for its permanent dissolution are initiated.

4. The right of association of civil servants may be subject to certain restrictions imposed by law. The same restrictions on the right of association may be imposed on employees of local government bodies, or other legal entities of public law, public enterprises, and public utilities.

5. Resort to strike for the purpose of achieving political or other ends irrelevant to material or moral interests of the workers shall be prohibited.

6. Strikes of any form by Civil Service personnel of any kind, personnel of local government bodies or of other legal entities of public law, shall be prohibited. The participation of such personnel in a strike is considered in itself as a submission of resignation."

Martial law was so curtailed, as to have been essentially lifted. By order of the Prime Minister, issued on April 17, 1971, offences under Penal Law remaining under the competence of courts-martial, were as follows:

a) Rebellion (P.C. Art. 170), b) Violation of maintenance of authority (P.C. 179), c) Sedition (P.C. Art. 183, 184, 185), d) Provocation and inducement to commit a crime or offence (P.C. 186), e) The formation of a gang (P.C. Art. 187), f) Breach of public peace (P.C. Art. 189), g) spreading false news or rumours (P.C. 191), l) Provocation of citizens to commit acts of violence (P.C. 191), i) Formation of an armed group (P.C. 195), j) Explosion (P.C. 270) and k) Violations relative to explosives (P.C. 272).

All other offences, which under martial law, should be heard by courts-martial, were transferred to ordinary justice.

#### PART 3: THE STRATEGIC ASPECT

Sir: The Greek problem has another aspect also; the strategic one. In my opinion, it should hold the attention of both Athens and Washington. Greece and the United States are members of the Atlantic Alliance. Greece has always (since the end of World War II) had great strategic significance to the security of Europe and the United States. No theories or arguments are needed to prove this. The weight carried by the Greek area within the defense system of the West, has been determined by events. In 1946-1949, both the political and military leadership of your country has studied the problem on the basis of factual data. After the Yalta Agreement, the Soviet Union changed its policy. It moved away from cooperation with the United States and Great Britain, it has not fulfilled what had been agreed upon regarding the organization of Europe after the end of World War II, and through one method or another, but mainly using armed force, it absorbed Rumania, Bulgaria, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia and East Germany, Communist regimes were also imposed on Yugoslavia which kept in very close cooperation with Moscow until 1948, and in Albania, which left the Soviet orbit in 1960. Soviet Russia did not confine herself to the aforementioned expansion, which added 1,481,598 square kilometres of European land to her, together with a European population of 132,995,000. She tried to go even further.

#### The attempt against Greece

Since 1946, Moscow has brought pressure to bear on three points: Persia, to reach the India Ocean through the Persian Gulf; Turkey, to seize effective control of the Straits (Bosphorus and the Dardanelles) to link the Black Sea to the Mediterranean, and finally Greece, to reach the Aegean through Bulgaria, and thus gain mastery over the Greek islands.

It was precisely then that American policy concentrated its attention to Greece. It gave very careful attention to its strategic value. What would happen if the Greek area were to come under Soviet control? It would be useful, Sir, for you to cast a glance upon the map. If Greece were to become a Soviet satellite, to begin with it would outflank the Straits through Western Thrace. Second, Greek harbours would be converted into sally-ports of the Russian navy. Almost the entire Mediterranean coast of Turkey would fall under direct Soviet menace, the bases of radiation of Soviet power being the Greek islands in the Aegean. The Middle East, North Africa, and Iran, would naturally follow and fall within the sphere of Russian influence. Western Europe would not have remained untouched. To begin with, Italy would feel the impact of Russian presence in the Mediterranean. The upset would be felt in France as well. As an American who closely followed events at that time said, Europe would have felt "the hug of the bear". Such thoughts led to the conclusion that the loss of Greece would cause a huge crack with even more dramatic consequences on the defensive system of the free world and would directly affect the security of the United States. This last reason, gave birth to the Truman Doctrine, on the basis of which economic and military aid was granted to Greece and Turkey, because as it is referred to in the preamble of law 75, "... the national integrity and survival of these nations (Greece and Turkey) is of great significance to the security of the United States". At that time Greece fought in an astonishing way and thanks to the skillfulness of her Army, the self-sacrifice of her people and the American support she restrained the effort of Russia to be established in Eastern Mediterranean.

#### The main slogan

In 1951 the membership of our country in the Atlantic Alliance was thought useful for both Greece and the Western World. First, because if Greece remained isolated it could not be excluded that she would have become once again the target of the aggressiveness of Russia and her satellites. Second, because the incorporation of Greece in the Atlantic Alliance discouraged the Russia expansionist intentions towards the direction of the Greek area and the Aegean sea. Greece's gain from the Atlantic Alliance was the effective guarantee of her territorial integrity and her independence. The benefit of the West was that as long as Greece stood up as an independent and territorially integral nation, no serious rupture in the security system of Europe and the United States would be created and the military balance in that area would not be changed. Namely, the contract carried a burden for both sides. Both sides benefited from it. Both sides undertook responsibilities. Both sides had rights. The aim of the Atlantic Alliance was distinctly defensive. There was no edge against any country.

As you know, Sir, in the instigation of local wars, the Soviet Union either uses the Communist parties where it controls them and they are dependent on it, or takes advantages of disputes among others by giving aid to the one side of the adversaries to utterly destroy Western influence and establish its own. The organs of the Russian expansionism in Eastern and Southeastern Europe were the Communist Parties.

The same thing happened in Greece. In December, 1944, the Communists almost took power. They held the whole of Greece except for the centre of Athens. Stalin deserted them temporarily because he realized that Britain would not accept Russian occupation of Greece. He left the Greek question for later. Other countries had to be preceded.

In 1946-1949 the Communists, assisted by the Communist regimes of Albania, Yugoslavia and Bulgaria tried to seize the Greek area. They were to split it with Yugoslavia, which would take Macedonia, and Bulgaria, to which Thrace would be given. The rest of Greece would be transformed into a Russian protectorate as long as it would be under the dictatorship of the Moscow-directed Communist Party.

The foreign-instigated Communist revolt was crushed. Communism, without giving up its aims, simply changed tactics. It tried to be restored, to return to public life, to break the moral isolation its treacherous acts and crimes had condemned it to, to contact and cooperate with other Communist Parties and finally to seize power through political means and other dynamic pressures from under, provided the right conditions were created.

The main slogan of the Russian and the Communist propaganda as of 1951 (year of Greece's entry into the Atlantic Alliance) was: "Greece should leave NATO". Because of the fact that Russia knows better than anyone else the defensive character of the Atlantic Alliance, the pressure on Greece to withdraw from NATO has an aggressive motive. It wants Greece to be left unprotected from the joint pressure from abroad by the Communist countries obedient to the Russian government and at home by the Communist Party and the other political factors willing to cooperate with it. The withdrawal of Greece from NATO, therefore was always the permanent demand and steady pursuit of Russian policy and the Communist Party.

#### A new situation

As of the summer of 1967 and with Israel's war with Egypt as the starting point, the situation radically changed in the Eastern Mediterranean. For the first time in modern history a permanent presence of powerful

Russian naval forces in the eastern basin of the Mediterranean was accomplished. The presence, I repeat, is permanent because certain countries make their ports available to the needs of the Russian vessels. The West's influence in Syria, Libya, Egypt, Algeria and Malta is annihilated. In Turkey an anti-American spirit developed. Greece remained the firmest support of Europe's defence and the security of the United States in Eastern Mediterranean. The revolutionary regime, as I have already mentioned, restrained the undermining of the allied ties of Greece with the West and the United States, to which the Communist Party and the Centre Union Party had methodically given their full attention. It kept the Greek people firmly knit to NATO and maintained calmness in the land. The U.S. Sixth Fleet moves in Greek ports without the slightest manifestation of enmity or coolness on behalf of the inhabitants, for the majority of the Greek people wish Greece to stay in NATO and the alliance with the United States hence they approve of the present government's position on this question.

General Goodpaster, Atlantic Alliance's Commander-in-Chief, defined the strategic role of Greece in the formed new reality in the Mediterranean in recent statements:

"Greece has common border lines with communist countries as well as seas. Soviet ships and supplies have to sail from the Black Sea to the Mediterranean.

For this reason Greece is of special importance to the defense of Eastern Mediterranean.

In case Greece was not a member of NATO, the Eastern Mediterranean would be isolated and exposed, and the Soviet activity in the southern sector of the allied command of Europe would be facilitated greatly, the communications and supply lines of the Alliance in case of a crisis would be seriously threatened and the supply of Europe with fuel would be interrupted."

The most disturbing case of this period is that while Greece's strategic importance in the defensive system of NATO increased and the new Greek Revolutionary Government put a stop to the previously cultivated popular currents against the Atlantic Alliance, an attack against Greece began in the West and the demand was expressed that the U.S. military aid granted to her be stopped, and furthermore that she be ousted from the bosom of NATO.

This campaign was a triumph of the Russian policy. And this triumph was completed when this demand for the military weakening of Greece found ground in the United States also. A basic pursuit, old and permanent of the Soviet Union, but impossible to be realised by it, was adopted by organs of the American State. Moscow kept silent. Why should it speak when its opponents worked in its favour?

The most tragic page of American policy may be written, Sir, on the Greek question. There is no worse thing than to do yourself what your enemy wishes and seeks. Greece is the last stronghold of the West in Eastern Mediterranean. If it were to fall the defense of Europe and the security of the United States would suffer a heavy blow. And this stronghold is undermined methodically and insistently, not by those who aim at the destruction of the Western World, but persons and state organs belonging to the Atlantic Alliance and declared guardians of the security and protectors of the survival of the free world and the American nation.

#### *A unique case*

We have no right, Sir, to interfere in your internal affairs. But since you discuss ours you authorise us to speak to you. We cannot hide our surprise to a few things that take place in your country. The Subcommittee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives invited various persons to testify be-

fore it on Greece, among them Sir Hugh Greene. We confess that the phenomenon is at least peculiar. The American Congress invites a British subject, residing in his country, to enlighten it on events in Greece he visited for a few days some months ago and recommend what the United States should do!! We think that this case is unique in history of all times . . .

However, since Sir Hugh referred to my Country, I am obliged to comment on his views. Before I do this I should draw your attention to two points: The first is that this gentleman refrained from specifying the sources of his information. As a basic rule, however, the value of a report is weighed principally from the gravity of the source which supplies it. The other point is that Sir Hugh Greene refused, despite my repeated requests, to declare by what means does he cover his expenses that are connected with his activity on Greek affairs.

I make no accusation. But it is his obvious duty to speak up immediately, clearly and in detail on this matter because it is not excluded that he himself might have fallen into a skillfully set trap. His British friend Francis Noel-Baker sent him a letter in which he criticises his activity against Greece and attributes it to the diminution of his political concept because of age. I cannot have an opinion on this. However, the establishment of a branch of political gerontology in the political science might be useful.

Sir Hugh Greene explained before you certain arguments. I shall refer to some of them. He told you: Short-term wise, Greece is useful and necessary to NATO. In the long term she will be lost, because the Greek people, turning against the present Greek regime, the preservation of which they attribute to the support of the United States and the Atlantic Alliance, will be declared against both NATO and Washington. Had the prevailing regime been overthrown soon and the country returned to democracy, everything would go well and Greece's ties with the West and the Atlantic Alliance will have deep roots. Sir Hugh Greene's argument is a logical fabrication without any contact with real facts.

If you recall what this letter contains in its first part, you will understand immediately that Sir Hugh's view is a paper castle founded on sand. The subject gentleman fails to mention a very significant event of the up-to April 1967 Greek political situation. What happened then in Greece? An unprecedented campaign has been developed to undermine the foreign policy of the country, based on NATO, in the conscience of the Greek people. Mr. P. Kanelopoulos declared that Northern Greece tended to become a North Vietnam. According to Mr. P. Papaligouras, the Centre Union Party worked to drive Greece to the communist iron curtain. George Papandreu confided to Stravros Costopoulos, Foreign Minister of his administration, his intention to relay the fire to all points of Greece with the torch of EDA (Communist Party). The Communist Party, working for the withdrawal of Greece from NATO and her attachment to the Warsaw Pact, characterised the situation as revolutionary and feverishly prepared to seize power, which automatically would have meant withdrawal of Greece from the Atlantic Alliance. A few days before the Revolution of April 21, 1967, Mrs. Helen Vlahou wrote that G. Papandreu was working objectively and consciously for Greece to abandon NATO and become a satellite of the Soviet Union. Shall I add the anti-American propaganda Andreas Papandreu made in alliance with the Communist Party? British Major Eugene Hinterhof, military commentator, summarised things in an article in the magazine "Defence" (July 1971 issue) as follows:

"It is generally accepted, even by those

who have but a superficial opinion of the situation in Greece, that had the military 'coup' not taken place, and if Andreas Papandreu won the elections (his victory was almost certain), he would have withdrawn Greece from NATO and would have either brought the country to neutrality or would have followed a non-aligned policy. As Nasser, Nehru and Mrs. Gandhi proved, this latter move means enrollment in the field of gravity of the Soviet sphere of influence. Papandreu's decisions could easily lead to events similar to those in Malta. The annulment of all treaties with the West and in time, the granting of 'facilities' to the Russians in the Greek ports and airfields, with destructive repercussions for NATO would have followed."

The procedure for the gradual psychological and political break of Greece from the Atlantic Alliance and cooperation with Washington was therefore put into motion in the country at that time. And what did Sir Hugh Greene recommend to you? The answer is simple: To place the system of undermining the Atlantic Alliance in operation again in Greece. Because if the agents of that system returned to Greek public life for a short instead of a long term Greece would become at least another Malta. And as for Sir Hugh Greene he will shrug his shoulders with indifference, but the West will lose a valuable ally and suffer serious military damage, irreparable perhaps, and my country will enter a period of dramatic adventures.

I am sorry, Sir, that I am obliged to tell you that Sir Hugh Greene lied to you. He gave you impressive figures for the dismissal of officers. He said 2,577 officers were chased out of the Army for political reasons. About this I must make the following remarks: Prior to 1967, 372 officers were demobilised annually. As of April 21, 1967 and until December 13, 1967, 626 officers were removed from all three services of the Armed Forces. Of these, 187 left at their own request, because of age restrictions, completion of 35 years in service, or health reasons. It should be taken into consideration that in the days of the Papandreu government a conspiratorial organisation called ASPIDA was discovered in the Army. Of those who participated, some were taken before a military court. Others were penalised with dismissal. On December 13, 1967, the known military revolt headed by the King broke out. For this action 122 Army, Air Force and Navy officers were dismissed. Earlier, in 1935, a military revolt took place. 1,036 officers were dismissed then.

#### *A string of inaccuracies*

Once an evil has been committed, innumerable ones follow. One lie brings another. This rule is applied absolutely to Sir Hugh Greene. In his opinion, the role of the Army in the national defence is of secondary importance. Selected military units no longer developed in the sensitive areas of Greece but manned with officers selected under the criterion of loyalty to the regime, were transferred from their original positions and stationed around Athens in order to safeguard the Government. It is, Sir, a blatant lie. After April 21, 1967 until the moment this letter is being written (September 1971) no new military unit has been added in the basin of Attica and Athens. The U.S. Government has military attaches at the Embassy and Military Mission in the Greek capital. You may ask them to investigate this and brief you on it. Sir Hugo Greene's inaccuracies continue. A special unit of marines was established by the regime he says, to control, among other things, the Navy. Let us look first into how this unit was established. This idea is not in keeping with the Revolutionary regime. This subject was discussed by competent staff members of the Armed Forces before 1964. Finally it was decided that the formation of a marines unit be based on the 32nd Infantry Regiment. The relevant order

was given and signed by the then Chief of the General Army Staff, General Greg. Spantidakis on November 12, 1966, five months before the outbreak and prevalence of the military revolution. So Sir Hugh Greene lies. And whoever has a rudimentary knowledge of the military laughs when he listens to talk of an alleged control of the Navy by the Marines. The Marines units occasionally board for short time periods amphibious vessels of the Navy to take part in national and inter-allied exercises. They have no other interference or engagement with the Navy. You were also told by El. Dimitrakopoulos that hundreds of officers, trained in the United States, were dismissed by the present Greek Government. I inform you, Sir, that 1,123 officers were sent for training in the United States from 1961 until 1970. Of these 50 were removed, I repeat 50, from April 21, 1967 until this date.

#### *A responsible assessment*

In the days of the Revolutionary administration, the fighting capacity of the Greek Armed Forces, and in particular the Army, had fallen to a low standard. This view had been supported by Sir Hugh Greene and El. Demetrakopoulos. Since then, the fighting capacity of the Army has fallen, it follows that NATO was weakened at its southeastern flank, which at the present moment constitutes the centre of gravity of the defence system of Europe and the United States. I mention with regret El. Demetrakopoulos's name. This individual was known in Athens as a suspicious mouse of inextricable cellar backstage work. I ask you, Sir, who is competent to judge the fighting capacity of the Army of a country? Isn't some specialisation needed, including elementary impartiality and a sense of professional responsibility? No negative view of the Greek Armed Forces has been expressed by any official figure or administrative official. Greece is a partner of NATO and lies in its southeastern flank. There is a commander of the Allied Forces of the southeastern flank. There is also the Supreme Commander of the Atlantic Alliance. The latter is always American, and usually the former one as well. Have you been given an unfavourable opinion of the state of the Greek Armed Forces by the supreme leadership of the Atlantic Alliance? Certainly not. Because it is exactly the opposite which is true. In May 1969, General Lemnitzer, Supreme Commander of NATO, visited Athens. He proclaimed:

"Greece has great military significance in the south flank of NATO. I have visited that area many times. I have full confidence in the capacity of the Greek Armed Forces. Although I am aware of the need for aid felt by the Greek Armed Forces, I would like to say this: Regardless of the material infrastructure, I know of no other force in which we may rely on with such faith as the Greek Armed Forces".

This was said, Sir, by the Supreme Commander of the Atlantic Alliance forces. Do you believe that the views of someone lacking competence in the matter as Sir Hugh Greene and a shady individual like El. Demetrakopoulos, carry more weight than the assessment of an American patriot, distinguished soldier and responsible Supreme Commander of NATO, as General Lemnitzer?

And how is it possible that the views of persons who know nothing on such matters should carry weight with you instead of those of a responsible American who has perfect knowledge of everything? Lemnitzer's successor as supreme commander of NATO, General Goodpaster said in May 1971:

"Beyond the geographic position of Greece, the Greek army constitutes an element ensuring balance of power. What adds great significance to its contribution to the Alliance is its clear familiarity with the terrain. The military significance of Greece in the south east flank of NATO is therefore, acknowledged and indisputable".

Admiral Rivero, Commander of the southern flank of NATO, said:

"I depend on this Greek Army to defend the area. On the basis of my own opinion, which I gathered during the exercises, the Greek soldiers are well trained. My mission is to strengthen defence, especially of Greece and Turkey. These two countries offer immense material contributions to strengthen their own defence".

In April 1970 General Ryan, Commander of the United States Air Force, visited Athens. He proclaimed his admiration for the Greek Armed Forces, and described them as a guarantee of security in the area of their responsibility and generally within the ranks of the Atlantic Alliance. In June 1969, the allied exercise "Olympic Express" was held. General Ben Harrell was in charge of its general coordination. After the end of the exercise, he expressed the view that its final phases were a definite indication not only of the fighting capacity and combat readiness of the Greek Army, but also of the progress registered in the field of its training. Admiral David Richardson, Commander of the U.S. 6th Fleet, on retiring from this post to take up leadership of U.S. naval forces in the Atlantic, expressed his admiration for the Greek Armed Forces, and underlined their constructive contribution in the defense of the south eastern sector of the Atlantic Alliance. Admiral Wade, Commander of U.S. Naval Forces, Europe, after inspecting Greek Navy installations in March 1969, expressed a favourable opinion, and also praised the high standard of training of the officers and crews of the naval units. USAF General Joseph Moore, Commander of the 6th Allied Air Command, USAF General Fred Ean, Commander of Allied Air Forces South Europe and spokesman of the Lockheed Company, manufacturers of F-104 aircraft, awarded and distributed prizes to units of the Greek Air Force for their superb performance thanks to the high standard of training and capability of its personnel.

#### *I shall do my duty*

It has been claimed before you that in the event of need, Greece would not fight to fulfill her obligation toward the Atlantic Alliance for two reasons: First, because her forces have allegedly weakened, and second, because the people, owing to their opposition to the regime would prefer to turn their arms against it and not a supposed enemy, in its wish to overthrow the political situation and not protect the national territory against foreign invasions, and honour its commitments to its allies. I believe that I dismissed the argument regarding the weakening of the Greek Armed Forces, having cited as witnesses persons who can speak authoritatively on the matter.

I am now left with examining the question of what would the Greek people do should circumstances call upon them to fight for their country and allies. All those who support this pessimistic view know nothing of the psychology of Greece and its history. Should Greece suffer unjust and unprovoked aggression, all Greeks would seize arms and fight to the end, regardless of who their rulers were. Because they draw a dividing line between defending their country and their political divisions. Mrs. Margaret Papandreou mentioned that "The Greek people proved to be an important ally in the struggle against fascism in the war of 1940. A gentleman by the name of Aris Anagnu wrote a letter to the International Herald Tribune published in the edition of August 20, 1971, in which he wrote among other things: "Such a regime (meaning the present regime in Greece), has no military value as an ally, because, in case of emergency, its armed forces would be unreliable. The soldiers might think it more important to mutiny and overthrow a loathsome government, rather than fight against a foreign ally. The writer is either a man of bad faith, or beyond words. Because he forgets what Mrs. Margaret

Papandreou said: Greece fought against Fascist Italy and Hitlerite Germany in World War II from October 28, 1940 to May 1941. You will no doubt recollect, Sir, that Greece was under a dictatorship since 1936. There was neither democracy, nor parties functioning. 47,000 of exiles had been sent to the islands. Who opposed Mussolini? The dictator, John Metaxas. And under whose guidance did the Greek people fight and beat Fascist Italy? They did so under the leadership of the dictator. Who decided to reject any idea of coming to terms with Germany, and that Greece should face Hitler's colossal war machine, even though her ally at the time, Great Britain, would afford her no aid whatever? The dictator, J. Metaxas died in January 1941. Every Greek mourned. The entire nation cried. I deem it imperative, to remind you of the nature of the contribution made by dictatorial Greece in World War II.

Here are some views:

"For the sake of historical justice, I am to acknowledge that of all opponents who have faced us, the Greek soldier has fought with bold daring and supreme contempt for death." (Adolf Hitler).

"The Battle of Mt. Pindus changed the course of history." (Marshal Jan Smuts.)

"If Hitler's Mediterranean plan—which failed thanks to the victorious resistance of Greece—had succeeded, Germany's attack on the Soviet Union would have had entirely different results. The heroes who have covered the sacred land of Northern Epirus with their blood, the fighters of Pindus and others, will together with the fighters of the Marathon, guide and shine mankind through the centuries." Anthony Eden, British Foreign Secretary at the time.

"It is unnecessary to speak today for many countries. But there is one, a small but heroic country, to which our thoughts turn today with sympathy and admiration. It is brave Greece and her forces which are defending the fatherland. Among examples in this war, there will certainly not be many acts that will match the acts of self sacrifice and heroism of the Greeks." Winston Churchill.

"Greece's admirable struggle in Albania is one of the turning points of World War II." George VI, King of England.

"We readily acknowledge that our Greek allies are the first who, through their superb victories in Northern Epirus paved the way and dealt decisive blows against Fascist Italy. The successes were not of local significance only, they influenced the whole outcome of the war. The defense of Crete saved Cyprus, Syria, Thrace, and probably even Tobruk." Field Marshal Wavell, Commander-in-Chief, British Forces, Middle East.

"I dare not think what Russia's position would be today, had Greece not fought." Field Marshal Alexander, October 1941.

Conclusion: Regardless of political regime, the Greek people, always defend their country with self-sacrifice, rally behind their Government no matter what its origin may be; they forget political preferences and fight to safeguard territorial sovereignty and national independence. Everything else fades away and disappears. Facts show therefore, that Greeks will do their duty to the utmost to their country and also fulfill their obligations toward their Allies. We are, Sir, a proud and honourable people. We love our country. And when Greece is in danger, we know how to defend her and refuse to destroy our nation, for the sake of any party, or political ideology.

Mr. Donald Frazer, a member of Congress, and Representative from Minnesota, wrote a letter to the New York Times on August 4, 1971, regarding Greece. The Representative is Vice-Chairman of the American Committee for Democracy in Greece. In that letter he claims that aid to the Greek regime does not serve NATO and United States interests, and for this reason, the House of Representatives Foreign Affairs Committee, of which he

happened to be a member, voted in favour of suspension. The decision regarding military aid to Greece, places the matter in the hands of the President of the United States. The President does not decide on the basis of reports and explanations provided by aliens, prompted by unknown motives and strings. Instead, he assesses confirmed data and responsible recommendations by American officials, whose sole criterion is to serve the interests of their country.

Mr. Donald Frazer committed another error. He wrote: "The role of NATO is the defence of the democratic institutions of its members." In other words, the Atlantic Alliance was set up to control the internal political life of its members. The preamble as well as Article 2 of the Atlantic Treaty, praise democratic principles. But beyond that, the real aim of the Treaty is laid down mainly in Articles 3, 4, 5 and 6: It is resistance against armed aggression. The Treaty is applied when, as mentioned in Article 4, the national integrity or political independence or security of its members, is threatened.

When Greece and Turkey applied for NATO membership, the Council, considering "that the security of the North Atlantic area would increase by the participation of Greece and Turkey in the North Atlantic Treaty, agreed to recommend to its member countries that subject to the implementation of the positive procedure governing each country, Greece and Turkey should be addressed the relative invitation." That is to say, the military criterion prevailed, and no other consideration was taken into account.

President Truman notified Ankara and Athens of the decision accepting them as NATO members. In his reply to President Truman, the Turkish President, Mr. Jelal Bayar, said on October 9, 1951: "You have made the most appropriate report in your message, by stressing the unshakable will and determination of Turkey to maintain its independence and territorial integrity in the face of all pressure and threats." The Greek Premier at the time, Sophocles Venizelos, also sent a message to Truman on the same days: "... It is true that Greece, faithful to her traditions will fight again, should she face aggression against her independence, even, if need be alone. But it is a great relief to us to know that we shall participate in a defensive organisation to which so many countries belong, and are prompted by the same ideals of peace, justice, and democracy, and by the same determination to safeguard their independence." In the debate held in the Canadian House of Representatives, the Foreign Secretary at the time, Mr. Lester Pearson, explained why Canada agreed that Greece and Turkey should be NATO members. "By adding members to our collective defensive strength, we render aggression against any one of us less likely."

#### *An internal matter*

The text of the North Atlantic Treaty makes no mention of procedure in case the democratic institutions of a member-country were to face a crisis. What would happen if a democratic regime were to be shaken, and power seized by Communists? The North Atlantic Treaty is mute. It would be an internal matter of the country concerned. According to the text of the agreement, no one has the right to interfere in the internal political life of a member of the Alliance. Each country who is a NATO partner has the right to defend its political freedoms as it thinks best. Only in case of threat or attack against the territorial integrity or political independence, and security of a NATO member "the contracting parties would consult jointly to face the situation" as laid down in Article 4.

Allow men to draw attention to one more error committed by Mr. Donald Frazer. He wrote in his letter that since the aim of NATO is to defend the democratic institutions of its members "its aim is not served

by granting aid to those who destroy those institutions." May we ask the honourable Representative from Minnesota ONE QUESTION: Who destroyed democratic institutions in Greece? Presumably, he is not informed. Let him take the trouble to read the first part of this letter. We shall quote again one of Mr. Karamanlis's sentences: "Democracy was assassinated in Greece by the liberal regime." But in that liberal regime no role was played either by the present Prime Minister, Mr. Papadopoulos, nor the Armed Forces. The parties were ruling. It follows that they destroyed democracy. If then, Mr. Donald Frazer, wishes to deprive aid from real destructors of democratic institutions, he should refuse all assistance to the Greek political parties and their leaders, instead of turning against those who undertook to face the consequences of the acts of those who assassinated democracy in Greece. He, therefore, contradicts himself. His arguments run contrary both logically and politically. We do not know the reason why he fails to realise the weakness of his argument and what he expects to gain from it.

The Minnesota Representative puts forward no innovation by supporting the exercise of pressure against the Greek Government. He simply emulates with some variation, the Brezhnev Doctrine. He accepts its principle which is the right of a country to interfere in any manner in the internal affairs of another. The leader of the Soviet Communist Party is Mr. Donald Frazer's ideological patron. Why is the Brezhnev Doctrine opposed by all peoples, whether free or under the rule of foreign influence. Because it abolishes the fundamental constructive principle of respect of the national sovereignty of states. The internal policy of a country, including its foreign orientations, is determined by the struggle between indigenous political forces.

This is precisely where the difference lies between the Warsaw Pact (an instrument of oppression of its members by Soviet Russia) and NATO (an instrument of defence of its members against foreign threat and attack). The Minnesota Representative has not realised that his theory has undergone a major transfusion from the oppressive mentality of the Brezhnev Doctrine. Both Brezhnev and Mr. Frazer begin with the same principle. The differences between them are of a quantitative order, that is to say, they refer to the means and degrees of pressing states and peoples, in their internal political lives.

#### *The need for unity*

Two NATO Supreme Commanders, Generals Lemnitzer and Goodpaster, have stressed the need for unity among the members of the Atlantic Alliance. According to the former, unity, team-work among peoples offers something much more than the aggregate of individual possibilities of members. General Goodpaster, who is the present leader of the Atlantic Alliance, underlined:

"The Soviet threat to NATO in the Mediterranean, is not limited to the military sector. The threat also carries political and psychological significance.

"In this area, the Soviet Union has considerable forces which, in a case of a crisis, will cause difficulties to our forces and eventually we may suffer certain losses at the beginning. In spite of all the weaknesses of the Russian position, we should, however, recognise that the Soviets have presented a new situation to us, a threat to our communications in the Mediterranean and our operations in that area.

"This threat may be confronted first with the maintenance of considerable Allied forces inside the area—as our intention is—and second with a demonstration to the Soviet Union, in every possible way, that we, the NATO countries, are determined to remain united and strong in the Mediterranean and in all other areas of Allied Command Europe. With united effort for a collective defence,

our countries prevented the enemy from overtaking each country separately or influencing one country against another. I am absolutely certain that this policy of collective defence will be proved successful in the future also".

The American Commander stresses the decisive importance for unity of the NATO country-members. He says that we show the Soviet Union that we the NATO countries, are determined to remain united and strong in the Mediterranean, the Soviet Union will not dare threaten us. This is the opinion of the most competent military leader. Unfortunately, an opposite view prevailed among certain circles in the United States. With their attacks against Greece they cultivate among country-members of the Atlantic Alliance a spirit of disunion instead of unity. And instead of calling for the strengthening of the country-members of NATO's southeastern flank, which include Greece, they demand that here military strength be diminished by the suspension of the military aid granted to her. I will sum up in a form of a geometrical theorem, the essence of this tendency:

Weakening of Greece=Weakening of NATO  
Weakening of NATO=Weakening of the United States

Weakening of the United States=Strengthening of the Soviet Union.

The above diagram, Sir, leaves no room for logical contradictions nor practical objections. It is based on absolutely objective facts.

Sir, we are friends. We are allies. We are threatened by the same opponent. We believe equally in democracy. We have common defence and security interests. These reasons make it my duty to address this letter to you. It is up to you to confront the problem in a manner serving the real needs of your country. We shall move forward without hesitation and prejudice. We neither long for the Communist dictatorship nor tolerate the Fascist one. Only recently, the Prime Minister, Mr. G. Papadopoulos ordered that a fascist organisation called "Fourth of August" be dissolved. We object to extremes. We hold the roads to democracy open; we walk on them. And we bear in mind the advice of our forebears: "Hasten slowly" and "adjust yourself to circumstances".

Sincerely yours,

SAVAS KONSTANTOPOULOS.

#### TRIBUTE TO LOUIS A. SILVEY

### HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

MR. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to a longtime friend and outstanding American, to a man who has spent his life asking what he could do for his country and then doing it. Louis S. Silvey of Mattapan, Mass., is celebrating his 85th birthday tomorrow. At this time it is a privilege for me to invite my colleagues to join with me in paying tribute and thanking Louis Silvey for his untiring service to America and his countrymen since World War I, always living by his motto: "For God and Country."

To describe this man as sincere, loyal, patriotic, humanist, and philanthropist does not suffice, as he is so much more. And to list now all of his charitable acts would extend this RECORD into several volumes; so I will only mention how others have judged him through honors and awards.

Mr. Silvey is a past commander and life member of the American Legion, Mattapan Post No. 128, a member of their National Distinguished Guest Committee and National Counter-Subversive Committee. He was awarded a 50th anniversary plaque for his many years of devoted service to the American Legion and is one of two men in Massachusetts ever to receive their National Commander's Citation which he received in 1964 for his outstanding acts of charity. Mr. Silvey is known all over America as "Mr. American Legion."

Louis Silvey is also past commander and Life Member of the Veterans of World War One, Mortimore Coakley Barracks 1148, and was aide to the department commander. He is in his fifth year as commander of the Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A., Boston Post No. 22 and is the national liaison officer of that organization to the American Legion. In 1965 the Jewish War Veterans of Massachusetts awarded him for being the "unsung hero of the year." Mr. Silvey is a member of Voiture 543 of La Societe 40 Hommes et 8 Chevaux, of which he was publicity chairman for 8 years in Massachusetts. He is a life member of the Handicapped Children's Organization of the New Bedford Hospital in Massachusetts.

In 1966 the Certificate of Merit in appreciation of faithful and meritorious service to the Disabled American Veterans was awarded to Mr. Silvey. In 1969 he received the Certificate of Appreciation from the U.S. Army for his support of the Army's recruiting programs. And again in 1969 he received the George Washington Honor Medal from the Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge, Pennsylvania for best advertising of Americanism for his slogan "Worship the ground you walk on, don't undermine it."

The accomplishments of this man go on and on. He is indeed a rare and remarkable breed of man. America is certainly lucky to have such a citizen as Louis S. Silvey.

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS DELIVERED BY THE HON. RICHARD T. HANNA AT WEST COAST UNIVERSITY

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the Members of the House a most stirring, forceful, and thought-provoking address. The speech was presented by our distinguished colleague from California, the Honorable RICHARD T. HANNA.

The impact of the speech on the audience at West Coast University last June was profound, as indicated by the fact that the president of the university chose to refer to Mr. HANNA's remarks in his introduction to the school catalog.

I am sure that my colleagues in the House will enjoy reading and reflecting

on the comments of our friend, the gentleman from California:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS DELIVERED BY CONGRESSMAN RICHARD T. HANNA AT COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES AT WEST COAST UNIVERSITY, JUNE 5, 1971.

SOCIETY IN TRANSITION

I have firmly believed from the beginning that in our American society, and in society wherever you might find it, one of the great qualities of humanness in a society is to have choice. It has also been demonstrated that the human being performs best when he is challenged, when there is a competitive environment. For these reasons, it seemed to me rather clear and rather important that we have in California a choice of some of the best in private education and some of the best in public education, and through the best of each we would be assured that that kind of quality would continue. And in a period of transition, in a period of change more than any other, this business of challenging back and forth is extremely important.

We are in a transition as a society. Some of you may be familiar with these words written by William Wordsworth:

"Action is transitory—a step, a blow,  
The motion of a muscle this way or that  
'Tis done, and in the after-vacancy  
We wonder at ourselves like men betrayed."

So, we are in a period of this transitory action, and as we look about and see the confusion that is arising, I think perhaps many of us wonder at ourselves like men betrayed. Every transition period is difficult. Comfortable attitudes and values recently valid during the recovery and progress of the post World War II era are being dismissed, as they should be, as irrelevant. The foundation of the institutional framework within which these attitudes were nurtured and protected are crumbling. All that seemed traditional and permanent in our society is being assaulted and many Americans, perhaps most, are confused and afraid of these times. Attempts at restoring balance seem only transitory in themselves.

Perhaps this is an exaggerated statement of the collective national psyche. If it is, it still will not be too far from the mark. It is unfortunate, but I think rather inevitable, that the dynamics of change are very painful. This has always been true. The values that become entrenched in our culture were outgrowths of equally difficult periods of transition that developed them. In fact, our society has been in a continuous transition since the first colonists successfully challenged nature for a foothold in the new world. But by virtue of continuity and being blessed with a pace of change which we as human beings of the times in which we lived, could absorb and accommodate, we have felt mostly minor shocks as these changes took place.

Today the transition has taken on an entirely different dimension. The very size of change and the rapid rate which it is occurring transforms the quality of experience we are exposed to. May I review for you my own view of where we have been in the last five to six decades and suggest that from this view some understanding can be acquired of the unique character of the present transitional stage. Then out of this I would hope that we could create a better understanding of why we have our present difficulties, why they are so challenging and frustrating, and finally out of this perhaps suggest some reason for hope and to point out for those to whom, in this commencement, the future is the most important thing—some paths for possible progress.

At the turn of the century, I, in an oversimplification, see these as the dominant themes for America: First we had going for us the momentum of the nineteenth century, and particularly the last four decades of that

century, in which the United States had reached a degree of industrialization that placed our country on a par or at least moved it parallel with the European nations with which we were competing. And we had, further, the momentum and dynamics of what I refer to as the three big E's.

Expansion—we had a great continent which we were expanding, always expanding towards the West. We had the expansion of our industries with our transportation system as we went off into the open frontierland. We also had other expansions, the expansions of our education system and expansions of many other levels of life.

There is also a great area of extraction. We were extracting in an accelerated way the natural resources of this country. We were also extracting from the ideas that were being developed elsewhere, by the ideas that were being developed here, but more of that later.

We were also exploiting. We were exploiting not merely man, but we were exploiting technology as it came on. We were exploiting the ideas that had been created. I've mentioned this business of ideas for a special reason because I think it is important for us to realize that at the time when these three big E's became the dominant themes, that we had developed in this country a great seed bed of basic ideas. We had borrowed some, we had constructed some, but look back and think with me, if you will, on what this has meant for the period out of which we are moving. There were new ideas in medicine. You recall that it was in Vienna then that psychiatry was just being discovered. That was the first place where they had done a transplant on a dog. It was in the last part of the nineteenth century. Many of the things that you see so expanded, the ideas that have been in a secondary, tertiary way extracted, came out of the medicine of that day.

What about these great men like Pasteur? It set the whole tone of the development of medicine during the 1900's. Does that stand alone? Oh, no it does not. If you want another example way off on the scale, think of the Englishman Babbage, who in the last part of the 1800's really developed the basic concept of computers. We really exploited, extracted and expanded on that one and we're still doing it. That was something that we inherited. I suggest you look in any kind of activity in your life and you will find back in that era a seed bed.

The labor movement—that's where you find the fellows like Debs, the men who started the whole basic movement that there ought to be a different relationship between the working man and the industry he served, between the management and the labor which works for the management. They wanted not to be the ones that were exploited, they wanted in on the exploitation. They wanted in on the expansion. They wanted to do some extracting of their own. They have done so. We have seen that great movement.

Look at education. Do you know that up until the latter part of the 1800's education in America really centered around the words of Jefferson who said about education, "If you want to have a good citizenry, you've got to have some of it." People said "Amen," and then went on about their business. But we really didn't start bringing education to the American people on any kind of a standard that met that great goal described in the words that Jefferson gave us until the 1900's. And it was out of the seed bed of ideas by men like Dewey and Royce that we've got to where we are today.

Now you follow the picture? Here we are; we are here because of our exploitation, extraction and expansion. And how did we do it? Well, one of the factors that came into the picture very early with Henry Ford, in the industrialization phenomena, and which helped put this in place, was a division of

labor. You had specialization and that called for education. So education grew with the idea that there ought to be more of it. There was a great demand for more of it. It was a quantitative problem in this period. More people were getting it. They were getting more of it and they were getting it over a longer period of time. And the curve on that has been ever upward.

But we haven't had time to look critically at what has happened during all this period of expansion, exploitation and extraction. I think that what we have developed has given us what we see around us, now that we have been brought to a halt and have to look. It developed for us tunnel vision—tunnel vision in which we felt as long as everything was all right where we were and in what we were doing, it must be all right with the world. You know the great song, "Don't Rain On My Parade." That's from the fellow who has tunnel vision. He lives in a well. He figures if the sky is blue over me it must be all right with the world. Well, unfortunately that kind of thinking, that kind of luxury is no longer ours, because we know we live in a bigger world than can be encompassed by living in a well. And we're forced out of the well, we've been broken loose from our tunnel vision, and it isn't very happy as an experience because we're seeing things we'd rather not see. And when we come out of the well we're feeling things we'd rather not feel, and we'd rather have the comfort that comes from well-dwelling and tunnel vision.

Another thing that came out of it is distorted bookkeeping. You see, as long as you are looking on a narrow basis you can make your profit and loss on the things you decide should be within your tunnel vision, and the things that you find accommodate your well. And if the bookkeeping doesn't reflect other things, that's somebody else's problem. Now if you pull coal out of the ground and you leave it where it is desecrated, cut up, you will leave places where there will be the accumulations of rancid waters which will pollute all of the underground resources of that wonderful product, water. If you bring subsidence, if you ruin the potentials of any development on the surface of the ground, if you leave the air full of acrid smells—that is somebody else's problem. If it is not on your balance sheet of what is the cost of carrying on that activity, that is somebody else's problem. When you leave enough of that it isn't somebody else's problem, it's everybody's problem. And that's where we are. We've had distorted bookkeeping. We haven't paid the real price for the things that we have been enjoying. Now we have to start facing up to it.

The third thing that occurs in tunnel vision is that you get out-of-date, unresponsive institutions. This was brought very sharply to my attention reading a little brochure written by a Dutchman. He had this view of us, and happily he softened it because he took the view of several other people at the same time; we weren't singled out. He said, "Well, as I view it, the American people have been so eminently successful at building great institutions, that those institutions have supported mediocre men." That hurt. That particularly hurts if you're serving in one of those institutions as I do—Congress. But that's true if you're serving in an educational institution. It's true if you're in a corporate institution. And as I look around me, I see that there are some very good evidences that the man wasn't entirely wrong. Because when the institutions start to fall, that really makes the game honest. And as you look at the institutions that are in trouble you find that they are not only governmental institutions. You've known from your own experience, educational institutions are in trouble and corporate institutions as well.

And this situation has not been entirely ours. There has been some problem in some

of the other countries, but the Dutchman said of Europe. "Europe builds such miserable institutions it had to have superior men to function." And as I look and become acquainted with the European scene, I see a lot of truth in what the Dutchman had to say. And then he really saved himself by his third observation. He said, "And the Russians have the marvelous ability to take superior institutions and superior men and by the false application of politics render both rather mediocre." Well, I suggest that he had a rather incisive view of the kind of world in which we live in terms of its institutions.

We must face, I think, the fact that we are at the end of a ride that became a great invigorating, exhilarating experience with the take-offs of the late 1800's. And it has been a great ride. But I'm one of the bus drivers now and I can tell you it isn't so great right now. The bus is full of a very strange collection of people. The ones that have moved towards the back have been on the bus a pretty long time. And they have great memories of where they've been and they don't have too many expectations of where they are going. They would hope that the bus would just remain comfortable and even if it stopped they wouldn't be too unhappy. But in the middle of the bus are those that are caught up with the idea of keep the bus running and keep our journey going. And up in the front of the bus, there are a lot of young people who are jumping up and down raising Cain with the bus driver telling him to go faster, turn left, turn right. You know, get going without any consideration that the bus can't go that fast or if he makes that kind of a left hand turn he's going to wreck the bus. And besides that, they haven't even bought their ticket or paid for any of the gas.

It's important however that the driver realize that he can't get them off the bus. And as a matter of fact, the most important thing the bus has to do is to get them someplace that counts, even if they can't make too much of a contribution at the present moment in telling him how to get there or how fast.

Well, our need as I see it from where we are, is three big M's. These three are maintenance, management and maximization. Now let me explain what I mean by these three. I'm not suggesting that the three E's will stop, but they will not be dominant. Not if we do things right.

Maintenance is very important in any aspect of life. I think that there was a fellow who wrote a book that talked about our throw-away civilization, that we really don't keep anything long enough to have any attachments. Well, no wonder, it costs so much to maintain the kind of things we've been making. The maintenance problems in our society are just fantastic and there has to be an understanding of the shift that comes from quantity to quality. And if you're going to make the shift from quantity to quality, this means that you're not going to be putting out so many of everything, which means that it has to be done a little better. It means it has to last a little longer. It means it has to have some maintenance. But it isn't things that bother me so much, it's institutions and people. Most important is people. But our institutions need a maintenance they haven't been getting. We have been so busy building our institutions in education, they haven't had proper maintenance, because the people in charge have felt the drive to expand. They wanted to exploit the situation that they found that made it attractive to get the funds necessary to expand. They exploited the conditions as any normal red-blooded American would do in trying to make their bag the best as they saw it, and the best meant the biggest. But that isn't quite good enough now, and they have to look towards maintenance. But so do we.

What about family maintenance? You know when you look at the divorce rate, when

you look at what is happening with the raising of children, you realize there has got to be some maintenance to the family. But it needs more than maintenance, it needs a better understanding of where the family is.

Let me just digress a moment and be personal. I was born just before World War I. I was born in a small coal mining town, one of seven children. My father was a coal miner. We had a great family, but it was great because that was the only way to be. I was a part of the working force of that family very early. I was the oldest of the boys, and since my mother had four of them before she had a girl, you know where she looked for the dish washing and the floor scrubbing and the diaper doing. And I was really checked out early. Now it wasn't because she enjoyed seeing me do it, it was because I had to do it. There wasn't dally diaper service. There weren't automatic washing machines and I assure you I wasn't very automatic. I had to be stimulated constantly! But it counted; it meant something. She knew it and I knew it, which was very important to the relationships in the family all the way along. We had to work with each other. We had to entertain each other. These things were important because that's the way the family was and that was the situation as it was.

It isn't that today. No use me regaling my young son and telling him, "Look, that isn't the way your Daddy did it" and, "Look back on my days, boy, to get your leadership and your guidelines." How can I have that same feeling engendered when he knows it isn't true? Believe me, I would not have carried on my duties if I had known that it wasn't true, if I wasn't really convinced that that was important for me to help. We have to understand the maintenance, the management and the maximization of the family relationship in every field. Everywhere we look we see this. The medical field that I mentioned—what do they need? They need management. They need a maintenance of a system once it's well managed. It's not enough to be a doctor any more. Do you ever go into a doctor's office with your children? What an experience as against what it was when you and I were children. We just don't have enough doctors to keep on doing medical services as we've been doing it. So what do we do? We ought to be thinking more of health maintenance. Because if we had a maintenance system that could be run by technologists, you wouldn't need the doctors. You could run your maintenance program. You could do this through the technology and the technologists. But this takes a shift in thinking and this is all part of the transition area.

I give you these examples to bring to your attention that this is actually what we must face up to and prepare for. I think in your school you really appreciate the real requirement of this.

You know, the kids have a saying. "Let's get it all together, Baby." That is a very fundamental thought, because if you're going to manage anything, you do have to get it all together. You have to think of your activities as a whole and relate to the rest of the elements. You can't have tunnel vision. You can't live in a well. You're part of an activity, you've got to know how you relate. But more than that, you have to see the relationship of your activities to the environment in which they are happening and you have to humanize it. You have to see it in relation to the people who are going to be affected by it. And that takes tremendous managerial capacities. And we have to, in education, start to develop these and reorient our education where we can do it. Now when we start to maximize in this society, we have to cover those who have been left out in all of this expansion, in all of this exploitation, in all the great extraction we have made from the resources of this great country.

We have left out three important groups.

Those living in the cocoon of the South that didn't break till World War II; those who lived in the cocoons of an area closer to us in the great Southwest—the Mexicans; and the third group, the Indians—the ones whom we treated more sorely than almost any others. Part of maximization should be to bring them into the play. We also must increase our efficiency. That's part of the whole quality equation. Instead of wasting that which we now call pollution, we should capitalize it and make that a source of new products. A place where we can do our extracting for some of our newer sources. If we are going to reduce maintenance, we have to have quality control in the things that we make so that when we bring something home from the store, it works. How many of you had the experience of bringing the doll home that is supposed to speak or walk or something, you slip the batteries in and you know, things just don't happen. Or if they do, they don't happen very long and now you've got yourself a child that is much more unhappy than she was before you ever got the doll. Or you bring home something that is supposed to be a joy like a little cook stove that plugs into your electric outlet in your house, and you find that this thing is an absolute menace. There is not much quality in this kind of production. Also, I don't think I have to do more than commiserate with you ladies about some of the appliances that you have in your house and the problem of trying to get anybody, including your husband, who can fix them.

If we're going to make the adjustment from quantity to quality, we must bring in line the three M's. And then there is always the big M that is always around. That's money. That's not only the public's money that is in the coffers of your government, as great as those might be. No, that is the money that is in the private sector. That's the money that is in your pocket. For example, it is going to cost us more if you want to get the lead out of gas. And do it quickly by putting a tax of three cents on gas that has lead in it, because for three cents a gallon they can develop gas that doesn't have lead in it. It will do the same things. But you have to pay that extra three cents for the gas. And I think that you could look at almost every area in which we have some requirements, and we can do it. But ultimately, it will come down to the question of who is going to pay the check.

There is a great song by one of our popular singers that says "If you want to be a friend of mine, you getta your money on the line. And I think our society has to face that. But it isn't money alone. It's are you getting what you pay for? Is what you're getting what you want?"

In an education these are pretty important questions. We're probably spending, after elementary school, about 85% of our education dollars on courses related to degrees, and those largely that were associated with the classic education of the latter part of the 1800's out of which we've all sprung. And the jobs that are here in society and coming on line in those categories are about 15% of the jobs. In other words, we're using 15% of our money for 85% of our jobs and 85% of our money for 15% of our jobs. Now that's an oversimplification, but it gives you some indication of the mismatching and that money isn't the whole thing.

I think we're going to have to look forward to the future with this in mind. It's a great future, but it needs some inputs that we got out of the 1800's. We have to find where the new seed bed of ideas lies. We have to apply in this complex society these three M's. And then we can get on with the business of the three E's, but cautiously, because we're never going to have these applied with the wild and reckless abandon that has been the history of your life and mine, and maybe then it will get a little more quiet on the bus. By

that time I'll be turning over my driver's license to somebody else.

It's not a future that is without hope. We have about us all the things we need to handle the frustrating problems of our times. But if you don't see them and you don't understand them, it's pretty hard to deal with them. And we have been a bit reluctant to cut with our past, see truly our present and then project our future. It is out of institutions such as we see represented here that we can find the best enlightenment, the best of leadership to move out into what I'm sure is going to be just as exciting a future for the young people in this hall as was the future that was prepared for me.

And I'm not afraid of that future and I don't think that most of these men here are afraid either. They just want to be pointed in the right direction, and I think that out of what we have seen of the true heritage of a period, we can determine where we are and settle it as to how we can move into this bright new world.

I'll be sorry not to be on the bus when it makes its next great stop, because I'm sure there are going to be some exciting days in the ride that lies ahead.

#### RECOVERING OVERPAYMENTS TO SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFICIARIES

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which would modify an unnecessarily harsh provision of the Social Security Act. The purpose of the bill is to make equitable the procedures used by the Social Security Administration in recovering overpayments to beneficiaries.

Under the present practice, the Social Security Administration notifies the beneficiary that he has been overpaid and that his benefits will be terminated until the overpayment has been recovered. Beneficiaries are then advised how they might go about taking an appeal from the decision. If an appeal is made, the final outcome could result in a determination that the beneficiary is without fault and that recovery would be against equity and good conscience. Or, agreement could be reached whereby benefits are merely reduced to effect the recovery. However, while the negotiations to reach an equitable conclusion continue, the beneficiary goes without any check.

In an extreme case, the termination of benefits could force a senior citizen on to the public assistance rolls. But even in more common cases, beneficiaries must borrow often at high interest rates, and seek assistance from their neighbors and relatives.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that most persons would not quarrel with the notion that the Government is entitled to recover overpayments it makes. I certainly believe that, but at the same time, the recovery process can be administered in a fairer and more humane fashion.

The bill I am introducing provides that the Social Security Administration may not terminate or reduce payments until it first determines if equity and good con-

science command relief from repayment. If relief is not in order a determination of equitable repayment terms must be established prior to any actual termination or reduction of benefits.

This bill would in no way change the liabilities and obligations of either the Government or the beneficiary. Nor, would it add to the burden of administering the social security program. Rather, it puts the horse before the cart. It would require the administrative inquiry to precede the actual recovery. It would assure that an equitable result be reached before, and not after recovery is made.

There is no reason, Mr. Speaker, why the administrative determinations pertaining to recovery cannot be made prior to the Social Security Administration's unilateral termination of all benefits. Indeed, simple due process compels this result. Unfortunately, the Social Security Administration does not share this view of the current law. Thus, my bill has been necessitated.

This simple addition to the overpayment section of the Social Security Act should be noncontroversial, and I hope it will be possible to win speedy enactment.

#### PURDUE UNIVERSITY LEADING WAR ON CORN BLIGHT

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, the most serious problem to plague America's farmers in recent years is the southern corn-leaf blight, which last year destroyed millions of dollars worth of corn crops.

One of the most serious problems posed by the blight has been its unpredictability. While science seeks for a way to prevent or treat the corn blight, it is a great boon to all concerned—farmers, scientists, agricultural marketers—to be able to know where and how severely the blight is liable to strike.

Now, projection of the blight pattern is being done, thanks to some excellent work being done at Purdue University, located in West Lafayette, Ind., in my own Second District. Funded by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and guided by NASA and the Department of Agriculture, scientists from several Federal agencies and seven State land-grant universities are conducting the largest single experiment ever aimed at an agricultural problem—the southern corn-leaf blight watch experiment.

This fight, centered at Purdue's Laboratory for Applications of Remote Sensing—LARS—is applying the very latest in technological developments to provide current information on this plague to America's corn crop.

Dr. J. B. Peterson of LARS has written an excellent description of the blight watch operation. I insert this article at this point in the Record:

SOUTHERN CORN LEAF BLIGHT WATCH  
EXPERIMENT

This year the largest single experiment ever directed to an agricultural problem, that posed by the southern corn leaf blight, is being conducted as a cooperative research project by scientists from seven state land grant universities and several federal agencies. This research program is known as the Southern Corn Leaf Blight Watch Experiment. The experiment is the result of the voluntary collaboration of many state and federal scientists in developing a plan to exploit for the common good the promising results of a 1970 study of the capability of remote sensing to follow corn blight damage over a large geographic area.

The 1970 experiment was conducted by scientists of the Laboratory for Applications of Remote Sensing (LARS) at Purdue University. LARS is funded by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) to conduct remote sensing research which can be applied to useful problems. The 1970 experiment was successful in identifying up to five levels of corn blight damage from aircraft altitude using either infrared photography or data from a multispectral scanner. In view of this achievement, interested scientists of several states and of NASA and USDA decided to take steps to organize a major research program in 1971 building on the 1970 experience.

This resulted in the development of a unified, well-coordinated effort carried jointly by NASA, USDA and scientists from seven Corn Belt states. The participating agencies are: for USDA, the Statistical Reporting Service (SRS), the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service (ASCS), the Extension Service (ES), the Cooperative State Research Service (CSRS), the Economic Research Service (ERS), and the Agricultural Research Service (ARS); for NASA, the Earth Resources Aircraft Project (ERAP), the Manned Spacecraft Center (MSC), the Earth Resources Aircraft Project at Ames Research Center (ARC); Laboratory for Applications of Remote Sensing (LARS) at Purdue; the Institute of Science and Technology (IST) at the University of Michigan; the University of California; and the Cooperative Extension Services and the Agricultural Experiment Stations of Nebraska, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Illinois, Indiana and Ohio. LARS, IST and the University of California are funded by NASA to conduct research work in various aspects of remote sensing. In addition, Michigan State University and the University of Michigan are conducting an independent study in corn blight incidence in Michigan.

This experiment is being conducted with efficiency and with excellent cooperation from all participating parties. It is an outstanding example of the flexibility possible within American publicly-supported research institutions and the capacity of the scientists in these institutions to join quickly in a well-coordinated, uniform, non-competitive effort to attack an immediate problem threatening the common good. In no other country in the world would such a smoothly operating, unified effort among so many agencies be possible. Probably one of the most unique features of the overall experiment is that all agencies went into it voluntarily without new additional funding. It was done by reassignment of resources. For example, the ASCS arranged to assign 1000 man days to the project by transferring personnel from other duties, postponing essential work in other ASCS projects.

The overall program is coordinated and directed by an Executive Committee on which each of the participating organizations is represented. Mr. R. B. MacDonald, NASA Project Scientist, who was instrumental in the development of the experiment, is chairman of this committee. Information on the progress of the experiment is released through a National Federal-State Information Center for the Corn Blight under the direction of Dr. John M. Barnes of the CSRS/USDA.

Major long-range goals of the experiment are: (1) to monitor development and spread of corn blight during the growing season across the Corn Belt region; (2) evaluate the techniques as a means of assessing the levels of infection in the Corn Belt; (3) evaluate the capability of remote sensing to assess the status of probable impact in crop production by corn blight and other foliar stresses; and (4) evaluate results for feasibility of application to similar situations occurring in the future.

The basic plan of the experiment was to obtain ground observations of corn in over 1500 preselected fields. This information could be used to check statistically the severity and spread of the blight. Additionally, this ground information was used as references or standards for the remote sensing aspect.

The remote sensing for the experiment is being carried out in two parts. One is the taking of infrared photography every two weeks following a special seven state sampling pattern using high altitude flights of 60,000 feet by a U.S. Air Force RB57F aircraft under the direction of the Earth Observations Aircraft Program Office of NASA's Manned Spacecraft Center (MSC), Houston. The other is multispectral scanning from a specially equipped C-47 aircraft of a sampling pattern over an intensive study area in Indiana at about 5,000 feet.

The first step was laying out flightlines which would provide sampling patterns meeting the requirements of good statistical design. These, for mechanical reasons, were based on 100 mile flightlines. Thirty-seven flightlines were chosen in which 210 segments, one by eight miles in dimensions, were geographically positioned. One hundred eighty of these are located over the entire seven-state study area. Thirty additional sites are in the Intensive Study Area in western Indiana.

The next step was the securing of base maps locating and identifying the crops in all fields in the test segments. These were obtained by ASCS enumerators trained by teams of representatives of SRS, ASCS and LARS. Enumerators delineated and obtained the acreage for each field, identified all crops planted or to be planted, and obtained particular information for each corn field, including corn cytoplasm type (Normal [N], Blend [B] and Texas Male Sterile [T]). These data were then returned to SRS which selected certain corn fields as subsamples within each of the 210 observation sites. These 6-12 fields selected as subsamples of the one by eight mile test sites are being visited, carefully observed and reported on standard forms by specifically trained Cooperative Extension Service (CES) and ASCS personnel in each of the seven states. The data acquired by these enumerators are sent to state SRS offices to be key punched. These offices forward the cards to SRS in Washington, D.C. to be summarized, placed on tape and forwarded to the Data Reduction Center at LARS. The CES and TSCS personnel engaged in the biweekly field (ground truth) observations were trained by representatives of SRS, LARS and plant pathologists of the land grant universities in the involved states.

The aircraft data acquisition flights were organized in three phases. In Phase One, during April 1971, the RB57F overflew all test sites to secure black and white photographs to be used as a basis for original field interviews, for orientation in photo-interpretation of the color infrared photography and in computer analysis of the data from the multispectral scanner.

In Phase Two, overflights were conducted over the segments with color infrared photography (1:120,000 scale) in early May. This film data were used to supply soils background information on the various sample sites. IST's C-47 collected multispectral data over the 80 segments contained within the

Intensive Study Area to provide a record of the spectral characteristics of the soils in that area.

During Phase Three, now continuing RB57F overflights to secure color infrared photography of the total overall list area are being flown every two weeks as nearly as weather permits, beginning June 14 and planned to run through September. At the same time, the Intensive Study Area is being overflown on the same biweekly schedule by the IST C-47. The C-47 flights are securing multispectral data of the Intensive Study Area for processing with computer facilities at both LARS and IST.

During this period of biweekly sensing of the test sites, the ground truth enumerators are visiting the test sites on dates as near to those of the overflights as possible.

All original aircraft photography is processed by the NASA/Manned Spacecraft Center. Several sets of duplicate positive transparencies are forwarded to the Photo Data Reduction Center at LARS. There six photo-analysis teams specially trained by NASA and the University of California (Berkeley) and LARS, review the aerial photography of the 210 test segments (sites). With the aid of data supplied by the field enumerators they continuously refine their capability of distinguishing different types of ground cover and in the corn fields, different levels of leaf blight damage. The results of these analyses are sent to SRS to be included in an overall statistical analysis being prepared for every flight period.

As the photo data reduction teams are analyzing the photography, copies of the color infrared transparencies are made available to the county personnel (CES and ASC) taking ground truth in the 210 segments. These 1:120,000 scale prints permit the county people to familiarize themselves with this kind of photography and to follow regularly the changes revealed throughout the season by the repetitive photography. In this way, a large number of agricultural professionals who work with problems of crops are becoming aware of the potential uses of data to be secured in the near future from the Earth Resources Technology Satellite (ERTS).

From the multispectral data collected by the IST C-47 over the Intensive Study Area, LARS processes the data over 15 of the 30 segments and IST processes the other 15. Each of these sites is analyzed by machine recognition programs to identify corn fields and to classify them as to presence and severity of leaf blight damage.

The photo-analysis output, machine-processed multispectral scanner output and field observation data are forwarded to SRS in Washington biweekly to identify infected areas. Additionally, the information is used to check and develop statistical models for prediction of disease spread.

The capability of color infrared photography and of multispectral scanner sensing to spot changes in a crop from remote platforms is not the only thing being tested in this large scale experiment. The ability of man to reduce this great volume of data quickly, analyze it thoroughly and express the results without delay with reference to geographic setting in an almost continuous inventory is being explored. Furthermore, the technique of getting many individual scientists and technicians to change quickly from on going work to join together in a smoothly running and efficient project for the common good is being perfected.

Judging by early results of the experiment, ways to successfully identify blight damage are being perfected. This can be important to agricultural interests, foresters and lumbermen and even to urban people, anyone interested in plant life.

The experiment promises that remote sensing has a high probability of being perfected to where it can give farmers and others a survey of the imminence, intensity and ex-

tent of spreading crop disease or other stresses.

Another promising aspect is that large areas of land can be quickly and accurately surveyed from remote distances. The identification by remote sensing of field patterns, land use, soil differences, soil mismanagement, kinds of crops on the land, crop vigor, and possibly before long, estimates of yield per acre seems a potential reward for such research on the 1971 Southern Corn Leaf Blight Watch Experiment.

#### HERDING

### HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the within letter is one further link of evidence in the case against busing. There are myriad problems involved with no educational returns and the one emphasized by this letter relates to time, safety, peace of mind, plus expense.

This is one more reason for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 43, which provides:

The involuntary busing of any student to a school or the required attendance of any student at a school outside the student's local school zone for the purpose of achieving racial balances or quotas is prohibited.

We must return schools to their proper roles as institutions for learning instead of laboratories for social experiment and reform. Children should not be herded like cattle.

The letter to Judge J. Robert Elliott follows:

Judge J. ROBERT ELLIOTT,  
Columbus, Ga.

DEAR SIR: We the undersigned parents in the Floyd Road-Buena Vista Road area are seeking help in providing our children with a safe and healthy year in school. Elementary school children in our area were assigned to Carver Elementary School in compliance with the Muscogee County School Districts de-segregation plan. We all feel that the neighborhood school plan with freedom of choice would have been in the best interest of our children, but the choice was not left up to us; therefore, we as law abiding citizens have tried to put aside our personal feelings and abide by the directions that were given to us.

On the first morning of school there was mass confusion as to where the busses would stop and what time they would arrive; as could be expected. When our children finally boarded the bus at 9:15 the bus was only half way filled and we felt that they (the children) were relatively safe. However in the afternoon our school bus did not bring our children home until 4:50. Some of our children had been due to leave school at 2:15 and some at 3:15. We were concerned and upset, but still we reassured ourselves that it was the first day of school and everything would smooth out by the next day.

On the morning of Sept. 9, 1971 the school bus arrived at the corner of Burbank and Bismark St. at 9:15; school having been due to start at 8:45. We asked the bus driver several questions about the time schedule and etc. In the course of our conversation we learned that our intersection was the first stop on this driver's route. The bus at this time was about half full and the driver said

he had six more stops to make. With this knowledge a group of us decided to follow our children to school to see for ourselves how many children would be on the bus when it arrived at school. The bus drove from the corner of Bismark and Burbank to Carver Elementary school making six stops along the way in 15 minutes. We were astonished to make a head count of children that numbered 139. The seats were filled and children were standing in the aisle in the bus.

Sir, as individuals we have talked with the transportation dept., the chief of police, the various members of the school board and the principal asking that safety measures be provided for our children and in the end we were referred to you. None of us would attempt to drive across town with our rear window blocked from our view, with our car over loaded with passengers and the gas pedal on the floor. And likewise we do not want to entrust that responsibility to anyone else with these conditions prevailing. We understand that the school district does not have enough buses and that court action has prevented the School District from making adequate preparations prior to the designated time for school to begin. Believing however that "an ounce of prevention is better than a pound of cure": Why we ask, couldn't the opening of school have been delayed until we could have been assured of adequate seating arrangements and safety for our children? And even now why can't we start over again and carry this plan out in a manner that would prevent all this concern and frustration.

These children are ultimately the responsibility of the parents to protect, instruct and educate. The laws of this land frown on the parent who fails to meet these responsibilities and yet at this moment we have been asked to abide by the plan for forced bussing which in our opinion is endangering those very lives that the law and our own love tells us we are to protect. When an accident occurs, or the children miss days out of school because of the hour that is being missed in the classroom each day due to inability to get them there on time, and our children suddenly (as they are now) becoming discouraged with going to school all we will have are regrets. Now, we feel, is the time to protect "the innocent" who are law abiding. Help us to teach our children that obedience to the law has its rewards. Ensure us a safe and profitable year of education for our children.

The undersigned are not members of any organized group. We are and will remain concerned parents until this problem is dealt with.

Mrs. WAYNE SEWELL,  
(And 22 others).

#### A FINE PLACE TO LIVE

### HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a constituent, Beatrice Peterson of Grundy Center, Iowa, has written a letter to the editor of the Wall Street Journal extolling the many merits of that community.

She wrote it because of a recent article in the Journal explaining why California has lost its lure for many people.

I certainly concur that not only is Grundy Center a fine place in which to

live, the entire State of Iowa—especially the Third Congressional District of Iowa—is a fine place to live.

I include the letter for insertion in the RECORD at this point:

GRUNDY CENTER

Editor, *The Wall Street Journal*:

I recently read a reprint of your article "The Golden State Loses Its Lure for the Multitudes." One paragraph stated that California isn't the perfect place to live, etc., but it was perfect when compared to Chicago's biting winds, steamy subways of New York and/or the dullness of Grundy Center. As I have never heard of another Grundy Center in these United States you evidently meant Grundy Center, Iowa.

I want to tell you a little bit about Grundy Center. We have a population of over 2,500 people, we have three fine beautiful schools, we have had a fine hospital for years, and just this year a new 55-bed addition was built which house the latest and finest medical and surgical equipment you can find in any hospital of this size. We have five fine churches, of which one is just new this year, we have a salad factory, a company that manufactures large equipment. We have two fine parks, a brand new beautiful swimming pool to replace the one we have had for years. We also have two beautiful new banks, one just completed last year and the other one just had their open house last week. I will challenge you to find any two nicer and better equipped banks any place.

We have a fine beautiful courthouse, old but well-cared for with a beautiful courtyard, we have one of the finest business sections you will find anywhere for a town of its size. We have a fine municipal light and power plant which also furnishes steam heat to most of the businesses, the courthouse, three churches and two school buildings. We have a very fine energetic group of business men, a Lions Club, a Commercial Club, and Rotary Club, a country club and beautiful golf course.

I could go on and on and sing the praises of our town, but don't you think this enough to let you know we do not have a dull town?

BEATRICE PETERSEN.

GRUNDY CENTER, IOWA.

#### MISS MARIE AHEARN, A DEDICATED SCHOOLTEACHER, RETIRES

### HON. LOUISE DAY HICKS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like my colleagues in the House to know of one of Boston's most dedicated schoolteachers who will retire this month, after completing many years of dedicated service with the Boston School Department.

Miss Marie Ahearn has done an outstanding job as a teacher, working with Good Government groups and has been responsible for the outstanding character of boys and girls in the Hyde Park area of Boston. Miss Ahearn spent many of her teaching years in the Hyde Park High School.

On behalf of the citizens of Boston, I would like to take this occasion to wish Miss Ahearn a full and happy retirement in the years ahead secure in the knowledge of long service, faithfully performed.

THE PRESIDENT'S "NEW ECONOMIC PROGRAM"—BILLIONS FOR BUSINESS, PENNIES FOR THE PEOPLE

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, I had the privilege of testifying before the distinguished Committee on Ways and Means on the President's new economic program. As I told the committee, I am not an economist, but this omnibus economic program involves far broader considerations than economic theory and policy.

The basic question which we must decide—now that the President has decided to face up to the fact that we are in a state of economic crisis—is a political and social one, for I think we all agree at this juncture that the Federal Government must take strong steps to resuscitate our sagging economy.

The issue before us is the means by which this resuscitation and revitalization should be effectuated, and the administration and I differ most vehemently on this point. As I point out in my testimony, Mr. Nixon's program would benefit rich corporations and upper-income individuals far more, and far sooner, than small businesses, middle-income taxpayers, and the poor.

I believe that the President's decision to come to Congress for assistance in straightening out the economy affords us a golden opportunity to take the initiative in reordering our national priorities as we pursue our efforts to restore the economy to its full vitality.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point the text of my statement before the Committee on Ways and Means:

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSWOMAN BELLA S. ABZUG BEFORE THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, SEPTEMBER 16, 1971

Chairman Mills, members of the Committee, I welcome this opportunity to appear before you today to testify on President Nixon's New Economic Program, even though I am not an economist. That may not necessarily be a handicap when one considers that most economists are only wise after the fact and rarely agree with each other, or even with their own past analyses.

I speak rather as a member of Congress who is concerned with the social orientation and effect of our economic policies and as a representative of a district whose festering needs have been largely ignored by this Administration. These needs, I might add, will continue to be slighted by the new White House policies.

The President's proposals, which I shall discuss in more detail shortly, reinforce his position as the superchief of corporate America. Although many Americans have been stunned by the reversal of the President's economic policies, from hands off to sweeping interventionism, there is a consistency that ties these policies together, in that big business remains the favorite and working people and small business are still the victims.

When the President set out originally to "cool" the economy and succeeded in presenting us with inflation and recession at the same time, it was working people and small businessmen who were most severely affected by government-manipulated unemployment.

Now, too, it is working people and small business who bear the burden of the wage-price freeze while big business is pampered with tax incentives and accelerated depreciation.

One of the most remarkable aspects of the national discussion about NEP is the extent to which it has managed to ignore the central fact of American life and a major cause of our economic problems. I refer, of course, to the inflationary pressures created by our military spending which now amounts to \$76 billion a year and which Defense Secretary Laird proposes to increase by another \$3 billion next year.

The most positive steps the President could take to strengthen our economy would be to end immediately and completely American involvement in the war in Indochina, cut back military spending on dollar-draining military bases in Europe and elsewhere, and instead of letting the so-called peace dividend be consumed by the Pentagon, use the funds for such purposes as to provide jobs, repair our decaying cities, build low and middle income housing, make mass transit facilities available, deal effectively with drug and pollution problems, and assure our 25.5 million poor people of a guaranteed annual income.

But instead of ending the war once and for all and reducing military expenditures, the President and some of his advisers are busily developing the myth that our economic problems are the result of the winding down of the war, rather than the war itself. George Romney, for example, said recently that if we have peace, we're going to have unemployment. Another Presidential myth is that of the lazy or greedy worker. I find it unseemly for the President to lecture the American people on the "hard work" ethic when millions have had to "moonlight" to make ends meet, when more than five million are looking for jobs and cannot find them, when more millions of women would work if there were jobs available for them and day care centers provided for their children, and when working people who empty bed pans in hospitals or wash dishes in high-priced restaurants or run elevators in luxury hotels frequently require supplementary welfare benefits to maintain their families because they earn such low wages.

The implication in the 90-day wage-price freeze is that rising wages and prices are responsible for inflation. I agree that prices have been rising at an unacceptable rate, but wage increases have certainly not kept pace with them. In a speech last spring (March 7), economist Leon Keyserling commented: "The wage earner continues to be pilloried as a main factor in the raging inflation, when in fact the real take-home pay of workers in manufacturing has declined during the past two years."

Mr. Keyserling suggested that a more likely factor in inflation was the Nixon administration's pre-NEP policy of raising interest rates. He pointed out that the Nixon budget projects about \$20 billion to pay interest on the national debt. "This is more than \$8 billion above what the interest payments would have been on a debt of the same size," he said, "if interest rates had stayed where they ought to be."

The President's unprecedented wage-price freeze, unencumbered by restraints on interest rates, profits or dividends, amounts, in effect, to a wage rollback since the cost of living as well as productivity is continuing to rise. Pay increases affected by the freeze are lost forever. They are not placed in escrow or deferred like corporate dividends or profits. The freeze is grossly discriminatory against teachers, against government workers, who have been singled out for a six-month penalty, and against women workers who, my office has been informed, will be barred from claiming back pay for unequal pay received during this period. Since it has been estimated that American business saves \$22 bil-

lion a year by paying women lower wages than men for doing essentially the same work, this 90-day freeze represents a tremendous loss for women who file back pay suits and, of course, another windfall for business.

For the worker, the freeze is grossly inequitable but for management it means, at least, a ceiling on an important part of total operating costs. Where price increases have been made in anticipation of wage increases (as on important steel products), the wage freeze provides a widening of profit margins. Roughly half of these unexpected profits will go to the U.S. as taxes; the other half will stay in corporate coffers. Thus, unions in some cases find themselves in the strange position of having negotiated higher earnings for the owners rather than higher wages for their members.

It should also be noted that the freeze on salaries affects only part of executive compensation or income. Many executives have been granted options to purchase the stock of their employing companies; many already own such stock or stock in other companies. There is no freeze on the gains they may make in trading these securities, and no doubt they profited greatly from the \$40 billion stock market boom which greeted the President's August 15th announcement.

While the freeze on wages is painfully real, no enforcement machinery exists to supervise the price freeze. In any case, the Bureau of Labor Statistics has said that the cost of living is not frozen because some 10% of the items included in the cost of living index are exempted from the freeze. Thus, those on fixed incomes—which now include all wage earners, pensioners, and welfare recipients—will continue to suffer erosion of real income.

With his single-minded concern for the interests of big business, President Nixon has enunciated a policy under which corporations can continue to increase their profits and the rich can continue to use methods of enhancing wealth not available to the large majority of America. The Administration has rejected the concept of an excess profits tax. With rare candor, Secretary Connally said recently, "There are no excess profits." According to the Secretary, in an interview August 16, "the profits of American business have not been that big."

On the contrary, the August newsletter of the First National City Bank of New York reported that corporate earnings in the second quarter of this year were up 11% over the year before, and that the index of after-tax earnings in manufacturing in the second quarter of this year was 18% higher than in 1967, or almost at the all-time high reached in the fourth quarter of 1968. And these increases were accomplished during a period when output was about 73% of capacity.

Increases in bank profits have also continued high, as a result of favored treatment by the Nixon administration. The Bank of America, with the largest deposits of any U.S. Bank, showed a 17.7% boost in net income per share.

A sample of other bank gains during the past year reveals the following: J. P. Morgan & Co., 21.9%; Chase Manhattan, 25.6%; First Chicago Corp., 14.3%; First National Bank in Dallas, 19.2%; Bankers Trust, 36.1% (Source, UAW Washington Report, September 6, 1971).

I would like the members of this committee to contrast the advantageous position of the corporations and banks with that of a wage earner in the New York area. In 1970, the real spendable earnings of a worker with three dependents was \$117 a week. I challenge any of you to try to live on that income and at the same time find yourself assailed by the President as an inciter of inflation. In fact, the BLS maintains that a moderate standard of living in the New York

area requires \$205 a week. As we have seen, the average wage earner is nowhere within sight of that income and by Presidential decree he has now been frozen into his sub-standard style of living.

What will happen when the 90-day freeze ends, or ends for all but government employees who have been singled out for an unfair six-month freeze? As must be evident by now, I do not favor a continuation of the freeze, nor do I favor compulsory, although more flexible wage-price controls. Representatives of organized labor have indicated they would accept a voluntary program of controls on wages, prices and profits, supervised by a tripartite labor-management-public board. It has been suggested that under such a policy pay increases would be tied to increase in productivity and the cost of living. This would mean that the wage earner would relinquish his claim to any real improvement in his standard of living, which I was raised to believe was as much a part of the American ethic as hard work.

During World War II, American workers voluntarily accepted a no-strike pledge and wage controls, even though prices continued to go up. They did so as part of a national commitment to win the war and to defeat Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy and Imperial Japan. No such common purpose unites our nation now as to require unilateral sacrifices by working people and small businessmen. On the contrary, the American people have overwhelmingly rejected the war in Indochina, which they would like to see ended now and which the Nixon Administration still refuses to do.

If voluntary controls on wages, prices, profits, interest rates and dividends were instituted as part of a great national effort to redirect our priorities away from military spending and toward the real needs of our people; if this Congress addressed itself to the question of curbing monopoly or so-called managed pricing, which Senator Philip Hart has indicated costs American consumers over \$45 billion a year; if an effort were made to correct the maldistribution of income in our economy, which now sees the top 20% of all U.S. families cornering 41% of the income while rising numbers of Americans are forced on to the jobless or welfare rolls, then, of course, I would support controls. I will, however, oppose any effort to perpetuate present gross inequities.

I believe that the Administration's tax proposal reflects its misplaced priorities and must be rejected in favor of individual tax relief for low and moderate income individuals and federal subsidies in job creative, socially useful endeavors.

The 10 percent investment tax credit has as its underlying assumption the belief that our economic problems are caused by an inability to produce sufficient goods. In actuality, there is presently some \$70 billion in unused productivity in our economy. Some 27 percent of our industrial capacity stands idle. There is a sluggishness in the consumer end of the economic equation: inflation, high interest, unemployment and lack of consumer confidence have combined to retard consumer demand.

In his new program, the President pledges to reduce taxes, proposes an equivalent, and highly selective, cut in federal expenditures. The decline in government spending and the reduction in the government work force will more than offset the projected expansionary effect of the tax cut.

But in any case, under the Administration plan, the individual taxpayer is given virtually no relief. While the President would advance tax cuts from 1973 to 1972, providing a family of four with a \$10,000 annual income with what is estimated at a \$57-\$95 savings, this would be more than absorbed by the social security tax rise set to go into effect on Jan. 1, 1972. As a minimum, this increase must be postponed to permit the individual taxpayer any relief at all under the Nixon plan.

The Administration calls the investment tax credit a "job development" credit, but aside from pious recitation of an arbitrary figure by Administration officials, there is no evidence that any significant number of jobs would be created by instituting the 10 percent investment tax giveaway. There are other reasons for rejecting the investment tax credit: it provides tax incentives for things a prudent businessman would do in any event, such as modernizing equipment; and it encourages economically marginal ventures which would not have otherwise been undertaken. There is no assurance that subsidized economically marginal activities would be otherwise socially redeeming.

Rather than seeking to achieve laudable social aims through the backhanded device of investment credits, which provide no opportunity for appropriate controls or accounting, I propose that the 10 percent investment tax credit and the accelerated depreciation range (ADR) approved illegally by the Treasury Department earlier this year without Congressional sanction be rejected in favor of federal subsidies for housing, child care centers, mass transit, manpower training and other job creating activities and individual tax relief.

In place of the \$9 billion business boondoggle, I propose also that the low income tax allowance which is presently set to rise to \$1,000 be raised to \$2,000, thus directly benefiting the working poor and moderate income taxpayer. The total cost of such a program would be \$4.5 billion.

In an immediate economic sense, the increase in the low income allowance would have maximum consumer impact since low income people ordinarily spend their money for consumer goods rather than invest it, as do higher income individuals. Even more important, we would be taking a small step toward a more equitable distribution of the tax burden, which is long overdue.

In addition to individual tax relief for low and moderate income tax payers, immediate attention must be given to the development of a comprehensive federal construction program for urban areas concentrating initially in depressed economic areas. Such a program could combine effective manpower training and improvement of the urban environment, which would consequently create more jobs and help retard the present rate of urban decay.

This is one way that Congress and the Administration can begin to fulfill the promise of the National Full Employment Act of 1946, which committed the government to providing "useful employment opportunities, including self-employment, for those able, willing, and seeking to work, and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power.

With unemployment exceeding five million, and most statisticians consider that grossly underestimated, it is urgent for the government to provide constructive employment, particularly for women, for young people, for Blacks and Puerto Ricans, for returning Vietnam Vets, all groups that have been most seriously affected by the recession.

As for the proposed abolition of the seven percent automobile excise tax, the Administration says this will save taxpayers \$2.1 billion a year. This may be true if they actually buy the X number of cars projected in the estimate. But are people who can afford a new car the ones who most need \$2.1 billion of federal help?

The tax rebate is primarily a profit-generator for the auto industry, which will be able, in effect, to reduce car prices by that \$2.1 billion and reap the benefits of the broadened market. More cars will be produced. But does traffic-choked, polluted America need more cars, rather than a stimulant for mass transit or the construction of low cost housing? Here again we see the absurdity of the Administration's priorities.

We see, too, the need for adoption of an

economic reconversion bill, such as that introduced by Senator McGovern which would not only reorient the industries involved but liberate aerospace workers, missile workers and others from the indignity of depending on anti-social products for their livelihood.

The Administration's international trade decisions—the "floating" of the dollar and the imposition of a 10 percent surcharge on imports—should be discussed in the context of American foreign policy and the extraordinary flight of American capital abroad over recent years.

As economists Peter Passell and Leonard Ross pointed out in the current New York Review of Books (Sept. 23 issue), the dollar's pre-devaluation privileged position in world finance made it easier to fuel the war in Vietnam. But, they continued, "stringent adherence to the orthodox rules would have limited our power to achieve all of our objectives, including the most deplorable ones. But it is not military adventures that the Nixon administration intends to jettison. What Nixon has mainly accomplished by his devaluation of the dollar is a transfer of wealth from American consumers to citizens in foreign countries and to high-priced American manufacturers."

As we have seen, the Administration has opposed vigorously Senator Mansfield's proposal for a reduction of our troops in Europe under NATO, which would certainly have reduced the out-flow of dollars.

Furthermore, in many cases, we are today competing not with foreign companies, but with foreign-based divisions of American corporations, particularly in Germany, France, Great Britain and Canada.

At the end of World War I there were about 250 foreign subsidiaries of U.S. corporations. In 1970 alone, more than 8,000 American investments in overseas companies came to some \$70 billion. It has been suggested that if the amount of foreign capital controlled by these American enterprises is added, the total for 1970 is more like \$100 billion in overseas investments.

The adverse results of this development have been felt most severely by small business and by working people who see their jobs disappear under the floodtide of cheap imports.

Before we take steps to impose quotas or tariffs on foreign imports, we should revise our laws that are structured to encourage the development of these multinational, American corporations. We should try doing away with some of the incentives that lead domestic companies to go overseas to use cheap labor to produce the goods which are then sold here.

Special low tariff rates are given to foreign-assembled goods which use parts or raw goods shipped to assembly points from the United States. Taxes are deferred—often forever—for foreign subsidiaries of American corporations. Foreign production uses technology developed at the expense of American taxpayers.

As I have said in a speech on the floor of the House (August 5), clear legislative direction is necessary to give the Administration authority—and the will—to regulate, supervise and curb the outflows of American capital.

Criteria to guide the President in his exercise of such authority should include considerations of the kinds of investment proposed to be made abroad, the products involved, the countries in which the investments would be made, the linkage of the investments to the flow of trade and the effect of the investments upon our domestic economy and employment.

I realize, of course, that these proposals and some of the others I have made here today are outside the immediate purview of this committee, but they are essential to the larger view of our economic problems which will undoubtedly guide your actions.

The 10 percent import surtax, which is one of the few features of the Nixon plan that

has the approval of unions, which are understandably concerned with foreign competition, was evidently designed to give relief to three big, and highly concentrated, U.S. industries: Steel, auto and chemical. Insofar as it is successful in cutting down imports of cheaper Japanese and German steel and autos and cheaper synthetic fibers, cameras, and TV sets, it will be a relief to Americans working in those industries, but it will also increase the costs to American consumers and drive up the cost of living for pay-frozen Americans.

The President's economic proposals, regrettably, invite the charge of favoritism on several fronts. The investment tax credit, for example, rewards midwestern industrial centers that are "capital intensive" with high factory equipment costs, while the import surcharge penalizes port enterprises in cities on the eastern and western seaboard.

New York is such a city, and 40 percent of the men and women who work there hold jobs either directly or indirectly related to maritime commerce. The protectionist surtax may prove to injure this vital component of New York's economy.

Even the apparel industry, in theory our local beneficiary of this policy, is concerned about reprisals in the international marketplace. I object to New York's having to bear the burden of monetary adjustment while Detroit, Cincinnati and other cities in the midwestern region reap a whirlwind of profits during this period.

For all too long, the federal government has paid lip service to the small businessman while pacifying him with fragmentary financial assistance. In light of the present incursions on New York's retail and import communities, if the surtax is continued, and I am still not convinced that this is the wisest course, then the monies collected from the 10 percent import charge at New York harbor should be placed in a fund to promote export development and international travel. Both these industries are deeply entwined in the fabric of New York's economy and in need of rejuvenation. This is a proposal to which I hope further attention will be given.

Another possible avenue of relief for New York would be to multiply the amount of financial aid available from the federal Small Business Administration by a factor corresponding to the impact visited on New York's retail and manufacturing activity by the import surcharge. Depressing port business must eventually injure other facets of our economy. From the street level, that could mean fewer people working or smaller paychecks.

In conclusion, I urge the rejection of President Nixon's New Economic Program, which is outrageously designed to aid big business at the continued expense of the middle-class, small businessmen, working people and the poor.

Congress must assume the responsibility of fashioning an economic program aimed at human, not corporate, values. I have outlined steps which I think Congress can take to provide genuine well-being for all our people, but I would remind you again that the essential first step is to withdraw totally from Vietnam and to curb the military budget.

#### PRESIDENT NIXON IS KEEPING HIS WORD

### HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, last week the President of the United States

withdrew an additional 900 soldiers from Vietnam.

On January 20, 1969, there were 532,500 Americans enduring the perils of an Asian war. Today, there are 215,800 Americans in Vietnam who are planning to come home.

Mr. Speaker, President Nixon is keeping his word.

#### LANDMARK DECISION IN MINNESOTA WILL HAVE FAR-REACHING IMPLICATIONS FOR ENTIRE ELECTRIC POWER INDUSTRY AND THE ELECTRICITY CONSUMER

### HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, a landmark decision was handed down last week in St. Paul, Minn., which will have far-reaching implications for the entire electric power industry and the electricity consumer. A Federal court decision maintained that electric utility companies transmit electric power for their competitors—public utilities and electric cooperatives as well as private utilities.

As Mr. Stephen Aug writes in the following article, the St. Paul decision should insure lower consumer prices, increased utility competition and better environmental preservation because of the need for fewer electric transmission lines.

Transmission lines, the key to control of electric power and power supply will be more open to use by municipal companies if these companies can afford to pay for the power. Public utilities can no longer be harassed and obstructed in their attempts to obtain power from privately-owned transmission lines.

This ruling has particular significance for the New England consumer who is burdened with high rates for electric power and inconsistent quality of service.

I submit to my colleagues the text of the decision and an excellent article in the September 14 Evening Star describing the decision and its implications:

#### ELECTRIC POWERLINES RULED OPEN TO ALL

(By Stephen M. Aug)

The Justice Department, in a highly significant case, has won a federal court decision requiring that electric utility companies transmit electric power for their competitors—municipally-owned utilities and electric co-operatives among them.

The little-noted decision, handed down late last week by a federal judge in St. Paul, Minn., is being highly praised by spokesmen for the public power industry—municipal companies, rural electric co-ops and the like—as portending lower consumer prices, broadened competition in the utility field, and preserved environmental values because it could result in fewer electric transmission lines.

The investor-owned utilities, however, see the decision as causing them severe financial peril, and perhaps having the effect of turning privately owned facilities over to government-controlled entities.

The decision is considered a certainty to be appealed to the Supreme Court.

#### OTTER TAIL POWER

At issue was a civil suit filed in 1969 by the Justice Department which charged that Otter Tail Power Co. of Fergus Falls, Minn., had monopolized the sale of electric power to 464 communities in Minnesota, South Dakota and North Dakota.

Specifically, the department contended that Otter Tail over a 14-year period had sought to prevent municipalities from shifting their local electric service from Otter Tail to other power systems—generally rural electric cooperatives which benefit from low-cost government loans, and municipally owned companies.

The Antitrust Division said Otter Tail had refused to sell power at wholesale rates to proposed municipal systems, had refused to transmit electric power (called "wheeling" power) from other wholesale suppliers to proposed municipal systems, and had engaged in "other activities designed to obstruct and defeat the attempt by municipalities to establish alternative electric power systems."

Among these "other activities" were a number of lawsuits designed to harass municipalities which sought to start up their own electric systems. The suits challenged technicalities in bidding procedures for electric power equipment and snarled bond sales which were to have provided funds to set up the municipal facilities which would replace Otter Tail as the source of electric power.

The most important issue in the case, however, is whether an electric utility—Otter Tail, in this instance—may be forced to "wheel" power for other, often competing, utilities. The issue has been hotly contested for years, and the investor-owned utilities have always presented a united front: Namely, refusal to wheel or do anything to suggest that transmission lines should be, in effect, common carriers (much like railroads, airlines, or telephone systems which must accept all customers).

The Federal Power Commission in 1969—after years of refusal to rule on the issue—finally decided that it did not have the power to order wheeling. That was in a case involving the City of Paris, Ky., and Kentucky Utilities Co.

#### ANTITRUST TACTIC

Thus, in 1969, the Justice Department's Antitrust Division decided that perhaps the antitrust laws could be used to force power wheeling—especially when the utility companies' refusal to wheel meant, to the department at least, that it was using monopoly power to prevent competition in the electric utility business.

The court last week agreed with the Justice Department and ruled that the utility must wheel low-cost power from the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation to the village of Elbow Lake, Minn.

The ruling, said Albert V. Hartl, Otter Tail president, "opens the way and makes it easier for various types of government entities or government financed entities to take over the private sector of the industry, because we can't resist when they want to."

Throughout the proceedings of the case before Judge Edward J. Devitt, Otter Tail lawyers insisted that its refusal to sell power at wholesale rates to municipalities or transmit power—and even its participation in litigation and political campaigns against public power bond issues—were justified by its right to preserve its business.

But McDevitt rejected that. "Otter Tail cannot violate the law, albeit its avowed purpose is to protect the integrity of its business," the judge said in ruling that Otter Tail had violated the Sherman Antitrust act.

To Hartl, however, it's a matter of survival—of preventing the erosion of a profitable utility business begun 60 years ago and

now owned by 10,000 shareholders. "Just this morning," he told a reporter in a telephone interview, "at my weekly staff meeting with my fellow officers for about the first 15 minutes there was a recitation of developments within the last week of REA cooperatives attempting to move into our communities."

He added that since the proceedings began there have been two instances when "communities we now serve, not wanting to go into business for themselves, just wrote us a letter and said 'will you please disconnect our lines, we want to get service from an REA cooperative.'" The reason, he said, is "because they figure they could get a lower rate from the REA co-ops."

Alex Radin, general manager of the American Public Power Association here—which represents cooperatives and municipal systems—was overjoyed at the ruling. He noted that "many municipal utilities that we represent have been denied an opportunity to take part in power pools or to obtain power from other sources because of the denial from power companies of the right to wheel."

He said the decision should benefit both public and private utilities. "I think it also is very significant for electric consumers generally because the effect of this decision is to broaden the area of competition in the electric industry, and it's long been our feeling that competition means lower rates."

He said it was important from an environmental viewpoint as well because it "could result in the elimination of duplicating transmission lines," with a number of companies—public and private—using the same transmission system.

He conceded, however, that it might have some adverse financial effects on the investor-owned utilities: "I think it's true that this decision will make it easier for some municipalities or some consumer-owned utilities to get into the business, but after all, the electric power industry is a public business and the people have always had the right to serve themselves through a municipally owned utility or cooperative if they so desired . . ."

"The privately owned power companies don't have any vested right to continue to provide service to a particular community in perpetuity nor for that matter do the public or cooperatively owned utilities."

[U.S. District Court District of Minnesota, Sixth Division, 6-69-Civ-139]

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, PLAINTIFF VS. OTTER TAIL POWER COMPANY, DEFENDANT

Kenneth C. Anderson, William Jaeger and Barry McNeil, Washington, D.C. attorneys for plaintiff.

Cyrus Field and David Lundeen, Fergus Falls, Minnesota, attorneys for defendant.

In this action brought under Section 2 of the Sherman Act the basic issue is whether the acts of Otter Tail Power Company, a Minnesota public utility, in refusing to sell electric power at wholesale, and refusing to wheel electric power to municipalities it formerly served at retail, constitute a monopolization of commerce in violation of the Act.

The Sherman Act, Section 2, provides:

"Every person who shall monopolize, or attempt to monopolize . . . any part of the trade or commerce among the several states . . . shall be guilty of a misdemeanor . . . 15 U.S.C. § 2.

Under Section 4 of the Act the United States District Court is vested with jurisdiction to restrain violations of the law. 15 U.S.C. § 4. Plaintiff seeks such an injunction.

Defendant Otter Tail Power Company with headquarters at Fergus Falls, Minnesota, is an investor-owned utility primarily serving small towns in western Minnesota and eastern North and South Dakota. Its business is almost exclusively retail. Its operation consists of an integrated power system running the full gamut from initial production to final sale of electrical power combined with

pool arrangements which supply emergency power reserves.

From time to time citizens of some of the municipalities served by defendant have worked for the establishment of municipally owned electric facilities. Otter Tail has opposed such movements and has refused to sell power at wholesale, or to "wheel"<sup>1</sup> power, to its former municipal customers who have converted or who seek to convert to municipal systems. Plaintiff claims this violates the Sherman Act. Defendant asserts this is but the exercise of proper business judgment aimed at protecting the integrity of its business.

The pleadings more particularly shape the issue. The government alleges that Otter Tail has sought to prevent the municipalities from shifting local electric service from defendant to other electric power systems, supplied either by Otter Tail or another supplier of power, by the following acts:

1. By refusing and threatening to refuse to sell power at wholesale to the proposed alternative local electric power system;
2. By refusing and threatening to refuse to wheel electric power from other wholesale suppliers to the proposed alternative local electric power system; and
3. By engaging in other activities designed to obstruct and defeat the attempt by municipalities to establish alternative local electric power system.

Otter Tail specifically denies that it has done anything in violation of Section 2 of the Sherman Act. In its Answer, paragraph IV, it "admits and alleges that it has refused to permit the use of Otter Tail's facilities (by furnishing either wholesale or wheeling service) to subsidize or support a new municipal electric system which is constructed for the purpose of ousting Otter Tail from the retail electric business in that municipality. Otter Tail also admits and alleges that it has attempted to use all reasonable means to continue in business, and to continue to furnish adequate and reliable service at reasonable rates at retail in the municipalities which are served by its integrated system, and in attempting to present its case that it is to their advantage not to sever their connection with Otter Tail's system and service."

The case was tried to the court June 1 through June 14, 1971. The parties stipulated to many of the facts. Plaintiff called eleven witnesses, the defendant three. Several extensive pretrial conferences preceded trial.

A summary of the facts essential to an understanding of the issue follows:

Otter Tail was incorporated in Minnesota in 1910. Its service area encompasses western Minnesota, northeastern South Dakota and eastern North Dakota. The company's integrated system consists of approximately 5,900 miles of interstate transmission lines which serve at retail, approximately 465 towns, mostly small communities of under 1,500 population. In 1969 Otter Tail sold 1,158,329 kilowatts (Kw.) of power to 103,829 customers, deriving a total operating revenue of \$31,191,000. Otter Tail had a net generation capacity of 271,145 Kw. in 1969.

Otter Tail has entered into interconnection contracts with other electric systems. These contracts provide means by which the company can obtain power to supplement that provided by its own generation and sell excess power to others. One of Otter Tail's interconnections is with the United States Bureau of Reclamation. The relationship between the Bureau and Otter Tail is reflected in a comprehensive agreement which dates back to 1950. Pursuant to this contract, Otter Tail purchased a considerable volume of dump and secondary power from the Bureau.

Otter Tail is also directly interconnected

<sup>1</sup> Wheel means to transport power for another supplier.

with Minnesota Power and Light, Northern States Power Company, Northwestern Public Service Company, Montana-Dakota Utilities Company, Minnkota Power Cooperative, Central Power Association, United Power Association and several smaller rural electric cooperatives.

Generally speaking, Otter Tail provides retail service to municipalities pursuant to franchise agreements awarded to it by the city or town. By state law in each of the three states the franchises are non-exclusive and, depending upon the state, the franchise terms are limited to periods ranging from ten to twenty years. The franchises customarily grant Otter Tail the right to construct and maintain electric distribution systems and necessary transmission lines, and operate these within the regulations and provisions imposed by the municipal government.

Otter Tail also regularly engages in the business of wheeling power. A large proportion of Otter Tail's wheeling activity is done pursuant to its contractual relationship with the Bureau of Reclamation. Beginning in the 1930's Congress appropriated funds for the construction of a series of hydroelectric generation facilities along the Missouri River in Montana, North Dakota and South Dakota. The Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior handles the marketing of the power generated by the facilities. Congress mandated that public bodies, REA electric cooperatives and municipal electric systems be designated as preference customers for this power: that is, that they be given first option to purchase the power.

The Congress also appropriated funds for the construction of high voltage transmission lines to transport Bureau power from the hydroelectric sites to the areas where the power was to be marketed.

In 1950 Otter Tail and the Bureau entered into the detailed contract which provided, *inter alia*, for the sale of dump power to Otter Tail and for the wheeling of Bureau power across Otter Tail transmission lines to preference customers. The Bureau pays a set wheeling fee to Otter Tail for this service. At the request of Otter Tail, a renewal contract dated June 14, 1955 contained language which, in the defendant's view, exempted it from any obligation to wheel power to towns which it previously had served at retail. Otter Tail does wheel power to 18 municipal preference customers which it has not previously served at retail. More background facts will be recited in connection with the court's consideration of the issues.

The principal thrust of the government's case is that Otter Tail has a monopoly on the retail distribution and sale of power to towns in its operating area. It is not contended that defendant acted illegally or improperly in achieving this claimed monopoly position but rather in its actions seeking to preserve this position. Specifically, it is urged that Otter Tail's refusal to sell or wheel power to towns desiring to establish municipal systems, and its actions participating in local municipal power political campaigns, and sponsoring, encouraging, and financially supporting court litigation are all intended to impede and frustrate attempts to establish independent municipal electric systems.

Otter Tail does not deny its refusal to sell or wheel power to municipalities which it formerly served at retail but argues that to supply power to these municipalities would aid in its own demise. It admits its participation in local municipal political campaigns and in litigation surrounding attempts to establish municipal systems but contends this is proper and legal conduct. Such actions were taken, defendant argues, to preserve the electric power free enterprise system for the benefit of its customers, shareholders and employees.

Otter Tail denies that it has a monopoly, is attempting to preserve a monopoly, or that it possesses a dominate share of the pertinent market under Sherman Act prin-

ciples. Defendant points to the many other electric power entities operating in the same area, particularly the United States Bureau of Reclamation, many electric cooperatives, Northern States Power Company, and other private power sources, from one or more of which electric power and the means of transmitting this power are readily available to those municipalities which defendant does not choose to serve.

Otter Tail finally urges a "Rule of Reason" and argues that its conduct is fully justified by its legitimate right to fight for its corporate life, remain viable in serving the public and prevent the erosion of its integrated system and the impairment of its credit.

A monopoly condemned by the Sherman Act is the power to fix prices or exclude competition coupled with policies designed to use or preserve that power. The United States Supreme Court in its most recent decision on the question, *United States v. Grinnell Corp.*, 384 U.S. 563, 570, 86 S. Ct. 1968 (1966), said:

The offense of monopoly under § 2 of the Sherman Act has two elements: (1) the possession of monopoly power in the relevant market and (2) the willful acquisition or maintenance of that power as distinguished from the growth or development of a superior product, business acumen or historic accident.

The two principal questions involved are: (1) Does Otter Tail possess monopoly power, and (2) Has it sought to maintain that power?

The term relevant markets consists of both a product market and a geographic market. *Grinnell*, supra. It is not disputed here that the product market is the sale of electric power at retail. Indeed more than 90% of Otter Tail's income is from retail sales.

There is dispute as to the definition of the geographic market. The government contends that each of the 465 towns served by Otter Tail constitutes a separate geographic market. If this not be accepted, the government urges that the geographic market is, at least, the towns in the Otter Tail service area.

There is some logical basis for considering each town a separate geographic market; but viewing it in a broader light, there are, in the Otter Tail service area, 465 towns served by Otter Tail and 45 towns served by municipal electric systems. On this basis it may be concluded that Otter Tail services approximately 91% of the relevant geographical market, certainly enough to justify the inference that the defendant possesses monopoly power in the area.

There are also 105 towns served by rural cooperatives in the Otter Tail service area. Because of congressional restrictions upon REA loans to cooperatives seeking to serve urban areas, it is doubtful that the 105 towns could be viewed as competitive and hence considered in determining Otter Tail's share of the total relevant market. But even if these 105 are considered as part of the market, the result still has Otter Tail serving 465 of the 615 towns in the area. This is 75.6 percent of the relevant market. In our view this percentage is sufficient to justify the inference that Otter Tail possesses monopoly power in the area.<sup>2</sup>

Having found that Otter Tail does possess monopoly power, the second question is whether Otter Tail has sought to maintain that power. A principal contention of the

government is that the defendant has been able to maintain this power because of its strategic dominance of transmission capacity in most of the Otter Tail area.

Several map exhibits in evidence reflect a maze of electric power lines covering, almost blanketing it would seem, the entire Otter Tail service area. Defendant urges that its transmission lines represent only 8% of the transmission lines of all power suppliers in the area.

Evidence at trial showed that electric power lines fall into three general categories:

(1) *Bulk power supply lines*, usually of a voltage of 115 Kv. or greater, which are intended to move large blocks of power from generating facilities to load centers.

(2) *Subtransmission lines*, usually of a voltage from 34.5 Kv. to 69 Kv. These are utilized to move power from the bulk power source to local retail distribution systems.

(3) *Distribution lines*, usually of a voltage of 12.5 Kv. or less, which move the power from the subtransmission network station to the ultimate consumer.

Most of the bulk supply lines in the Otter Tail area are owned and operated by the Bureau of Reclamation. The Bureau does not maintain its own subtransmission system but contracts with Otter Tail, and others, to transmit the power from bulk supply stations over their subtransmission lines to local retail distribution systems whence it is stepped down for delivery via distribution lines to customers.

About two-thirds of Otter Tail's total electric line mileage, or 4,036 miles, consists of 41.6 Kv. subtransmission lines. It appears that Otter Tail is dominant in operation of subtransmission lines in the area.

The contract between Otter Tail and the Bureau contains a provision [Para. 27(a) (2)] which Otter Tail interprets as meaning that it need not wheel Bureau power over its subtransmission lines to its former retail customers. Otter Tail refuses to do so, the Bureau does not have its own subtransmission lines to use for that purpose and the transmission lines of others are not readily available in the area sought to be served. Hence many potential preference customers of the Bureau, including municipalities, are unable to obtain Bureau power because of the absence of available subtransmission lines and the refusal of Otter Tail to wheel that power over its lines. It is not economically feasible or practical for a municipality to construct its own subtransmission lines.

In support of its argument that Otter Tail does not have a dominance of transmission facilities, defendant showed at trial that 87,000 miles of electric power lines in the Otter Tail service area are owned by various rural distribution electric cooperatives. This testimony and other evidence established, however, that most of these lines are of a voltage of 12.5 Kv. and hence suitable only for distribution to the customer and not for transmission, which requires a heavier voltage, in the range of 34 to 69 Kv.

One of defendant's witnesses at trial, Mr. Nye, testified that the 12.5 Kv. cooperative lines in the vicinity of *Elbow Lake* and *Hankinson*, (two municipalities here involved and concerning which more will be said later) were not capable of transmitting power to these towns.

Northern States Power Company (NSP) does distribute retail power in some towns near the Otter Tail service area but it refuses to supply power to towns not in its own service area. For this reason NSP refused to supply Alexandria, Minnesota, and Coleman, South Dakota. Hence NSP is not an available power source for municipalities refused service by Otter Tail and desiring to convert to municipal ownership.

We conclude that Otter Tail has a strategic dominance in the transmission of power in most of its service area.

Much of the evidence at trial was directed

to the claimed employment of this dominance in transmission to prevent municipalities in the area from obtaining power to operate municipally owned systems. The testimony dealt principally with five towns, Elbow Lake, Minnesota, Hankinson and Finley, North Dakota, and Coleman and Aurora, South Dakota, with the emphasis on happenings at Elbow Lake and Hankinson. A summary of events at each of these towns follows:

Elbow Lake, Minnesota, is a small county seat town near Fergus Falls. Elbow Lake was served at retail by Otter Tail until 1966 when the citizens voted for a municipally owned system. The defendant refused to furnish power at wholesale. Elbow Lake acquired its own generating plant. It sought stand-by power from Otter Tail which was refused. Litigation ensued. The Federal Power Commission ordered the defendant to furnish stand-by power. The Court of Appeals of the Eighth Circuit affirmed. *Otter Tail Power Co. v. Federal Power Commission*, 429 F.2d 232 (8th Cir. 1970).

When Otter Tail refused to sell power to Elbow Lake, the town sought power, either as a sole source or on a stand-by basis, from the Bureau of Reclamation, the United Power Association, the Basin Electric Power Cooperative and the Runestone Electric Association.

Each of these sources was willing and able to furnish the power, but could not, as the power could only be delivered to Elbow Lake over Otter Tail's transmission lines, because of the restrictive provisions contained in the contracts between Otter Tail and the suppliers previously discussed, and because of Otter Tail's refusal to wheel the power. It was, and is economically unfeasible, for either Elbow Lake or the suppliers to build the required transmission facilities from the power source to Elbow Lake.

From all of the evidence, of which this is a short précis, the court concludes that Otter Tail employed its dominance in transmission in the Elbow Lake area to prevent Elbow Lake from obtaining electric power from outside sources of supply.

Otter Tail served Hankinson, North Dakota, with electric power under a 20-year franchise dated February 16, 1931. In 1947 the voters of Hankinson approved the establishment of a municipal electric system. Otter Tail refused to sell power at wholesale to Hankinson. The town sought power from the United States Bureau of Reclamation, the Basin Electric Power Cooperative and the RSR Electric Cooperatives. All three of these suppliers were dependent on the use of Otter Tail's transmission lines in transporting power from the nearest Bureau subsection at Forman, North Dakota, some 39 miles from Hankinson. Otter Tail refused to wheel power over its lines to Hankinson. Again, it was not feasible for Hankinson to construct its own transmission line 39 miles to Forman. The Bureau was unable to do so for the same reason, with the result that Otter Tail's conduct prevented Hankinson from obtaining needed power to service a municipally owned system. The town abandoned its efforts and granted a new retail franchise to the defendant.

On the basis of the above the court finds that defendant has a monopoly in the relevant market and has consistently refused to deal with municipalities which desired to establish municipally owned systems on the alleged justification that to do so would impair its position of dominance in selling power at retail to towns in its service area. The court concludes that this conduct is prohibited by the Sherman Act. It is well established that the unilateral refusal to deal with another, motivated by a purpose to preserve a monopoly position, is illegal. *Eastman Kodak Co. v. Southern Photo Materials Co.*, 273 U.S. 359, 47 S. Ct. 400 (1927); *Lorain Journal Co. v. United States*, 342 U.S. 143, 72 S. Ct. 181 (1951).

<sup>2</sup> (1) *American Tobacco Co. v. United States*, 328 U.S. 781, 66 S.Ct. 1125 (1946); (2) *United States v. United Shoe Machinery Corp.*, 110 F. Supp. 295 (D. Mass. 1953), aff'd per curiam, 347 U.S. 521, 74 S.Ct. 699 (1954); (3) *United States v. Grinnell Corp.*, 384 U.S. 563, 86 S.Ct. 1699 (1966); (4) *United States v. E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. (Cellophane)*, 351 U.S. 377, 76 S.Ct. 994 (1956).

Here the defendant does not dispute that its purpose in refusing to deal with municipalities desiring to establish municipally owned systems is to protect itself in the position it now enjoys in the area. Such is a monopoly position, and the law prohibits conduct such as this when such is intended to preserve the monopoly.

A similar "refusal to deal" case was decided in this district in 1945, *United States v. Klearflax Linen Looms, Inc.*, 63 F. Supp. 32, 39 (D. Minn. 1945). There Judge Nordbye capsulized the legal principle involved when he held that "A refusal to sell, while it may be lawful *per se*, cannot be used in order to achieve an illegal result."

Here Otter Tail refuses to sell power to municipalities which would thereby take retail power business from defendant and refuses to wheel power for others willing to sell to these municipalities. Because of its dominant position Otter Tail is able to deprive towns of the benefits of competition which would result from municipally owned facilities.

Pertinent to an examination of the law is a reference to cases expressive of the "bottleneck theory" of antitrust law. This theory reflects in essence that it is an illegal restraint of trade for a party to foreclose others from the use of a scarce facility. Here the theory finds application in Otter Tail's use of its subtransmission lines. One authority believes:

"The Sherman Act requires that where facilities cannot practically be duplicated by would-be competitors, those in possession of them must allow them to be shared on fair terms."<sup>3</sup>

This statement epitomizes the holdings in federal cases which have established the principle: *United States v. Terminal Railroad Assoc.*, 224 U.S. 383, 32 S. Ct. 507 (1912); *Gamco, Inc. v. Providence Fruit & Produce Building Inc.*, 194 F.2d 484 (1st Cir. 1952); *Packaged Programs, Inc. v. Westinghouse Broadcasting Co.*, 255 F.2d 708 (3rd Cir. 1958); *Six Twenty-Nine Productions, Inc. v. Rollins Telecasting, Inc.*, 365 F.2d 478 (5th Cir. 1966).

The bottleneck principle is applicable to Otter Tail. Its control over transmission facilities in much of its service area gives it substantial effective control over potential competition from municipal ownership. By its refusal to sell or wheel power, defendant prevents that competition from surfacing.

#### COURT LITIGATION

The efforts of Elbow Lake, Hankinson, Aurora and Colman, South Dakota, to establish municipal power systems were opposed by the defendant in court proceedings. Otter Tail either instituted or sponsored and financially supported court litigation which had the effect of frustrating the sale of revenue bonds to finance the municipal systems. A "no-litigation" certificate,<sup>4</sup> reflecting the absence of litigation which might impair the salability of revenue bonds, is essential to a successful sale of municipal bonds. The pendency of litigation has the effect of preventing the marketing of the necessary bonds thus preventing the establishment of a municipal system.

Most of the litigation sponsored by the defendant was carried to the highest available appellate court and although all of it was unsuccessful on the merits,<sup>4</sup> the institution and maintenance of it had the effect of halting, or appreciably slowing, efforts for municipal ownership. The delay thus occasioned and the large financial burden imposed on the town's limited treasury dampened local enthusiasm for public ownership. In some instances, Otter Tail made offers to the towns

to absorb the towns' costs and expenses, and enhance the quality of its service in exchange for a new franchise. Hankinson, after several years of abortive effort, accepted this type of offer and renewed defendant's franchise.

While every person has the right to resort to the courts to redress claimed wrongs, the right is not without limitation. One who enjoys a monopoly may not resort to litigation for the purpose of illegally maintaining the monopoly. The Ninth Circuit has observed that " \* \* \* litigation can be an integral part of a scheme prohibited by the Sherman Act." *Trucking Unlimited v. California Motor Transport Co.*, 432 F.2d 755, 760 (9th Cir. 1970).

This legal principle is well established and has been expressed in patent cases particularly in connection with the institution of infringement suits. See *Walker Process Equipment Inc. v. Food Machinery & Chemical Co.*, 382 U.S. 172, 86 S. Ct. 347 (1965); *Plastic Contact Lens Co. v. Butterfield*, 366 F.2d 388 (9th Cir. 1966); *Kobe, Inc. v. Dempsey Pump Co.*, 198 F.2d 416, 424 (10th Cir. 1952).

In *Kobe*, supra, the court said:

" \* \* \* we must not permit the courts to be a vehicle for maintaining and carrying out an unlawful monopoly which has for its purpose the elimination and prevention of competition."

The court finds that the litigation sponsored by defendant was instituted for the purpose of delaying and preventing the establishment of municipal electric systems with the expectation that this would preserve its predominant position in the sale and transmission of electric power in the area.

Defendant urges that the so-called *Noerr* doctrine, *Eastern Railroad Presidents Conference v. Noerr Motor Freight, Inc.*, 365 U.S. 127, 81 S. Ct. 523 (1961), exempts its conduct in the field of court litigation from antitrust attack.

But the *Noerr* principle is applicable only to efforts aimed at influencing the legislative and executive branches of the government. It only immunizes political activity directed toward the enactment and enforcement of the laws from antitrust attack. See *Woods Exploration & Producing Co. v. Aluminum Co. of America*, 438 F.2d 1286 (5th Cir. 1971), and *Trucking Unlimited v. California Motor Transport Co.*, supra. *Noerr* does not free from antitrust sanctions the institution of court litigation.

From all of the evidence it appears that defendant, by refusing to deal with municipalities and by conducting or sponsoring court litigation, has violated Section 2 of the Sherman Act and monopolized or attempted to monopolize the sale of electric power in its service area.

#### IMMUNITY AS A RESULT OF "VALID GOVERNMENT ACTION"

But Otter Tail takes the position that since it contracted with government agencies with reference to the delivery of power, it is thereby immune from antitrust sanctions.

It will be recalled that Otter Tail's agreement with the Bureau of Reclamation contains a provision which defendant interprets as freeing it from any obligation to wheel power from the Bureau to any municipality which received retail service from Otter Tail as of the date of the contract, that is, June 14, 1955. Further, Otter Tail's transmission agreements with certain cooperatives (Cooperative Power Association, Lyon-Lincoln Electric Cooperative, Inc. and Traverse Electric Cooperative, Inc., RSR Electric Cooperative, Inc. and East River Cooperative, Inc.) contain provisions which prohibit the use of defendant's transmission system to supply power from the cooperatives to a retail customer served by Otter Tail. These contracts also extend the same prohibition with respect to customers served by the cooperatives.

It is urged by Otter Tail that these re-

strictive provisions are immune from antitrust attack. The gist of this contention seems to be that since the Bureau is a government instrumentality and the REA administrator approved the contracts with the cooperatives, the contracts are the result of "valid governmental action," thus falling within the scope of *Alabama Power Co. v. Alabama Electric Cooperative, Inc.*, 394 F. 2d 672 (5th Cir. 1968).

In my view there is no merit in this contention. The *Alabama Power* case is inapposite. The restrictive provisions here are, in reality, territorial allocation schemes. Agreements among competitors to allocate customers or territories are *per se* violations of the Sherman Antitrust Act. *Northern Pacific Railroad v. United States*, 356 U.S. 1, 78 S. Ct. 514 (1958). Our Eighth Circuit has held to the same effect. *Montana-Dakota Utilities Co. v. Williams Electric Cooperative, Inc.*, 263 F. 2d 431 (8th Cir. 1959). There the court condemned a contract provision between an investor-owned utility and a rural electric cooperative allocating marketing territories as a *per se* antitrust violation. The court said:

By the great weight of authority in this country, the rule has been promulgated and consistently applied that contracts between quasi-public corporations, having for their object the division of territory between such companies, are against public policy, and being so, are absolutely void, untempered by any application of the 'rule of reason.' *Montana-Dakota Utilities* at 434.

A recent decision of the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, *Hecht v. Pro Football, Inc.*, F. 2d (D.C. Cir. 1971) held that a public armory board, in leasing a public stadium to a professional football team exclusively for a period of 30 years, was not immune from the antitrust laws.

In *Hecht*, the court held that in order for antitrust immunity to attach to action by a governmental body there must be specific and unequivocal language to this effect in the enabling statute.

"The basic philosophy of our antitrust policy has been so long established, is of such recognized economic importance, and has assumed in the statutory scheme of things such high dignity that a contrary Congressional intent of 'immunity from antitrust laws is not lightly implied.'" *Hecht* at —.

There is nothing in any of the legislation under which either the Bureau of Reclamation markets its power or the rural electric cooperatives operate which either expressly or impliedly confers immunity from antitrust laws upon the actions of the Bureau in negotiating contracts for sale of power or upon the action of the REA administrator in approving contracts between a cooperative and a private power company.

The record reflects it was reluctantly, and only after a determination that no other transmission facilities were available, that the Bureau signed the contract with defendant which contained the restrictive provision in question. In addition, the Bureau interpretation of the contract varies from that of the defendant. The Bureau officials were and are of the view that the provision is not a blanket restriction but requires the defendant to give separate consideration and to reach separate judgment as to each applicant for transmission service over defendant's lines.

In order for antitrust immunity to attach in situations of this kind there must be a clear indication that Congress, in enacting the law, considered the competing interests of antitrust policies and whatever policy is best served by the other competing interest, and expressed a clear judgment that the antitrust policy should be suspended. There is no such showing here. No antitrust immunity attached to the contracts or to the parties executing them.

<sup>3</sup> A. D. Neale, *The Antitrust Laws of the U.S.A.*, Cambridge University Press at 67 (1960).

<sup>4</sup> With the possible exception of litigation in Aurora where the court held that Otter Tail had no standing to sue.

That which defendant refers to as the "heart of the case" is its argument that if Otter Tail is required to sell power at wholesale or wheel power to its former retail customers, it will be contributing to its own corporate death because more and more municipalities would then change to municipal ownership to obtain the cheaper Bureau power. Eventually, defendant claims, most of its customers would convert and the Otter Tail system would be eroded to the detriment of its customers, stockholders and employees. This argument was pressed hard by defendant and its president, Albert Hartl, who testified vigorously and eloquently in defense of privately owned utilities vis-a-vis public power interests.

Of course, it should be remembered that a public utility which operates without exclusive franchises from its customers does not have a right to be free of competition. *Rural Electrification Administration v. Central Louisiana Electric Company*, 354 F.2d 859 (5th Cir. 1966). This has long been the law and extends to competition from municipally owned facilities. *Alabama Power Co. v. Ickes*, 302 U.S. 464, 58 S. Ct. 300 (1938).

One principal purpose of the Sherman Act is to insure competition. Otter Tail cannot violate the law albeit its avowed purpose is to protect the integrity of its business.

The Supreme Court recently held that the Schwinn Bicycle Company could not employ anti-competitive methods in order to preserve its business which was gradually but markedly going downhill. *United States v. Arnold Schwinn and Co.*, 388 U.S. 365, 375, 87 S. Ct. 1856 (1967). The court said:

"The promotion of self-interest alone does not invoke the rule of reason to immunize otherwise illegal conduct."

So here there appears to be no legal justification for conduct which violates the Sherman Act.

A so-called "erosion study (DX 41) offered by defendant sought to foretell its financial disaster if it is required to serve its former customers which convert to municipal operation.

The pessimistic view of the matter suggested by the defendant is not supported by the record. The Bureau of Reclamation now furnishes power to only two towns previously served by Otter Tail, to wit, Colman and Aurora, South Dakota. Elbow Lake also has an allocation of power for future use. The Bureau's generating capacity is now fully committed, it has denied requests for allocation of power from several applicants, including Sioux City and Aurella, Iowa, and no new generating capacity is scheduled to be activated. It is not unlikely that some present Bureau customers will have to find a continued power source elsewhere. All in all, it does not appear that Bureau of Reclamation power is a serious threat to the defendant nor that it will be in the foreseeable future.

But regardless, as stated, even the threat of losing business does not justify or excuse violating the law.

The court finds from a preponderance of the evidence that the defendant has attempted to monopolize, and has monopolized, interstate commerce in the retail distribution of electric power in violation of Section 2 of the Sherman Act.

Now therefore, the defendant and its agents are enjoined from any and all conduct, whether expressed in terms of contracts, policies, or practices, having the effect of continuing the violations of the Sherman Act herein found to exist.

Plaintiffs' counsel shall promptly present suggested detailed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order for Judgment reflective of these expressions together with a form of Judgment.

Dated: September 9, 1971.

EDWARD J. DEVITT,  
Chief Judge,  
United States District Court.

## A MESSAGE ON DRUGS

### HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, Robert H. McBride, the U.S. Ambassador to Mexico has embarked on a noteworthy and hopefully successful program to educate Americans entering Mexico on the local police attitude toward drugs.

Many Americans, especially young Americans, believe that Mexican authorities are complacent about the use of drugs. References to "Acapulco Gold" and thoughts of pursuing mushroom highs in the high Andes have led to the misconception that Mexico is a mecca for easy drug use and illegal purchases.

The fact is, since the United States and Mexico began "Operation Cooperation" last year, the Mexican authorities have been most diligent in the crackdown on drug users and pushers. Many Americans are now languishing in Mexican prisons as a result.

In an effort to alert presumptuous Americans to this fact, Ambassador McBride has prepared a leaflet on the drug attitudes in Mexico for distribution at all border crossings. He hopes to clearly forewarn any American contemplating violating the drug laws that the U.S. Embassy will not be available to "get them off." He is at the same time hoping that the Americans approached by drug pushers will help the authorities to apprehend these criminals.

The drug problem is not going to be solved by a series of laws or pronouncements alone. However, efforts such as this one by Ambassador McBride coupled with the efforts of others across the country will help rid this Nation of the curse of drug abuse.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues, I am inserting the Ambassador's leaflet message at this point in the RECORD:

#### A MESSAGE ON DRUGS

Since my arrival in Mexico I have noted an alarming increase in the number of American visitors who have been arrested by the Mexican authorities for violating the narcotics laws of Mexico. There is an apparent misconception held by some young American visitors regarding the Mexican Government attitude on narcotics.

Many seem to feel that local narcotics regulations are not stringently enforced and that they may violate Mexican laws with impunity. This is a completely mistaken notion . . . as many have soon discovered.

As of June, 1970 there were 187 Americans in prison in Mexico for narcotics violations. Of this number some may be found not guilty but only after due process of law. Those found guilty face stiff jail terms ranging from two to nine years for possession and three to ten years for trafficking in narcotics.

What worries me most is that a significant number of those arrested are students. Records show that students of all ages—from the secondary school level to the college level—have been involved in drug usage. These young people come from fine families and their experimentation in drugs can lead not only to arrest and detention, but to a lengthy and demoralizing imprisonment.

Many American visitors arrested for involvement in the sale or use of narcotics ap-

parently feel that they merely have to appeal to the United States Embassy for help and Embassy officials can intercede in their behalf and obtain a speedy release. Nothing could be further from the truth: once a narcotics violator is imprisoned there is little the U.S. Embassy can do to assist him other than providing advice on obtaining proper Mexican legal counsel and equal treatment under the law. Mexico does not grant release on bail to persons arrested in connection with drug offenses.

The United States and Mexican Governments have jointly launched the "Operation Cooperation" campaign which is designed to end the spread of narcotics and the Embassy is conducting an active education program for members of the local American community.

As the United States Ambassador to Mexico I appeal for your wholehearted support in dealing with this vicious problem. If you know of someone who is using narcotics and who you think would benefit from our counseling services, please refer him to the Citizens Consular Services' office in the Embassy. If you are approached by someone who offers to sell you narcotics, please inform the U.S. Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs which is located in the Embassy.

I appreciate your cooperation in this important matter and I hope that you will enjoy your visit to Mexico.

## THE TRAGEDY AT ATTICA: LET US BEGIN TO DEAL WITH THE CAUSE

### HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, as the tragedy at Attica—not entirely dissimilar to the recent tragedy at San Quentin—continues to be retold and rephrased, all individuals must have the same feeling I have with regard to the obvious failure of our prison system.

It becomes more apparent each day that the decision to invade the prison follows in a consistent pattern; a pattern which disregards the human and individual qualities of those men incarcerated in such institutions. It is this pattern of thinking that must be abandoned, or else all of the rhetoric about protecting inmates and guards, the rehabilitative function of prisons and the notion the prison is a deterrent for crime will only serve as a smokescreen for the disregard of very serious and basic problems in the penal system.

Because I believe that the issue of prison reform is one which the Congress will have to face squarely and honestly, I wish at this time to introduce the following article into the RECORD. I believe that it provides a most moving and eloquent statement, from which myself and my colleagues can begin to think about changes and alternatives to our current penal system.

The article follows:

WITNESS AT PRISON: WASHINGTON NEGOTIATOR  
CRIED AT ATTICA KILLINGS

(By Lance Gay)

At noon Monday, attorney Julian Tepper wept.

Exhausted by three days of helping to negotiate for the release of hostages held by

rebellious prisoners in Attica state prison, the Washington lawyer and penologist saw his hopes for a peaceful end to the riot wiped out.

That morning, he and others in the mediation panel watched from a window of the steward's room in the prison as a phalanx of helmeted troopers marched through clouds of tear gas inside the prison wall.

"I started crying. I didn't stop until this morning," the 30-year-old Tepper said yesterday. "It's something I always do in a situation where men end up dying."

#### "TIME WAS NEEDED"

As part of the team of more than 20 men who had worked for four days to save lives, Tepper had passionately pleaded for time.

"There was a feeling that an impasse had been reached" and that neither the prisoners nor the state prison officials would give way. "Time was needed, time so that what was then not negotiable might become negotiable later. . . . It would not have endangered anyone's life if the police had not moved," he said.

Tepper, director of the National Legal Aid and Defenders Association at 1601 Connecticut Ave. NW, blames New York Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller directly for the decision which proved fatal for 42 persons—hostages and convicts.

"There was no way to mount an assault on the prison without risking the lives of the hostages," Tepper said. "If he had accepted a delay he might have saved their lives."

#### STALEMATE ON AMNESTY

Throughout the negotiations, Tepper said he felt the inmates who held Cell Block D of the 44-year-old prison were tense, but had the situation in their ranks "under control."

"I knew every time I went into D block, our safety was in the hands of the inmates. But they guaranteed our safety in and out," he said, recalling that the convicts went out of their way to prevent any harm to the negotiating team in the unlighted passageways.

The team had won agreement from the state on 28 of the 30 demands the prisoners had made—most concerning improvements in medical care, food and the guard's relationship with prisoners. But the negotiations stalemated over the issue of amnesty from prosecution for the prisoners.

Appearing on WETA-TV last night, Rep. Herman Badillo, D-N.Y., one of the negotiating team, said that Rockefeller might have been able to break the stalemate had he gone to Attica.

"All of us on the committee felt that his meeting with us would have served a useful purpose. . . . I think he could have waited, we only asked for an additional day," Badillo said.

Tepper, who also appeared on the program, agreed with Badillo and added that he felt Rockefeller believed that there were "more votes available by taking this type (of forceful) action" than by continuing the attempt to mediate the dispute.

"His actions led to a loss of life. . . . and what Rockefeller did is horrible," Tepper said.

However, after the show, the young penologist said the seeds of the revolt were sown "with years and years and years of lack of concern about humanity, of oppression outside and inside jails."

#### PRISON SYSTEM CRITICIZED

The society in which some children are born unequal, with unequal educational opportunities, who grow up in a subculture which conflicts with the mainstream of society, is responsible for the prisons in America, Tepper said.

"What do Americans expect of a prison system? If they just want to confine people,

then they've got what they want—a system which makes a person more brutal.

"But if they want a system which has a chance of releasing inmates who will not commit crimes, then they don't have that now. And it's the responsibility of people in high office . . . people who have no idea what a prison is like. . . ."

"Most prisons are structurally incapable of rehabilitating or handling inmates. There's not that much time given to rehabilitation programs and when time is given it's just the icing on the cake when it should be the cake," he said.

#### TWO WARNING LETTERS

On the television program last night, Tepper read excerpts from two letters he said were sent to Rockefeller in 1969. The letters, written by a source whom Tepper declined to disclose, alleged brutal treatment and bad conditions for prisoners at Attica and Auburn prisons in New York and predicted that riots were "inevitable" unless some action to prevent them were taken. Auburn also had a recent riot.

"Gov. Rockefeller should have had knowledge of the problems at Attica beforehand," he said.

Tepper said that he has been asked by corrections officials here to attempt to reform the facilities at Lorton. "Lorton is trying to avoid trouble" such as happened in Attica, he said.

"I am going to devote my energies to prisoners' rights and reform and revise things at Lorton before it can happen—which is what all prisons should be doing."

He predicted violence in other prisons throughout the nation unless officials attempt to correct the "current methods of handling prisoners."

#### TRIBUTE TO FORMER CONGRESSMAN HUDDLESTON

### HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep sorrow that I learned of the untimely passing of my close friend and valued colleague, the Honorable George Huddleston, former Member of Congress from Alabama.

George Huddleston left the imprint of his wisdom and advice on all of us honored to have served with him as he sat in the Congress from 1956 to 1965. As a valued member of the Armed Services Committee, he sought in all cases to assure a strong and free America.

His record of public service was outstanding. He served in the U.S. Navy with distinction for 4 years as an officer and devoted 32 months of his life to overseas service. He was deputy circuit solicitor for the 10th Judicial Circuit of Alabama and was assistant U.S. attorney for the Northern District of Alabama prior to his election to Congress.

His contributions to his Nation are many and varied. Let it simply be said that George Huddleston was a fine, dedicated, and patriotic American and I regret deeply his passing.

All of us who knew him well convey to Mrs. Huddleston and their children our deepest and most sincere sympathies and we share with them the knowledge that without George Huddleston, America would have been the poorer.

#### EEOC ENFORCEMENT—MOTION TO RECOMMIT

### HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, those of us in Congress who have consistently advocated legislation to provide the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission with effective enforcement power view the adoption of this substitute bill with profound regret.

Since the creation of the Commission in 1964, it has become increasingly apparent that the problem of discrimination in job hiring has not been solved. After much thought and investigation, the Committee on Education and Labor concluded that the most forceful way to attack this persistent problem was to grant the EEOC the power to try cases of alleged discrimination and upon its determination that such discrimination did exist, to issue judicially enforceable cease and desist orders. The committee concluded that by providing this power to the Commission, the EEOC would at last have the tools necessary to assure that the protection of the rights of Americans sought by title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 would be accomplished once and for all.

The substitute bill, which we now have before us would merely impede the effectiveness of the EEOC rather than help it. This bill contains provisions which would restrict the amount of back pay awards, make title VII an exclusive remedy, and prohibit class action suits.

However, the most crippling effect of the substitute bill is the provision which grants the EEOC court enforcement powers rather than "cease and desist" powers which were provided by the original bill.

I would like to remind my colleagues that granting the EEOC cease and desist powers would merely be granting this agency the very same powers which agencies and the vast majority of State fair employment agencies are presently using to enforce the law. This is the manner in which consumers are protected by the Federal Trade Commission, and workers are protected by the National Labor Relations Board.

By denying these powers to the EEOC what we would actually be doing is imposing second class citizenship on the minorities and the women whom the Commission is charged with protecting.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, by forcing the Commission to use the courts rather than the administrative procedure to carry out its responsibilities, we would simply be adding to the already existing problem of overburdened courts. It is estimated that as many as 20,000 new cases every year would be added to the caseloads of our overburdened courts if the substitute version is adopted. And, I may hasten to add, if we adopt this version now before us we would be completely ignoring the advice of the Chief Justice of the United States who warned us in a speech in August, 1970, about passing new laws without adequate con-

sideration of the consequences in terms of caseloads."

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the adoption of this substitute would relegate job discrimination cases to already overburdened courts, would give the Attorney General veto power over equal employment opportunity enforcement, repeal the provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1866, oust the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board in employment discrimination cases, prevent economical and effective class action suits, and limit the chances of victims of discrimination to be fully reimbursed for the wrongs which they suffer.

Mr. Speaker, we simply cannot tolerate such an ineffective solution to the continually mounting problem of employment discrimination which exists in this country. No bill at all would be better than the one we have before us now. For these reasons, I urge all my colleagues to vote to recommit this bill to the Committee on Education and Labor.

KEEP THE RADICALS AWAY FROM  
THE PRISONERS

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the tragic deaths at Attica prison in New York are clearly attributable to the revolutionary propaganda that has been infiltrated into the prisons for the past few years. A conscious effort has been made by such revolutionary groups as the Black Panther Party and the Trotskyite Youth Against War and Fascism to inflame the prison population in New York State. During the recent convict rioting at Attica observers and negotiators were admitted into the prison from such groups as Youth Against War and Fascism and the Young Lords, as well as Black Panther leader Huey P. Newton and William Kunstler of Chicago conspiracy case notoriety.

The Black Panther Party, some of whose members were active in the leadership of the riotous prisoners, has announced that they had made arrangements to transport the prisoners to non-imperialist countries if the amnesty had been granted them.

These revolutionary groups and their propaganda have proclaimed to the convicted criminals that they are not in jail for crimes but are political prisoners. This is manifestly untrue. The prison population at Attica, for example, a maximum security prison, consists primarily of persons who have committed serious crimes of violence against society. These are the murderers, muggers, and the rapists who have been caught. They, of course, want their freedom so that they can be back committing their crimes of violence again. It is in the interest of society that these people be removed from the streets until they can act like human beings. In watching them on TV, the spokesmen for prisoners were brazenly

arrogant and little more than savages. Irreconcilable positions between criminals and society cannot be solved by negotiations. They can only be solved by criminals giving up the commission of crime.

Concessions made to the prisoners such as that agreed to by the New York Correction Commissioner Oswald, "to remove visitation screens as soon as possible" only sets the stage for future prison riots. It was the lack of a visitation screen at San Quentin that allowed George Jackson the opportunity to obtain a gun and resulted in the death of Jackson, other criminal victims and three guards.

The negotiations at Attica were a mistake. Giving prison inmates the impression that their impossible demands—such as amnesty for transport out of the United States—might be met only keeps the riot going. This policy also allowed the militant prisoners to win over those who might have been wavering during the early stages of the riot. The lives of most of the hostages were saved by the actions of the New York State Police. Hostages who were in danger of having their throats slit were saved by the marksmanship of State police sharpshooters who killed their assailants. Some hostages apparently died when they were forced to dress in prison uniforms and were used as shields by the rioting convicts.

It is my belief, Mr. Speaker, that had the State police been sent in days earlier the lives of all the hostages might have been saved. I also feel that any investigation of Attica must look into the area of which groups and which individuals carried revolutionary literature into the prison and agitated the convicts to commit the crimes that have so shocked this country. Above all, allowing visitation by political radicals like William Kunstler and Bobby Seale only helps harden the position of the rebellious criminals.

We should have an investigation of the degree to which the radicalization of the prisoners by subversive groups and the activities of militants in and out of prison prompted this tragedy at Attica. I believe that an investigation would show that there is a very clear connection. We should act now or face the prospect of more confrontations as we have seen in California and New York.

PETROLEUM EXPLORATION  
INCENTIVES

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today for the purpose of reintroducing the Domestic Exploration Investment Tax Act of 1971. Originally introduced as H.R. 9759, this legislation provides for a 12.5 percent tax credit to encourage domestic exploration for oil and natural gas. The amended bill I introduce today also provides this credit for investment in secondary recovery wells.

By adding this amendment, I believe we can accomplish a much broader goal. This would be extra incentive to conserve already proven reserves, lead to additional development of these reserves, and make better use of the capital available to attempt to meet this Nation's energy crisis.

As stated in my July 13 remarks in introducing H.R. 9759:

The primary purpose for this legislation is to help reverse the present dangerous trends which appear to be leading toward a growing reliance upon Middle East sources of crude oil. These sources could literally "go up in smoke" either as a result of resumption of Arab-Israeli hostilities or as a result of the internal political struggles which plague many Middle East countries.

Recent statistics brought to my attention indicate that further development of these proven reserves could help prevent this impending reliance upon foreign petroleum. I invite all my colleagues to give this matter their closest attention before it is too late.

THE THREAD OF UNITY

HON. FRED SCHWENDEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. SCHWENDEL. Mr. Speaker, George T. Nickolas of Davenport has authored a most appropriate article for Constitution Day which will be observed tomorrow, Friday, September 17.

Mr. Nickolas has written several articles on the history and heritage of our Nation. It is my own feeling that this is an outstanding article which I would like to share with the House.

The article follow:

THE THREAD OF UNITY

(By George T. Nickolas)

The Declaration of Independence is the spiritual base of our Government and way of life, but it is regrettable that the celebration of its signing has overshadowed most other patriotic holidays. Few people, in fact, know the date the U.S. Constitution was signed, which is unfortunate since the Constitution is the legal basis of our Government.

In 1787, in the twelfth year of our Independence, the country was ravaged by disordered finance, poor credit, and ruined commerce. The "Articles of Confederation" did not meet the requirements of the time and something had to be done.

A convention was called and conservative men were selected to draft a revision to the "Articles of Confederation" and to establish a base to govern the United States of America. These men had little faith in democracy, and it was mainly this general lack of faith in democracy that held these conservative men together during the long hot summer while they were confronted with their trying assignment. They wanted to create a government that was democratic, but just democratic enough to facilitate the adoption of the document by the states.

On September 17th a document was presented and signed by the delegates. It is considered by many as the "Great Compromise." We, the Citizens of the United States, can see from history that the Government they created has endured and grown. In each year of its existence, the Government has shown

proof of its utility and its blessings. Our country has stretched out from its original boundaries, the population has doubled, and then doubled many times over; but we have not extended beyond the protection or the benefits of the Constitution.

The United States of America has been called by many ignorant and unthinking people the land of the "Almighty Dollar"; but because of the Constitution, it is the land of opportunity, permitting every citizen to participate in the governing of his life and his country.

The President has proclaimed September 17th to the 23rd as Constitution week. As citizens under the protection of this document we should pause for a few minutes to give thanks to Almighty God for the living, changing and growing thread that holds this Government and our people together. This and future generations can have high, exciting and gratifying prospects as long as the Constitution of the United States of America prevails.

### GOD HAS BEEN GOOD TO ME

#### HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the trials and tribulations of today too often succeed in taking all the joy out of living. Faced with problems and worries, we are prone to forget the good things of life.

This is not true, fortunately, for a resident of my 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania. Just reading about this individual is enough to bolster your own spirits. I am talking about Mrs. Annie M. Rankin, of 1712 Manor Avenue, McKeesport, who just recently celebrated her 100th birthday.

She has seen many wondrous things in her lifetime; yet she has not lost the thrill of anticipation for what lies ahead. "I don't want to miss anything," she told a newspaper reporter who interviewed her at the start of her second century.

Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure I insert the article about Mrs. Rankin into the RECORD. I am certain that after reading it, my colleagues will join with me in wishing this sparkling, personable woman continued health and happiness:

"GOD HAS BEEN GOOD TO ME," LOCAL CENTENARIAN SAYS  
(By Marilyn March)

Mrs. Annie M. Rankin begins her second century of life tomorrow armed with the verve and optimism of a woman half her age. "I don't want to miss anything," declares the 100-year-old city woman and the twinkle in her eye and determination in her voice leave little doubt that she will.

Mrs. Rankin, a widow for the past 22 years, resides with her daughter, Mrs. Myrtle Reed, at 1712 Manor Ave.

Tall and slim, Mrs. Rankin's bright blue eyes sparkle with anticipation of the big weekend ahead when her children, grandchildren, nieces and nephews will be here from all points on the map to help her celebrate her 100th happy birthday.

This unbelievably alert woman keeps a firm finger on the pulse of life and the world around her. She reads weekly news and business magazines, the daily papers and the latest books.

#### MOON WALK "WONDERFUL"

In her lifetime she has seen the fledgling airplane develop from a wooden brainchild of the Wright Brothers through the thrills and excitement of Lindberg's Atlantic crossing all the way to the latest Apollo mission and man's walk on the moon.

"Wasn't it wonderful? I watched the whole thing," she declares. Change has been a watchword in her life and she regards much of it as for the best, but views the trend away from religion as a cause of most of the nation's current ills.

A staunch Republican, she first voted in 1921—the first year women had the right to vote—and cast her ballot for Warren Harding. And since that date she has voted in every election.

A special birthday card and a personal letter from President and Mrs. Richard M. Nixon stand in a place of honor along with a stack of other birthday remembrances from family, friends and neighbors.

"Somebody wrote and told him I've been a lifelong Republican and a big fan of his so I guess that's why he (the President) sent along the letter, too," Mrs. Rankin said happily.

She attends church every Sunday at Wesley Methodist Church in White Oak and tomorrow that congregation will pay special tribute to the centenarian during the 11 a.m. service.

In addition to the congregation's tribute, McKeesport Council has passed a special resolution citing Mrs. Rankin's lifetime "exemplification of the Christian ethic" and extending best wishes on her birthday.

Initiated by Councilman Harry P. Helmstadter, the resolution was approved by Council at yesterday's meeting.

The resolution points out that Mrs. Rankin's life "spans an area which began under pioneering and nearly primitive conditions in a pristine forest and field area and extends into the atomic and moon rocket age . . . spanning a century of the most dramatic achievements of mankind."

McKeesport is proud to number among its own, one whose character all can admire and seek to emulate," the citation adds.

Born on a farm near Ligonier, Sept. 12, 1871, she had to leave the country school she attended when she was 16 so that she could care for her invalid mother and the rest of the family.

She married Frederick R. Rankin in 1892 and they were the parents of four children, two of whom are living. They include Mrs. Reed and a son, Milton, of St. Petersburg, Fla. He and Mrs. Reed will be joined by Mrs. Rankin's two grandchildren and two great-grandchildren and nearly 40 nieces and nephews in a family observance this evening and tomorrow.

In excellent health, Mrs. Rankin still keeps busy with light housekeeping chores for herself and her daughter and has the evening meal planned, cooked and on the table when Mrs. Reed arrives home from work.

She loves to go shopping at the big malls and keeps right up on all the local news events along with the national news," Mrs. Reed relates. A slight hearing loss and a need for glasses for reading are the only apparent toll the years have taken.

The beauty, the dignity and the faith of God and the future still remain in abundance. "I just wish folks had more reverence for the Sabbath," Mrs. Rankin said.

"Back in my girlhood on the farm, we spent the best part of every Sunday in church—not out shopping or at some sports event like today. God has been good to me and it's only been through His will that I've been here so long and had good health," she commented.

Mr. Rankin, who worked at U.S. Steel's National Works, died in 1949—seven years after

the couple celebrated their golden wedding anniversary.

With quiet dignity, Mrs. Rankin shrugs off the praise and plaudits. "It's too much fuss for the likes of me," she maintains.

Her plans for the future? "I think I just may slow down a bit, now that I'm a hundred," she jokes.

### SOUTH AFRICA: OPPRESSOR OR OPPRESSED

#### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, South Africa continues to be a victim of gross discrimination, bias, and distortion from the UNO and continues to be denied its proper place in the family of nations because the free world has accepted without question or investigation the myths and superstitions advanced by "certain Communists and many others" that South Africa engages in the practices of slavery and oppression.

The United Nations Organization even refused to accept the statement of fact offered by South African Foreign Minister Eric Louw to that organization in 1961 and moved to strike his speech from the record. Even the Washington Post, that bible of extreme leftwing liberals, was shocked and described the action as "moblike." The Post continued in most uncharacteristic language:

Nothing that South Africa has done and nothing that its representative said justified the mobile censure which the United Nations visited upon that country and its Foreign Minister, Mr. Eric Louw.

The UNO is discriminating against South Africa and is even unwilling to investigate the truth of charges against the country. Such a system of prejudicial justice is typical of the UNO and indicates its true colors.

What do the international bureaucrats in the UNO fear about South Africa or hope to gain from continued suppression of the truth?

I insert a news article detailing the United Nations Organization's discriminatory practices against South Africa in the RECORD at this point:

[From the New Hampshire Sunday News, Sept. 12, 1971]

UN'S STONEWALL OF PREJUDICE—NO EVIDENCE TO UPHOLD SLAVERY, OPPRESSION CHARGES  
(By L. E. S. deVilliers)

(NOTE.—Mr. deVilliers is the chief information officer in this country for the South African government.)

In 1946, South African Prime Minister Smuts returned from the very first session of the newly established United Nations Organization a very disappointed man.

South Africa, he said, found itself up against a stonewall of prejudice. Without a shred of evidence to support such wild charges, his country stood accused of slavery and oppression in the so-called parliament of mankind.

Smuts played a leading role in San Francisco during the deliberations which led to the establishment of the United Nations. He served as chairman of the Commission on the

General Assembly and initiated several important amendments in connection with the Security and Social and Economic Councils.

His ideals for the U.N. were embodied in the preamble to its Charter—Smuts wrote that preamble.

"People think that slavery still continues in South Africa," Smuts explained after his return from that disappointing first session. "They think that we exploit people here. This is the impression certain Communists and many others continue to propagate and spread—and, unfortunately, it is very difficult for us, and very expensive, to fight such a campaign."

The impenetrability of that wall of prejudice was clearly demonstrated in 1961 when South Africa's Foreign Minister, Eric Louw, presented the U.N. General Assembly with an answer to its numerous charges of oppression and slavery. This was done by way of comparison between conditions for the black man in South Africa and other African states.

Louw gave ample proof that the black people of South Africa had a higher income per capita, better educational opportunities, far superior medical and social services and altogether a much higher standard of living than any of the inhabitants of independent black Africa.

A motion of censure was adopted against Louw. His speech was struck from the record.

The Washington Post described this censure by the Assembly as mob-like. "Nothing," the Post contended, "That South Africa has done and nothing that its representative said, justified the mob-like censure which the United Nations visited upon that country and its Foreign Minister, Mr. Eric Louw."

And just how difficult it was for South Africa to fight this campaign of calumny, became even more apparent once the United Nations decided to involve itself in the affairs of South West Africa.

While Louw was censured in the General Assembly, a so-called U.N. Special Committee on South West Africa was busy preparing for the record an indictment of the territory's administrator.

It proceeded with impunity. Relying on tales by so-called petitioners, it accused South Africa of genocide, oppression and militarization in South West Africa.

As administrator of this vast but thinly populated territory first placed under its control by the now defunct League of Nations, South Africa invited the chairman and vice-chairman of this special U.N. Committee to take a look for themselves.

Both Men—Vittorio Carpio and Dr. S. Martinez de Alva—were given the opportunity to travel freely and extensively in South West Africa and to meet with as many local inhabitants in private as they desired.

In a joint communique issued from Pretoria at the end of their trip these two gentlemen refuted their own committee's charges. The Committee in turn simply sacked its Chairman and Vice-Chairman, denied the existence of their communique and continued as if nothing had happened.

Basically, the same charges featured in a court action brought against South Africa at the World Court in The Hague, in the early Sixties. Serving as applicants on behalf of the Organization of African Unity, Ethiopia and Liberia drew heavily upon "evidence" garnered by the UN Special Committee.

At last South Africa had the opportunity to challenge these accusations in a court of law. It countered with a written presentation of nearly 3,000 pages, while the verbatim report of its oral proceedings covered twice as many volumes.

Fifteen expert witnesses were called out of a list of 38 presented to the Court.

Counsel for the applicants, on the other hand, preferred to save their U.N. petitioners the embarrassment of a court appearance.

They did not call any witnesses.

South Africa offered to pay the expenses of these petitioners to travel to The Hague as it would have afforded the opportunity to cross-examine them in her court. This was refused. The charges, in fact, were dropped in a dramatic about-face by counsel for Ethiopia and Liberia.

Barely three weeks later—Nov. 29, 1965,—the General Assembly once again passed a condemnatory resolution on South West Africa. The charges? "Oppression," "militarization" and a "threat to world peace." They were based once again on the "evidence" of U.N. petitioners.

In the protracted case of the Sixties, South Africa also suggested an on-the-spot inspection of South West African conditions by the Court. The same offer was repeated in a more recent case, which concluded some months ago. Both offers were declined.

So was South Africa's offer to hold a plebiscite under joint control of the World Court and the South African government—and in doing so, putting these allegations of oppression, repression and denial of self-determination to a fundamental test.

It's a long time since Smuts first encountered a stonewall of prejudice in the United Nations. The wall is still there.

"In this World," said Douglas Jerrold, "truth can wait, she's used to it." Truth has been waiting on the doorstep of the United Nations for 25 years. She's still waiting.

Some day, perhaps someone may decide to let her in and free the U.N. to devote its precious time to real world problems instead of imaginary South African misdemeanors.

#### TESTIMONY FOR CURE AND CONTROL OF CANCER

### HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is presently holding hearings on various bills to achieve a cure for cancer.

As a cosponsor of H. Con. Res. 27, a resolution to effect the cure and control of cancer in this decade, I have submitted a statement in support of this legislation, which also is cosponsored by 137 of my colleagues, to the subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, I request that my statement be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN (R-MD) SUBMITTED TO SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT OF THE HOUSE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE IN SUPPORT OF H. CON. RES. 27, NATIONAL COMMITMENT TO CURE AND CONTROL CANCER, SEPT. 15, 1971

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to express my support for a commitment to cure and control cancer in this decade, and in particular to express to the Members of this Subcommittee my support for H. Con. Res. 27 of which I am a co-sponsor.

I request, Mr. Chairman, the indulgence of the Subcommittee to include here at the beginning of my testimony a letter which I received from one of my constituents in New Carrollton, Maryland, which describes realistically and tragically the heartbreak faced by thousands of Americans whose family life is ravaged by this dread disease.

The letter from Mrs. Albert J. Wallace follows:

Dear Congressman Hogan:

Several years ago when you were running for Congress, our son Robert walked many a mile in New Carrollton carrying campaign literature and stood hour after hour on election day holding Hogan signs.

In November, 1970, at 9½ years old, he died of cancer. He lived 10 months after we discovered he had cancer—10 months of indescribable agony.

Needless to say we strongly urge you to support cancer legislation because we know the heartbreak of it and that none of us are immune.

I'm certain, Mr. Chairman, that all of the 137 cosponsors of H. Con. Res. 27 have received similar communications from their constituents, although in Mrs. Wallace's case the heartbreak of losing a minor child who would have had a full life to look forward to is even more grievous than the loss of a loved one who has lived a complete and meaningful life. We are reminded that all too many of the more than one million Americans currently undergoing cancer treatments are young people to whom the Nation must look for its future leadership.

Because our colleagues in the other body passed on July 7, 1971, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to create an independent National Cancer Agency, I believe it is imperative that this committee act expeditiously to report favorably a companion measure in this body.

Approval of the Concurrent Resolution which I have cosponsored would not only indicate our desire to authorize a much-needed increase in funding—an increase from \$230,383,000 appropriated in fiscal year 1971 to an annual \$650,000,000 for the next ten years—but it would also call for the establishment of an independent National Cancer Authority to plan and implement a coordinated attack on cancer. Such an agency—when provided with the proper funding—would be able to mobilize the Nation's most talented manpower and to draw upon our vast base of scientific knowledge about cancer to find a cure for the disease which annually brings misery to the homes of so many thousands of Americans.

Escalation of our efforts to control and cure cancer cannot wait. We owe it to ourselves and to the people of our Nation to amplify the hope generated by our successful research efforts in the past few years by committing ourselves to the elimination of this disease.

I urge this Subcommittee to act with the greatest haste on this legislation so that not another year goes by when more than 300,000 Americans lose their lives to this dread disease.

#### MEXICAN INDEPENDENCE DAY CELEBRATED

### HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pause and take note of the fact that today is Mexican Independence Day. Today is the anniversary of the proclamation of Mexico's independence in 1810 by Father Miguel Hidalgo in the village of Dolores, Guanajuato.

In 1810 a group of patriots began meeting under the pretext of literary studies to prepare for the rebellion. The similarity to our own independence

movement is striking. This group advocated the extension of human rights to the then oppressed mass of Indians and mestizos. Betrayed by co-conspirators on this day 161 years ago, Father Hidalgo called his parishioners together by ringing the church bell and then raised the cry of freedom, "Mexicans, viva Mexico." One of the first decrees made by this group of rebels was to abolish slavery.

Though the struggle was a long one, the ultimate product of these efforts of the Mexican people is our democratic and modern neighbor to the south. I would like to join with my friends and neighbors of Mexican descent today in celebrating this momentous event.

**VEYSEY ANNOUNCES 38TH DISTRICT POLL RESULTS**

**HON. VICTOR V. VEYSEY**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, some 24,000 of my constituents have voiced their opinions on the major issues facing us both nationwide and locally within our 38th Congressional District in California. This response represents nearly 15 percent of the total vote cast in our last congressional election.

The 38th District itself is a well-balanced cross section of America, and includes broad representation from minority groups, urban centers, agriculture, military personnel, resort areas, industry, and various other segments of our society.

The feelings of my constituents, I believe, fairly reflect the sentiments of the majority of Americans across the country and should surely be of interest to all of us in public life.

With that in mind, I am including, at this point, a listing of the 12 questions in my poll and a complete tabulation of the 24,000 responses:

**38TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT CONSTITUENT POLL**

Question 1: Do you favor a federally guaranteed annual income for every family?

- Total: Yes, 27.28%.
- Total: No, 72.72%.
- Adult: Yes, 27.31%.
- Adult: No, 72.69%.
- Youth: Yes, 27.16%.
- Youth: No, 72.84%.

Question 2: Do you favor Federal Revenue Sharing . . . the President's plan to share federal money with local governments?

- Total: Yes, 69.27%.
- Total: No, 30.73%.
- Adult: Yes, 69.34%.
- Adult: No, 30.66%.
- Youth: Yes, 68.56%.
- Youth: No, 31.44%.

Question 3: Do you favor federalized welfare . . . transferring control of welfare from local government to Washington?

- Total: Yes, 41.04%.
- Total: No, 58.93%.
- Adult: Yes, 41.20%.
- Adult: No, 58.80%.
- Youth: Yes, 42.64%.
- Youth: No, 57.36%.

Question 4: Do you favor higher taxes on everyone to help stop pollution?

- Total: Yes, 35.86%.

Total: No, 64.14%.

Adult: Yes, 35.36%.

Adult: No, 64.64%.

Youth: Yes, 40.80%.

Youth: No, 59.20%.

Question 5: Do you favor President Nixon's strategy in the Vietnam war?

Total: Yes, 56.86%.

Total: No, 43.14%.

Adult: Yes, 58.42%.

Adult: No, 41.58%.

Youth: Yes, 41.22%.

Youth: No, 58.78%.

Question 6: Do you believe that labor unions are growing too powerful?

Total: Yes, 84.67%.

Total: No, 15.33%.

Adult: Yes, 85.28%.

Adult: No, 14.72%.

Youth: Yes, 78.56%.

Youth: No, 21.44%.

Question 7: Do you believe that farm workers should have a secret ballot in any unionization effort?

Total: Yes, 92.12%.

Total: No, 7.88%.

Adult: Yes, 92.28%.

Adult: No, 7.72%.

Youth: Yes, 90.50%.

Youth: No, 9.50%.

Question 8: Do you believe that the federal government should subsidize health insurance for every citizen?

Total: Yes, 50.46%.

Total: No, 49.54%.

Adult: Yes, 50.00%.

Adult: No, 50.00%.

Youth: Yes, 55.03%.

Youth: No, 44.97%.

Question 9: Do you believe the U.S. should help other nations remain independent?

Total: Yes, 44.74%.

Total: No, 55.26%.

Adult: Yes, 44.49%.

Adult: No, 55.51%.

Youth: Yes, 47.20%.

Youth: No, 52.80%.

Question 10: Do you believe the government should create public service jobs for unemployment?

Total: Yes, 73.45%.

Total: No, 26.55%.

Adult: Yes, 72.93%.

Adult: No, 27.07%.

Youth: Yes, 78.60%.

Youth: No, 21.40%.

**MAJOR PROBLEMS—38TH DISTRICT**

Question 1: What is the No. 1 and No. 2 national problem?

Question 2: What is the No. 1 and No. 2 local problem in the 38th District?

(Scoring: No. 1=2 pts.)

(Scoring: No. 2=1 pt.)

**COMPOSITE OF NINE AREAS**

*National problem*

- 1. Law and order . . . . . 5,978
- 2. Vietnam war . . . . . 5,545
- 3. Economy . . . . . 5,512
- 4. Environment . . . . . 4,345
- 5. Welfare . . . . . 2,367
- 6. Drugs . . . . . 1,573
- 7. Taxes . . . . . 1,474
- 8. Urban problems . . . . . 1,340
- 9. Excesses in government . . . . . 1,248
- 10. Communist threat . . . . . 1,245

*Local problem*

- 1. Enforcement . . . . . 8,406
- 2. Law and order . . . . . 3,574
- 3. Economy . . . . . 3,402
- 4. Welfare . . . . . 3,136
- 5. Taxes . . . . . 2,878
- 6. Drugs . . . . . 1,560
- 7. Urban problems . . . . . 1,019
- 8. Farm labor (unions) . . . . . 711

**RIVERSIDE AREA**

*National problem*

- 1. Vietnam . . . . . 2,001
- 2. Economy . . . . . 1,512
- 3. Environment . . . . . 1,493

*Local problem*

- 1. Environment . . . . . 2,860
- 2. Law and order . . . . . 1,286
- 3. Economy . . . . . 1,240

**PALM SPRINGS—PALM DESERT AREA**

*National problem*

- 1. Economy . . . . . 1,029
- 2. Law and order . . . . . 1,006
- 3. Environment . . . . . 701

*Local problem*

- 1. Environment \* . . . . . 1,877
- 2. Law and order . . . . . 473
- 3. Taxes . . . . . 373

**SUN CITY—HEMET—SAN JACINTO AREA**

*National problem*

- 1. Law and order . . . . . 1,681
- 2. Economy . . . . . 1,133
- 3. Vietnam . . . . . 1,006

*Local problem*

- 1. Environment . . . . . 1,185
- 2. Taxes . . . . . 833
- 3. Law and order . . . . . 716

**BEAUMONT—BANNING—IDYLLWILD AREA**

*National problem*

- 1. Law and order . . . . . 437
- 2. Economy . . . . . 313
- 3. Environment . . . . . 312

*Local problem*

- 1. Environment \* . . . . . 576
- 2. Welfare . . . . . 314
- 3. Law and order . . . . . 270

**CORONA—NORCO AREA**

*National problem*

- 1. Vietnam war . . . . . 329
- 2. Economy . . . . . 303
- 3. Environment . . . . . 297

*Local problem*

- 1. Environment . . . . . 429
- 2. Economy . . . . . 258
- 3. Law and order . . . . . 166

**SAN BERNARDINO AREA**

*National problem*

- 1. Environment . . . . . 231
- 2. Law and order . . . . . 228
- 3. Vietnam . . . . . 195

*Local problem*

- 1. Environment . . . . . 306
- 2. Law and order . . . . . 194
- 3. Economy . . . . . 189

**RURAL RIVERSIDE AREA**

*National problem*

- 1. Vietnam . . . . . 372
- 2. Law and order . . . . . 351
- 3. Economy . . . . . 315

*Local problem*

- 1. Environment . . . . . 308
- 2. Economy . . . . . 250
- 3. Law and order . . . . . 209

**BLYTHE-INDIO-SALTON SEA AREAS**

*National problem*

- 1. Environment . . . . . 290
- 2. Vietnam . . . . . 273
- 3. Law and order . . . . . 258

*Local problem*

- 1. Environment . . . . . 443
- 2. Welfare . . . . . 272
- 3. Taxes . . . . . 153

**IMPERIAL COUNTY AREA**

*National problem*

- 1. Law and order . . . . . 594
- 2. Economy . . . . . 516
- 3. Vietnam . . . . . 415

*Local problem*

- 1. Welfare . . . . . 595
- 2. Environment\* . . . . . 422
- 3. Economy . . . . . 304

\*Salton Sea comprising at least 10% of points.

**METROPOLITAN LIFE INSURANCE  
CO. SUBVERTS PRESIDENT'S RENT  
FREEZE ORDER**

**HON. EDWARD I. KOCH**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of our colleagues an outrageous act on the part of Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., the landlord of a large housing project known as Stuyvesant Town in Manhattan. The company is seeking to induce tenants to sign leases at a 15-percent increase and I believe its action pressing tenants to sign such leases now violates the letter and surely the spirit of the price stabilization regulations promulgated by President Nixon. Andrew Stein, New York State assemblyman for the district, and I have written a joint letter to Secretary of the Treasury Connally setting forth all of the details. The letter follows:

SEPTEMBER 16, 1971.

JOHN B. CONNALLY, JR.,  
Secretary of the Treasury, Department of the  
Treasury, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We would like to bring to your attention an incident which we feel constitutes a violation of the spirit of President Nixon's wage price control order of August 15th, if not the letter thereof. It is a matter that has a potential effect on 20,000 of our constituents.

The Metropolitan Life Insurance Company owns and operates the Stuyvesant Town housing project here in Manhattan. The project was built under the State's Redevelopment Companies Law which limits the profit Met Life may earn. Earlier this year Met Life requested a rental increase of 15%, effective October 1st. The request was rejected by the New York City Board of Estimate, then later upheld in court.

Although the matter is presently under appeal, on September 17th Met Life sent the residents of Stuyvesant Town new lease forms for a two year period at 15% increases, effective October 1st. An accompanying rider stated that rent payable under terms of the new lease would be no greater for any month than the maximum rent allowed under the President's freeze order. A covering letter asked tenants to indicate whether or not they would renew their leases. The leases also called for a 15% increase in the security deposit which was to be paid immediately.

The immediate request for additional security was clearly a violation of the freeze and will be properly protested by the tenants. We feel, however, that Met Life's mailing of the leases and their demand that tenants indicate their renewal intentions now is an arbitrary act that unfairly prejudices the tenants.

It has been made quite clear by yourself and others that some form of price stabilization will no doubt continue after the 90 day period ends. Such controls might well bar for an additional period of time the amount of increases which Met Life is asking. (It is certainly clear that a continuation of rent controls designed to prevent the type of increase Met Life is seeking is absolutely necessary here in New York City). Despite the probability of on-going controls, Met Life is requiring tenants to make a decision now on where they wish to live for the next two years without the tenants having the benefit of knowing what their rentals may be.

We believe it is unfair to require these tenants to state their intentions before they know what control if any will affect their

rents after the 90 day period ends. We feel that this action on the part of Met Life deprives its tenants of the kind of protection the freeze was intended to provide. If the freeze was designed to cool off the economy, to provide a psychological breathing period so to speak, the tenants of Stuyvesant Town are not getting that benefit. In our opinion Met Life's action is if anything psychologically inflationary.

We note that you summoned various corporations to Washington when they announced, during the freeze, that they would increase dividends, in one case at least, when that dividend was not to go into effect, until after the expiration of the freeze. Is not Met Life guilty of a similar type violation, and is their action perhaps not a greater violation, in so far as rents were explicitly frozen under the President's order whereas dividends were not?

The only reason we can attribute to Met Life's insistence on October 1st as the effective date for new leases, is that they may attempt to apply retroactively to that date to recoup rent whenever controls are removed or substantially relaxed. Such a request for a retroactive rent increase would be highly improper, and we urge you now to make the government's position perfectly clear that such requests will not be tolerated.

We note also that as long as the freeze is in effect it can make no financial difference to Met Life whether tenants are asked to sign renewals October 1st or November 1st.

Accordingly, we are requesting that you insure the tenants of Stuyvesant Town receive the kind of protection which we feel the President's economic plan was intended to provide, by prohibiting Met Life from asking tenants to sign renewal leases until such time as it is made clear just what controls on rents if any, will extend beyond the official freeze.

Sincerely,

EDWARD I. KOCH,  
Member of Congress.

ANDREW STEIN,  
New York State Assemblyman, 62d A.D.

**PROTECTION FOR EMPLOYEES OF  
THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS**

**HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY**

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, I introduced a bill to establish an equal employment opportunity program for the protection of employees of the Library of Congress. After the events of June and July at the Library, it was clear that a system was critically needed to protect the rights of minority employees.

First, this legislation will require the Librarian of Congress to establish and maintain a positive program of equal employment, subject to the approval of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. At present, the Librarian has sole authority and discretion to hire and fire as well as to promote and demote employees. The Librarian is only accountable to Congress; but under this bill he is required to submit his plans for equal employment to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

Second, as a part of his equal employment program, the Librarian shall establish a procedure by which an aggrieved

employee may bring a complaint of discrimination. The procedure must be clearly defined and information made available to all employees. Further, and equally as important, this act provides for an appeal process within the Library of Congress. In short, I am calling for the initiation of a complete and equitable administrative procedure within the Library of Congress to handle complaints of discrimination.

**PROFITS AND PATERNALISM**

**HON. TOM RAILSBACK**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. RAILSBACK. In an age when big business has frequently come under attack, I am proud to have in my district, the Northwestern Steel & Wire Co. Northwestern is one of the finest companies in this country and its high standards are to be complimented.

In the August 15 issue of Forbes magazine, there appeared a very informative article on Northwestern and its president, P. W. Dillon.

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

**PROFITS AND PATERNALISM**

Being the U.S.' most profitable steel company might seem like winning first prize in a race with only one contestant. But Northwestern Steel & Wire Co. is better than that. Easily steel's most profitable company, it runs a fast race in any industry. Over the past five years it has averaged a 19% return on stockholders' equity and more than 11% after taxes on sales.

Northwestern is not a big company by steel industry standards. Its 1970 sales of \$159 million were dwarfed by even such second-line steel companies as Allegheny Ludlum and Wheeling-Pittsburgh. It operates electric furnaces rather than conventional big-company equipment and runs on scrap, not ore. But Northwestern is no midget. It sold more than 1 million tons of steel last year. Nor does it produce high-profit specialty steels; in fact it averages only about \$155 a ton for the steel it sells, as against an industrywide average of about \$175.

Northwestern is not so much different as it is better. It is simply more efficient than its competitors.

The man who runs Northwestern, Chairman Paul W. Dillon, is as unusual as the company. He's a six-foot, silver-haired man of 88, a son of the founder and a Victorian patriarch transported into the mid-20th century. He has his desk in a bull-pen space in the company's ancient Sterling, Ill. office building; when it was last painted no one can recall. Steam engines, donated years ago by railroads (railroad buffs come miles to see them), wheeze around this plant.

But there are also frequent cash bonuses, often amounting to hundreds of dollars, handed out on the field of battle, as it were, to supervisors for outstanding performance.

Northwestern executives are expected to take their jobs as seriously as Dillon does his. All key personnel must be available 24 hours a day; officers have phones in their cars to insure their availability. The aged but still spry Dillon scoots up ladders and along catwalks ahead of the few visitors he suffers. (No outsider gets too near the heart of his operation, the furnace.)

This old-fashioned work ethic helps, but the real heart of Northwestern's profitability is something else: Its technology is probably superior to any other in the U.S. steel industry.

Which is one reason Dillon keeps visitors from Northwestern's furnace. The secret—it is a secret to most of its competitors—is ultra-high power, which allows higher temperatures, faster melting and much more economical steel production, a technique "that goes beyond patents," as one analyst told Forbes. Learning that technique wasn't easy. When Dillon was experimenting with ultra-high power in the early Sixties, the transformers to provide it weren't available. But he mastered the technique and in 1964 and 1965 doubled his transformer power, with two transformers of 48,000 kilovolt-amperes.

Result: In the past five years Northwestern's return on equity and return on sales have more than doubled those of the early Sixties. Simple? Other electric furnace users in the past two years have gone to ultra-high power, in the 75,000-kva range, but most are having difficulties getting it to work. Northwestern's new 400-ton electric furnace, the world's largest, now is using 200,000 kva.

Northwestern depends on steel scrap to feed its furnaces, and scrap prices fluctuate, as no one knows better than Northwestern. Last year scrap prices jumped from under \$35 a ton to over \$45 a ton. And Northwestern's earnings in its first half of fiscal 1971, ended Jan. 31, dropped 28% on a 3% sales increase. Scrap prices are back under \$35 a ton now, but the specter of fluctuations still haunts Dillon.

So, Dillon and his aides are looking for ways to use iron ore instead of scrap. Iron ore can't be fed as it is to an electric furnace; it has to be reduced to nearly pure iron first. That could be done in a conventional blast furnace, but would be far too expensive for a company Northwestern's size. It could be done by direct reduction in a kiln. Midland-Ross (see p. 22), which developed such a process, offered to supply Northwestern with furnace charge for under \$35 a ton, a price fully competitive with scrap and much more stable.

#### GOING IT ALONE

Characteristically, Dillon turned it down. He doesn't like to depend on other people's technology. He is working on his own process, just as he worked alone on ultrahigh power. One outsider reports Northwestern already has a cheaper experimental process.

At any rate, Northwestern is working at the very frontiers of steel industry technology. Even the biggest companies are experimenting with electric furnaces; by eliminating the need for blast furnaces, the electricians are capable of huge savings in fuel, shipping and capital costs. Especially the latter: Northwestern's new 400-ton furnace cost less than one-third as much as conventional facilities of equivalent capacity.

What keeps Paul Dillon going at this pace in his ninth decade? Only his intimates know. Dillon refuses to meet either the press or Wall Street. His experience in the steel business goes back to the days of Andrew Carnegie and his attitudes show it. Dillon runs his company like the family business it has always been—in spite of the fact that roughly one-third of its 2.5 million shares are in public hands. Northwestern's president, not surprisingly, is Paul's son, W. Martin, age 61. Grandson Peter Dillon is a vice president. Turnover among non-Dillon executives is, reportedly, high: Paul Dillon is a tough taskmaster.

Any way you look at them, Paul Dillon and Northwestern are a throwback to earlier capitalism. But a remarkably effective throwback.

## A LOSS NOT A GAIN

### HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, many words have poured forth from the presses of our Nation as a result of the Supreme Court's 6-3 decision to permit publication of articles based on and excerpts of the top secret Pentagon papers on the origin of the war in Vietnam.

Recently, however, a friend sent to me a copy of a signed editorial from the Houston Post which sets forth in clear and unequivocal terms its tenets of responsible journalism in handling a grave issue such as this.

It was authored by the publisher, Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, a distinguished journalist and public servant, and a great lady.

Because I believe this excellent summation of the case deserves the full attention of my colleagues and the American people, I insert it at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Houston Post, July 4, 1971]

#### A LOSS, NOT A GAIN

(By Oveta Culp Hobby)

The Supreme Court's 6-to-3 decision to permit publication of articles on the origin of the Vietnam war based on top secret Pentagon documents represents a net loss of freedom of the press.

The Houston Post defends the rights guaranteed by the First Amendment. Free speech and a free press come to the same thing—the right of the people to be informed, to dissent. But to be a free press means to accept the responsibility of being a free press.

As Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes showed long ago, the First Amendment's protection cannot be unlimited. We are guaranteed free speech, he said, but we cannot false cry "Fire!" in a crowded theater.

Newspaper editors are not employees of the government, but they must share with the government the responsibility of protecting the people. When editors set themselves above not the law but the security of the country, the country may be endangered. Publication of the Pentagon documents is too grave a responsibility for decision by any editor acting alone. It is impossible for an editor to know what is sensitive and what is not sensitive in the government's operations.

But an editor can ask if a document affects the nation's well-being; a procedure exists for declassifying documents that may no longer be sensitive. The newspapers concerned did not ask if the documents were sensitive, if they could be declassified.

The question does not concern the government's embarrassment but whether the vital interests of the people were endangered.

"In this case," Chief Justice Warren E. Burger wrote in his dissenting opinion, "the imperative of a free and unfettered press comes into collision with another imperative, the effective functioning of a complex modern government and specifically the effective exercise of certain constitutional powers of the Executive. . . ."

"To me it is hardly believable that a newspaper long regarded as a great institution in American life would fail to perform one of the basic and simple duties of every citizen with respect to the discovery or possession of

stolen property or secret government documents. That duty, I had thought—perhaps naively—was to report forthwith to responsible public officers. This duty rests on taxi drivers, justices and the New York Times."

Thursday, Secretary of State William P. Rogers appealed to the press to withhold voluntarily publication of any of the Pentagon documents that would "harm the security of the United States." He added that "the government remains ready to lend its assistance in identifying any documents which, if disclosed, would result in such harm."

The New York Times twice and the Washington Post once condemned what each has now been granted the right to do. Of the Otepka case, involving a member of the State Department who in 1963 delivered confidential State Department files to the Senate Internal Security Committee, a Times editorial said:

"Orderly procedures are essential if the vital division of power between the legislative and executive branches is not to be undermined. . . . The use of underground methods to obtain classified documents from lower-level officials is a dangerous departure from such orderly procedures."

The Washington Post concluded that if such a practice were to continue, "the executive branch of the government would have no security at all."

Again, when Stewart Alsop co-authored an article describing deliberations of the National Security Council, the Times said in an editorial: "What kind of advice can the President expect to get under such circumstances? How can there be any real freedom of discussion or dissent; how can anyone be expected to advance positions that may be unpopular or unprofitable?"

Are the statements of these two distinguished newspapers less applicable to the present case than to the former ones?

#### DRAFT BILL CONFERENCE REPORT: NOT ACCEPTABLE

### HON. PETER N. KYROS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, when the House of Representatives last considered the extension of the Selective Service Act and military pay increase presently before the other body, I voted against the conference bill. In doing so, I stated my dissatisfaction both with the proposed pay levels at the lowest grades, and with the alteration of the amendment which would have assisted in our efforts to withdraw our military forces from Vietnam within a specified time period, 9 months from the date of enactment.

The reasons which forced my opposition to this legislation in its present form are more compelling today than a month ago. First, it has become apparent that our military personnel require greater congressional support if they are to receive the equitable pay which they deserve. In the case of enlisted personnel in the lowest pay grades with dependents, "equitable pay" is perhaps an esoteric term. These men and women require a living wage, and they do not receive it. A recruit in pay grade E-1 is being told that his proposed pay level will

be \$164 below the rate first voted through by the House of Representatives—and that represents a “compromise,” \$448 below the figure enacted by the other body. It is the recruit who has been compromised, not the pay levels.

During the past weeks, the administration's wage-price freeze has required greater financial sacrifices from military personnel than from perhaps any other group of wage earners. Not only are military personnel required to forego the scheduled pay increase, insufficient as it may be at the lower levels, for a 9-month period; they are to be denied even the step increases which are so much a part of the incentive system for continued service.

The disregard for our military personnel apparent in the “compromise” pay levels has been reinforced by the inequities of the administration's economic program. Our men and women serving in the Armed Forces should not be regarded as sacrosanct, but neither should they serve as scapegoats in seeking wage stabilization. I cannot vote to continue to draft men under the pay provisions presently advocated.

Under the pay provisions first enacted, it was possible to support continuation of the draft for a 1-year period as a necessary transition phase in moving toward an all-volunteer army. The pay provisions now proposed drastically reduce the possibility of achieving an all-volunteer army in the near future.

As I cannot vote to draft men at unacceptably low pay levels, so I also cannot vote to draft men for possible service in a military conflict which has become meaningless, or worse. The past weeks have seen the defoliation of that last remaining rationale for our continued presence in South Vietnam, where the people were to have a “choice in determining their own future.” That choice, now being euphemized as a “referendum,” is no broader than the choice available to the people of the Communist countries. I was in South Vietnam only a month ago. Aside from the horrifying spectacle of hundreds of American servicemen seriously addicted to hard narcotics, I was shocked to note that in the streets of Saigon itself, American soldiers are increasingly being subjected to personal attack and finding it difficult to walk freely without having someone grab at their watch or some other personal possession. Now, even more than a month ago, a date certain for our withdrawal of forces from Vietnam is mandatory.

It is certain that the Congress will be increasingly exposed to the argument that failure to extend the Selective Service Act immediately with the reduced pay increases will bring chaos to our military manpower and defense programs. I suggest to my colleagues that our military posture will not be strengthened through legislation which requires men and women to serve at hardship pay levels and possibly in a tragic and meaningless war which we will not end. Let us instead insist upon highly trained, motivated, adequately paid armed forces. The necessary funds can be found in many areas, beginning with a meaning-

ful reduction in the number of U.S. ground forces stationed in Europe, bearing a burden which the European allies will never begin to share more equitably until our own presence is reduced.

#### DISCUSSION OF THE ABORTION QUESTION

### HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, numerous States have taken steps to liberalize their laws against abortion. This action has posed many questions for the various religious faiths in our country. Since this body may take up the question on a national basis, I am inserting in the RECORD two important items which I am sure will add greatly to my colleagues' knowledge on the subject of abortion.

The first is a statement on abortion from the chief rabbinate of Israel in Jerusalem headed by Chief Rabbis Isaac Nissim and Isser Yehuda Unterman. The second is a statement issued by Rabbi David B. Hollander, vice president of the Rabbinical Alliance of America. I commend both to my colleagues:

TEXT OF STATEMENT FROM JERUSALEM, AS TRANSLATED FROM THE ORIGINAL HEBREW BY RABBI DAVID HOLLANDER

(1) The conference of rabbis took up the situation of the limitation of births in the land either through prevention of pregnancy or abortion with the aid of physicians and under the influence of women activists who, supposedly, for the sake of improving the circumstances of families with many children, are urging women to employ various means to limit births.

These activities are contrary to Jewish Religious law. Abortions are in the category of the taking of human life, and it is also a threat to national security. For while there is a struggle to bring immigrants from other countries, there is a reckless attempt to reduce the population internally.

(2) The conference of rabbis turns to all heads of Jewish families and calls their attention to the severity of the religious prohibition against abortion and on the serious violation involved in other methods of birth prevention, and on the urgent obligation to preserve family purity and modesty.

(3) The Rabbinical Conference turns to all physicians not to aid in abortions except in such cases where there is an imminent danger to human life.

(4) The Conference imposes a duty on rabbis in their communities to explain the high value placed by Judaism on the increase of families.

(5) The Conference turns to the Council of the Chief Rabbinate to continue to deal with this issue and to exert every effort toward the increase of the family.

(6) The Conference turns to the Knesset (parliament) and the government to increase the penalty of those who arrange for abortions and those who aid them, and to aid the birth of children thru social assistance and concessions to families with many children.

#### ABORTION: A RABBI'S VIEWPOINT

To those of us who rail against G-d for having “allowed” countless children to perish under the Nazis, or from war, disease

and hunger, there is this challenge: How dare we blame G-d when we now voluntarily and energetically advocate and promote legislative and other programs to advance unrestricted abortion and other methods to take the lives of countless children already alive but yet unborn.

As always when the G-d-given moral law is being violated, it is given, ironically, a seemingly “moral” justification such as the prevention of overpopulation which in turn means in hunger and pollution. Instead of changing our selfish overindulgence in food and in the exploitation of natural resources by giving more of our time to spiritual and humane pursuits, thus limiting our avaricious hunger, we seek to “solve” the problem by interfering with the gift of life which is the exclusive domain of G-d.

Abortion is a serious threat not only to the unborn child, but also to all adults, especially to the elderly. Why is this so? For two reasons: (1) Once it is rationalized that human life can be extinguished, just because we do not actually see the victim (many killings today thru long-range weapons and bombings have invisible but nonetheless real victims), we cannot stop. Once we are not subject to G-d's immutable law on the sanctity of human life, any program of “Constructive” elimination of human life to ease problems will be justified. Indeed there are many voices today in the world of medicine and social welfare who advocate that people of a certain age be permitted to “expire” (a term less harsh than “die”). And, of course, there is EUTHANASIA or the merciless “Mercy-killing”, thus potentially imperiling every human life.

Even before abortion was legalized, its practice was immoral and dangerous to the sanctity of all human life, but when it was made legal, that danger accelerated a thousand fold, not only because of its vast increase in the number of abortions, but because of the LAW which sanctioned the interruption of innocent human life.

(2) Abortion kills also in another way, namely in eliminating the possibility of the birth of those who might have the genius and talent to discover cures for dreadful diseases and other perils affecting mankind.

Judaism (except where it is necessary to save the life of the mother) strongly prohibits abortion, and places it in the category of the taking of human life, however “noble” the motivation.

Even those who say that while they oppose abortion, they feel it is a private matter and the law should not interfere, are simply not facing the fact that the law always does and should interfere where human life is the issue. Thus the law forbids suicide, refusal to submit to medical treatment, or the mistreatment of children, the sick and the helpless. The law forbids the abandonment of children by parents. Is there a greater “abandonment” than abortion?

Respectfully submitted.

Rabbi DAVID B. HOLLANDER.

#### NEWS RELEASE

NEW YORK, N.Y.—Rabbi David B. Hollander, Vice President of the Rabbinical Alliance of America, today announced his receipt of a statement on abortion from the Chief Rabbinate of Israel in Jerusalem, headed by Chief Rabbis Isaac Nissim and Isser Yehuda Unterman.

The statement, an appeal to Jews everywhere to shun abortions, states the position of the Conference of Rabbis at the Chief Rabbinate in Jerusalem, and it is addressed to all heads of Jewish families, to rabbis and to Jewish physicians.

The statement condemns abortion as the taking of human life and a serious violation of Jewish law and a threat to national security. It furthermore urges Jewish physicians not to perform abortions, except where

there is an imminent danger to the mother's life, and it calls for legislation to increase the penalties for those who arrange for abortions and those who aid them.

The full text of the statement is included in this press release.

In a personal statement, which is also included in this release, Rabbi Hollander said abortion represented a serious threat not only to the unborn child but also to all adults, especially the infirm and the elderly, since a policy against life once rationalized cannot stop. Rabbi Hollander stated that legalization of abortion made this threat accelerate a thousand-fold.

Rabbi Hollander also stated that those who say that while they oppose abortion, they feel it is a "private matter and the law should not interfere", are simply not facing the fact that the law must always interfere where human life is the issue.

Respectfully submitted,

RABBI DAVID B. HOLLANDER.

#### ISRAEL'S CHIEF RABBINATE URGES ALL JEWS TO AVOID ABORTIONS

NEW YORK.—The Israeli Chief Rabbinate has sent an appeal to Jews all over the world to avoid abortions because they are "contrary to Jewish religious law." A letter signed by Rabbi Akiva Gottlieb, chief secretary of the Rabbinate was presented last week to a meeting sponsored by the Long Island Right to Life Committee, a group comprised of Catholics, Protestants and Jews opposed to legalizing abortions. The text of the letter was made available to the Jewish Telegraphic Agency by Rabbi David Hollander, vice president of the Rabbinical Alliance of America, an association of Orthodox rabbis. It reported on a conference on the problem of abortions sponsored by the Israeli Chief Rabbinate at which abortions were denounced as "the taking of human life" and "a threat to national security." The letter assailed "woman activists who, supposedly for the sake of improving the circumstances of families with many children, are urging women to employ various means to limit their birth." The letter claimed that "while there is a struggle to bring immigrants from other countries to Israel, there is a reckless attempt to reduce the population internally."

#### HEALTH CARE CRISIS

### HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, the Evening Star editorial of September 7, 1971, is a timely comment on the health-care crisis facing our Nation and the need for a determined effort by the administration and the Congress to correct this situation.

I am pleased with the work my Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment did on health manpower legislation which has passed the House and is now in conference.

But there is more to do if we are to effectively curb the rising costs of health care and improve the delivery of services. I anticipate that following the hearings on the "Conquest of Cancer" legislation which began yesterday before my subcommittee, hearings will begin on Health Maintenance Organization as the subcommittee continues its efforts to improve health care in the Nation.

I insert at this point in the RECORD, for the benefit of my colleagues, The

Evening Star editorial of September 7, 1971:

#### REFORMS THAT CAN'T WAIT

In his economic bombshell message on August 15, President Nixon proposed postponement of his welfare reform and revenue sharing measures, to help restrain inflation. But he made no mention of another major domestic program—health-care reform—and we hope that neither the administration nor Congress has any idea of putting it on ice.

While no one has suggested that, neither is anyone near the top of the power heap talking very forcefully about the health-care crisis right now. That's due in part to Congress' protracted summer vacation. But upon reconvening it will be so preoccupied with the New Economic Plan proposals, and perhaps the continuing foreign policy debate, that some vital questions are likely to get sidetracked.

Health care should not receive that treatment, because it involves economics as well as healing. And the economic prospect in this field gets gloomier all along. Health care has led the inflationary race of the past few years. Its costs soared by more than 50 percent in the Sixties, compared to a 31 percent increase in the consumer price index.

And now comes a new federal study report predicting another 50 percent rise in health-care costs by 1974. The increase will run even higher than that, the survey director says, if efforts to stabilize the national economy prove unsuccessful. Cost estimates produced by the study will be used in considering about a dozen proposals for national health insurance that are before Congress.

These are so diverse and controversial that no final action is likely this year. But further hearings on them should be conducted, with an eye to passage of legislation next year.

The prime emphasis in the remainder of this session should be on measures that would vastly broaden prepaid group medical practice. This is the device that offers the best hope of curbing runaway health-care costs. Several pending bills, including one offered by the administration, would provide strong federal incentives for group physician practice in so-called Health Maintenance Organizations (HMOs). These have a proven capability of cutting costs while enlarging benefits.

There already has been a signal health-care achievement in this session. Before the vacation recess, both houses of Congress passed legislation to dramatically expand the training of doctors and nurses and relieve the financial despair of medical schools. These are the main prerequisites to setting up the universal health-care system toward which the country is moving. It cannot be an effective reality until the medical manpower shortage, and the maldistribution of doctors, are remedied. Congress is responding laudably to that challenge.

Now it must begin tackling the HMO proposals, through which health-care delivery would be reorganized in the public interest. Hearings on these are needed in both houses, without delay.

#### THE OLD: DOES ANYBODY CARE?

### HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the following is the third of a series of eight articles on the problems of elderly people by Carol Ann Smith in the Champaign, Ill., News-Gazette. This article was published on August 31, 1971:

#### HOW DOES IT FEEL TO WAKE UP OLD?

(By Carol Ann Smith)

What does it mean to a feeling human being to wake up one morning and discover that he is old?

Is everything over or does it just seem to be that way? What has happened in terms of humanity?

Facing these questions is painful for an individual, but aging is bound to happen to him or to someone he knows or loves.

Social scientists see both the society and the individual; the two are somehow supposed to fit together. They think first in terms of a social system—the connections, functions and relationships between various structures that persons create as they come together in the mass we think of as society.

Then the social scientist looks to the individual to determine how that individual fits in the social system—how he is placed himself or how he has been thrown into the system or how he has been excluded from the system.

The individual integration into a social system is generally judged by three indices: social values, formal and informal group memberships and social roles.

In simple terms, an individual is tied to his society by what he believes, the groups he belongs to and the positions that he occupies.

Irving Rosow, author of *Social Integration of the Aging*, formulates the theory that insofar as older people can preserve their middle-age patterns they maintain their integration in society.

But to the extent that their lives do change, the integration may be undermined. The crucial factor, he indicates, is the disruption in the previous life styles, activities and relationships of those who reach "old age."

Rosow goes so far as to insist that every institutional factor which would tend to preserve their functions in society (ownership of property and control over the opportunities of the young, their command of strategic knowledge and skills, strong kinship, strong religiosity) is being undermined in the United States.

"Though their material needs may even come to be adequately provided for, Rosow says, "the basis of old people's social life will steadily deteriorate. They will progressively be excluded from the mainstreams of social activity and the central functions of society."

Rosow believes that as far as social values are concerned, there is "almost no evidence and none conclusive" that the old have significantly different sets of beliefs than young people specifically as a result of aging.

There is nothing to indicate that a person is conservative simply because he is old, or more religious because he is old, and there is evidence that the old share with the younger generations many basic beliefs such as images of what constitutes the "good life," that they are interested in buying and owning.

Social scientists have, however, evidence that group memberships and social roles are different, and different because of age.

"With increasing age, there is a progressive loss in social roles, especially in such vital areas as marital status, employment, health and income," Rosow indicates.

The loss begins before the age of 65 years and continues steadily until the age of 75 and after 75 years accelerates rapidly.

What is significant is that once the role of wife, working breadwinner, or leader is lost, it is lost forever for most of the aged.

Some persons may re-marry and some workers may take part-time jobs, but the vast majority of the aged never regain their roles, and society has to this point provided no viable substitute.

The problems thus begin to become inter-related. Social roles are lost and at the same

time the social world of the aging contracts. Their membership in various formal organizations can be shown on a line that dips sharply and dips down.

They belong to fewer organizations and just as significantly if they retain membership they hold fewer offices and are less active than in earlier years.

What happens within the family situation is not quite so clear. Some experts believe that modern urbanization and mobility has fostered the isolated nuclear family and have certainly separated the older generation from their adult children. Older people therefore have fewer meaningful functions to perform in the family and the ties with their children are less meaningful.

Other experts insist that despite mobility and urbanization, families—parents and their adult children—still perform as a cohesive unit and that there is even demonstrable geographic proximity between parents and at least one adult child.

There is, they maintain, substantial evidence that there continues a pattern of mutual aid and assumption of responsibility for aged parents especially in the working classes, or in rural areas and among certain ethnic groups.

However, it appears to be universally true that old people have fewer friends than young people, and there are studies which indicate that the aged not only have fewer friends but that the friendships are more shallow in old age than they were during the younger years.

Rosow looks at all of these components of the individual and society and reaches some disquieting conclusions—disquieting perhaps because we see them demonstrated around us.

First, he says, the role loss leads to role ambiguity. There is nothing that tells the aged person how he's supposed to act, what is preferred conduct. At all other times in life the individual has been provided with definitions by society, norms against which to match himself, expectations of him. There is literally nothing for the aged to do, and they understandably become inactive and bored.

Second, the young and middle-aged do not accept the old demonstrated by either simple indifference or active discrimination. The young and middle-aged view them in terms of stereotyped images and familiarity and contact with older persons will not change the stereotype.

Third, older people accept the stigmatizing images and attitudes about their age group and they display many of the defensive reactions and self-hate shown by other devalued minorities.

Then to avoid the social stigma attached to being old, the aged retain youthful self-images: because there is no incentive to identify themselves with a devalued group they see themselves as younger than other people see them.

Because they have lost their social roles and group memberships the aged are ignored, rejected and discriminated against by the young—simply because they are old.

Roles and even group memberships are bound up with money and the older member of society has very little of it. He finds out just how little he has on the day the retires.

THE LATE HONORABLE GEORGE  
HUDDLESTON, JR.

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my deep sympathy in the recent

passing of one of Alabama's native sons and a distinguished former member of Congress, George Huddleston, Jr. It is not easy to describe a man who fought so hard for so many years for his constituents because you remember him so full of life. George was a man of great personal charm, of strong convictions and opinions, and a man who has left behind favorable impressions upon the pages of American history. For many years he served as a faithful and dedicated member of the House Committee on Armed Services and the entire committee was saddened when Chairman HÉBERT made the sad announcement of this loss of our former colleague to Tuesday's meeting of the full committee.

George Huddleston stood for many things. He loved his family and had just recently moved them to the rural area of the beautiful State of Virginia. George also loved his country as evidenced by his dedicated service during World War II as a member of the U.S. Navy. Then, upon coming to Congress he was diligent in his work as a member of the House Committee on Armed Services, staunchly supporting those measures which he knew were in the best interest of his beloved country. I recall the energy and time he spent in helping organize the Veterans Day commemoration program in Birmingham and this tribute to America's veterans is now the largest of its kind throughout the country.

George Huddleston was a great patriot and he was extremely proud of his country and all that it stands for. His passing leaves a void in the fraternity of Alabamians in the Washington area which will be solely missed and I express my deepest sympathy to Congressman Huddleston's wife, Alice Jean, and to other members of the immediate family in this time of personal bereavement. I shall ever treasure my friendship and appreciate his sincere Christian spirit and character.

TAX REFORM FOR SMALL BUSINESS

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bill and thus add my name to the growing list of cosponsors of legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide income tax simplification, reform, and relief for small business.

Small businesses in this country account for 99 percent of the firms, 40 percent of the jobs, and upward of one-third of the gross national product in this country. Socially as well as economically there is a unique value to the small business. This Nation relies upon the continuance and prosperity of small, independent businesses.

Yet, the last few years have not been very good years for small business. According to the Small Business Administration Economic Review, the 1970 record on business failures and new incorporations suggests that the "economic en-

vironment during the past year was poor for small business."

I hope that this legislation will help to change that environment. Over the past few years small business has suffered from the highest interest rates in a century, consumers have ceased or cut back on buying, badly needed new technology has increased in expense, and there are new requirements that must be met to avoid pollution and attend to the occupational safety of workers.

This proposal to provide income tax simplification and reform was the result of a great deal of careful study on the part of the House and Senate Select Committees on Small Business, the Commerce Department, the Small Business Administration, the Treasury Department, and many others. It is my hope that this legislation will be passed as soon as possible.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL  
AND CRIME

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, when the Attorney General of the United States made the astounding statement last week that fear of crime "is being swept from the streets of some—though not all—American cities," I assumed that Cleveland, Ohio, was not on his list of emancipated communities. I was the president of the city council in Cleveland in 1970—the year for which we now have the FBI crime statistics that inspired the Attorney General's statement—and it was my observation during that time that it was not fear that was vanishing from the streets, but rather people—people who were too afraid to walk the sidewalks or even to drive in many neighborhoods. However, it occurred to me, after hearing what our honorable Republican Attorney General had said, that perhaps I had been too close to the scene in Cleveland as a representative of the people of my ward, and as their contact man with the councilmen from other wards—and that, in fairness, I should now, in 1971, take a new sighting from afar—from the fresh perspective of Washington, D.C.—using as my guide the same FBI crime figures for 1970 that had so heartened Mr. John N. Mitchell.

Mr. Speaker, I can now report to you and to my colleagues sitting here that I have done just that. I have obtained and examined the FBI's Uniform Crime Report for 1970. I regret, deeply, to find that I had been correct in my original assumption. Mr. Mitchell unfortunately could not have meant my city because in 1970, Cleveland reeled from 313 criminal homicides, 307 forcible rapes, 5,475 robberies, and 1,909 aggravated assaults. Enough crime, in other words, for fear to blanket the streets. However, Mr. Mitchell did try to soothe us with the observation that while crime did increase around the country, the rate of increase

was slowed down. Therefore, although I doubted that the total of 8,004 victims of violent crimes in Cleveland in 1970, to whom I have just alluded, could or would take comfort in Mr. Mitchell's reassurance, I also obtained the FBI's Uniform Crime Report for 1969. I find that in that year there were 314 criminal homicides in Cleveland, 303 forcible rapes, 5,638 robberies, and 2,073 aggravated assaults—indicating a total of 8,328 victims.

Mr. Speaker, comparing the record of any given city such as Cleveland with its record for the preceding year is really meaningless if we agree, as I am sure Mr. Mitchell would, that no total for violent crimes is tolerable. Does it matter, for instance, to each of the victims that Chicago had 12,767 aggravated assaults in 1969 but "only," if you will, 11,667 in 1970? Is it not enough to say, rather—or, really, too much to say—that Los Angeles had 1,988 forcible rapes in 1970, that Detroit had 23,038 robberies and that Houston had 356 criminal homicides—to cite just a few examples?

I find it interesting that the FBI's prose, in its uniform crime reports, is more matter of fact than Mr. Mitchell's press releases and political statements. The phrasing of these reports, and their real thrust so far as the men and women swept from the streets are concerned, hardly varied from 1969 to 1970. On page 4 of the 1969 report, I find this statement:

In calendar year 1969 almost 5 million Index offenses were reported to law enforcement agencies, a 12-percent increase over 1968. The violent crimes as a group made up 13 percent of the Crime Index total and rose 11 percent, with murder up 7 percent, forcible rape 17 percent, robbery 14 percent and aggravated assault 9 percent. . . . The Crime Index rate for the United States rose from 2,235 offenses per 100,000 inhabitants in 1968 to 2,471 in 1969, an 11-percent increase in the victim rate. The rise in the national crime rate since 1960, or the risk of being a victim of one of these crimes, has more than doubled.

Mr. Speaker, on page 5 of the 1970 report, we find this statement:

In calendar year 1970 an estimated 5,568,200 Index offenses were reported to law enforcement agencies, an 11-percent increase over 1969. The violent crimes as a group made up 13 percent of the Crime Index total and rose 12 percent, with murder up 8 percent, forcible rape 2 percent, robbery 17 percent, and aggravated assault 8 percent. . . . The Crime Index rate for the United States rose from 2,477 offenses per 100,000 inhabitants in 1969 to 2,740 in 1970, an 11-percent increase in the victim rate. The national crime rate, or the risk of being a victim of one of these crimes, has increased 144 percent since 1960.

While the Attorney General, then, is juggling figures, the FBI merely inserts them in prefabricated sentences that give us the same gloomy message from year to year. I am convinced now, having seen these FBI reports, that my perspective in Cleveland in 1970 was clearer than that of the Attorney General, who is viewing Cleveland and other cities from Washington in 1971. But I have not recently been in Chicago or Detroit or Houston or most of the other large cities listed in the FBI report, and I wonder whether any of

my colleagues from congressional districts there, or elsewhere, are finding happily that the fear of crime is being "swept" from the streets of their own cities. Are there any such Congressmen sitting here? If so, I would like to hear from you, because you might have some valuable suggestions for the law enforcement authorities and administrators of criminal justice in Cleveland, Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that I do not hold the Nixon administration accountable for crime in Cleveland. I realize that we had crime in my city during earlier administrations as well. The point is, however, that this is no time to be issuing phony political communiques claiming that the war against crime is being won. Rather, it is a time for all of us—Republicans and Democrats—to redouble our efforts here in Washington to improve a situation that really has not improved very much, if at all. Manipulating numbers will never build up enough momentum to sweep fear from the streets. But hard work by public officials, and recognizing facts for what they are, can give us a start—and perhaps a shove in the right direction.

At this point, I would like to append to my remarks some recent newspaper articles pertaining to this subject:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 11, 1971]

#### THE ATTORNEY GENERAL AND CRIME

Each year about this time, it becomes necessary to try to take out some of the political spin that the Department of Justice under Attorney General Mitchell has imparted to the FBI's annual crime report. This year, we regret to say, is no different from the last two. Mr. Mitchell and the department have demonstrated again their ability to find the golden lining in a dark cloud.

Take, for instance, the press release accompanying the FBI's report. Its first paragraph said, "Serious crime in the nation continued to increase in 1970, Attorney General John N. Mitchell announced today, but at a slower rate than in 1969. It marked the second year in a row that the crime statistics showed a tapering off of the sharp upward swing recorded during the mid 1960s." This claim is based on the undisputed fact that the rate of increase in serious crime was 11.3 per cent in 1970—a rate lower than the rate of increase in 1969, 1968, 1967, 1966, and 1964. But if you look at the figures in another way, the impression conveyed is quite different. It is equally fair to write that the numerical increase in serious crime in 1970 over 1969 was the second highest in the nation's history and that the increase in the last two years has been greater than the increases in 1965, 1966 and 1967 combined. That is based on the undisputed numbers reported by the FBI. The following table may make this clearer—it lists the so-called index crimes reported to the FBI for each calendar year, the increase in each year's total over the preceding year, and the rate of increase (the figure Mr. Mitchell likes to talk about):

	Index crimes	Numerical increase	Rate of increase (percent)
1970	5,568,200	566,700	11.3
1969	5,001,400	534,800	12.0
1968	4,466,600	664,300	13.8
1967	3,802,300	538,000	16.5
1966	3,264,200	334,000	11.4
1965	2,930,200	175,200	6.4
1964	2,755,000	319,100	13.1

The rate of increase figures do give the illusion of statistical progress against crime; when the number of crimes goes from three to four million, for example, the rate of increase is 33 per cent; when the number moves from four to five million, the rate of increase is only 25 per cent. That's what Mr. Mitchell would call "progress." But the numerical increase from one year to another in both instances is still one million crimes—and for the one million victims, there is not much comfort in the thought that the rate of increase is decreasing. By our way of looking at it, even the fact of constant, continuing increase of, say, a half million in the number of crimes every year is difficult to translate into "progress," and an actual increase in the number of additional crimes each year, which is what happened between 1969 and 1970, can only be put down as retrogression if we are going to face the facts honestly.

There is a second example this year of how Mr. Mitchell lets rhetoric outrun facts. He told a meeting of law-enforcement officers Thursday that the monumental effort of local and state police in the last couple of years has resulted in fear "being swept from the streets of some—though not all—American cities." We suspect that the average person would believe, upon reading that statement, that American cities are safer today than they were when the Nixon administration took office. Yet in only two of the 25 largest cities—Pittsburgh and Baltimore—was there less serious crime, according to the FBI report, in 1970 than there was in 1968. In 16 of those cities, the serious crimes reported increased more than 20 per cent between those two years. If you measure only crimes of violence—murder, rape, robbery and assault—two of the 25 cities showed a decrease (Seattle and Milwaukee) and 16 showed an increase of more than 20 per cent. These figures lead to only two possible conclusions if Mr. Mitchell is right and fear is being swept from the streets: either the fear in 1968 was created by the words of the man whose campaign be managed, not by the facts, or people now have a false sense of security.

We have gone through this exercise in numbers not to paint the picture blacker than it is nor to discourage the law-enforcement personnel from trying harder but in an attempt to keep the record reasonably straight. There was a crime problem in 1968. There is a worse crime problem now. In some places, like the District of Columbia, the situation has improved within the last year. In others, it has deteriorated. (Remember how the administration talked about New York City a year ago when it showed a slight drop in crime? Nothing has been said about the 8 per cent increase this year.) One of those crimes of the sort that make up the FBI's annual survey was reported for every 45 citizens two years ago and one for every 36 citizens last year. We find it difficult to believe anyone thinks that is an improvement.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 8, 1971]

#### MITCHELL AND HOOVER: FOCUS DIFFERS ON CRIME DATA

(By Fred P. Graham)

WASHINGTON, September 7.—For the last year, the office of Attorney General John N. Mitchell has been rewriting the Federal Bureau of Investigation's interpretations of the nation's crime statistics, which for four decades had been within the sole control of J. Edgar Hoover.

As a result of the interpretations placed on the crime situation by Mr. Mitchell's public relations staff, it has been made to appear that the F.B.I. believes the crime rise that began under a Democratic administration almost a decade ago is tapering off.

The figures, however, show that reported crime is rising at about the same velocity as before.

Mr. Mitchell's efforts with the crime figures are in line with the Nixon Administration's law-and-order political strategy. President Nixon won office in 1968 on a campaign of criticism of the high crime rates under the Democrats, coupled with promises to do better.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation has often been accused of presenting crime figures in a way that emphasizes the crime increases, supposedly because this will justify larger F.B.I. budgets. Attorneys General before Mr. Mitchell have tended to stress what good news could be found in the figures, as if to say that Justice Department programs were succeeding.

#### UNIFORM CRIME REPORTS

Documents have come to light illustrating how the Attorney General began last June to change the interpretation placed on the crime figures without altering the figures themselves or omitting crucial statistics.

The F.B.I. Uniform Crime Reports are compilations of local police departments' statistics on crimes reported to them. Each year, the bureau issues the figures in four quarterly reports and an annual report.

The reports are presented in virtually impenetrable form, consisting of tables of figures plus some explanatory passages. So the public's impression of what the figures show is largely influenced by at press statement that is always issued on F.B.I. stationery with the reports.

Ever since the bureau began releasing crime figures in 1933, Mr. Hoover, the director, has drafted the statements to explain the figures. This changed last June 22, when Mr. Hoover's office prepared a statement, under his letterhead, that characterized the statistics to be released that day as follows:

"For release Monday P.M. June 22, 1970—according to figures made available through the F.B.I.'s Uniform Crime Reports and released by Attorney General John N. Mitchell, serious crime in the United States continued its upward trend, recording a 13 per cent rise nationally for the first three months in 1970 when compared to the same period in 1969."

#### ANOTHER VERSION

The Statement, rewritten in Mr. Mitchell's office, and as it was actually issued under Mr. Hoover's letterhead, began as follows:

"For release Monday P.M., June 22, 1970—Attorney General John N. Mitchell announced today that the F.B.I.'s Uniform Crime Reports show that the rate of increase of violent crimes in the first three months of 1970 slowed by 7 per cent in the major cities of the nation—and by 3 per cent in the nation as a whole."

It is not until the third paragraph of Mr. Mitchell's release that it was disclosed crime had risen by 13 per cent.

Since then, each release of F.B.I. figures has revealed a difference in tone between the explanatory material written by the bureau and printed in the crime reports themselves, and the statement authorized by Mr. Mitchell and published under the F.B.I. letterhead.

The bureau's explanation invariably stated how much reported crime had risen. Mr. Mitchell's accompanying statement began with a passage that explained how the crime rise had slowed in certain respects.

The difference between Mr. Hoover's view and Mr. Mitchell's view of the crime figures came into sharp focus last week when the annual figures for 1970 were released. They showed that, in the two years since the Republicans took office, reports of major crimes have risen from 4.4 million in 1968 to 5.5 million last year—a rise of 25 percent. The crime rate has also risen, but not as rapidly—from 2,235 reported major crimes per 100,000 United States residents in 1968 to 2,741 per 100,000 in 1970.

#### EXPLANATION MATERIAL

The explanatory material written by the F.B.I. in the report said that reported crime increased by 11 per cent in 1970 over 1969, and that it rose by 144 per cent since 1960. "The risk of becoming a victim of crime in this country is increasing," it concluded, and "population growth cannot alone account for the crime increases."

When the figures were released on Tuesday, some news reports said that crime was rising, others said that it was "tapering off," and others quoted Mr. Hoover as having said that the risk of being a crime victim was rising, and then quoted Mr. Mitchell's statement that the crime rise was slowing down.

Commenting in response to questions about the revisions of the release, Jack W. Hushen, a Justice Department spokesman, said:

"Press releases come up to us from various divisions and we are continually changing things, putting emphasis on more newsworthy items and significant points that we find have been overlooked.

"What they send us is a proposed press release. We review them to see that they are set in the proper context. I can show you a lot that have been rewritten a lot more than that. After all, these are reports put out under the Attorney General's name."

Spokesmen for the F.B.I. and Mr. Mitchell's office said that the releases were being handled as always, with the Attorney General's office giving final approval to the press statements. Comparisons between the F.B.I.'s explanatory material and the press statements of past years make it clear that only in Mr. Mitchell's tenure has Mr. Hoover's copy been edited.

#### A MATTER OF STRESS

In no case has Mr. Mitchell's statements changed the figures or omitted crucial statistics. But he has stressed certain figures that tend to show that the crime picture has improved under the Nixon Administration, and the pattern seems clear enough by now to establish that the Republican candidates will probably stress certain points in discussing crime.

One is the "rate-of-increase" argument. It points out that, while the volume of reported crime was 11 per cent higher in 1970 than 1969, and 12 per cent higher in 1969 than 1968, this is a slower rate of increase than in 1968, when it rose 17 per cent over 1967, and 1967, when it rose 16 per cent over 1966.

Statisticians say that there is some validity to this argument, but that it also contains a built-in distortion because, as the volume grows, the rate of increase usually shrinks. They cite the following example:

If there were one million crimes in 1968, two million crimes in 1970, crime would have increased by 100 per cent in 1969, but by only 50 per cent in 1970. It could thus be said that the rate of crime increase had been cut in half in 1970.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 16, 1971]

#### CAPITOL PUNISHMENT: IT'S GOOD NEWS

(By Art Buchwald)

There was good news out of Washington last week, according to Attorney General John Mitchell, President Nixon's war on crime has been successful, and the results of the administration's monumental efforts have been so great that "fear is being swept from the streets of some—though not all—American cities."

He was supported in his optimism by Jerris Leonard, of the Justice Department's law enforcement assistance administration; who said the only ones who weren't happy with the decrease in the 1970 crime statistics were the President's critics.

"I believe," Mr. Leonard told a conference of law enforcement officials, "they are principally disturbed because they have lost

something—crime as a political issue has been taken away from them. They feel they have been robbed, and being robbed they are angry."

The reason for the euphoria in the Justice Department is that FBI statistics for 1970 indicated that the rate of increase of crime had gone down from 12 per cent in 1969 to 11.3 per cent in 1970.

This sounded terrific, until I read that the same statistics revealed that 566,700 more crimes had been committed in 1970 than in 1969.

Admittedly confused, I sought out my friend Professor Heinrich Applebaum, the great Justice Department statistician, whose definitive book "Do Decimal Points Have a Sex Life?" is used in every math class in the country.

"Professor Applebaum, the Justice Department reports that the rate of crime has gone down in the country under President Nixon. Yet the same report says there have been a million more crimes in the past two years. How can that be?"

"It's quite simple," said Applebaum. "Percentage-wise crime has gone down, crimewise it's gone up."

"But where does that leave the average person?"

"It depends whether you're a Republican or a Democrat. If you're a Republican you have nothing to fear walking the streets of our American cities. But if I were a Democrat, I'd stay home."

"Are you saying that the Republicans are trying to take the crime issue out of the 1972 campaign?"

"They have," Applebaum said. "The last year the Democrats were in office crime had gone up 13.8 per cent. When the Republicans took over in 1969 it only went up 12.0 and last year 11.3 per cent. The Democrats can't argue with that."

"But still more people were robbed, mugged, murdered, and raped in 1969 and 1970 than they were in the previous four years."

"We're not talking about people," Applebaum said, irritated. "We're talking about percentages. You can't think about the people who were molested in 1969 and 1970, you have to think about the ones who weren't. There are probably over 100,000 citizens who weren't mugged this year thanks to President Nixon's leadership"

"It's hard to think in those terms," I admitted.

"That's because you're not running for election next year. You must understand the reporting of crimes is a very serious business, and can cause great conflict. J. Edgar Hoover, in order to prove he is doing his job, has to show that crime is going up in the country. At the same time the administration has to prove that crime is going down."

"The Attorney General has solved the problem by reporting the percentages, which are lower, and Hoover, by reporting the crimes which are higher. That's the beauty of statistics. It makes everyone feel better."

"Well, thank you, professor for the explanation."

"That's perfectly all right. Here let me unlock the door for you. This is really a creepy neighborhood."

#### TRIBUTE TO FRAZIER REAMS

#### HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this means of paying a brief but sincere tribute to the memory

of our former colleague, Frazier Reams, who passed away in California earlier this week.

Frazier Reams was an anomaly in politics—he was aligned with neither political party. On one occasion during a close contest for Speaker he declined to vote for either candidate. As a result he became—for a time—a man without a committee as well as a man without a party—and on other occasions on the other side of the aisle.

He had strong convictions—and he adhered to those convictions.

Frazier Reams was my friend—I liked him. The members of the Tennessee delegation "adopted" Frazier because he was born in Franklin, Tenn., and was a graduate of the University of Tennessee in Knoxville, and Vanderbilt University in Nashville. He also began his law practice in Tennessee before moving to Ohio in 1922 where he was elected to Congress in 1951.

Frazier Reams served well and faithfully in the Congress and while I did not agree with his attitude on party affiliation I respected him as a great American, a close friend and an able legislator.

Certainly I want to extend to his wife Crystal—Mrs. Reams—and other members of the family this expression of my deepest sympathy in their loss and bereavement. My wife Ann joins me in these sentiments.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, as a co-sponsor of legislation repealing the Emergency Detention Act and prohibiting the establishment of any future detention camps, I am most sorry to have missed Monday's general debate on H.R. 234 and yesterday's votes on the measure. However, as some of our colleagues may know, I was a member of a citizens' committee which spent 4 days in around-the-clock efforts to negotiate a peaceful settlement of the disturbances which occurred at the Attica State Prison in New York.

It was necessary for me to remain in New York City yesterday to pursue events leading from the tragic climax of the disturbance and to take steps to insure that there would be prompt and effective followup action. Accordingly, it was not possible for me to be in Washington. Had I been present I would have fully supported H.R. 234 and would have fought to prevent any crippling and dilatory amendments. I commend our colleague from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) for his leadership in this important effort and his perseverance in having the Emergency Detention Act repealed and in assuring that we will no longer endure the national shame of detention camps. I am hopeful the Senate will now take prompt and favorable action.

### THE AX, HARRIER, AND CHEYENNE

### HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, today Senators WILLIAM PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin, and CHARLES MATHIAS, of Maryland, and I issued a report on the AX, Harrier and Cheyenne close support aircraft. This report is ninth in a series of 14 reports critically analyzing military weapons systems and policies. These reports are being issued by the bipartisan group, Members of Congress for Peace Through Law.

I request that my statement and the full text of the report be printed in the RECORD at this point.

#### STATEMENT BY HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

The expensive and wasteful duplication of effort cited in our report results from the muddled perspective of military planners, who seem to see the extravagant acquisition of weapons in an inter-service arms race as more important than a rational consideration of the appropriate role and mission of each service.

Six years ago, in 1965, the Army and the Air Force attempted to resolve some of the confusing mission overlaps then existing between them. But instead of approaching this issue from the standpoint of roles and missions, they chose to see it as a question of deciding which service would have jurisdiction over which types of equipment. They were more interested in dividing up the paraphernalia of defense than they were in clarifying their own roles in the employment of it. It was decided that rotary-wing aircraft would fall within the Army's bailiwick, while the Air Force would take responsibility for all fixed-wing aircraft.

The Air Force had traditionally assigned a low priority to the development of an advanced aircraft to provide close-support for ground troops, and it was unprepared—both in Korea and in Vietnam—to provide the Army with the kind of close-in support its infantrymen needed. In both wars the Air Force improvised, relying on a motley combination of trainers, World War II fighters, and pre-World War II transports. In Vietnam, the Air Force has had only one advanced plane—the F-4—available for close-in combat support, and even that plane was not designed with this mission in mind.

The Army responded to this deficiency on the part of the Air Force by attempting to develop a close-support aircraft of its own. Since it had been agreed that the Air Force would have the fixed-wing planes, while the Army would have the helicopters, the Army close-air support craft had to be a helicopter.

Evidently, the possibility that no helicopter could effectively provide the kind of close-support the Army wanted was never considered. Consideration of that question was ruled out by the machine-over-mission approach to weapons development which was inherent in the 1965 agreement. This then was the genesis of the Cheyenne.

The Air Force's decision to go ahead with the AX was prompted by the Army's prior development of the Cheyenne. The Air Force was not responding to the real needs of U.S. ground troops. It was responding to a more parochial need to hold its own in a game of mechanical and technical one-upmanship with the Army.

The AX is a welcome development—even if it is the right plane fortuitously developed for the wrong reasons. In this instance, the

Air Force has clearly developed the superior machine. Not only will the AX be able to perform the close-air support mission more effectively than either the Army's Cheyenne or the Marine Corps' Harrier; it will be substantially cheaper to purchase initially and to maintain later. For the same \$1.2 billion it would take to buy 273 Harriers or 222 Cheyenne helicopters, we could purchase 600 copies of the AX. Common sense dictates that the Air Force AX should be chosen as our primary close-air support vehicle.

But resolving this very specific conflict will not solve the more general problem of military myopia. The Secretary of Defense and his civilian assistants are responsible for balancing the conflicting demands of the three service arms in accordance with the criteria of need and economy. It is a responsibility they have abdicated. It is unrealistic to expect the military to act responsibly until their civilian bosses act responsibly. Until that day comes, the Congress will continue to be bombarded from across the Potomac by requests for glamorous, sophisticated, expensive—and superfluous—military hardware."

#### REPORT ON CLOSE SUPPORT AIRCRAFT: THE AX, HARRIER, AND CHEYENNE

(A Research Paper Prepared by Senator Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., Senator William Proxmire, Congressman John F. Seiberling, for consideration by the Military Spending Committee, Senator William Proxmire, Chairman, Congressman Ogden Reid, Vice-Chairman of Members of Congress for Peace through Law)

#### SUMMARY

During the past five years the Department of Defense has funded, at a cost of nearly \$600 million, the development and procurement of three new close support aircraft, the AX, the CHEYENNE, and the HARRIER. Each of these aircraft has been specifically designed to provide close-range, highly responsive aerial fire support to our combat troops in the field, against targets ranging from troops to tanks.

We fully recognize the importance of the close support mission. We do not believe its performance would be aided, however, by continuing with three separate close support aircraft programs, since two of them involve aircraft with at best marginal advantages over existing systems. While there may be some justification for retaining a triad of strategic nuclear deterrents, a triad of new close support aircraft is ridiculous.

Last year the House Appropriations Committee directed the Department of Defense to conduct a comprehensive study of its close support needs and to choose between the aircraft options involved. The only compliance to date has been a six page "interim report" submitted to the Congress by Deputy Defense Secretary David Packard in June. The gist of the report was that the aircraft involved "offer sufficiently different capabilities to justify continuing all three programs at the present time."

The purpose of this report is to do the hard analytical work which the Defense Department itself should have done long ago.

It is our belief that the AX provides the responsiveness, survivability, lethality, and operational readiness which we will need in a close support aircraft in the event of a NATO-Warsaw Pact confrontation in Europe.

The CHEYENNE, on the other hand, does not. Due to limited loiter time and substantial maintenance requirements, it might not be available when needed. And if the CHEYENNE were available, its high vulnerability and poor maneuverability would make it a sitting duck for enemy fire. The fact that the CHEYENNE carries a price tag twice as high as the AX does not make it any more appealing.

We recommend therefore that the CHEYENNE program be terminated immediately and that the AX be designated as the primary system for the future support of Army ground troops in Europe.

We also believe that the HARRIER offers only marginal improvements in the close support capabilities already available to the Marines in the form of the A-4M, and then only in the initial stages of an amphibious assault operation. Therefore, we recommend that the HARRIER program be terminated after the purchase of 60 aircraft, and that no production of the HARRIER be undertaken in the United States at this time.

Our detailed recommendations follow. If implemented, they would result in a savings of approximately \$6 billion out of about \$12 billion that would be spent in the next ten years if all three aircraft programs were continued.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS Roles and missions

We believe that the Department of Defense, in order to end twenty plus years of inter-service rivalry, should make a firm decision as to which service shall have the responsibility for close-air support of Army ground troops.

We believe that the close-support mission is best accomplished with fixed-wing aircraft at the present time. Given the contemporary limits of rotary-wing technology, and in view of the fact that the Air Force currently maintains the overwhelming preponderance of fixed-wing assets, it is our opinion that the Air Force clearly should be given the primary close support mission for the foreseeable future, provided that the Air Force demonstrates that it will give the Army adequate and continued support.

We also believe that the Department of Defense should clarify the responsibility of the Navy and the Marines, respectively, in providing close-air support for Marine Corps infantry operations.

#### AX (Air Force)

1. We recommend the continued development of the AX as a high-priority Air Force program, and that Congress approve the Air Force request for FY 72 funding of \$47 million.

2. We recommend that the Air Force revise its internal priorities so that the mission of close-air support receives significantly greater emphasis and that the AX project be elevated to a higher priority. In order to ensure that the Air Force is giving proper emphasis to this mission Congress should require from the Air Force a yearly accounting of funds on close-air support.

3. We recommend that Congress act to ensure that the production version of the AX be kept as simple and austere as feasible. We believe that the AX represents a welcome change in procurement philosophy, in its austere and functional specifications, and its competitive development program. This emphasis, which promises a highly effective close-support aircraft at a price of under \$2 million, should be continued. Complex and expensive night- and all-weather avionics and armaments should be added only when the AX is fully developed and thoroughly proven through realistic testing, and then only to a fraction of the force.

#### Cheyenne (Army)

1. We recommend that the Cheyenne program be ended. The Cheyenne is a proven mistake with inherent vulnerability and inaccuracy that cannot be corrected. Congress should not approve any further funding pointed towards deployment of the Cheyenne.

2. We recommend that Congress fund no new attack helicopters as substitutes for the Cheyenne, since all other possible alternatives suffer from the same crucial defects of vulnerability and inaccuracy. To fill the unique function of escorting lightly-

armed troop transport helicopters. Congress should rely on existing operational helicopters.

3. We recommend that the Army acquire as test-bed vehicles the eight existing Cheyenne prototype and incorporate these aircraft into existing rotary-wing research and development programs. These prototypes should be used to test the rigid-rotor technology, gun-platform stabilization, survivability and anti-tank capabilities. This proposed research program should in no way point towards eventual production of the Cheyenne.

#### Harrier (Marine Corps)

1. We recommend that funds for FY 72 procurement of 30 Harriers be appropriated, but that procurement be halted at the end of FY 72, thus equipping the Marine Corps with 60 operating aircraft. We further urge that these aircraft be used for intensive testing of the significant uncertainties remaining about Harrier effectiveness and the feasibility of the Marine's battle plans.

2. We recommend that no funds be authorized at the present time for transferral of Harrier production from the United Kingdom to the United States due to the limited abilities of the aircraft, the excessive costs required for transferral, and the general uncertainties about V/STOL technological promise.

3. We recommend that the Harrier fleet be used not only by the Marine Corps but by the Air Force and Navy as well to conduct modest evaluation of V/STOL concepts and capabilities for their respective missions.

#### INTRODUCTION

Over the past five years the Department of Defense has funded, at a cost of nearly \$600 million, the development and procurement of three separate aircraft intended for essentially the same mission of close-air support. The job of these aircraft is to provide close-range, highly responsive aerial fire-support for friendly units in the field against targets ranging from troops to tanks. Each aircraft represents a different approach to the mission of close-air support, and each is sponsored by a separate military service. A brief description of each follows:

#### AX (Air Force)

The Air Force's entry is the AX, a relatively inexpensive and unsophisticated twin-turbofan fixed-wing aircraft operated by a one-man crew. According to the Air Force, the AX is the first U.S. plane specifically designed for the mission of close-air support. The AX will have short take-off and landing capabilities (STOL), exceptionally good payload and long-range abilities, and a high degree of survivability due to its excellent maneuverability, twin engines, redundant control systems, heavy pilot protection, and large amount of armor plating. The AX is likely to fly in excess of 450 knots, and be able to loiter over the battlefield for long periods of time. The AX will carry a maximum load of 16,000 pounds of external ordnance, and will incorporate as its primary anti-tank weapon an internal automatic 30 mm armor-piercing cannon with 1350 rounds of ammunition. The AX will also mount other guns on its wing stations.

The Air Force is requesting \$47 million for FY 72 to continue development of the AX. Contracts totaling \$60.1 million have been let to two companies, Fairchild-Hiller and Northrup, to construct two prototypes each of the AX as part of a competitive "fly-before-buy" development program. First flight is expected for the summer of 1972 with production to begin late in 1974 and initial operating capability slated for early 1975.

#### AH-56A Cheyenne (Army)

The Army's CHEYENNE, built by Lockheed Aircraft, is a single-engine rigid-rotor compound helicopter planned to incorporate sophisticated electronics which are claimed

to enable it to fly in adverse weather conditions and at night. Operated by a two-man crew, the CHEYENNE can mount internally a light 30 mm cannon in a 360 degree belly turret; and either a 40 mm grenade launcher or a 7.62 mm mini-gun in its interchangeable nose. In addition, the CHEYENNE can carry on six wing stations a variety of projectile weapons, including up to 152 2.75 inch rockets and/or up to 32 Hughes TOW wire-guided, optically-tracked anti-tank missiles, although 16 TOW's is likely to be the operational complement. Revised CHEYENNE specifications call for a top speed of 212 knots, which has not as yet been met by the development complement.

The CHEYENNE program is now in the final stages of engineering development. While the FY 72 budget contained no new request for RDT&E appropriations, the Army asked for \$13.2 million in "advanced production engineering" funds and for authority to reprogram \$61.3 million of funds left over from the terminated CHEYENNE production contract into further R&D. The \$13.2 million request has been turned down outright by the Armed Services Committees in both Houses of Congress.

Moreover, only \$35 million of the \$61.3 million reprogramming request has itself been approved. This \$35 million is part of an overall settlement of litigation with Lockheed on the Cheyenne program and is designed to reimburse the company for R&D expenses incurred out of its own pocket after December, 1969. Another \$17 million of the \$61.3 million requested has been denied outright (since it will not be needed until fiscal 1973), and the Senate Appropriations Committee has agreed to consider the final \$9 million in conjunction with its actions on the fiscal 1972 Defense Appropriations bill. If the Committee decides that R&D work on the CHEYENNE should continue, it will add this \$9 million to the Appropriations bill. It will then be subject to action by the Senate as a whole as part of the normal budget process. Barring Congressional action at that time, funds for full-scale production of the CHEYENNE are likely to be requested in the FY 73 defense budget.

#### AV-8A Harrier (Marine Corps)

The third aircraft is the Hawker-Siddeley HARRIER, now in series production in the United Kingdom. Presently the only operational V/STOL combat aircraft in the free world, the HARRIER achieves its vertical takeoff capabilities through rotation of the vectored thrust nozzles on its single Rolls Royce Bristol engine. A single-seat aircraft, the HARRIER is limited in both range and payload, but the Marine Corps asserts that its capabilities are sufficient for its projected mission of short-duration forward-based attack and support, where its ability to take off from small ship-board platforms and austere VTOL pads on the beachhead is said to be important.

The HARRIER is subsonic in level flight, with a claimed range of action ranging from 50 miles (VTOL) to 380 miles (STOL), both with 3000 pounds of external stores, though with very short loiter time. The HARRIER carries no weapons internally but is advertised to be able to carry as much as 5000 pounds of ordnance on short missions using conventional takeoffs. Under such conditions it can mount twin-low velocity 30 mm guns as well as a variety of other ordnance on its four wing stations including 2.75 inch rockets and a maximum of four 500 pound bombs. The Marine Corps has already purchased thirty of these aircraft and hopes to procure a total of 114.

The Marines have requested \$102.3 million in FY 72 to purchase 30 additional aircraft. In early August the Senate Armed Services Committee revealed that it had added \$23.7 million to the Marine Corps request in order to "provide the additional expenses necessary for a phased program which will lead to the

domestic production of this aircraft." McDonnell Douglas holds the U.S. production license for the HARRIER.

#### CURRENT STATUS

The Defense Department's decision to proceed simultaneously with three different close-support aircraft has already been subjected to considerable criticism both in and out of Congress. Last year the Senate Armed Services Committee directed the DOD to terminate the CHEYENNE program, arguing that the AX would be sufficient for the job. At the same time, funding of the HARRIER was continued.

Eventually, funds for the CHEYENNE program were restored in conference with the House on the military procurement authorization bill. The House Appropriations Committee, also concerned with unnecessary duplication, later directed the Department of Defense to conduct a comprehensive review of the close-support mission and the aircraft options involved. The purpose of the Appropriations Committee's action was to force the Department of Defense to make its choice among planes. As Committee chairman Rep. George Mahon later explained in an interview published in the Washington Post:

"We're going to hold the Pentagon's feet to the fire to get the best possible solutions to these alternatives. . . . What we want is to compel the Defense Department to do the hard analytical job."

What Chairman Mahon sought initially was a decision on "the aircraft best suited to meet the close-air support need" in time for the FY 72 budget hearings. Not until February 1971, however, did the Department of Defense set up a study group headed by Deputy Secretary Packard to review the close-support options available. By that time, of course, the FY 72 budget had already been proposed and in presenting that budget to Congress Defense Secretary Laird urged continued funding of all three programs. Speaking specifically of the AX and the Cheyenne, Laird stated:

"... we believe they complement each other, through overlapping zones of coverage and diverse operating modes."

In June, Deputy Secretary Packard sent to Congress a six-page letter which he said was an interim report on the Defense Department's close-support study. Packard urged once again that funds be provided for all three planes, claiming that "they offer sufficiently different capabilities for our future forces to justify continuing all three programs at the present time." The report did not endorse production of either the Cheyenne or the AX. Rather, it suggested continued development in FY 72 pending a final decision before FY 73.

The interim report simply did not address itself to a number of key issues. It is our understanding, for example, that it contained no substantive explanation of how the supposedly "complementary" aspects of these aircraft serve to better accomplish the mission. Also insufficiently analyzed were major questions of conciliating roles and missions, the vulnerability of the Cheyenne to ground-to-air missiles and air-to-air threats, the relative ease with which the Tow antitank missile of the Cheyenne can be counter-measured, and the comparatively poor maneuverability of the Harrier at speeds above 150 knots. These omissions cast serious doubt upon the value of the report.

In effect the Department of Defense has tried to stall the issue for another year, hoping perhaps that Congress will back off and allow all three planes to proceed into production. If there were unlimited resources available for the close-support mission, Secretary Laird's argument for a "mix" of "overlapping" weapons systems might be valid. But such conditions do not exist now, and tight budgetary conditions are likely to continue in the future. Thus continued development of a redundant "triad" of close-support aircraft cannot be justified.

So far close to \$600 million has been spent on this "triad," a tiny fraction of the more than \$11.5 billion that will be spent on close-air support if Congress gives all three programs complete production approval. Here is how this figure is derived:

Based on a conservative program unit cost estimate for the Cheyenne of \$5.4 million, an Army purchase of 375 aircraft will entail a minimum of \$2.0 billion in investment costs alone. In addition, experience has shown that operations and maintenance (O&M) costs over a 10 year period will run to 200 per cent of initial investment costs for aircraft programs of this type. This would mean ten-year O&M costs of \$4.0 billion for the Cheyenne. Cheyenne costs alone, therefore, will total \$6.0 billion, roughly half the overall close support total.

Marine Corps planning presently calls for a total of 114 HARRIERS, with final costs dependent in large part on whether Congress approves a phased transfer of production to the U.S. for the remaining 84 aircraft. If these aircraft are built in Great Britain, total investment costs for the 114 HARRIERS have been estimated by the Marines at \$4.4 million apiece, or \$503.6 million. The Marines have also estimated that U.S. production, as called for by the Senate Armed Services Committee, could add as much as \$275 million more, with unit costs for the 84 aircraft still to be purchased rising to \$7.8 million. On the assumption that ten-year O&M costs would be 200 per cent of investment costs, O&M costs for the U.K. built version would be approximately \$1.0 billion. O&M costs for a U.S. built version might be somewhat higher, due to the higher cost of U.S. manufactured replacement parts involved. Thus total ten year systems costs for the HARRIER, even for the less expensive U.K. version, should reach at least \$1.5 billion.

The Air Force hopes to purchase at least 600 of the AX aircraft. Two versions of the AX have been mentioned, the AX-A, which is the standard operational version, and the AX-B, a possible follow-on to the original that would contain advanced avionics for all-weather and night combat capabilities. The Air Force has estimated that the B version, which is still in the conceptual stage, would cost at least \$2 million per unit, and 100 AX-B's at \$4 million each, the total investment cost for these 600 aircraft will be approximately \$1.4 billion. Including probable O&M costs of \$2.8 billion, ten-year systems costs for the AX will be approximately \$4.2 billion.

Thus if all three aircraft become operational in the numbers desired by their respective sponsors, the cost to the taxpayers for the questionable benefits of a "triad" of close-support aircraft likely will be in excess of \$11.5 billion.

#### CLOSE-AIR SUPPORT IN EUROPE

With the end of American military involvement in Southeast Asia, the primary mission environment envisioned for future close-support aircraft is the European theater. There, close-air support would play a key role in any confrontation between NATO and Warsaw Pact forces. Facing numerically superior Pact armored forces, the first priority for our close-support forces on the European battlefield would be to provide effective anti-armor fire. Also critical would be the ability to provide accurate and lethal suppressing fire in support of friendly forces. Since the CHEYENNE and the AX are specifically earmarked for the support of Army troops in the European theater, their capabilities will be contrasted here.

The Marines expect the HARRIER, to have specialized applications in forward-based attack situations where available ground-basing facilities are at a minimum and where the unusual qualities of a V/STOL attack aircraft could be considered useful. In particular, the Marines foresee use of the HARRIER in support of invasion forces against heavily

defended beaches, where its carrier and ship-based abilities would also be important. Due to the special nature of its intended mission, the HARRIER will receive separate treatment later in this report.

#### Roles and missions

For over twenty years a dispute has existed as to which service should have the responsibility for close-air support of Army ground troops. This dispute, unmitigated despite a number of Department of Defense directives and inter-service agreements, has led to the current costly controversy between the Air Force and the Army revolving about the AX and the CHEYENNE.

The last major organizational agreement between the Army and the Air Force was concluded in 1965. Called the Johnson-McConnell Agreement after the names of Army and Air Force Chiefs of Staff, this agreement set out to eliminate some of the confusing overlaps as to which service was to do what.

Actually, the Johnson-McConnell Agreement did little more than sort out some of the actual hardware involved rather than solve any of the basic disputes. The Army was given authority to develop a rotary-wing "fire-support" system, which it did, and the Air Force, perhaps too confident that no helicopter could challenge fixed-wing aircraft for this mission, continued for a time its low priority effort in close-support systems. The Johnson-McConnell agreement thus led directly first to the development of the CHEYENNE and then the AX.

It is little wonder that the Army wants to develop its own aircraft, for in both Korea and Vietnam the Air Force has been poorly equipped to provide close-air support. The AX is the first Air Force plane specifically designed for the close-air support mission, and until now the United States has had the only major Air Force in the world not to have an aircraft tailored solely for this role.

Instead the Air Force has given preference to the more classic missions of strategic bombardment, tactical air-superiority, air-defense, and interdiction. Though experience in Vietnam, Korea, and even World War II demonstrated the marginal utility of interdiction missions, both the Air Force and the Marines have become overburdened in this area at the expense of close-air support. In fact, over the last few years the Air Force has spent nearly all of its tactical-air budget on air supremacy and interdiction bombers.

To meet the requirements of the close-support mission, the Air Force has had to turn to eclectic combinations of ill-suited aircraft, ranging from trainers to World War II fighters and even pre-World War II transports. They have even had to suffer the indignity of asking the Navy for the A-1, a World War II vintage aircraft that has been the mainstay of Air Force close-air support in Vietnam. A table follows of the primary aircraft types used by the Air Force for close-air support in Korea and Vietnam:

Korea: T-6 (trainer) and P-51 (WWII fighter).

Vietnam: A-1 (WWII tac. aircraft procured from the Navy); A-37 (attack version of TA-37 trainer); T-28 (armed version of trainer); T-38 (F-5 version); F-4 (Mach 2 fighter-bomber); and C-47 (Pre-WWII military transport).

There is little doubt that either service has the capability to perform the close-air support mission. The doctrinaire argument the Army makes for the Cheyenne—that, being an Army aircraft, it would work "organically" with troops in the field—can quickly be put to rest. It has not worked that way in Vietnam. Instead, armed helicopters have been supplied from a central control at the Corps level in much the same way as Air Force planes. Moreover, the centralization is likely to increase with the advent of more complicated and expensive helicopters like the Cheyenne, fewer of which will be available.

We believe that the Department of Defense, in order to end the over twenty years

of Army-Air Force rivalry, should make a firm decision on which service shall have the responsibility for the close-air support mission.

As will be demonstrated in the following section, fixed-wing aircraft like the AX possess an inherent superiority over rotary-wing aircraft for the close-support role. Since the Air Force already operates the preponderance of fixed-wing assets it is our opinion that the Air Force should be given responsibility for close-air support for the foreseeable future, provided that the Air Force demonstrates to Congress annually that it is giving the mission continued and adequate support.

We also believe there to be auxiliary missions to the primary close-support role of the Air Force that can be fulfilled by the Army with its current attack helicopter, the AH-1G Cobra. However, due to the inherent weaknesses in contemporary rotary-wing technology, we see no value whatever in replacement of the AH-1G with a more advanced attack helicopter at the present time.

#### Key combat characteristics

##### (1) Responsiveness/Loiter:

The nature of the close-support mission is such that its first prime requirement is quick aircraft responses. If troops on the ground are being attacked or an observation post or spotter aircraft should sight a moving column of tanks, the aircraft must get to the scene rapidly. Moreover, the nature of most scenarios for a European battle suggest that during the first critical days the action is likely to be in rapid movement. Close-air support will be keyed not to fixed targets but to constantly changing battle lines. Unless an aircraft arrives quickly, it may not know where to go.

Optimum responsiveness is not obtained either through high speed or extreme forward basing. Instead it is best achieved with aircraft that have the ability to loiter over the battlefield for long periods of time. Aircraft already in the air over the front are able to eliminate delays due to take-off, transit time, communications, familiarization, and assignment lags. By contrast, no amount of speed or forward basing can eliminate these delays. Aircraft at forward bases are also likely to be well within reach of the enemy's tactical missiles or artillery.

Its poor response time is one deficiency of the CHEYENNE. The CHEYENNE is limited by its fuel capacity to what is called "ground loiter" in the immediate vicinity of the combat troops, where it will be well within range of enemy artillery. And even this forward basing will not eliminate frequent trips to its main base for more fuel. Thus the CHEYENNE will fly many sorties to provide a limited amount of actual support. And one side effect of its refueling trips could be to aid enemy detection of the main base, bringing on air strikes and artillery harassment.

In contrast, the AX will be able to linger over the battlefield from one to four hours depending on the length of take-off and amount of ordnance carried. Loitering at moderate altitude over the critical areas, the AX will remain virtually secure from hostile fire while being able to respond in under 10 minutes to the needs of either a 100 mile battleline or a 7,500 square mile area.

A specific test of the advantages of fixed-wing, long-loiter, close-air responsiveness was conducted in combat situations in Vietnam in 1969. Nicknamed MISTY BRONCO, the test used Air Force OV-10As in a joint role of forward aircontrol and close-air support. The OV-10A, though slower and less maneuverable than the AX, demonstrated the ability of loitering fixed-wing aircraft to bring effective fire-power to bear in support of ground forces within minutes of request. The response time averaged only 5.1 minutes with the majority of that time (3.7 minutes) consumed in obtaining ground clearance to fire.

By comparison, helicopter response time in South Vietnam has proved to be in the range of 30 to 45 minutes due to the various delays in getting from the base to the battlefield.

##### (2) Survivability:

Survivability is a second prime requirement for any close-support aircraft called upon to operate in the European theater. In Southeast Asia, both our fixed- and rotary-wing close-air support aircraft have enjoyed total air supremacy and have rarely had to face concentrated enemy fire from the ground. This would not be the case in the NATO-Warsaw Pact confrontation.

On a European battlefield, close-support aircraft will be confronted with a vast array of sophisticated and concentrated anti-aircraft (AA) weapons. In contrast to the under .50 caliber AA threat encountered in less developed countries, the predominant threats in Europe will be .51 caliber and .60 caliber machine guns and 23 mm anti-aircraft artillery (AAA) fire. In addition, close-support aircraft that happen to cross into enemy territory are likely to be menaced by a variety of larger AAA cannons, hostile fire from enemy aircraft, and front-line surface-to-air missiles (SAMs). Another possible threat could be the development of a Soviet equivalent to the U.S. REDEYE, a small, man-portable heat-seeking ground-to-air missile.

An aircraft will have to fly through light and medium automatic weapons fire with relative impunity if it is to perform the close-support mission in Europe. Moreover, it will have to fly low enough and slow enough to acquire targets and to engage them with optimum accuracy.

The two characteristics which will work together to determine an aircraft's ability to do this are its vulnerability and its maneuverability.

Vulnerability refers to the physical characteristics of the aircraft itself—the extent of its vulnerable parts and the damage likely if it is hit.

Helicopters are inherently complicated and fragile devices and the Cheyenne will be no exception. It will have a number of very vulnerable components—such as rotors, rotor-heads, gearboxes, and shafts—which are almost impossible to adequately protect. Moreover, it will have an excessively exposed canopy area with the consequence that crew members themselves might easily get hit.

The AX, by contrast, promises to be one of the least vulnerable aircraft in the United States inventory. Recognizing that the ability of an aircraft to take a hit is far more important than its speed, the Air Force has designed it from the bottom up with this basic need in mind.

The biggest dangers if an aircraft is hit are fire aboard the aircraft and loss of its basic control systems. To prevent the first, the fuel tanks on the AX are separated from the ignition and the engines, placed in areas of minimum vulnerability, foam-protected against explosion and fire, and designed so they will leak externally. To prevent the second, the AX incorporates redundant and separated control systems, with the key linkages armored.

The back-up controls of the AX will be fully mechanical, rather than hydraulic, to further reduce exposure to fire.

The next biggest danger is engine loss. The AX will carry two engines to the Cheyenne's one. Because the engines will be widely separated, there is little danger that a hit in one will result in the loss of both. Because they are duplicating, the aircraft will be quite able to fly even if one engine is gone.

Finally, the AX carries more than twice the armor of the Cheyenne. The AX crew compartment itself is encased in 750 pound bathtub of armor, leaving the pilot vulnerable to most AAA hits only through the plane's small canopy area.

Dr. John S. Foster, Jr., Director of De-

fense Research and Engineering, summed it up this way in his March 18, 1971 testimony to the Senate Armed Services Committee:

"If the enemy defenses, even in the vicinity of our troops are formidable, if the fire is intense, the AX will probably survive while the CHEYENNE will not. It will survive simply because it is a less complicated airplane. I don't believe we can make a helicopter that will take the beating the AX can take."

As far as maneuverability is concerned, the CHEYENNE again loses out, with flight characteristics markedly inferior to those of the AX. The CHEYENNE is limited to attack speeds well below 200 knots, while the AX has a range from 150-400 knots. The AX can also pull fully seven "g's", as opposed to approximately two for the CHEYENNE.<sup>1</sup> This high "g" capability is terribly important, since what it reflects is the ability of the aircraft to deviate from the straight line flight-path which aimed gunfire presumes.

Because helicopters are so vulnerable and unmaneuverable, the Army has argued the case for the CHEYENNE on the basis of tactics. It claims that the CHEYENNE will be able to fly in a "nap-of-the-earth" profile to mask its presence until it can suddenly "pop up" to fire on its targets from long range, with the wire-guided TOW missile system. These tactics, it says, will keep the CHEYENNE alive.

In the fall of 1970, the U.S. 7th Army Air Cavalry conducted a field evaluation in Europe, using Huey Cobras, to test these tactics. While the evaluation has been proclaimed a great success, some of the evidence, as reported in an unclassified write-up of the exercises, casts serious doubt on this conclusion.

It indicates first that the CHEYENNE will encounter poor visibility of battlefield targets when operating in "nap-of-the-earth" flight. This finding buttresses one of the long-standing criticisms of the Army's tactics—that the CHEYENNE will not be able to actually acquire many targets unless it "pops up" to an altitude of 1,000 feet and then closes to a distance of one-half mile or less for visual target identification.

Under these circumstances, the CHEYENNE would be fully exposed for quite some time to hostile enemy fire. After it "popped up," it would require between five and fifteen seconds for target acquisition and fire preparation and as much as another twelve to fourteen seconds after the TOW missile is launched to track it to its target. Thus, for as long as 29 seconds, the CHEYENNE could be a shooting gallery target for enemy fire.

The CHEYENNE would not have to hover in place while tracking the TOW. It could also "fly down the wire" (along the missile flight path). But this tactic would bring the aircraft even closer to hostile enemy fire. It should be noted in this regard that the Army itself has said that it would be "unacceptable" for the CHEYENNE ever to fly behind enemy lines. This recognition of the CHEYENNE'S vulnerability is fine in theory. In practice, it is highly doubtful whether there would ever be any clear-cut lines in a fast moving European battle.

A second problem revealed by the 7th Army Air Cavalry evaluation is in the havoc which power and telephone lines could wreak if "nap-of-the-earth" tactics were employed. Collisions with these lines, extremely difficult to see in flight (especially in marginal weather), could prove to be a major source of losses. A related consideration is the possibility that the wire which guides the TOW could get tangled up in trees.

As an alternative to "nap-of-the-earth" flight, the 7th Army also experimented with flight at tree top level—higher than "nap-of-the-earth" but considerably lower than flight

<sup>1</sup>1.5 claimed at 190 kts., 2.13 claimed at 170 knots.

profiles used in Southeast Asia. It was found, however, that even at this altitude the helicopters were "skylined" against the background and were easy enemy targets. Unfortunately, it was also found that pilots who flew at tree-top level and at relatively higher speeds acquired more targets than those who flew "nap-of-the-earth."

The 7th Army Air Cavalry evaluation casts serious doubt on the ability of the Cheyenne to successfully employ the tactics it has been hoped it could use. There is little chance that it could acquire many targets at the stand-off ranges it is designed for and even less chance it could long survive if forced into the thick of the battle. In fact, seven out of eight senior Army officers who participated in the exercises cited helicopter survivability when questioned about the negative aspects of the exercises.

The AX will not be burdened by the questionable tactics of the Cheyenne. It will not be restricted to the "friendly" areas of the battlefield. Instead it will loiter over wide areas for long periods of time, above the range of automatic weapons, with the maneuverability, acceleration, and rate of climb needed to rapidly attack defended targets with a minimum of exposure to hostile fire.

These characteristics will be especially important if we do, in fact, face Redeye-type missiles and enemy fighters in Europe. Since no close-support aircraft could hope to match a SAM or a MIG in speed, survivability would depend in great degree on the aircraft's ability to outmaneuver the missile and perhaps the fighter as well till help arrives.

The Cheyenne would have no hope of surviving in this environment. During the Lam Son 719 operation conducted in Laos this past spring, under conditions only remotely as severe as those which would exist in Europe, chopper losses were staggering. The Army reported a total of 94 helicopters shot down between 5 February and 11 March, but other reports, including one in the New York Times, put the loss for the Laos incursion at 219 helicopters. This is the equivalent of 60 per cent of the total Cheyenne buy.<sup>2</sup>

### (3) Lethality/Accuracy:

Even if an aircraft can respond quickly and fly through enemy fire with impunity, it will be of little value in the close support mission unless it can deliver lethal and accurate fire against the targets with which it is confronted.

Any close support aircraft operating in the European theater will have to deal with two kinds of targets: "hard" targets such as tanks, armored personnel carriers, and bunkers; and "soft" targets such as command posts, lightly fortified machine-gun and mortar points, and vehicles and troops in the field. The "hard" targets will be both the most important and the toughest to destroy—important because the opposing armored forces will spearhead any enemy advance, and toughest to destroy because they will be camouflaged, mobile, and well protected.

Unguided rockets or bombs will not be adequate against armored vehicles because of their inherently poor accuracy. Needed instead will be small, penetrating warheads

(hard core bullets or shaped charges) accurately delivered against them. Our choice, therefore, will be primarily between guided missiles like the Tow and the Maverick, or high velocity, high impact automatic cannons of 30 mm. or larger with armor piercing warheads.

The Cheyenne will not be able to rely on its own gun as an antitank weapon. Like all helicopters, it suffers from high vibration and relative instability, both of which are fatal to accuracy. Even with its rigid rotor which minimizes rotor vibration to a degree, the Cheyenne will be forced to incorporate a very complex and very expensive computer-controlled turret stabilization system to achieve acceptable accuracies. And since this turret system will not accept the high recoil associated with an antitank capable cannon, its weapons will not be usable except against relatively soft targets. The Army readily acknowledges that they will be light armor piercing only.

In February, 1971 the Army attempted to demonstrate to a Congressional audience at its Yuma proving grounds the ability of the Cheyenne to fire its turret weapons simultaneously at two widely separated targets. Despite the unrealistically optimum test conditions (there would be no opportunity for careful preparation by highly trained technicians in a battlefield environment), a malfunction in the Cheyenne's fire control system caused machine gun fire "to be sprayed all over the hillside." Even if similar malfunctions can be prevented on the battlefield, it is doubtful whether the Cheyenne will achieve the accuracies called for in its design specifications, since their attainment is predicated on a minimum of aircraft movement which could well prove fatal if employed in the face of hostile fire.

Since it is incapable of mounting a 30 mm. cannon with the velocity, impact, and accuracy needed to counter enemy armored vehicles, the Cheyenne will have no choice but to use the Tow wire-guided missile as its primary anti-tank weapon. Unfortunately, there are a number of problems with the Tow, which was originally designed for use on the ground.

First, there are the target acquisition and survivability problems alluded to earlier. It is unlikely that the CHEYENNE will be able to acquire targets at the stand-off range for which the TOW is designed and unlikely that the helicopter will survive if forced to move closer to its targets.

Second, there is the fact that the TOW can be countermeasured by simple, low power techniques.

Third, there is the high cost and complexity of the missile. For example, the 16 TOW missiles which the CHEYENNE will normally carry will cost six times as much as the normal AX payload while providing sixty times fewer actual warheads. And since the TOW system will also be difficult to maintain, costly to repair, and have poor battlefield reliability, these figures probably understate its relative cost disadvantages in terms of functional sorties delivered.

At the Yuma demonstration referred to earlier, the carefully prepared CHEYENNE fired two missiles at standing targets under ideal conditions. One of the missiles hit the tank, but the other simply fell out of its launch tube.

This failure is not a good omen. In combat it is unlikely that the CHEYENNE will face tanks standing exposed in bright sunshine on the side of hills. Instead it will have to fire in adverse weather and under high crew stress conditions, at moving targets with good camouflage, and in the face of enemy countermeasures against the missile. All of these factors will gravely compromise the effective use of the wire-guidance system which requires highly accurate optical tracking either during hover or in "down-the-wire" flight.

The AX, on the other hand, will be well suited to delivering lethal and accurate fire against enemy targets. It will have the maneuverability needed to acquire its targets at short range, turn in the one-half mile or less needed to maintain visual acquisition, and then attack in close at a speed slow enough to ensure accuracy yet fast enough to reduce exposure to hostile fire.

Air Force tests conducted in 1965 demonstrate the very high degree of accuracy which can be achieved by fixed-wing multiple pass strafing such as the AX will be able to deliver. When its new 30 mm. cannon is developed, the AX will also have a weapon of sufficient impact and velocity to pierce any armored vehicle in the Soviet inventory. Moreover, this cannon will be cheaper to maintain and operate than the infinitely more complex TOW.

Finally, the AX will be able to carry up to 16,000 pounds of external ordnance, more than three times as much as the CHEYENNE. As a corollary, it will also be able to carry a greater variety of ordnance and engage a much wider range of combat targets.

### (4) Operational Readiness Requirements:

(a) Peak Sortie Rates. If a close support aircraft is to be counted on when needed, it is vital that it be able to fly 4 to 6 sorties per day, for one or two days, when necessary in emergency conditions.<sup>3</sup> The main determinant of an aircraft's ability to achieve peak sortie rates is the degree of its overall complexity.

A complex aircraft like the CHEYENNE will require its own retinue of highly trained technicians and considerable support materiel wherever it goes, and it will still be under repair much of the time. The Army's current attack helicopter, the Huey COBRA, has spent considerable amounts of time "in the shop" while serving in Vietnam. The much more complicated CHEYENNE would no doubt have a worse record. By contrast, a simple aircraft like the AX will have less failures, and thus demanding less maintenance, will fly more.

(b) Austere Basing Capabilities. There are several reasons why close support aircraft should be able to operate away from carefully prepared airstrips. For one thing, there are not likely to be airstrips in the immediate vicinity of a battlefield. Even if present, any aircraft operating from them would inevitably cut significantly into its responsiveness, its loiter time, and/or its payload if it could even reach the scene. An added danger of centralized bases is hostile strikes which could eliminate large fractions of the force in one swoop.

Although a helicopter like the CHEYENNE would seem at first glance to have advantages in this regard, they turn out to be somewhat illusory in nature.

To begin with, the CHEYENNE derives little advantage from its vertical take-off and landing (VTOL) capability. As argued earlier, forward based "ground loiter" is no substitute for long loiter in the air above the battlefield when responsiveness is the point at issue. Due to its vulnerability, the CHEYENNE will not be able in any event to sit down in areas really close to hostile fire. In Vietnam, for example, attack helicopters have operated almost entirely from sheltered rear bases with intermediate stops only at secure helicopter clearings. Finally, it must be remembered that vertical take-offs extract an inherent penalty in terms of the amount of fuel and ordnance carried. When fully loaded, even the CHEYENNE required room to roll for take-off.

<sup>3</sup> The Army and the Air Force do not use the same definition of a sortie. The Army reports every touchdown as a sortie. Thus one attack mission may be reported as consisting of five to ten sorties. In referring to a peak sortie rate desired of four to six per day we are using the Air Force definition.

<sup>2</sup> Although most of the losses in Laos were of helicopter troop-carriers—"slicks"—such as the UH-1G Huey, the experience of the slicks is applicable to attack helicopters as well, since armed helicopters like the Cheyenne are more likely to engage enemy defenses. Laos particularly demonstrated the severe vulnerability of helicopters to .51 caliber machine guns (12.7 mm). In contrast to this, the AX, which has over 1000 lbs. of armor to 453 for the Cheyenne, has been specifically designed to safely take fire up to .60 cal. (14.5 mm).

The AX will be able to rely in Europe on the large number of austere dirt and paved airstrips which can accommodate an aircraft with its own short take-off and landing (STOL) capabilities. It is designed to be able to take-off fully loaded from forward areas, hastily prepared dirt airstrips in distances as short as 2,200 feet. The Air Force A-7, by comparison, requires 7,000 feet of hard surface runway.

In fact, due to its lesser support requirements, it will be possible to disperse the AX to a far greater number of bases than the CHEYENNE, which will have to return far more often to its main base for fuel, ordnance, and repairs. And the helicopters then will be grouped together for possible enemy strikes.

(5) Night and All-Weather Capabilities: An aircraft that could always provide accurate and discriminating fire at night and under all weather conditions would without question be most desirable for the close support mission. The Cheyenne clearly has more sophisticated night and all weather avionics than the AX but it is doubtful what added capabilities they give it.

First, as demonstrated by Air Force experience with the A-1 in Southeast Asia, sophisticated avionics are not needed for effective close air support operations in marginal daylight conditions that kept other more avionics-equipped yet less maneuverable aircraft on the ground. The A-1 also operated at night with equipment no more exotic than flares, using the technique of making multiple, tight, low-speed turns within the duration of the flares.

The time when special avionics would be most helpful—and when aircraft cannot operate without them—is under conditions which combine bad weather and the night. Unfortunately, no package of sensor systems yet developed and none on the horizon has shown any ability to discriminate effectively between friendly and hostile forces. Yet this is a basic prerequisite for close-air support, especially under these conditions.

Despite the fact that the target identification problem remains unsolved, the Cheyenne is designed to incorporate an exotic passive infra-red night-vision system that adds greatly to its complexity and to its cost. In the 7th Army Air Cavalry evaluations referred to earlier, one helicopter troop experienced only 6 per cent of its total acquisitions and only 3.6 per cent of its actual engagements during its night operations. The more advanced equipment on the Cheyenne might make some improvement in that score but not enough to justify the cost.

The AX, by contrast, incorporates no such avionics in its standard operating version, yet its inherent maneuverability will allow it to operate even more effectively in most weather conditions than the A-1 did in Southeast Asia. If and when avionics are developed which could significantly improve its performance, they could easily be incorporated in a fraction of the total AX force.

(6) Force Structure Implications:

Our tactical air strength in any European encounter will depend not only on the quality of the aircraft we have but the numbers in which they are available. Here cost is but the numbers in which they are available. Here cost is an all important consideration, and again the AX comes out ahead.

Due to the innovative management techniques being applied to the AX program and the basic simplicity of the aircraft itself, the AX will be less than half as expensive as the Cheyenne. Its lower unit price will translate directly into substantially more aircraft for the money spent, as the following table demonstrates:

\$1.2 billion buys: 600 AX, \$2.0 million\*;  
222 Cheyenne, \$5.4 million\*;  
273 Harrier, \$4.4 million\*;  
(UK version).

\* Program unit costs.

In addition to its investment cost advantage, the AX will have lower operations and maintenance (O&M) costs as well. Experience shows that O&M costs usually average out to approximately 20 per cent of investment costs per year. This would put annual O&M costs for the AX at \$400,000, compared to \$1.08 million for the Cheyenne. This \$400,000 is a far cry from the upwards of \$1.5 million per year which we are already spending on a number of sophisticated Air Force planes.

The recent revelation that the Air Force is planning to develop an inexpensive "light fighter" to supplement the expensive F-15 is a first welcome indication that greater consideration is being given by the services to the importance of force structure implications in making their procurement decisions. It would not be in keeping with this new trend to replace the \$700,000 Huey Cobra with the more than seven times as expensive Cheyenne. The trade-off in numbers is simply not warranted by the few added capabilities actually gained. Given their inherent vulnerability and poor maneuverability, it is quite possible that a sizeable fraction of the small total Cheyenne force could be wiped out during the early stages of a conflict, and that no reinforcements would remain.

#### ANALYSIS OF THE CHEYENNE

The Cheyenne program has been a monumental accumulation of mistakes, misjudgments, and mismanagement, on the part of the Department of Defense, the Army, and Lockheed Aircraft. The program is now three years behind schedule, and yet it is virtually certain that few of the original performance specifications will be met.

The cost per aircraft has risen from an original estimate of "under \$1 million" to at least \$5 million per unit (program cost). Deputy Secretary of Defense Packard has estimated total research, development, testing, and engineering (RDT&E) costs to be \$293 million, up \$167 million from the original RDT&E estimates, or an overrun of 233 percent. Large overruns have occurred in virtually all major contract areas, as well as in contracts for auxiliary systems, in particular weapons and avionics. In addition, \$200.3 million was appropriated for FY 69 production of the Cheyenne, but never spent for procurement purposes once the Army cancelled the production part of the Cheyenne contract in May of 1969. Instead, this \$200.3 million has been used for contractual settlements with Lockheed, payoffs on Lockheed program expenses since contract termination, and continuing RDT&E expenses.

To date Lockheed has lost a minimum of \$120 million on the aircraft while through FY 71 the government has spent, in the words of New Hampshire Senator McIntyre, "about \$40 million each" for the ten Cheyenne prototypes that have been built (two of which have been destroyed in accidents). For a total expenditure, including just known losses on the part of the contractor of \$120 million, and government appropriations of over \$435.2 million, there currently exist only eight Cheyenne prototypes, only four of which fly, none near original specifications. According to Packard, there is no other military aircraft development program into which a company has sunk more of its own money.

The Cheyenne program began in the mid-1960's with the development of two experimental rigid-rotor helicopters, the L-286 and the IX-51A, the latter a compound vehicle as well, meaning that it used stub wings for lift instead of rotor blades as do ordinary helicopters. At the time Lockheed officials expected little difficulty in scaling up to a larger vehicle. A quotation from Aviation Week and Space Technology reveals:

"Officials now concede they were overly

optimistic in predicting the ease with which a 5,000 pound gross-weight helicopter could be scaled up to a 20,000 pound system. In some cases, performances were enthusiastically guaranteed beyond what the Army had sought in its original request."

One of these excesses was Lockheed development of a dive-bombing technique for the Cheyenne, using the rear pusher-prop as a speed-brake. This capability was developed not for the Army, the sponsor of the project, but for the Air Force, who Lockheed was trying to interest in the plane.

Problems began to develop immediately, and the difficulties reached major proportions in March of 1969, when a prototype crashed due to "uncontrollable rotor oscillation," killing the pilot. Then in April 1969 the Army issued to Lockheed a "cure notice," stating that the Army considered Lockheed's "... failure to make satisfactory progress toward the production and timely delivery of an aircraft which will meet contractual requirements, a condition that is endangering performance of the AH-56A production contract..."

Lockheed responded to the cure notice by suggesting a schedule slippage of about six months and a reduction in production, but the Army felt that even with these changes an unacceptable aircraft would be delivered and it cancelled the program in mid-May 1969. Stunned by the cancellation, Lockheed filed an appeal to the Armed Services Board of Contracts, opening a dispute that was not settled tentatively until January of 1971 when the Army agreed to pay Lockheed a total of \$72 million in settlements on the cancelled production contract and on company losses in the R&D side and allowed Lockheed to keep \$54 million as progress payments. Still the company had to agree to absorb losses of \$75 million on the developmental program and \$45 million on the production part. The result was hardly a productive venture for either side, with the Army sinking huge funds into an apparently bottomless pit while Lockheed took losses then without precedent.

But still the Cheyenne rolls on, though none of its problems has been solved. As of March 10, 1971 almost two years after the cancellation of the production contract, after numerous changes (quite a few of which were major, including relocation of the tail rotor), even the best of the flying aircraft was still nearly 10% short of the specified level flight top speed of 220 kts, 19% short of the dive speed specification, some 20% deficient in maximum maneuverability, with similar restrictions covering at least 10 other flight specifications.

It was also revealed this Spring that one of the Cheyenne prototypes was forced to make an emergency landing on March 9, 1971, due to structural failures caused when the aircraft was flying 2000 pounds below specified gross weight. Upon inspection it was found that one of the main rotor blades had buckled.

Despite over 1000 hours of flight testing, more than experienced with any other recent military aircraft development program the Cheyenne still suffers from serious maneuverability and response problems that threaten to even further downgrade its operational effectiveness. Maneuverability of the Cheyenne is limited to only a 2.0 "g" range and reportedly then the best of the development aircraft cannot sustain even a 60 degree turn. And, in spite of the long development, the reliability and effectiveness of the Cheyenne's rotor-control system is so questionable that the Army has had to recently advance an "advanced mechanical control system" to replace the current components. Cheyenne responsiveness is reputedly so poor that only one Army pilot will fly the Cheyenne, and even he will only fly the single prototype equipped with a highly experimental downward ejecting escape system.

### Conclusions

The Cheyenne is an aircraft of enormous cost with at best marginal effectiveness. The history of the program is filled with across-the-board mistakes, with responsibility divided between the Pentagon, the Army and Lockheed, and Congress. The United States has committed some \$435 million to this program to date, with the spectre of billions just beyond the horizon. Despite this already large investment, the Cheyenne program has clearly reached the point where it is extremely doubtful that any amount of further funding will result in a useful aircraft that could be effectively and safely used by American pilots in combat.

The Cheyenne is a classic example of a program of tremendous cost that holds little promise. Since there is a better and cheaper alternative to the Cheyenne on the horizon in the Air Force AX, Congress should act with all deliberate speed to put a merciful end to the Cheyenne program. No production contract should be approved and present RDT&E requests should be turned down.

So as to make some use of the vast funds expended so far, the Army should acquire and use the existing Cheyenne prototypes in low-level programs of research, perhaps incorporating them into existing R&D "advanced helicopter concepts" programs. These R&D programs should explore the critical areas of rigid-rotor technology, survivability, gun-platform stabilization, and anti-tank capabilities. These proposed research programs should in no way point toward eventual production of the Cheyenne.

Currently the Army is considering three alternative rotary-wing systems to the CHEYENNE, the Sikorsky S-67 BLACK-HAWK, and improved TOW-equipped Bell AH-1G COBRA, and a follow-on version of the AH-1G tentatively dubbed the "KING" COBRA. Although all of these aircraft would cost considerably less than the CHEYENNE they could not increase performance. As such, none of these alternative helicopters should receive production approval. Until rotary-wing technology develops to the point that a cost effective attack helicopter with demonstrable combat capabilities can be produced, Congress should fund no further production-oriented development of attack helicopter systems. However, Congress should continue to give adequate support to the Army's current attack helicopter, the AH-1G COBRA, since it can provide useful capabilities auxiliary to the primary close-support mission we believe should be given to the AX.

### ANALYSIS OF THE AX

#### Development program and procurement approach

A series of innovative management approaches have been initiated for the AX development and procurement program which encompass austere and functional specifications, competitive hardware development, and thorough flight assessments before production approval. These reforms should result in a relatively low RDT&E cost for the AX program with minimal risks while promising a highly effective close-support aircraft at a price under \$2 million.

The simplicity of air frame design and minimum of avionics and other complex subsystems incorporated in the AX should assist the program in avoiding the dangers of excessive sophistication and technological over-assumption that have in many other programs led to serious schedule and cost difficulties. This emphasis upon design simplicity should be continued, for the nature of the AX mission is not one that requires advanced technology. Rather, the use of proven components will increase mission effectiveness by resulting in a rugged aircraft with a high degree of reliability, ease in maintenance, and minimal support requirements for basing. And, the simplicity of design will make the AX inexpensive

enough to enable the Air Force to buy the aircraft in adequate numbers.

The benefits of austere and functional specifications have been followed up on with a full competitive development program, the first since 1956. Two companies, Fairchild-Hiller and Northrop, have been let contracts to build two AX prototypes apiece (the A-10A and the A-1A respectively). This dual hardware development program is a marked departure from the more frequent "paper competition" and "total package" type of contracts that have caused numerous problems in the past with aircraft like the AH-56A (CHEYENNE), the C-5A, the F-111 and the F-14.

The actual "fly-off" part of the competitive development program is another feature of the AX development program. Having the two versions of the AX compete against one another should have a number of positive effects for the program. The competition will identify not only the best aircraft, but also potential problem areas to be solved during later stages of development. The "fly-off" also virtually demands that both contractors produce the best possible aircraft, since lesser effort could clearly result in the loss of the contract.

The net result of these innovations in program management should be the development of a relatively risk-free, highly effective close-support aircraft with a comparatively low price. Although direct RDT&E costs, at an estimated \$281.2 million, are not particularly low, the benefits achieved through the competitive development program should in the last analysis result in a better aircraft at a lower total program cost than would be achieved were more conventional management techniques applied.

#### Air Force priorities

Although the past twenty years of operational experience has clearly demonstrated the importance of close-air support, the Air Force has consistently given this mission a low priority and has thus found itself in both Korea and Vietnam, without an aircraft designed for this mission. The Air Force has instead preferred more glamorous missions and has funneled most of its tactical-air budget into the questionable utility of strike-and-interdiction bombers like the A-7, the F-4, and the F-105.

Given this past preoccupation with interdiction aircraft, it is little wonder that the Air Force did not get the AX program moving until fully a year and a half after the Army had begun development of the CHEYENNE. It seems that only the threat of losing the close-support mission to the Army really convinced the Air Force to develop the AX. But development does not itself ensure that the Air Force will give adequate attention to close-air support in the future.

We are particularly concerned that the Air Force place sufficient wings of the AX in the active force structure before equipping the Air National Guard. We believe that at least five wings (or 600 aircraft) are necessary to ensure that the Air Force will be able to effectively meet the close-support need with the very short notice that will be expected in a potential NATO-Pact confrontation. Assignment of large numbers of the AX total buy to the Air National Guard would most likely result in grave delays in combat deployment of the aircraft and subsequent weakening of tactical strength, due to the time associated with Guard unit activation, transport, and familiarization.

While fully supporting the AX program, we recommend that Congress monitor Air Force performance of the close-support mission by requiring over the life of the AX program an annual accounting sufficient to show:

- (a) continued satisfactory development of the AX
- (b) sufficient numbers of the AX in the active forces

(c) adequate spares, training, and flying hours for the AX

(d) adequate provision for close-support munitions

(e) adequate inventory of forward air-control (FAC) aircraft and sufficient training for this important auxiliary mission.

#### Survivability

Although the relative survivability of the AX is clearly superior to that of other close-support and standard attack aircraft, this comparative edge does not assure that its absolute survivability will permit the really close-in operations desirable in a European battle. To date the Air Force has taken commendable actions in behalf of AX survivability, and we strongly recommend that further survivability research and development for this aircraft be made a matter of highest priority.

We believe that extensive live-firing tests will be necessary to gauge the absolute survivability of the AX. Since the large payloads of the AX allows for the addition of more armor at the expense of marginal ordnance loss, any undesirable vulnerability indications arising from these tests might well be compensated for with a minimum of performance sacrifices and at a relatively low cost.

#### Avionics, night and all-weather combat systems

In view of the Air Force's demonstrated fondness for sophisticated avionics, and the available space for them in the AX, it is important that avionics expansion be very carefully monitored by Congress to guard against needless cost growth.

Of particular concern is the possible development of a follow-on to the standard AX, dubbed the AX-B, equipped with night and all-weather avionics that would add at least \$2 million to the cost of the basic aircraft. As discussed in the section dealing with the characteristics of the close-support mission (see pages 7 to 16) the utility of sophisticated night and all-weather combat delivery systems are sufficiently questionable to place cost-effectiveness of an AX-B in serious doubt at this time.

The 7th Army Air Cavalry field evaluations this year, in which only 3.6% of one troop's total engagements and only 6% of total acquisitions occurred after sunset, convincingly demonstrated the limited effectiveness of any aircraft, be it fixed or rotary-wing, operating at night in a European combat situation.

A NATO-Pact confrontation in Central Europe will almost certainly be highly mobile, with battle lines changing so quickly that the whole concept of front-lines becomes clouded. Under these conditions, the inability of any night-all-weather sensor system currently available or on the horizon to discriminate between friendly and hostile targets gravely compromises the operations of close-support aircraft. The very nature of the close-support mission requires that the aircraft be able to provide effective fire against enemy targets in very close proximity to friendly forces, and it is not at all clear that this prerequisite will be met.

In view of the operational, technical, and financial risks involved, development of an AX-B should be undertaken only with the greatest of care. Any proposed "B" version of the AX or major avionics additions to the standard aircraft should be carefully screened in realistic tests. These tests should be conducted with targets and tactical postures representative of battlefield conditions and with particular attention given to the safety of friendly troops in the field. Early evaluations of the operational effectiveness of a follow-on AX-B might be projected by using a portion of the 13 OV-10A nighttime forward air control and strike designation aircraft being developed for the Air Force PAVE NAIL program, provided that they were suitably modified for ordnance de-

livery test to a configuration similar to that of the Marine Corps YOY-10D (NOGS) Night Observation Gunship. If the AX-B should receive production approval, we recommend that it be procured in small percentages of the total buy.

#### *The MAVERICK missile*

Despite the almost ensured success of the AX 30-mm. cannon in the anti-tank mission, the Air Force has recently pressed for incorporation of the electro-optically guided MAVERICK terminal-homing missile as a major component of AX anti-tank effectiveness. The use of this missile, which is guided by a type of television that enables it, once fired, to be completely independent of the aircraft, has less supporting evidence than almost any other aspect of AX effectiveness. Due to the inherent limitations of the MAVERICK, extremely serious doubts exist that this missile will have any useable anti-tank capabilities.

Studies have shown that it is highly unlikely that camouflaged tanks can be visually acquired at sufficient distances, given realistic European battlefield conditions of compromised visibility and diverse terrain, to allow firing of the Maverick before its minimum launch range restrictions are encountered.

Furthermore, the time required for visual lock-on with the Maverick is at least 2½ times the aiming time for the strafing pass required for the 30 mm cannon. As demonstrated by experience in Vietnam with the Walleye electro-optical guided bomb, the increase in targeting time that a Maverick delivery necessitates renders the aircraft much more vulnerable than would a dive-bombing or strafing delivery.

The limitations in acquisition and aiming time for the Maverick will in all probability require a Maverick-carrying aircraft to make first a purely acquisition pass and then return for a separate engagement pass. Even with this second pass there is hardly any assurance that between the time of the initial entrance pass and the second approach the target will not have moved to another position which again makes it impossible to engage within the Maverick's range limitations. In addition, multiple passes for acquisition and engagement increase exposure time to the dense hostile fire that will be encountered over the European battlefield.

Given the extremely high cost of the Maverick and associated launch equipment (approximately 50 times more expensive per round than a 30 mm cannon burst), the serious doubts as to Maverick acquisition and targeting characteristics, and additional doubts that exist as to the ease with which the Maverick can be countermeasured, we recommend that there be no Maverick installation for the AX.

#### *Development procedure for the 30 mm cannon*

The Air Force has let contracts to General Electric and Philco-Ford for competitive development of the 30 mm high-performance cannon. This cannon will be the primary armament of the AX and its performance a key determinant of AX combat effectiveness. But while the cannon is being developed under management procedures similar to those used for the AX airframe, including a "shoot-off" between the two contractors, present plans do not call for incorporation of the cannon into the AX airframe "fly-off" itself.

Since the cannon is acknowledged by the Air Force to be the "pacing item" of AX systems development and because of its importance to aircraft operating effectiveness, we believe that the Air Force should take actions to make cannon and airframe development parallel, so that the gun can be included in the airframe "fly-off".

The approximately six-month delay in the "fly-off" competition that would be entailed

is fully justified by the importance of the cannon to the AX system. The cost of such action would be small by comparison to total program cost.

If the airframe "fly-off" were to incorporate the cannon "shoot-off" the competitive development program would take on valuable new dimensions, enabling decisions on both airframe and cannon to be made more realistically. Parallel cannon development will also protect against later failures in the cannon program, which, if the gun was not incorporated integrally into airframe development, might lead to serious program slippages and downgrading of overall system performance.

#### *ANALYSIS OF THE HARRIER*

The AV-8A HARRIER now being procured for the Marine Corps from Britain's Hawker-Siddeley Aviation is the only operational V/STOL aircraft in the free world. It is a fixed-wing plane which can either take off vertically like a helicopter or with a 1,200 foot forward roll.

The Marines' present plan is to buy 114 planes, enough for three operational and one training squadron. We have invested \$123.9 million for 30 aircraft to date, and \$102.3 million has been requested in the FY 72 budget for 30 more. On the assumption that all remaining aircraft are purchased in the U.K., total costs for the 114 aircraft program are estimated by the Marines at \$503.6 million.

The Senate Armed Services Committee, however, has added \$23.7 million to the FY 72 request to initiate phased domestic production of the HARRIER in the United States. The total additional costs for such domestic production, it now appears, could range anywhere from \$113.8 to \$275.0 million, depending on whether the airframe alone or the entire plane were built in the United States.

In our view, there are sufficient remaining doubts about the importance of the HARRIER's projected mission, the operational tactics it is intended to use, and its basic effectiveness as a close support aircraft to justify limitation of the program. We therefore recommend that this year's projected buy go forward but that the program be terminated at a total of 60 aircraft.

We feel that there is even less justification at this time for transferring any part of the production work remaining to the United States.

#### *Roles and missions once again*

Just as the Air Force has been charged with the mission of providing close air support to Army ground troops, the Navy has been charged with providing close support to the Marines. And the Navy has been just as neglectful of its responsibilities as the Air Force, preferring to concentrate instead on what it regards as the more glamorous interdiction mission.

At present the only aircraft at all suited to close support in either the Navy or the Marine inventory is the A-4, the latest version of which is the A-4M, with unit flyaway cost of \$1.9 million. The Navy has never bought the A-4M and is already phasing out earlier A-4 squadrons. It now has two A-4 squadrons in its inventory, compared to six composed of newer aircraft in the hands of the Marines.

Perhaps the best indication of the Navy's neglect of its close support responsibilities is provided in testimony this year to the Senate Armed Services Committee. When asked what aircraft the Navy would be using for close support in the next few years, Admiral Thomas F. Connolly replied:

"Well, to a very large degree we will use A-7's and as long as we have A-4's we will use A-4's, and we have been using F-4's when it was necessary. And the Marines will be using the HARRIER. And I wouldn't be surprised under some circumstances that they will load

the F-14 up because it covers a lot of real estate and can carry a big load of bombs and under certain circumstances it might turn out that the F-14 would do close air support."

In short, once the A-4 has been phased out, all the Navy itself will have for the close support mission is one interdiction aircraft and two fleet air defense fighters.

We believe that the Department of Defense should attend to this role and missions problem also, both to avoid unnecessary duplication and to see to it that the Marines are provided with adequate close support assistance.

#### *The amphibious assault mission*

The mission of the HARRIER is to operate in support of amphibious forces in assaults against heavily defended beaches. It is for this reason that the Marines are attracted by its ability to operate in a vertical take-off mode either from ships or forward pads while retaining the maneuverability characteristics inherent only in a fixed-wing plane.

Amphibious assaults are the classical Marine mission. No such assaults have been conducted, however, since the Korean War, and no heavily defended beaches exist at this time which appear to be active candidates for invasion. We face no hostile island empires.

Because of the diminishing importance of amphibious assaults operations, a change has already taken place in recent years in the role of the Marines. They have become increasingly less specialized in their operations and now fill the role of an elite, well-trained, and rapidly deployable infantry with versatile capabilities. It is in this role, for example, that they have performed so ably in Vietnam.

The HARRIER, on the other hand, is a throwback to the days of extreme specialization. Only in the early days of an amphibious assault operation when no land bases were available could it arguably perform better in the close support role than the far simpler and less costly A-4M now used by the Marines for the mission.

We believe it important that the Marines continue to become more versatile in their capabilities. The sixty HARRIER buy which we recommend will enable them to equip one, and perhaps two, of their three tactical air wings with HARRIER squadrons. Given the questionable importance of the amphibious assault mission, a larger total buy would consume an undue share of the total resources available to the Marines.

#### *HARRIER close air support effectiveness*

(1) The Intended Tactics: It will be easier to evaluate the effectiveness of the HARRIER if we examine first just how the Marines intend to use it in support of amphibious assaults. They envisage three distinct phases of HARRIER operations.

In Phase I—the initial stages of the assault—the HARRIER will operate directly from its sea base, an LPH or some other smaller aircraft carrier. It will fly from the sea base directly to the target area, where it will either provide immediate support or loiter on the ground at a suitable forward site nearby until needed. After each such operation, it will have to return to its sea base to rearm and refuel.

In Phase II—after an initial beachhead is established—a Harrier facility will be set up ashore. It will have some support material and enough matting for a short runway, but the Harrier will still be largely dependent on its sea base for ammunition, fuel, and maintenance.

In Phase III, a main base ashore will be established and enough logistics support transferred to it to end the Harrier's dependence of its sea base. This main base will be suitable for adaptation into a SATS site—Short Airfield for Tactical Support—able to

serve other conventional aircraft as well as the Harrier.

Once established on its main base, the Harrier will leapfrog forward fully armed and fueled to a forward site, where it will loiter on the ground till needed. After each engagement, it will return to the main base to reload, since its forward site will have neither fuel nor ammunition. Once re-equipped, it will repeat the process for another engagement.

(2) Effectiveness Evaluation: It should now be possible to evaluate the effectiveness of the Harrier, both in amphibious assaults and other close support operations.

(a) Sea Basing Feasibility. According to the Marines, it should be possible to operate the Harrier from sea bases ranging in size from CVAs to LSDs, but the feasibility of all-weather operations from sea platforms smaller than a CVA or CVS has never been thoroughly tested.

While the British Royal Air Force has conducted demonstrations of sea-based operations in calm seas, none of its own Harriers have ever been operationally deployed at sea. And the Marines themselves have done no sea-based Harrier testing in this country.

It should be noted in this regard that the HARRIER will be more difficult to operate in its VTOL mode than a helicopter. It will be more difficult to control and have less margin of lift. Extensive tests are therefore in order to ensure that it will prove effective under the wide range of conditions now envisaged by the Marines for its use. Until such tests have been conducted, a basic premise of the Marines' tactics for the HARRIER will remain open to question.

(b) Responsiveness/Loiter. It has already been argued that optimum responsiveness is not obtained either through high speed or extreme forward basing but with aircraft that have the ability to loiter over the battlefield for long periods of time.

The HARRIER will suffer from the same relative deficiencies in this regard as the CHEYENNE. Even when operating in the STOL mode, it will have payload, range, and loiter capabilities more limited than those of conventional fixed-wing planes. And in the VTOL mode necessary when operating either from small ships or forward sites, it will have only one-fifth the range and at best one-third the payload which its STOL operations will provide.

Looking first at VTOL operations, it should be recognized that forward site operations with the HARRIER are in some respects more difficult than with the CHEYENNE. Because large amounts of dust would otherwise be ingested by its engines with devastating effect, the HARRIER will be restricted either to existing hard surfaces or steel mat covered take-off pads specially prepared by the Marines. And even with these mats in place, easily visible clouds of dust will be generated on take-off and landing unless somehow shielded by the terrain. If the site in question were close to the front, these dust clouds could aid enemy detection of the site and bring down a rain of artillery fire.

This problem could be averted by basing the Harrier well out of range of enemy artillery fire but only at the expense of longer transit time to the front and less loiter time once there. According to Marine Corps testimony this year to the Senate Armed Services Committee, a Harrier operating in the VTOL mode would have only five minutes of combat time over the battle area if it carried 3,000 pounds of bombs on a 50 miles radius mission. And if there were no urgent targets available during these five minutes, it would have no alternative but to pick the best target it could find before returning to its main base for more fuel.

Accordingly, the Harrier will almost always

operate in the STOL mode once a main base is established ashore. Even so, more Harriers will still have to fly more sorties to provide the same battlefield coverage as conventional aircraft could use. Operating from the same base as the Harrier in the same standard take-off mode, the A-4M, for example, could provide twice the loiter, payload, or radius of the Harrier on any given mission.

In short, the only time the Harrier would have an advantage in responsiveness over a conventional plane would be in the early stages of an amphibious assault operation—and then only if it proves capable of consistent use on smaller ships than those which can accept conventional planes.

(c) Survivability. As argued earlier, the two characteristics which will work together to determine an aircraft's survivability are its vulnerability and maneuverability.

The Harrier's relatively high vulnerability is in large part a direct result of its VTOL capability. Because of the weight limitations which VTOL operations impose, the Harrier cannot afford the heavy armor protection available to the AX. And it is made more vulnerable by its dense fuselage and the considerable fuel and hydraulics placed around its single engine. The Harrier is likely to suffer considerable damage if hit, with a fire breaking out and spreading from one critical component to the next. In short, its vulnerability will be much greater than that of the A-4 (which benefits from considerably more armor protection and a manual back-up control system like that on the AX) and quite comparable to that of the F-4.

The HARRIER will have much better maneuverability than the CHEYENNE, but not as much as either the AX or the A-4. This latter point is often misunderstood. The HARRIER will have an ability to execute very tight turns while flying slowly (under 150 knots), but at the 450 knot speed realistically required for its dive bombing attacks, it simply does not have sufficient wing area to turn as tightly as the A-4, much less the AX. This problem will not be solved by its vectored thrust capability (a rotation of its engine nozzles), since this will provide only a 1/2 "g" increase in its immediate maneuverability and only at the expense of a large loss in speed, which will further decrease the lift and g's available. The number of g's an aircraft can pull, it will be remembered is a direct measurement of its ability to deviate from the predictable straight-line path which aimed gunfire presumes.

(d) Lethality/Accuracy. The HARRIER initially is limited in the payload it can carry. Operating in the VTOL mode, it would be effectively limited to four 500 pound bombs, some 2.75 inch rockets, and two low-velocity 30 mm cannons with a small amount of ammunition. And as indicated earlier, this 3,000 pound load would restrict it to a mere five minutes of combat time on a 50 mile radius mission. Even in the STOL mode, it is normally expected that the HARRIER would carry a maximum payload of 5,000 pounds, considerably less than the 7,500 pounds normally carried by the A-4 in Vietnam, and less than half the normal 11,000 pound payload of the AX.

The HARRIER will also have a very limited anti-tank capability, regardless of the size of its ordnance load. Its low velocity 30 mm. cannons will not be suitable anti-tank weapons. Instead it will have to rely on ROCKEYE shaped-charge cluster bombs which are six times more expensive but considerably less effective than a high velocity 30 mm. cannon burst.

Furthermore, the accuracy of the HARRIER's ordnance deliveries must remain open to question, notwithstanding the Marines' claim that its visual-aided automatic bombing system will give it 40 per cent better

accuracy than that attainable with fixed sight conventional aircraft. Similar claims have been made in the past about other such automatic systems, but they have never proved out in combat. In Vietnam, for example, orders have been in effect prohibiting the use of the WALLEYE as a close support weapon because its automated bombing system has consistently shown itself subject to shortfalls which could seriously jeopardize troop safety. The HARRIER's own system, it should be noted, has never been tested by the Marines in the United States.

Another consideration is the limited nature of the attack profiles in which the HARRIER will be able to operate. Because of its limited wing area and lift, it will be restricted to dive bombing attacks at high speeds which could put its accuracy in the same vicinity as that attainable with the F-4, which the Marines have found only marginally useful for close support. Accuracy is very important in the close support mission because lethality decreases as the square of ordinance miss distance. Yet the HARRIER may not be able to attack in close at a speed slow enough to ensure the accuracy required.

(e) Operational Readiness. Because the HARRIER is a very complex aircraft, it may have high maintenance requirements which could prevent attainment of the peak sortie rates which emergency conditions could require. The British experience, it should be noted, is that the HARRIER will require 23 man-hours of maintenance per flight-hour. This compares to the 14 man-hours of maintenance per flight-hour which the Marines have experienced with the A-4.

Because of its complexity, the HARRIER will also be more dependent than the A-4 on support equipment and facilities. While the A-4 will require a somewhat longer prepared runway, the other requirements of the HARRIER are considerable. As noted earlier, it will be able to operate in the VTOL mode only from existing hard surfaces or steel mat covered take-off pads specially prepared by the Marines. The Marines also estimate that a main base supporting 20 HARRIERS would require "up to 195 tons per day" of supplies and that it would therefore have to be "accessible by road or beach to the source of supplies."

(f) Force Structure Implication. Even if produced in the U.K. the HARRIER will have a cost per unit 70 per cent more expensive than the A-4 (about \$3.3 million to \$1.9 million in terms of unit flyaway costs). Domestic production would make the HARRIER more than twice as expensive as the A-4. Accordingly, any sizeable HARRIER buy would inevitably be at the expense of the total number of aircraft which would be available to the Marines for the close support mission.

To sum up, there are serious limitations on the responsiveness, survivability, lethality, and readiness of the Harrier, in addition to some remaining doubts about its basic concept of operations. Everything considered, there seems no justification for purchasing more than 60 Harriers at this time.

#### *The domestic production issue*

It makes even less sense to transfer production of however many Harriers we decide to buy to the United States. Three arguments have been cited for domestic production of the Harrier, none of which are very persuasive.

First, it has been suggested that domestic production of the Harrier would alleviate unemployment in the United States. This would be true, however, only in the vicinity of the St. Louis, Missouri, production facilities of McDonnell Douglas Corporation, the Harrier's domestic licensee. More important, we believe that there are much better and more appropriate tools than the defense

budget available for managing the national economy.

Second, it has been suggested that domestic Harrier production would eliminate United States dependence on a foreign source of supply for a needed weapon system. This argument, too, seems rather specious. To begin with, there is little likelihood that the British source of supply would be cut off. Moreover, we are getting with each batch of aircraft all the spares and support equipment which the Marines believe will be necessary for the long term operation of the planes. The Marines themselves, it should be noted, have been very pleased with British handling of the program and see no need for U.S. production of the Harrier.

Third, it has been suggested that by building the HARRIER here we could establish a technological base for future V/STOL developments in the United States. This deserves more serious attention. In theory, V/STOL would seem to have a number of important applications. It might be useful to the Navy, for example, which has an urgent need to reduce the dependence of its surface fleet on large carrier operations. At the same time, there are some basic facts both about V/STOL and the HARRIER which should be clearly understood.

To begin with, the United States has already done a great deal of work on V/STOL aircraft. A summary of the most notable U.S. V/STOL programs is shown in the following:

- Aircraft designation, description and manufacturer.
- VZ-2-Tilt Wing, Boeing Vertol.
- VZ-3-Deflected Stipstream, Ryan.
- XV-3-Tilt Rotor, Bell.
- VZ-4-Tilting Duct Propeller, Doak.
- XV-4-Dir Lift/Vectored Thrust, Lockheed.
- X-18-Tilt Wing, Hiller.
- X-19-Tilt Propeller, Curtis-Wright.
- XFY-1-Tail Sitter, Convair.
- XV-5-Lift Fan, Ryan.
- XFV-1-Tail Sitter, Lockheed.
- X-14-Vectored Thrust, Bell.
- X-22-Ducted Propeller, Bell.
- XC-142-Tilt Wing, LTV.

These development programs took place over a period of ten years at a cost of approximately \$1 billion, and then employed the talents of a large number of highly reputable airframe manufacturers. None progressed past prototype development and several were terminated by crashes which destroyed the aircraft.

Largely as a result of these programs, many reputable airplane designers have doubts as to whether V/STOL really is the wave of the future. They note, for example, that the simple physics of flight design are such that substantially more power is required to lift an aircraft straight up than is required for a conventional take-off. This inherent trade-off between VTOL and payload/range is all too visible in the HARRIER itself, which when operating in the VTOL mode has only one-fifth the range and at best one-third the payload that its STOL operations provide. This is not to say that a VTOL aircraft could not be designed with more payload/range than the HARRIER. The basic point is that for any given payload/range requirement, a VTOL capability is likely to make the aircraft at least twice as expensive to buy and operate as it would be if equipped only with a STOL capability. Accordingly, it might prove a much wiser longer-term investment to concentrate on STOL technology, to give our aircraft continually shorter conventional take-offs without imposing the requirement for true vertical flight.

To the extent that we do wish to pursue V/STOL development efforts, it is doubtful whether domestic production of the HARRIER is the best vehicle. While it is now

the only operational V/STOL aircraft in the free world, it was designed in the early 1960's, and some of its technology dates back even further. We might get far more for our money if we concentrated on new prototype development efforts rather than HARRIER production. It should be noted that a new Navy initiative in R&D for V/STOL propulsion for fixed-wing aircraft is already scheduled to commence in FY 72.

The main argument against production of the HARRIER in the U.S. is the high cost likely to be incurred for the marginal benefits just cited. The Marines now estimate that the additional costs could run anywhere from \$113.8 to \$275 million, depending on whether the airframe alone or the entire plane were produced in the United States. If we bought an additional 84 HARRIERS in the U.K., their unit cost would continue to be \$4.4 million. If we build only the airframe in the U.S., this unit cost would rise to \$5.9 million for the 84 planes. And if the entire aircraft were built here, it would rise to \$7.8 million. In short, U.S. production would make the HARRIER either 3 or 4 times as expensive as the \$2 million AX, depending on the degree of U.S. production.

Moreover, the implications of the less expensive airframe production only approach should be clearly understood. According to the Marines, Hawker-Siddeley now has about 46 subcontractors working with it on the HARRIER. If the airframe only approach were chosen, we would remain dependent on many of these subcontractors as a foreign source of supply. We would also accomplish far less from the standpoint of establishing a technological base for V/STOL development in the United States. The key to V/STOL efforts, it should be noted, is not so much the airframe as the engine, which would continue to be produced by Rolls Royce. Yet when U.S. production of the HARRIER was first considered over a year ago, the engine was specifically excluded, both because of cost and lack of interest on the part of U.S. engine manufacturers, neither of which factors seems to have changed.

Finally, it should be recognized that U.S. production might entail support as well as cost problems. Whether an airframe only or complete aircraft program were chosen, production would be phased gradually to the United States. During the next year, for example, no parts would actually be produced by McDonnell Douglas, whose efforts would be limited to assembly of parts produced in the U.K. Thereafter, the degree of U.S. fabrication efforts would increase gradually over the remaining life of the HARRIER program. Only in the last year of the presently scheduled Marine buy would even the entire airframe be built in the United States.

This kind of arrangement could produce support problems of various kinds. First, there would be the difficulty of co-ordinating production efforts between two countries. Second, there would be the problem of having available suitable replacement parts for each somewhat unique batch of aircraft. And third, there could be a problem of pilot and maintenance personnel familiarity with the discrepancies between the planes. We must admit in all candor an inability to evaluate the potential seriousness of these problems. We do know that they could be avoided altogether, however, if U.K. production continued.

For all these reasons, we are opposed to the transfer of HARRIER production to the United States at this time. We recommend instead that a handful of the 60 HARRIER aircraft produced in Britain be made available by the Marine Corps to both the Navy and the Air Force to conduct modest evaluations of V/STOL concepts and capabilities suited to their respective missions.

TABLE 1.—SYSTEMS COST PROJECTIONS—AX, CHEYENNE HARRIER

INVESTMENT COSTS (INCLUDING R.D.T. & E.)			
[Price figures used reflect conservative estimates of program unit costs]			
System	Projected total, buy	Program unit cost (million)	Total (billion)
Cheyenne.....	375	\$5.4	\$2.00
Harrier (UK) <sup>1</sup> .....	114	4.4	.50
AX-A.....	500	2.0	1.00
AX-B.....	100	4.0	.40
Total.....			3.90

<sup>1</sup> Phased transferral of Harrier production from Great Britain to the United States could add a total of \$275,000,000 to the cost of the remaining 84 aircraft, with unit program costs rising to \$7,800,000 per aircraft. Total investment costs could rise, using USMC figures, from \$503,600,000 to \$778,600,000 for the buy of 114 aircraft.

TOTAL SYSTEMS COST INCORPORATING OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE COSTS OVER A 10-YEAR PERIOD (BASED ON O. & M. COSTS FOR A DECADE AS 200 PERCENT OF PROCUREMENT COSTS)

[In billions of dollars]			
System	O. & M. cost (10 years)	Investment costs	Total
Cheyenne.....	4.00	2.00	6.00
Harrier (UK).....	1.00	.50	1.50
AX-A.....	2.00	1.00	3.00
AX-B.....	.80	.40	1.20
Total.....	7.80	3.90	11.70

## NATIONAL ENERGY POLICY—PART VIII

### HON. R. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the New York Times on the current coal rush in the West points out once again the need for the establishment of a national energy policy.

The rush to strip mine western coal—

States the article—

is being brought on by the Nation's apparently insatiable demand for energy.

Satisfying this demand is drastically altering vast areas of isolated open spaces. Portions of six States—Arizona, Colorado, Montana, New Mexico, North Dakota, and Wyoming—have been turned into a moonscape. So far, the area strip mined is equal to half the area of New Jersey.

This coal rush would not have occurred if there already had been established a set of priorities for the supply of energy materials, and a long-range power development plan which the coal companies, and other material suppliers, could use to judge the energy requirements of tomorrow. Without these basic essentials, energy suppliers have no choice but to plunge ahead on their own, creating in their wake problems far more severe than those they wish to solve.

To my mind, Mr. Speaker, this situation cries out for the establishment of a national energy policy as soon as possible.

The article follows:

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

#### COAL RUSH IS ON AS STRIP MINING SPREADS INTO WEST

(By Ben A. Franklin)

WASHINGTON.—A new stage in the development of the American West is beginning on the arid plains and badlands that flank both slopes of the Rocky Mountains.

On thousands of square miles of vacant land west of the Mississippi—much of it in Federal ownership, or in government land grants to Indian tribes and railroads—a feverish coal rush is on.

The scramble is for coal leases and rights that will open an enormous and virtually untapped reserve of cheap western fuel to strip mining.

On a scale far larger than anything seen in the East, where acreage totaling half the area of New Jersey has been peeled off for coal near enough to the surface to be strip mined, portions of six Western states—Arizona, Colorado, Montana, New Mexico, North Dakota and Wyoming—face a topographic and environmental upheaval.

It is being brought on by the nation's apparently insatiable demand for energy, by the air pollution crisis in urban centers, by new technology in the conversion of coal to clean fuels, and by the economies of bulldozing rather than tunneling for coal that are available in the West.

In resolving the energy and air pollution problems, however vast areas of isolated open spaces in the West may be drastically altered.

The visual impact of strip mining is invariably stunning. On flat or rolling terrain, mammoth power shovels crawl day and night through great trenches, lifting, wheeling and depositing the unwanted strata above the coal seam into thousands of uninterrupted acres of geometrically perfect windrows of spoil banks.

In mountain coalfields where one, two or as many as five seams may lie horizontally through timbered slopes far above the valley bottom, the contour strip mines are notched in continuous, sinuous strips around the mountainsides. Trees and earth and rock are cast down the mountain flanks to expose the strippable edge of the coal bed.

The legacy of upheaval remains. Silt fills streams for thousands of miles. Sulfur-bearing coal, left in place and exposed to the elements, yields a long-lasting trickle of sulfuric acid which chemically burns streams and kills aquatic life. From the air over a "hot" acidic strip mine, pools of rainwater glow in weird shades of red and orange.

The debate over strip mining has been gathering since the late nineteen-fifties, when larger and larger earth-moving machinery made its growth economically feasible and gave it a cost advantage over underground mining. With a passion that coal men tend to see as mysticism, conservationists say that stripping destroys the very roots of men's souls—the land. The mining industry sees it with similarly strong conviction as the best way to tap a vital national resource which, as one strip mining executive put it recently, "God put there for man's use—it's a sin to waste it."

According to one Government geologist here, the six states and others in the west—Oklahoma, Texas and even a patch of Washington State—"are on the brink of, not years, but generations of strip mining for coal that will make the excavation for the Panama Canal look like a furrow in my backyard vegetable garden."

The first wave has begun. In 1970, for the first time in the 100-year history of coal mining in America, a Western mine—the Navajo strip mine of the Utah Construction and Mining Company near Farmington,

N.M.—became the largest single producer in the country. Its output from Indian coal lands was more than six million tons for the Four Corners Electric Power Complex, an environmentally controversial steam-electric station serving New Mexico, Arizona, Nevada and Southern California.

Near Centralia, Wash., 30 miles south of Olympia and just beyond the foothills of Mount Rainier, a 5,000-acre, 135-million ton deposit of coal that was only nibbled at by tunneling from 1870 into the nineteen-fifties for pre-diesel locomotive fuel for the Northern Pacific and Union Pacific Railroads, is being turned into one of the biggest strip mines in the country. The planned rate of production is five million tons a year for a 700,000 kilowatt generating station of the Pacific Power and Light Company and the Washington Waterpower Company.

Pacific Power and Light also owns rights to an estimated 1.6 billion tons of strip mine reserves in Wyoming and Montana. The company expects to rank among the top five coal producers in the country by 1977 with production of 23 million tons a year. Its president has said that the company will go slow on expensive investment in nuclear power stations because "we've got coal running out our ears."

Even Texas lignite—lignite is the lowest rank of coal in energy per ton and it has never generated more than an asterisk in Government coal production statistics—is having a sudden boom.

Three electric utilities—Texas Power and Light, Dallas Power and Light and Texas Electrical Service, Inc.—announced two months ago that they would begin a 35-year strip mine operation on 17,500 acres of lignite beds in Freestone County, near Fairfield, to fuel the new Big Brown steam-electric station east of Waco. Other lignite-fired plants are scheduled for Rusk and Titus Counties.

Western Coal is low in sulphur—a boon to electric utilities caught between soaring power demand and new air pollution regulations that forbid the burning of sulphur-contaminated fuel. Accordingly, also for the first time last year, some low-sulphur western coal was hauled by rail as far east as Chicago.

But according to Government coal men, an immense strip mine explosion west of the Mississippi River that, by comparison, will make this excavation for electric power stations look like a mere desert gulch, is coming in the nineteen eighties for a giant new coal consuming industry, gasification.

Official forecasts here say that 20 years from now perhaps 300 million tons of coal a year—half of last year's total United States production—will be processed at huge, refinery-like plants, surrounded by massive strip mines in the Western coal fields. The product will be quadrillions of cubic feet of pipeline quality, pollution-free gas. The Government and the mining and gas industries are now committed to this basic change.

#### VAST COAL BEDS IN WEST

Coal gasification will replace the country's dwindling supply of natural gas from wells, now estimated to be only about a 15-year reserve. Consumed in power plant and industrial boilers in the east, the gas will reduce air pollution. And pumped through pipelines that might otherwise be empty, it will save the pipeline industry from collapse.

Millions, perhaps billions, of dollars are thus finally ripening in coal beds under Western sagebrush, where the mineral has lain for geologic time, 130 million years.

The speculative market in Western strip mine leases to dig it, and in permits to explore for more, has suddenly become a bonanza.

In the 12 months that ended in July, 1970, the increase in prospecting permits issued by the Interior Department's Bureau of Land

Management for coal exploration on Federal land—national forests, grassland, desert and range—shot up by 50 per cent to the greatest number in history, covering 733,576 acres. That is the area of all of New York City and Long Island, with Westchester and Rockland counties thrown in.

Prospecting permits on Indian reservations, issued separately by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, went from none to exploration rights covering 500,000 more acres. Such permits are convertible to firm mineral leases if coal is found.

#### COAL-FIRED TURBINES

Nearly one million acres of public and Indian coal land in the West is already leased. Leases by private owners, chiefly by the transcontinental, land-grant railroads, are unknown but may cover an equal area.

The forces behind the sudden migration of coal mining to the West are complex, and the reasons for them are probably as irresistible as money.

First, despite the wide acceptance during the nineteen-sixties of visionary forecasts for nuclear electric power, half the nation's electricity is still generated by coal-fired steam turbines.

Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, the retiring chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, recently conceded that the poor record of the A.E.C.'s vaunted nuclear-electric program means that coal will fuel an even greater portion of the enlarged generating capacity required for the next three decades.

Other important factors are mining costs and mining volume.

Strip mine production of coal in the country as a whole has advanced very rapidly in the last few years, from about one-third of the annual tonnage in 1968 to 40 or 42 per cent last year. According to the United States Bureau of Mines, the cost advantage over deep mined coal is on the order of three to one.

Productivity per worker runs as high as five to one in favor of strip mining, and is going higher under the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969, which requires deep mines to take expensive steps to curb the high rate of death and injury underground.

Moreover, particularly for gasification, huge guaranteed volumes of cheap, strip-mined coal are essential.

#### 77 PER CENT OF RESERVE

The Bureau of Mines has just cautiously disclosed in an unpublished compendium that beneath 13 states west of the Mississippi River there lies 77 per cent of the country's total of economically strippable coal reserves of 45 billion tons. The Western coal is in seams 12 times thicker, on the average than in the East, and 25.5 billion tons of it is low-sulphur coal.

Wyoming and Montana, together, contain 21 billion tons of the entire Western reserve of low-sulphur coal. Wyoming's low-sulphur reserve, alone, is eight times West Virginia's and Kentucky's put together.

The Government has apparently pre-empted most of one of Colorado's major strip mine fields by building the Air Force Academy on top of it at Colorado Springs. But Colorado still contains nearly half a billion tons of the highest grade of low-sulphur strip mine coal.

And still undisturbed beneath the wheat and grasslands of western North Dakota wait 50 billion tons of lignite—the leanest rank of coal, but equivalent in total energy to all the better grades of coal left to be mined in the four largest producing states, West Virginia, Kentucky, Pennsylvania and Illinois.

The Bureau of Mines has recently disclosed that Pennsylvania and Illinois have no low-sulphur stripping coal left at all. The reserve in West Virginia is only about 1.2 billion

tons, one twenty-fifth of the national reserve.

For a hundred years the traditional coal field regions of the United States have been there—in the Appalachian east and south and across southern Indiana and Illinois, tapering off into Missouri, Kansas and eastern Oklahoma.

Billions of tons of coal and billions of dollars of investment in immovable tools and tunnels remain in these traditional coal areas, and depletion of total coal reserves is not the most important factor in the move to the West.

But although the Eastern and Midwestern fields now supply 94 per cent of the 600 million ton-a-year coal production, they contain only 17 per cent of the remaining reserve of strippable low-sulphur coal.

ENERGY SYSTEM SHIFTING

It is this arcane statistic, the 83 per cent of shallow, strippable, low-sulphur coal beneath the Western states, that is starting what the United States Geological Survey calls "a massive change" in the whole national fuel and energy system.

Until the air pollution crisis of the nineteen sixties and seventies the West's low-sulphur coal was as worthless as a coyote. Coal is the cheapest of fossil fuels and, accordingly, freight is a large part in its cost to consumers. Longhaul reserves were not cost-competitive.

But now that many urban pollution abatement laws forbid the burning of coal or oil containing more than 1 per cent sulphur by weight—and the Federal Environmental Protection Agency has said the limit may have to be pushed to 0.7 per cent—the ancient economic year industry, are caving in.

Already, in a break with transportation tradition, the historic flow of coal from Appalachian mines to Lake Erie port to docks at Superior, Wis., or Duluth, Minn., has begun to turn around.

Burlington Northern, Inc., the merged railway system—and also one of the largest private owners of Western coal reserves through 19th century Federal land grants—has been loading low sulphur coal from the Peabody Coal Company's Big sky strip mine at Colstrip in eastern Montana. The coal goes by train to the docks at Superior and is shipped by lake steamer to Taconit Harbor, Mich., a movement that would have been economically unthinkable a few years ago.

Strip-mined Montana coal is under contract to fuel steam-electric plants as far east as Cohasset, Minn., and Hammond, Ind., east of Chicago. To reduce the sulphur dioxide emissions from its stacks, Commonwealth Edison of Chicago has contracted for 22 million tons of Montana coal and is testing New Mexico coal that comes 1,500 miles by rail.

SIGNIFICANT BEGINNINGS

More remarkable still, the Tennessee Valley Authority—the giant Government-owned power agency in the heart of the Appalachian coal fields—has bought 1.4 million tons in Eastern Oklahoma. The coal will be towed 485 miles east in barges along the newly opened Arkansas river Waterway and then north on the Mississippi to Memphis.

These revolutionary changes in what is probably the nation's most conservative industry, designed to tide over the immediate crisis of electric power versus air pollution, are regarded here as significant beginnings—but only beginnings.

It is the prospect of prodigious volumes of strip-mined coal to supply gasification plants that lies behind the frantic scramble by coal, petroleum and pipeline interests—and by land brokers and speculators who expect to profit at their expense—to assemble leases and rights to large tracts of Western coal for future stripping.

The scope of this Western stripping for gasification—large both on a plant-by-plant basis and also in the area to be affected by big new surface mines—is suggested by what the American Gas Association calls its "very confidential" study of potential gasification sites.

ALL BUT 20 IN WEST

Apparently for fear of stimulating price gouging in mineral leases and arousing conservationist opposition, the association will not discuss the study beyond acknowledging its existence. Association officials will not even say which states have been identified as gasification sites, much less which counties.

But it is known that the association report pinpoints 176 prospective plant locations—each to require a \$200-million to \$300-million investment in strip mine and coal processing facilities—and industry officials say variously that "a large majority" or "nearly all" of them lie west of the Mississippi.

A Government geologist who has seen the association study says that 156 of the 176 sites—all but 20—are in "the Rocky Mountain West." Enough of them are to be developed by 1985, the study suggests, so that gasification by then will materialize as a \$1-billion-a-year industry on the West's open spaces.

According to Interior Department reports, coal for future gasification is spurring recent transactions like these:

In response to a United States Bureau of Land Management invitation to bid on 6,560 acres of Federally owned coal land in Campbell County near Gillette, Wyo.—the bureau delicately described the 10-square-mile area as "susceptible to stripping"—the Cordero Mining Company won the coal leases with a record high price of \$505 an acre. In recent years, some Federal coal leases have gone for under \$1 an acre. Cordero is a subsidiary of the Sun Oil Company.

On the same day last December, the Mobil Oil Company bid \$441 an acre for leases on 4,000 acres of bureau land adjoining the Cordero site. The United States Geological Survey had estimated its worth at \$35 an acre.

Bureau lease prices have advanced so rapidly that a short time earlier a successful bid of \$257.50 an acre by a land-buying affiliate of the Ashland Oil Company—\$1.9-million for coal rights to 7,600 acres, or 13 square miles, of Carbon County near Hanna, Wyo.—was being called a "precedent-shattering high price." The \$257.50 precedent lasted two weeks, when Cordero doubled it.

But particularly on Indian reservations, there have also been what one official of the Bureau of Indian Affairs here calls "some damn lucky breaks" for Eastern coal companies bidding for leases of tribal coal reserves.

Last September, Westmoreland Resources, Inc., a year-old Western strip mining partnership of the Philadelphia-based Westmoreland Coal Company, Penn Virginia, Inc., the Kewanee Oil Company, the Morrison-Knudsen Company, and the Kemmerer Coal Company of Wyoming, had to bid an average of only \$7.87 an acre for 32,300 acres of coal rights held by the Crow Indian reservation in the Sarpy Creek area of Treasure and Big Horn Counties, Mont.

Within months, the syndicate had sold options to buy 300 million of its 900 million tons of Montana coal reserves to the Colorado Interstate Gas Company, the pipeline division of the Colorado Interstate Corporation. The company is a major pipeline company and may be one of the first to erect a coal gasification plant, presumably near Hardin, Mont.

OTHER VAST RESERVES

Other vast coal reserves in the West are owned by the railroads. Government land grants to the railroads, which were originally

meant to encourage and finance the construction of track to the West but which have remained dormant and unsalable for 100 years, are suddenly valuable.

But by far the greatest acreage of coal leaseholds is being acquired on speculation for later sale to the coal gasification industry.

An unpublished "working paper" prepared at the Interior Department shows that the 10 largest holders of Federal coal leases control 49 per cent of the 773,000 acres of public domain turned over to mining interests or land speculators as of July 1, 1970, and that very little of their acreage is being mined. Some of the inactive leases have been held at little cost since the nineteen-twenties but most are about five years old.

The 10 largest lease holders, in order of the acreage of their coal rights, are listed as the Peabody Coal Company; the Atlantic Richfield Company; the Garland Coal and Mining Company; the Pacific Power & Light Company; the Consolidation Coal Company; the Resources Company; the Kemmerer Coal Company; the Utah Construction and Mining Company; Richard D. Bass, a Dallas geologist and land investor, and the Kerr-McGee Corporation.

Meanwhile, the coal industry is working hard to picture the environmental prospect for the West as benign, if not uplifting.

One coal industry suggestion, put forward earlier this year at a session of the Rocky Mountain Mineral Law Institute, was that tourists might have some interest in visiting the scarred and barren "badlands" created by strip mining.

SULFUR CONTENT OF STRIPPABLE COAL RESERVES

(Millions of tons by sulfur content)

	Grade <sup>1</sup>	Low	Medium	High	Total
Wyoming.....	B	13,377	65	529	13,971
Montana.....	B, C	6,133	764	0	6,897
New Mexico.....	B	2,474	0	0	2,474
North Dakota.....	C	1,678	397	0	2,075
West Virginia.....	A	1,138	669	311	2,118
Texas.....	C	625	684	0	1,309
Kentucky (east).....	A	532	189	60	781
Colorado.....	A	476	24	0	500
Arizona.....	B	387	0	0	387
South Dakota.....	C	160	0	0	160
Virginia.....	A	154	99	6	259
Washington.....	B	135	0	0	135
Alabama.....	A	33	74	27	134
Arkansas.....	A, C	28	118	28	174
California.....	B	25	0	0	25
Oklahoma.....	A	10	44	57	111
Utah.....	A	6	136	8	150
Tennessee.....	A	5	43	26	74
Michigan.....	A	0	0	1	1
Maryland.....	A	0	8	13	21
Ohio.....	A	0	126	907	1,033
Iowa.....	A	0	0	180	180
Kansas.....	A	0	0	375	375
Pennsylvania.....	A	0	225	527	752
Kentucky (west).....	A	0	0	977	977
Indiana.....	A	0	293	803	1,096
Missouri.....	A	0	0	1,160	1,160
Illinois.....	A	0	80	3,167	3,247
Total.....		31,787	4,036	9,161	44,984

<sup>1</sup> A—Bituminous, B—Subbituminous, C—Lignite.

Note: The westward movement of strip mining has resulted from low-sulfur reserves west of the Mississippi that promise less pollution in fuels to meet the energy crisis.

PRO AND CON IN A BITTER DEBATE

WASHINGTON.—Behind the argument over strip mining there lies a maze of complex public issues and private interests that the combatants on both sides agree touch on the most serious environmental questions in the country today.

On one side is the nation's seemingly infinite demand for electrical energy and, at the same time, for clean air. On the other is its equally urgent desire to preserve the national environment.

Coal, the cheapest of fossil fuels, now pro-

vides the energy for more than half the country's electric power production. Although it has been a major source of particulate and sulphur-dioxide pollution, the Atomic Energy Commission is now saying that coal will continue to dominate the utility market for three more decades.

Thus, as power demands increase, so will coal mining. The cheapest coal—and the safest coal to mine in human terms—is strip mined coal.

Much of the vast Western coal reserves can be mined in no other way. It is too shallow for underground tunneling, or in seams that are too thick or structurally unsound.

One of the chief attractions of the Western coal is that it is low enough in mineral and chemical contaminants to meet the strictest air pollution standards when it is burned.

It is also the only coal abundant enough, in concentrated beds, to supply the new coal gasification industry, another source, when it is fully developed, of nonpolluting fuel.

The assault on strip mining has brought a fierce response from the coal and electric utility industries, and even from some Government officials.

"Unwilling or unable to face up to the facts of life" is the characterization given the conservations by Aubrey J. Wagner, the board chairman of the giant, Government-owned Tennessee Valley Authority, the nation's largest single power producer and the largest consumer of strip-mined coal.

In testimony before the Tennessee Legislature last April, Mr. Wagner said that environmentalist critics who seek to abolish strip mining outright or to impose prohibitive reclamation standards "fail to recognize that coal is essential if the electric power needs of the nation are to be met."

#### CONSERVATIONISTS' REBUTTAL

"Nor do they understand that coal cannot be obtained in the near term without resort to strip mining," he continued, "and, further, that resort to deep-mined coal instead, even in the long term, creates problems of environmental deterioration and human safety. They would outlaw strip mining even in the face of the fact that such action would create a power shortage in which industrial activity would be severely curtailed, unemployment would increase, commerce would stagnate, and home life would be disrupted."

"Their solution would, in my judgment create problems of more disastrous consequences than the problem they seek to cure.

Conservationists call the "trade off" idea—that a measure of strip-mine damage must be accepted to guarantee the nation's power supply—a rationalization in advance for a permanent defacement of the land.

They cite the frequent admonitions of Government officials—Under Secretary of the Interior William T. Pecora, for example—that the environmental-vs.-progress trade-off must be the product of "an informed citizenry which must participate in making these decisions in a rational and timely fashion."

They note that without general public announcement, 2,390 square miles of the Interior Department's Western public lands have already been put under strip-mine leases and permits for coal mining and that for an area half the size of Connecticut the decisions have been made with little if any public participation.

Moreover, many conservationists seriously question the industry's assertion that it is averting an electric power crisis by strip mining more and more coal.

"We waste electric power as if it were cheap and easy to get," Ed Chaney, a National Wildlife Federation lawyer, said in an interview. "But if you look at what strip mining has done to West Virginia or South-

ern Illinois and Indiana, you see that it wasn't cheap after all."

"If we ever see, as a people, what strip mining is doing to our country," Mr. Chaney said, "I'm sure we would insist on some other answer, and less use of electricity may be a temporary solution while we find other means of generating power."

"But no one is asking the question: Are we willing to accept one continuous strip mine from the Dakota, Wyoming and Montana to Arizona?" he said. "I don't think we are. But since no one is even looking at that problem, we may have it. And then people will say, 'How did it happen?'"

#### MEXICO'S INDEPENDENCE DAY

### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today the friendly people of the great neighboring republic to the south are celebrating their independence day. The freedom of the United States of Mexico dates from the time when the cry of Dolores inspired the revolt that culminated in independence.

When Napoleon Bonaparte replaced King Ferdinand VII of Spain with his own brother Joseph, a group in what was then called New Spain maintained that the deposition of Ferdinand caused sovereignty in Mexico to revert to its people. Not long afterward, at 6 o'clock on the morning of September 16, 1810, Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla, a priest in the town of Dolores—now Dolores Hidalgo—shouted from his pulpit: "Long Live Our Lady of Guadalupe! Long live Independence! Death to the Spaniards!"

With an army of 100,000 creoles, Indians, and mestizos, Hidalgo captured Guanajuato, Guadalajara, and Valladolid and reached the vicinity of the capital. His army was then forced to retreat.

On January 17, 1811, Spanish forces led by Felix Calleja defeated the revolutionaries at the bridge of Calderon, near Guadalajara. Hidalgo, who fled with part of his forces, was eventually captured, being put to death by the Spaniards on July 31.

Leadership of the revolt was then assumed by one of his lieutenants, Jose Maria Morelos y Pavon, also a priest. His forces took Oaxaca on November 25, 1812, and Acapulco on April 12, 1813. Morelos, who had become head of the rebel government in 1813, was captured by Spanish troops in November 1815, and executed on December 22.

The cause of freedom for Mexico and its people could not be denied forever and eventually became a reality in 1821. Today, a century and a half later, Mexico is a great, industrious, and prosperous nation of 48 million people.

Mr. Speaker, on this auspicious occasion, the anniversary of their independence, the people of the United States of America salute the people of Mexico and express the wish that they may enjoy many more years of freedom, friendship, and peace.

#### THE 106TH PRECINCT LAUNCHES HUMAN RELATIONS PROGRAM

### HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, too often police officers are demeaned and derided in the process of doing their jobs. I believe New York City has the finest police force in the country.

In my area, Queens, New York, the 106th precinct, is proud to have two very concerned and determined officers who have launched a series of community relations programs which merit national attention. Sgt. Edward Doyle and patrolman George D. Olivet have formed a team to bring to the community information about the function of the police, the rights of citizens, available counseling services for addicts, alcoholics, and their families, youth group organizations and the role of the citizen in curbing crime.

The appearances of these two young policemen at colleges and community forums throughout New York City have had a constructive impact on the improvement of community understanding of the police and the mutual problems which confront police and citizens alike.

In addition to community relations programs, Sergeant Doyle and Patrolman Olivet of the 106th precinct have contributed their skills and enthusiasm to a most interesting and novel human relations program for police officers. The "Invitation To Understanding" workshops are designed to improve understanding of the views and cultures of policemen of differing ethnic backgrounds.

This program was the subject of a recent article in the Police Chief, the magazine published by the International Association of Chiefs of Police, Inc. I believe this unique program offers hope to a better understanding of the society in which our police must participate and many other communities throughout the Nation may benefit from the experiences of the 106th precinct. For those reasons, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the article entitled, "An Invitation To Understanding" in the RECORD at this point:

#### AN INVITATION TO UNDERSTANDING

(By William McGarry, Edward Doyle and George D. Olivet)

Many indications of polarization existed within police departments throughout the nation in June, 1970. These reports indicated that both black and white officers had refused to cooperate with each other in the enforcement of law. In Jackson, Mississippi, white police officers were accused of firing on black civilians implicitly because they were black. In other areas, black officers were accused of not supporting their white brother officers. There were widespread reports that black and white police were not acting as police officers but primarily as members of their ethnic group. Throughout the nation, police departments were experiencing the divisiveness just at the time when the increase in crime demanded otherwise.

To neutralize these countercohesive tendencies, a fresh experimental approach was needed. Under the title of a "human relations workshop," an empirical program was instituted in the 106th Precinct to explore the need and apply such remedies as might be required.

#### SELECTING PARTICIPANTS

Manpower requirements for policing the precinct necessitated close programming. To obtain a racial and ethnic balance, 12 officers were selected from 26 volunteers to whom the purpose of the workshop had been explained.

Six of the selected officers were black and six were white. Insofar as possible, they represented a cross-section of age, length of service, squad assignment, social background, previous employment, education, religion, and political commitments—from militant to conservative.

It was considered most feasible to schedule eight two-hour, open-ended sessions (which were the first and last hours of the second and third platoon), and for continuity, two sessions per week were planned. More sessions would have been beneficial but summer demands for manpower precluded this.

The authors comprised a three-man team to structure the human relations-sensitivity training program. Approval of the program was secured from superior officers and the first session of "Invitation to Understanding" was held June 11, 1970 in the Unit Training Room of the 106th Precinct station house.

The brief synopsis of the eight sessions given below may be helpful to other departments planning similar programs.

#### THE FIRST SESSION

The 12 members of the workshop, in civilian clothes, were seated in a circle. Captain McGarry explained that it was their job to find out if there was an attitude of prejudice as great as some said and whether there was divisiveness between black and white policemen that was impossible to overcome. If this was the case, he asked, what could each one do to improve his attitude and be more sensitive to those around him as well as to members of the community. He explained the structure of the workshop and stressed meaningful participation as of great importance to the group. He emphasized that no one need fear embarrassment or repercussions from anything that they might say and that what was being striven for collectively was greater than the individual. He then turned the workshop over to the moderators, Sergeant Doyle and Officer Olivet, and participants so that his presence, as a commanding officer, would not inhibit full participation.

The moderators defined and stated the group rules for workshop participation: we must listen, we must be utterly frank, we will only get out of the time what we are willing to put into it, we should not scream at anyone, we should not attack any member of the group personally but rather learn to disagree, to discuss, and to listen even if we do not agree. The ground rules for this type of workshop are many and time was taken to make certain that all understood and could agree to them at the outset. At this time the participants were told that if they were not present for a session there was no other person to take their place, hence the importance of starting, continuing and finishing together as a group.

The moderators asked the group to pair off for each man to prepare a biographical sketch of his partner. It was explained that it was important to know more about the individual than he would be willing to divulge and therefore it would take good interrogation to determine a man's feelings about politics, education, emotional outlook, family background, philosophy, etc. Both partners were to have ten minutes in which to prepare a re-

port on the other. When this had been done they were asked to introduce their partners and tell everything that they had learned about him. One after the other did so until all had reported. This revealed the obvious—there was a great difference in the group's structure. There were Catholics, Jews and Protestants, Democrats, Republicans, Liberals and Conservatives, with overtones of racial feelings on both sides of the political spectrum. This reporting broke down some of the barriers.

The second phase dealt with one-way versus two-way communication. The point of this exercise is to show that for successful communication there must be two-way communication where questions and answers are involved, where one can define what one means and others can ask what they want to know. One-way communication is not constructive. The procedure called for one participant to seek to describe, without the benefit of questions from the other participants, the interpositions of four geometric figures which they then attempted to duplicate. This is one-way communication and usually ends in misunderstanding and failure. Then another participant attempted the same thing but this time questions and answers were permitted. This resulted in better understanding and more accurate duplication of the geometric figures. This was a very apt illustration because the men could readily see its simplicity and obvious truth.

The last part of this session was given over to explaining and demonstrating that an optical illusion can distort truth. A subtle drawing shows the profile of two women, one old and the other young. A viewer at first look sees either one or the other but not both. When told that what he sees is not what someone else sees there is consternation. Everyone is certain that what he sees is the truth. Usually a class will split almost evenly on which profile it sees. After discussion, the participants were asked to show the opposing side of what they saw by outlining the face of the woman. The obvious result is that all men then see both faces. Discussion followed and the point was made that everyone believes what he sees is the absolute truth, and while in this drawing there are two truths that may be perceived, we see only one. The men themselves made other points which were pertinent to the session, breaking down preconceived ideas and feelings about the workshop and its aims. When the session ended the men were asked to write, at home, a short sentence on what they would do to reduce prejudice in the police department.

#### SECOND SESSION

Each man turned in his statement on ways to correct the problems of prejudice. Some of these comments were:

"If the department as a whole has the attitude of what it can give to the public instead of what can the public give to them, the larger portion of prejudice in the department would gradually be dissolved."

"We should institute a program to educate the new recruit in the past history of New York City and its citizens, problems they faced, conditions under which they had to live and the prejudices they had to overcome. With this knowledge, he will have a better understanding of the problems faced by today's minority groups."

"Policemen, on the whole, are practical and resourceful people, called upon to perform a fantastically diversified number of tasks. Policemen must be shown that by eliminating prejudice, their working conditions will be improved for there will be less tension in the streets from groups who feel that they are victims of prejudice."

"Segregation, discrimination and de facto segregation are the prime roots of the problem, and as long as they exist, we are plagued. The only thing that the police can do is to set the guidelines for men to follow . . ."

"The word prejudice is overused and many times misunderstood. I am assuming we mean bigotry between different people. I'm prejudiced but I do not consider myself a bigot."

"It must become common knowledge, inside and outside the department, that prejudice or double standards will not be tolerated."

"The problems involved in remedying or eliminating prejudice within the department is one mainly concerned with leadership. Administrators and supervisors must become more deeply involved in carrying out their tasks."

After reading these statements, the men were given cards on which were printed the words, "I AM," and asked to complete each I AM statement with the first thoughts that came into their minds. The cards were then read back to the men without revealing their names. The majority of the men had completed the I AM statement with a reference to their group attachment: I am an American, I am Catholic, I am Black, etc. These statements show that each man sees legitimate group connections in his own life as important to him. The point then discussed was that each man sees his own group connections as part of his existence and is happy to greater or lesser degrees because of these connections. The moderators pointed out that the first line of prejudice extended to anyone is usually concerned with one's group connections and yet we all identify with groups. We see others as unlikeable because they are connected to groups such as white, black, Jewish, Catholic, Protestant, etc. We desire to be accepted with our group attachments, yet fail to extend this privilege to others. This prejudice can be eliminated to a great degree by practicing acceptance of individuals regardless of group connections. We must see people as individuals instead of group representatives.

The moderators asked the participants to tell everyone about the first time they had felt prejudice applied to them. This is an excellent technique. All the participants by their rapt attention evidenced their emotional involvement with the other men as each told of their experiences in their youth, military, school, and police department experiences when they were hurt by prejudice and became angry and disillusioned. There was such interaction from this subject and such a good, honest display of emotion that the entire time was devoted to this subject. A further breakdown of barriers became very obvious.

#### THIRD SESSION

At this session, some of the group members asked to discuss topics they wished to submit. A film, entitled "The Eye of the Beholder," was shown. The ensuing discussion brought out that emotional baggage weighs one down and prevents one from viewing things objectively. The members then shared their hang-ups on how projected attitudes into various situations can add to erroneous conclusions and deteriorations of good human relations. This is a rut that is easily fallen into unless one becomes part of the solution and not part of the problem.

The moderators took one man aside and told him a story about a woman who was going into the hospital for an operation and her husband was having a problem parking the car near the hospital. This officer was then asked to tell the story to the man next to him and so on until it had been passed on to the last man. This simple story traveling between just twelve men was ridiculous by the time it was ended. Distortion was almost complete. The discussion then centered upon the need for professionalization of attitudes and aims of policemen. It was indicated that part of this goal can be accomplished by disregarding rumors and dealing with realism where possible.

The subject of a person's sensitivity to being called names was introduced. The point was made that the recipient of name-calling feels both insulted and injured. One moderator stated he had seldom had his name pronounced properly and this was a source of aggravation to him. The other moderator expressed his sensitivity in similar areas and this stimulated others to do the same. It was agreed that all men feel they should be called, addressed, and spoken to properly, thus not detracting from their humanity. This is a two-way street in communication and often a proper attitude can dispel a disagreement by the tone of speech. To have a friend, we must be one. To gain respect, we must give respect. We must yield to another the very right that we so very much demand for ourselves. Mutual respect expressed by simply saying "good morning" is appreciated by most men, yet this is often overlooked. All decided we must work on this problem and not shirk it as being someone else's job. A comical reaction resulted during which everyone began to address each other with Sir, Mr., etc. The point had been made, however, and it became apparent from the men's reactions that this was an open nerve—all felt a need for being respected. It is not possible to review the many points discussed within the framework of the workshop; but in retrospect the manner in which the participants expressed themselves openly, sharing their thoughts on what was important to them, will have lasting impact.

#### FOURTH SESSION

Each participant was given a list of subjects and asked to number them from one to 20 in the order of their relative importance. The list included: career success, character, economic security, family, freedom, friendship, good disposition, health, honor, humor, knowledge, love, peace of mind, power, recognition, religious faith, respect, social acceptance, tranquil environment, and wealth. The results were reported to the group. It was apparent that race or other group connections had little to do with the order of rank given to the subjects. Color lines were crossed and recrossed as the individuality of each man was indicated by his choices. Discussion followed on why some men felt some topics should rank the way they had chosen them. Such comments as "Without health there is nothing" and "Peace of mind means everything" showed that the values of most policemen in the workshop were almost identical, with the first three choices centering upon family, health and peace of mind.

The moderators then prepared to hold an election. One "candidate" asked to be elected on a platform which denied there was prejudice in the department—and if it did exist it was not our job to do anything about it. The other platform was one which held there was indeed a problem of prejudice in the department and something should be done to eliminate it where possible—and it was everyone's job to work toward that goal. If elected, he said, he would put into effect a program of human relations whereby all members of the department could discuss and share their feelings and beliefs with others. In the ensuing voting, the workshopers cast all twelve ballots for the positive, do-something candidate.

Several participants spoke on the history of minorities. The discussion ranged from the problems the Irish minority had in achieving recognition in this country to the problems of other minority groups facing similar situations. It was mentioned that often a minority will take an active role in a do-something program rather than remain involved in a do-nothing situation. There was good interaction in this discussion in which a wide difference of opinions was apparent on some points and very close agreements on others. In this no-holds-barred rap ses-

sion, most white participants realized that all people desire change (even as their own forebears had) and that change is most desirable now. An excellent exchange of meaningful statements centered upon the need for an end to social injustice to help the affected minorities attain status in society.

#### FIFTH SESSION

The moderators asked the participants to form a circle after reflecting for a moment upon previous discussions in which they had shared experiences of prejudice or bigotry aimed at them. Then they were asked to think of those unwritten laws that are never enforced which state we must be fair to all and not injure another unnecessarily; that we must treat all men as we ourselves desire to be treated.

This led to the next step in the program. The men were asked to try to recall someone who had caused them to be embarrassed or insulted preliminary to conducting a sham trial in which one man would be the prosecutor and another the defendant. The prosecutor was to accuse someone in the room of being guilty of a crime. He was to specify the accusation and present his case to the jury (the ten other participants). The man who was chosen to be the defendant had to accept the invitation, sit and listen to the charges, and to the best of his ability defend himself with reasons and excuses for his actions. The moderators served as judges. This particular technique makes the prosecutor, even though he may share the feelings of the accused, defend the position that is forced upon him. The accused must think of all the reasons for a man to do what he was charged with doing and to present a defense sufficient to demand a not guilty verdict. This thought process requires both the prosecutor and the defendant to defend a position regardless of his own personal feelings. The jury, of course, is intent upon the why's and wherefore's of the charges and just as intent upon the many excuses presented by the defendant.

Policemen are inventive under pressure. The success of this particular part of the workshop must be credited to these officers. Forgetting themselves, they became wrapped up in the situation before them. Some of the accused held particularly untenable positions; others fared better. The jury's verdict was to be delivered at the next session. The participants left, strangely silent.

This sham trial procedure, as well as the other techniques, was developed by one of the moderators to produce increased emotionally charged involvement. The results as measured by response of the workshopers were most gratifying.

#### SIXTH SESSION

The participants took their positions for the continuation of the sham trial without being asked to do so. The men were then given a prepared list of questions to answer. The questions pertained to human relations and associated attitudes.<sup>1</sup>

Each participant was asked to submit a short statement on "What I would do if I was a (black) (white) policeman." Each was to put himself into the place of an opposite member, i.e., a black officer would tell what he would do if he was white and vice versa, for the purpose of correcting attitudes observed in others that are injurious to human relations. There was some expression of disagreement with this. Many apparently thought there was a difference in what either black or white officers should do as policemen. It was further defined that we often feel the other guy is capable of doing more than we can to improve human relations.

<sup>1</sup> A photocopy of the questionnaire which is too long to accompany this article, may be secured by interested police administrators from *The Police Chief*.

This technique, we believed, could do much to define what we think the other fellow could really accomplish by his actions. Still there was an undercurrent of feeling that there should be no difference in what either blacks or whites should do as policemen.

This consensus may be the most significant of the entire eight sessions.

#### SEVENTH SESSION

The short statements on "What I would do if I was a (black) (white) policeman" were returned. There was a constructive attitude evident in most of these statements. Others were objectively critical and made no reference to black or white but rather what they would do under either situation.

The results of the questionnaire were also presented. The replies again indicated that black and white voted the same negatively and positively (as a general rule) on 95 percent of the questions. In the following discussion the participants tried to define what some of the questions really meant to them as policemen. There was an exchange of comments and further questions presented. Before the end of this session the workshopers developed critiques as basis for a paper to be approved for submission to the Police Commissioner. This 10-point Position Paper appears on page 26.

The discussion took up the subject of the uniqueness of every man and woman. A poll was taken on how many blacks and whites tend to group all people of the opposite color into one group, believing that they act, feel, talk, vote, speak, think, and dress alike. The poll indicated that the same perceptions exist in both groups.

The participants asked if Captain McGarry could attend the last session on an informal basis to answer questions they felt were important to them. Some said it was not fair to ask the Captain to come and sit under the gun, as it were, but they would like to report to him their feelings about the workshop.

For the remainder of this session, the discussion was open for any subject. Immediately twelve subjects were suggested. The men had reached the position of desiring to talk things out—to tell it like it is.

#### EIGHTH SESSION

The participants were asked to fill out a printed critique of the workshop with the same complete frankness that they had shown in the discussions. There remained one sham trial to complete, following which two additional topics were introduced for a good exchange of comments.

Captain McGarry addressed the final moments of the concluding session. He indicated he had been advised of the session-by-session progress and had gauged by individual conversation the reaction of most of the participants. He expressed gratification with results and promised to pursue the program in the interests of a more harmonious and efficient department. Individually, the workshop participants thanked the Captain for making the program possible, and their enthusiasm which had developed in the initial sessions was obvious.

The Position Paper was approved by all members. And there was a unanimous vote in favor of a follow-up workshop at a later date.

The reduction of divisive influences among the workshopers became increasingly noticeable not only through observation and individual conversation, but from their own review of the data reflected in the questionnaires. It was best indicated, perhaps, during the final session when the subject of a proposed dinner for the group was raised. One workshoper said, "A month ago I would have said that possible embarrassment would have made a group dinner not worth the trouble, but now I say, let it start here." And everyone agreed.

TEN POINT POSITION PAPER: PREPARED BY PARTICIPANTS IN "INVITATION TO UNDERSTANDING"

1. Administrators in the police department play a prime role in being an example to policemen of ways to deal with men in an unprejudiced manner. The rank and file look to superiors for discussion, correction, or advice; and if not present, often causes a reaction of indifference to professional attitudes on the part of the members involved.

Point: Superiors are looked to for fair play and unprejudiced attitudes and actions in their decisions, and if not found, generate the same indifference they possess.

2. No prejudice should be shown against any member of the force trying to obtain an assignment in his own rank, i.e. clerical, harbor, aviation, emergency. The choice of men for these jobs should be made on associated skills and ability of the man chosen. This policy though in effect at this time should be examined continuously lest it become slack and therefore ineffective.

Point: Assignments within a rank must be absolutely without prejudice if the rank and file are to be satisfied with the decision.

3. At the scenes of riot and disorders where the black community is involved, assignments should not be made of black officers only, but rather on a black/white basis to show unity among the men, and to remove an unnecessary burden from the shoulder of the black officers. Heretofore some assignments at these riots have been of black officers with the thought that it would help to cool the situation if black confronted black. This is erroneous and it is far better to share the problem, black and white officers together. These assignments, if to be acceptable to all, must be made on a black/white basis regardless of whether the community is black or white.

Point: Black and white policemen should stand together in these situations and no assignments of black officers to the black problems or white officers to a white problem. All policemen are capable, and it must be made more obvious to the community, and to the rank and file.

4. The department should make it more obvious to all its members that assignment of black officers to narcotics, detective division, special services, etc., is made on the basis that these men work well in that capacity and that it is not just a soft position.

Point: It is thought by some that preferential treatment is accorded to black officers in certain assignments and the fact is that they are doing a good job; that is why they are assigned to that position.

5. A regular memo should be issued by the Police Commissioner and read at all roll calls to the effect that all members of the department need the cooperation of each other regardless of race or religion.

Point: The rank and file need reminding, as do all men, that we need each other to get a job done. This will also make it obvious that there is an interest in the problem from the top.

6. The Police Commissioner should respond to the charges recently made by one of the fraternal organizations within the department by stating that he would undertake to have police machinery investigate the charge and if found to be true, measures taken to correct this condition. This statement should be made publicly.

Point: After this charge was made there was no answer, but rather total silence, which inflamed the situation even further. A desire for good human relations in any police department is to be desired and an answer showing interest is expedient.

7. Guidelines should be issued for all policemen who respond to the scenes of riots and disorders. These guidelines, to be effective, must be instructive and inclusive, and should set department policy for the aims and attitudes suggested for this current age.

Point: Policemen look to the top for certain orders and when they are not issued there is dismay and inaction. At these scenes of disorders it is necessary that a solid attitude be maintained, and that the men be able to expect and know what that attitude is.

8. The Police Commissioner at certain times should call a panel of policemen together to discuss with him in an informal manner the problems that are present in the rank and file, the condition of human relations, ways to unite all policemen together for greater efficiency, and to share with them his problems, etc.

Point: An informal meeting of the commissioner and policemen would show that cooperation is possible and he will seek any way to obtain it from the men who are patrol rank and file.

9. It should be made known to every man in the department that no crystallization of personal attitudes or politics are to affect the service of any member of the department. There is a job to be done, and it is to be done with maximum efficiency and skill.

Point: The department must define to all policemen where personal areas end and where police proficiency begins. The police service to be effective must be without political motivation or personal emotional problems.

10. A human relations workshop program for policemen should be started in each precinct in this city, where policemen can be involved together on a voluntary basis, to search their attitudes and actions for possible correction. This will produce a nucleus of good attitudes and produce understanding within the department, but mostly in the patrol force which is in direct contact with the community. Possible suggestions for consideration of such workshop programs are: (1) members of the force should volunteer to enter the workshop program; (2) members should be guaranteed anonymity in reports and feedback; (3) moderators should be members of the force who are uniquely qualified and trained for the job; (4) this human relations program should be attended on department time; (5) any suggestions forwarded to superiors should be considered and not rejected out of hand; and (6) comfortable facilities should be made available for housing the workshop such as good lighting, comfortable chairs, etc.

#### MINNEAPOLIS HEALTH HEARINGS

### HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, at the recently concluded Minneapolis health hearings Paul J. Vogt, Hennepin County director of health and hospitals, discussed his personal view as to new ways in which health care delivery could be provided to the county.

One of his points is that block grants to communities from the Federal Government could be a means to generate community level health care. As Mr. Vogt pointed out, various communities differ in their needs. For example, the Longfellow area of the county contains a number of senior citizens who are quite concerned about specific health care available to them. In other areas of the city where, for example, the pilot city program is located, the health needs of the citizens are different. Mr. Vogt's com-

plete statement with a number of other important suggestions follows:

In response to Congressman Donald M. Fraser's invitation, the following statement is made as a personal opinion and is in no way to be construed as an official posture of Hennepin County Government.

I view the Federal Government's role as that of a prime force in the reformation and financing of our nation's and our community's health care delivery services, primarily through providing incentives and support for individuals and families to have comprehensive health services. Particularly, the health services should encompass awareness and prevention and restoration and maintenance programs. A commitment of a cooperative community health program—which includes health manpower, facilities, and services—is essential.

This commitment means involvement of business and labor and insurance companies to support health care services which will allow persons to receive early health care and to be participants in maintaining their "wellness". It means the commitment of health providers—doctors, dentists, nurses, hospitals, nursing homes, public health authorities, and others—in adopting comprehensive community health planning, organization, and cooperation to provide their vital services in a way that is effective and efficient for all members of the community.

It also means that non-medical services such as housing, legal aid, welfare, nutrition, and other human resources should not only be accessible and available to people but should also be coordinated with the delivery of health care in order that the needs of individuals and families can be met on a totally coordinated basis rather than by the present episodic, categorical-aid, disease-entity approach. The Federal Government, in its funding and program support, must focus on a total delivery of health care through a local community coordinated and managed approach to provide effective and efficient health care services for community members.

Special emphasis should be placed on certain health services: these include all services to children and to the special preventive health aspects of the adolescent, the middle-aged adult, and the senior citizen. Also, certain disease programs of high incidence and risk should be given special consideration, such as mental health, alcoholism, and drug abuse. Special assistance should be provided for the development of community-wide emergency health services which give quick, efficient, and effective life-saving treatment.

Any Federal programs of support should contain a program of evaluation of the services provided so there is opportunity to further develop and deliver those services which are effective and efficient and to discourage support of those services which are not.

Support for the training and development of health manpower is important in any community health program; and use of clinical training should be recognized and maximized in the new delivery of health programs.

Community-wide comprehensive health planning to assist in the re-formation of all health resources should be further developed and should include the necessary stimulus, controls, and incentives to achieve it. Both the public and private sectors of health care delivery should be encouraged and supported in this re-formation. The elimination of unnecessary duplication of vital resources is paramount.

I believe that block grants to communities from the Federal Government are important so that programs and priorities can be established at the community level to respond to the particular community needs, rather than having specific programs directed by a state or federal agency.

A long-range commitment by the Federal Government to achieve a state of "wellness" for each of its citizens is essential, and all funding and program support mechanisms should be designed to lead to this goal.

Thank you.

"SUPERSWEET"

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, the subject of our remarks is obviously a superlative. The quality of being sweet is one sought after by all the ladies. But both sexes have a disposition to express ourselves in superlatives. Remember the character of comic strip fame known as "Superman"? Each year the dream game of football is called the Superbowl Game. Every American delights to use superlatives in conversation.

On Wednesday, August 11, during the congressional recess, it was my privilege to participate in the formal opening and dedication of the new Supersweet Feed Mill located just west and north of the city of Higginsville in Lafayette County, Mo. It is truly a super mill, superlative in every sense of the word.

The dedication ceremony began at 11 a.m. Before that, participants in the ceremony and invited guests were given a tour of the plant which proved most informative and interesting. We had the pleasant opportunity to see this beautiful new mixing and blending plant in operation. We observed the ingredients of special purpose feeds carefully weighed, then mixed and packaged. The plant is a multiformula plant providing several different formula feeds for cattle, dairy cows, poultry, swine, and horses. These feeds, when delivered to the farm, contain every necessary ingredient including minerals such as iron, fish meal, and the minimum requirements of several vitamins. In some instances as many as four feed grains are ground and mixed together in one package including soy beans, milo, wheat, and corn. We learned every special formula feed was carefully proportioned, thoroughly mixed, and packaged in moisture proof bags ready for distribution to farmers in a wide radius from this new mill.

Mr. Speaker, the principle address of the morning was delivered by the distinguished Lieutenant Governor of the State of Missouri, the Honorable William S. Morris. On the platform with Governor Morris, serving as master of ceremonies, was Mr. Wesley C. Baker, vice president and general manager of the Agriculture Products Division of International Multifoods. Also present and the speaker at the luncheon which followed the dedication was Mr. Darrel M. Runkel, executive vice president of operations of International Multifoods, Minneapolis, Minn.

International Multifoods Corp. is a diversified food company that owns and operates Supersweet Feed Mills. The subsidiary, Supersweet, has 16 feed mills

located throughout the Midwest specializing in feed for cattle, dairy cows, poultry, swine, and horses through a dealer network. The new Higginsville mill will serve a widespread area, including all of Missouri, East Kansas, and northern Arkansas.

The address of Governor Morris was not lengthy but most excellent in its context. He pointed out that Higginsville, the site of the new mill, is his hometown. He described the type of citizens who live there as the kind that are the very backbone of our society.

Our Lieutenant Governor, on the day of his address, was in truth and in fact the Governor of the State because Gov. Warren E. Hearnes was attending the Governor's Conference in California. In his remarks he proceeded to make an optimistic appraisal of the population problem when he pointed out that regardless of the problems confronting agriculture, he had confidence that there would be a constant improvement in production methods that would meet the food needs of a growing world.

Perhaps the finest thought in Governor Morris' remarks was at the point when he said we must all recognize the magnitude of our present day problems which carry the potential of wrecking our society. He hastened to add that all of us must embrace the philosophy of the late Adlai Stevenson who said that all our problems are manmade and, therefore, can be solved by man. Put differently, he said that the solution of today's problems lies with people working together to utilize the power of their Government.

It was my good fortune, at the luncheon which followed, in conversation with Mr. Runkel who is executive vice president of International Multifoods, to hear him say that his corporation had confidence that the problems of America could be solved. He went on to tell me that he was so confident of the economic future of this country that his corporation did not intend to confine itself to agriculture products alone but would diversify into prepackaged foods and engage in the franchising of restaurants and doughnut shops, not only in the United States and Canada but in other parts of the world. This kind of confidence was most inspiring and reassuring.

Mr. Speaker, the address of Governor Morris at the dedication of the Supersweet mill in Higginsville, Mo., contains so many excellent thoughts that I want to share them with my colleagues and, accordingly, I include these remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time:

ADDRESS OF LT. GOV. WILLIAM S. MORRIS

If I may be pardoned for displaying what I believe to be a justifiable amount of pride in my hometown of Higginsville, there are a few congratulatory comments which seem to be in order at this time.

The first day of the Higginsville Jubilee celebration is an appropriate time for me to pay my respects to each citizen of the town. The people of Higginsville are responsible for building and maintaining the kind of community which has made America such a great nation. Over the years, this has been a solid community of good citizens who help form the very backbone of our society.

Yet the goals of progress have not been sacrificed in order to retain traditional val-

ues. Higginsville has shown that the traditional spirit of a solid community is entirely compatible with steady growth and improvement. You can have the best of both.

Today we open the Jubilee celebration in full recognition of the fact that this is still the kind of hometown anyone can admire, and today we observe the open house of a new plant which has brought new jobs and new dollars to strengthen the local economy. It is with these facts in mind that I say my feelings about Higginsville amount to justifiable pride.

Besides the comments about my hometown, I believe congratulations are in order with regard to the immediate topic—the opening of a new plant by the International Multifoods Corporation.

When the Agricultural Products Division decided to build a new feed plant here for the production of Supersweet feeds, we knew this would be a solid addition to the business growth of the community. But perhaps we did not realize at first just how solid an addition it would become.

International Multifoods is a large and rapidly growing organization, with sales last year of \$434 million, representing a 13 per cent increase over the previous year. It is the kind of company which has shown consistent growth with an obviously bright future.

Part of its pleasant outlook is clearly due to diversification. The company has divisions dealing with numerous brand names in the fields of industrial foods, agricultural products, consumer products, pre-packaged foods, and is in the business of operating and franchising restaurants and donut shops. The various operations of this firm in the United States, Canada and overseas are an indication of financial stability and the prospect of continuing growth.

You and I know that American history has been marked by a search for growth. This search is a dominant force in agriculture and industry, in cities large and small, and, indeed, in all phases of life. After a long period of engaging in that search, however, it has only been in recent years that Americans have made a sharp distinction between the quantity and the quality of growth.

Increasingly, we have learned that growth by itself is not enough. We have become more and more concerned about the quality of life we experience within our families, our community, state, nation and world. We have long known that we must have growth in order to keep from becoming a stagnant society. Now we know we must have high quality growth in order to keep from becoming a sick society, physically, mentally and spiritually.

In the instance at hand, there is no cause for concern. The people in Higginsville, as elsewhere, are no longer looking blindfolded at the prospects for industrial growth. They want not just growth, but growth they can live with and be proud of. Success on those terms has been achieved in this new partnership between Higginsville and International Multifoods Corporation.

It is a pleasure for me to participate in the grand opening of this new feed plant because all indications are that it is a good development for everyone concerned.

Tied as closely as it is to the eventual fate of agriculture, this new plant seems marked for growth and prosperity. This is because increased efficiency and productivity in the livestock and poultry industries are directly related to the rising standard of living in our country. We know that regardless of the many problems confronting agriculture, there will be constant improvement in production methods and a steady increase in output designed to meet the needs of a growing world.

Farming is big business in Missouri, with the value of all cattle in the state at the beginning of this year set at \$873 million, and with the total value of crops produced

in the state last year estimated at \$732 million and from my recent trips around the state, barring some calamity, this year will be greater. I have never seen better crops in our state. We ranked ninth in the nation last year in cash receipts from livestock and tenth with regard to all commodities produced.

These statistics represent major assets in our state, built-in strengths in our economy, which combined with the clear needs of the future, reveal that agriculture will grow and grow in Missouri for countless years to come. This is one of our strong points. We should recognize it and be proud of it.

I have never been one of the prophets of gloom and doom, and I hope I never will be. On the contrary, I have been, and am, an optimist about our state and America. I believe there is far more right than wrong with our great state and nation.

Certainly, we have problems—some of which are so large they threaten to destroy us. But when haven't we had such problems? Each chapter of our history is stamped with threatened destruction, but also with the story of how these major obstacles were overcome.

We would have to be blind not to see the problems confronting us today in our cities and in the countryside. Problems of poverty and lack of opportunity, problems of hunger and unrest, problems of war and the causes of war, problems of population balance and a deteriorating environment.

These are problems of such magnitude that, individually or combined, they carry the potential of wrecking our society. But I believe it was the late Adlai Stevenson who noted that our problems were manmade and can therefore be solved by man. The solution lies with the people, sometimes working alone but more often as a group utilizing the powers of their government.

If we have learned anything from the trends of shifting power in recent decades, it is that the centralization of business and the federalization of government caused more problems than it solved. It seemed to divorce the people and alienate them from major powers which influenced their lives.

Business learned that lesson and began to move toward regional operations which could provide much better service to consumers. Improved service resulted in more business which more than offset the cost of operating in several locations rather than a central headquarters.

Likewise, we have learned that government must be brought back as close to the people as possible. It is my deep belief, and I believe a truism of our times, that local and state governments must now take on as much responsibility as they can possibly handle. Government must serve the real needs of the people where they live, rather than becoming enslaved to statistics about people as compiled at the federal level.

All that I have mentioned today comes back to my native pride in Higginsville and my pleasure in the opening of this new plant. What is happening here is a vital part of what is making and keeping America great.

#### TAXPAYERS WARN FREEZE IS TEMPORARY SOLUTION

**HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, many of the Members of this body realize that one of the chief causes of inflation is Federal spending in excess of Federal tax

receipts. I am pleased to note that the California Taxpayers' Association is aware of this fact, and further, that at the Western States Taxpayers Conference held August 19 in Portland, Oreg., the executives of the taxpayer associations of those 11 States declared:

That in any reordering of national priorities, action to put the federal government fiscal house in order be placed at the top of the list.

Cal-Tax News for September 1971, reports the policy statement of the Western States Taxpayers Conference which I earnestly call to the attention of my colleagues. The report follows:

#### TAXPAYERS WARN FREEZE IS TEMPORARY SOLUTION

Action of President Richard Nixon in freezing prices and wages for 90 days is only temporary and will not in itself resolve the economic issues facing the nation, the executives of the Taxpayer Associations from the 11 Western States believe.

At their meeting in Portland, Oreg., August 19th, the Western States Taxpayers Conference adopted this policy statement to place the freeze in proper perspective:

"The need for decisive action to restore the nation's economy to a sound position, reduce and control inflationary pressures, and protect the dollar has long been apparent. The far-ranging economic remedies advanced by President Nixon, therefore, touch upon issues of vital concern to every citizen and taxpayer.

"It is imperative, however, that these proposals be kept in proper perspective.

"First: The President's program constitutes an emergency response to a critical situation, not a permanent cure for our economic ills. They must be complemented by a strong, constructive, and credible program to deal with these serious problems on a long-term basis.

"Second: A number of the President's proposals, particularly in the fiscal policy area, cannot be implemented without the support of, and responsible actions by the Congress. This, in turn, will require the support of responsible citizens.

"Third: Both this temporary emergency program and the required longer-range policies cannot be implemented unless officials and citizens demonstrate the will to exercise much more fiscal and economic policy discipline than has been evidenced in recent years.

"The executives of the eleven statewide taxpayer research organizations attending the Western States Taxpayer Conference view with great concern reports already circulating about developing pressures in Congress and elsewhere to go beyond the President's tax relief proposals and/or resist his expenditure cutback proposals. We view a return to fiscal responsibility as the essential ingredient of any sound and effective program to restore and maintain a sound economy.

"Despite repeated promises to the contrary, huge Federal deficits have been piled one on the other, year after year. These deficits have been a primary cause of inflationary pressures and a major cause of our current economic ills. It is far past time to return the phrase 'balanced Federal budget' to the accepted political lexicon.

"To this end, the Western States Taxpayers Conference insists:

"1) That in any reordering of national priorities, action to put the federal government fiscal house in order be placed at the top of the list;

"2) That demands for new and expanded federal assistance programs be firmly resisted;

"3) That state-local governments, most of which are in stronger financial position than

the federal government, intensify their efforts to solve their own problems. Federal aid conditioned upon the proposition that such aid is necessary to relieve political pressures on state-local officials is unacceptable.

"This period of national economic crisis, serious as it may be, should be a time for reflection and resolve. Recognition that the crisis results from past excesses in both the public and private sectors, and a strong resolve to exercise needed discipline and restraint in the future cannot only avert disaster, but also forge a new commitment to responsible and effective government."

#### ROUT OF THE DOLLAR

**HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, as Under Secretary of the Treasury Charles Walker stated in a recent briefing for Members of Congress, the immediate cause triggering the dramatic public announcement of the administration's new economic policy was another international monetary crisis similar to—but worse than—that of last May. The elements of our new economic policy pertaining to foreign exchange and trade signalize the rout of the dollar in the markets of the world. The dollar is now officially acknowledged to be no longer the world's soundest currency—the assumption on which the whole international monetary system has been based ever since the Bretton Woods Conference during World War II.

At the beginning of this century, gold was the sole basis for the exchange of money among nations. Then the strict gold standard was replaced by the use of certain particularly strong national currencies—ultimately the dollar—which were presumed to be "as good as gold." Now the dollar, weakened by 25 years of inflation, no longer convertible into gold by anybody, and held by foreigners in quantities vastly exceeding the shrunken supply at Fort Knox, has no fixed standard of value whatever. Other currencies will be allowed to "float" by comparison with the dollar, which means that their value, and the dollar's value, can and will change day by day due to current market conditions. We are vaguely told that a new international monetary system will be worked out—but what it will be, no official can, or cares to predict at this time.

But there are ominous signs. The most disturbing is a little-noticed bill passed by Congress in October of last year and signed by the President as Public Law 91-508. At the time of its final consideration in the House, mine was the only voice raised against it. This law empowers the Treasury Department to impose sweeping new regulations on the withdrawal of money from individual bank accounts, the purchase of traveler's checks, the use of credit cards overseas, or the transfer of money out of the country in any form.

On June 10 of this year, the Treasury Department published in the Federal

Register its first new regulations under the authority granted by Public Law 91-508. First scheduled to go into effect August 1, their effective date has now been postponed to November 1. Sufficiently vocal and widespread opposition, expressed through letters and telegrams to Members of Congress, might bring about further postponement, or significant modifications in the regulations.

These Treasury regulations would require a report to be made to the Federal Government, under most circumstances, when more than \$5,000 is to be taken out of the country in any form, or withdrawn in currency from a bank account regardless of what use is to be made of it. The regulations further require records to be kept for Federal inspection on every financial transaction involving the citizen's bank account, with special emphasis on transfers of more than \$1,000 out of the country, including purchases of traveler's checks totaling over \$1,000. This latter regulation brings these new powers directly into the lives of the ordinary middle-class American citizens who travel abroad, since many of them will spend more than \$1,000 on their trip.

As those familiar with the gun registration controversy are particularly well aware, to require a report to Government on an activity of which powerful elements in Government strongly disapprove is often a prelude to prohibiting it altogether. Once guns are registered, they are ripe for confiscation. Once transfers of money out of the country down to as little as \$1,001 must be recorded for official inspection, the next step is to prohibit them. As the rout of the dollar continues, just as more voices will be heard demanding price and wage controls to stop inflation by force, so more will be heard demanding the use of force to prevent Americans from exchanging their less and less valuable dollars for other currencies of more solid value.

Government has no right to take action of this kind. A man's money, freely and legally earned, is his own, to do with as he will. If he thinks—perhaps with good reason—that it would be safer in some form other than dollars, it is his right to make the transfer. Otherwise he might find the savings of a lifetime suddenly and totally wiped out, as happened to thrifty Germans in the early 1920's when, as a result of explosive inflation, it cost millions of marks to buy a bag of groceries.

The dollar cannot be protected by exchange controls any more than the problem of inflation can be solved by price and wage controls. There is a limit to the degree that any economy can be controlled by Government dictate. Beyond that point, the black marketeers, the smugglers, and the bribed officials begin to take over.

The only way to restore the value of the dollar, both at home and abroad, is to begin restoring its convertibility into gold at whatever gold is actually worth in terms of today's dollars—not the official but unsupportable figure of \$35 an ounce which, unfortunately, belongs to a bygone era of a far healthier dollar.

## CHURCH AND SOCIETY TASK FORCE REPORTS ON EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on September 14, 1971, Mrs. Virginia K. Mills, president of Church Women United Presbyterian Task Force on Women, gave a report on the equal rights amendment to the Presbytery of Washington City. As a result, the Presbytery voted to endorse passage of the equal rights amendment without crippling additions and to write to each Member of Congress setting forth their position.

The Presbytery of Washington City includes the jurisdiction of northern Virginia, southern Maryland, and the District of Columbia. It has 71 churches with a membership of 39,631 as of December 31, 1970.

Mrs. Mills is a mother of four, an elder in her local church, a suburban housewife, and an adult educator working on self-development of women. I commend Mrs. Mills' report to the attention of my colleagues:

### CHURCH AND SOCIETY TASK FORCE REPORT TO PRESBYTERY OF WASHINGTON CITY

It is a privilege to report to the Presbytery from the Church and Society Task Force, on which I serve.

My report concerns the Equal Rights Amendment. The Church and Society Task Force recommends approval of a resolution urging the passage of this amendment. It is now before the Congress and is due for a vote on Wednesday, September 22 in the House of Representatives. A brief review of the background of the Equal Rights Amendment may be helpful to Presbytery.

The Equal Rights Amendment has been before the Congress for 48 years. It is essentially a single sentence to be added to the Constitution, namely: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex."

Originally the ERA was submitted to Congress in 1923 as a natural extension of rights to women following their newly won right to vote. Although the proposed amendment has frequently passed the Senate, only once before has the House of Representatives approved it—last year when it came to the floor over the objection of the Rules Committee by a discharge petition. Through these 48 years, the amendment has often suffered a crippling rider which in effect nullifies equality for women. For over a decade the Hayden Amendment was attached to it and only last year Sen. Ervin of N. Car. attached a new crippling amendment. This year Congressman Wiggins of California has added a similar amendment in this traditional effort to modify full equality. I will read the original amendment and then the Wiggins addition: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex. (Wiggins) This article shall not impair the validity of any law of the United States which exempts a person from compulsory military service or any other law of the United States or of any state which reasonably promotes the health and safety of the people." The Wiggins Amendment exempts women from the draft, and would continue the protective legislation against

which the Equal Rights Amendment was proposed.

I will speak briefly on 3 points and then answer questions the Presbytery may have regarding the Equal Rights Amendment. I will cover in turn 1) the legal status of women today, 2) the effect of the Wiggins Amendment, and 3) the actions of the United Presbyterian Church in the USA which support the E.R.A.

American women won the right to vote in 1920 after 75 years of struggle. When the constitution was originally written we were governed by English Common Law. At that time when a woman married she completely lost her legal existence, and her husband represented both the man and woman before the law. Specifically, this meant that married women lost all right to control property they brought into the marriage, they had no right to their earnings, no legal right regarding their own children, etc. Therefore when the constitution refers to "person," it does not mean married women, just as it did not mean slaves. A major effort of the suffrage movement was directed toward granting married women legal right to property, guardianship of children, etc. Even today, the constitution is not interpreted by the Supreme Court to forbid discrimination against women on the basis of their sex. Women have never been protected under the 14th Amendment provisions. Even the 1964 Civil Rights Law—into which a clause forbidding sexual discrimination was introduced as a joke by a southern congressman—the Civil Rights Law specifically exempts from its provisions educational, religious and governmental agencies—the three institutions in our society which most discriminate against women.

In summary, American women at the present time are only given the right to vote under the Constitution. All their other legal status comes from various state laws which vary from state to state; educational opportunities, labor legislation, property and guardian rights are state matters. So there are 50 separate and complicated codes of law affecting American women. A woman living in Virginia has different legal rights from a woman living in Maryland, Illinois or California. Passage of the ERA will mandate a uniform legal status for all American women—their full equality under the law. When it is passed, a long over-due review of state codes affecting women will occur which will enhance citizenship for the majority of Americans, the women.

In regard to the Wiggins Amendment, which modifies the ERA, there are two clauses: it exempts women from the draft, and it would continue all laws which reasonably promote health and safety. Under the draft many young men serve their country as part of their citizenship. Women should do no less. Actual combat service is not required from most draftees. At present enlisted women serving in the armed forces cluster in secretarial, personnel and nursing fields—but there is a low quota on their enlistment. Training obtained in the armed services and veterans benefits in education, preference for jobs, housing, medical and pension services have helped many young men from poor families and minority groups move up in life. Women need these same opportunities. The highest unemployment rate is among young girls and women. Women are not asking to be exempt from the draft. They need and desire full citizenship together with the opportunities it affords. The second clause in the Wiggins Amendment would continue legislation which "reasonably promotes health and safety." Civil rights supporters will recognize this clause which used to rationalize racial segregation. It functions in the same way against women in a series of laws which restrict women in the labor mar-

ket, in educational institutions and in securing full community services. Women are protected from greater opportunities by many such laws. For these reasons the Church and Society Task Force is opposed to the Wiggins Amendment.

For my last point, I would like to review the official actions taken by our denomination which support passage of the ERA. In May, 1970 the General Assembly voted approval of the ERA and urged its passage by Congress. The United Presbyterian Women's organization, representing 480,000 women also recorded its support for the ERA in July, 1970. The Task Force on Women of the General Assembly submitted supporting testimony for the amendment to the Senate Judicial Committee one year ago.

The Equal Rights Amendment would secure equality of rights under the law for every American regardless of sex and is long overdue. The Church and Society Task Force recommends that "the Presbytery of Washington City vote its approval of the Equal Rights Amendment without crippling amendments and write members of Congress to this effect."

#### MAKING SENSE ON THE BUSING ISSUE

### HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, in the past few weeks the issue of busing has aroused great passion in many areas of the country. Several of our communities are bitterly divided, and in some the finally realized hope of steady progress toward integrated education is threatened.

It is terribly unfortunate that the debate over busing has been so full of emotion, threats, and rhetoric that we have not been able to put busing in its proper perspective as a means to accomplish the equality of educational opportunity for black children that was promised in the Supreme Court's historic decision in *Brown* against Board of Education.

In the *New York Times* on Wednesday, September 15, there appeared an article by Father Theodore M. Hesburgh, president of the University of Notre Dame and Chairman of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, which is both a reasoned response to the passions of the present and an inspirational call for us to rise above prejudice and hatred to a greater understanding of the meaning of full racial equality in this society.

I hope that each of us will read this article and gain a greater understanding of the real issues involved in this national debate on busing.

The text of the article follows:

IT'S THE END OF THE BUS RIDE THAT MATTERS—WE MUST TRANSCEND OUR "DISMAL HISTORY" OF RACIAL INEQUALITY

(By Theodore M. Hesburgh)

NOTRE DAME, IND.—After seventeen tortuous years, the United States was about to desegregate many of its formerly segregated schools, North and mostly South. Following a decision of the Supreme Court, many of the school districts were using busing as a means—often the only possible means—of doing so. After more than a decade and a

half of legal struggles, the law seemed clear and finally, through the heroic efforts of many school boards, mainly in the South, the law was about to be followed. The result would be that finally, more than a century after slavery was ended in America, the great-grandchildren of former slaves would finally have the opportunity to obtain a first-class education—the key to final liberation and upward social mobility.

At this strategic point, the President of the United States declared that he was opposed to busing. The case in point seemed to be Austin, Tex., which was following a plan devised by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and seemingly approved by the Department of Justice and the White House. Then came the intervention by a powerful Texas Senator that led to the repudiation of the Federal Government's plan by its leader. All who had worked for the implementation of the *Brown* decision during these seventeen dreary years were stunned, but little was said. It was the August doldrums. Then came the second blow with the White House press office reiterating the President's statement, and indicating that anyone in the Government opposing it might well find himself working elsewhere.

Who could respond? Most of those who might have responded were long since gone—from H.E.W., Justice, White House. The only maverick left was the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights—an independent, bipartisan agency created under President Eisenhower in 1957 to try to discover the facts on equal protection and discrimination and to advise the President and Congress regarding corrective action. The commission is a peanut. It has a budget that is one-fourth the cost of a single fighter plane, a staff of about 150, and six commissioners who are employed full time elsewhere.

Even so, they spoke out, indicating that the President's statement, at this particular time, could only give aid and comfort to those who opposed the desegregation of schools, and render the task of those trying to comply with the law immensely more difficult.

Moreover, the President's statement, while obviously popular with those who are unwilling to pay the price for a united America with freedom and justice and good education for all, especially blacks, really ignores the facts of busing. Forty per cent of all school children in America are bused to school—two million miles a year—at a cost of 98 million dollars for 250,000 buses. To be opposed to busing is to not want 40 per cent of American youngsters to get to school.

If the commission had hired Governor Wallace, he could not have performed better. The day after the commission's statement, Wallace began to help the President. All across the South, and also in the North where school buses were fire-bombed in Pontiac, Mich., the forces of obstruction arose anew, buoyed by the President's stance, and the battle already won, had to be joined again. Numerous Federal judges had to restate their cases and even the Chief Justice of the United States had to speak again—on the side of the angels, but with reservations.

Busing is really not the issue. What is important is the education that awaits the child, especially the minority child, for the first time good education, at the end of the bus ride. Busing never aroused emotions when it was done for all the wrong reasons—like the black youngsters in Wallace's Alabama who were bused 100 miles a day from Selma to Montgomery and back to attend a black vocational school when there was a lily-white vocational school where the buses left from in Selma. I remember Medgar Evers saying that his first recollection of busing was the new school buses passing him and other black children on the way to school—a very bad school—splashing them with mud as the white children on their way to a good

school yelled out the window, "Nigger, nigger!" No objections to busing then.

One can argue about the costs of equality in America today. God knows we have known the costs of inequality—wasted talents, frustration, poverty piled on poverty, generation after generation. Laws have been grudgingly passed and more grudgingly obeyed, with every possible legal evasion tested. If we are ever to emerge from our present state of inequality, it will not be by missing on minimum compliance with minimum laws. Generosity, magnanimity, and human understanding will alone allow us to transcend, in our day, our dismal history of racial inequality.

#### NEED FOR IMPROVEMENT IN RAIL SERVICE

### HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, there is much concern today in this country that we create a balanced transportation system through which we make the best use of the several modes of transportation to give the people of this country the quality of service required in this day and age. Part of this effort centered in the past Congress when we created the National Rail Passenger Service with the intention of strengthening a form of transportation that had atrophied over the past 25 years.

Many of us had substantial hopes that a national service with Federal financing and the sole intention of providing quality rail passenger service could reactivate and revitalize the rails for millions of our traveling public. Thus far, the results of this effort have produced very little.

Even today as Secretary Volpe talks about making rail passenger service the core of the Northeast corridor's passenger transportation network, Amtrak is plodding along as if we were in another era. I have particular reference to the service they are operating between Washington and Parkersburg, W. Va., a distance of approximately 350 miles. The previous trains operated by the Baltimore & Ohio traveled this route in 10½ hours, and had done so for nearly 40 years. This was a passenger train that stopped at nearly every station along the way, the kind of run characterized as the milk train run.

Now 40 years later under new management with many of the small stops eliminated, Amtrak has managed to cut the time on this run by one hour so that a passenger leaving Parkersburg, W. Va., at 7 in the morning will not arrive in Washington until nearly 5 in the evening, thus spending the entire day on the train.

This is the type of service that forced passengers away from trains in the millions after the Second World War. This is the kind of service that literally destroyed rail service in this country. It is, in short, the kind of service that led to the crisis which we sought to end with the establishment of Railpax.

It is, Mr. Speaker, sad to note that this rail passenger service is only minutes faster than the freight service. It averages less than 40 miles per hour when our highways will allow us to average 60 miles an hour.

In my judgment, Mr. Speaker, it is time for this body to exercise its oversight functions and to scrutinize the operations of Amtrak and to insure that our investment in rail transportation for this country lives up to expectations.

It is certainly not doing that now as my experience suggests. And, of course, the experience we have had is not limited to the Washington-Parkersburg service as the following editorial in the Washington Post on September 9, 1971, indicates.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I am inserting that editorial, "Chugging Along With Amtrak," along with an article from the Parkersburg News describing the service under the title "Amtrak Says, 'Use It or Lose It.'"

It is clear at this juncture that Amtrak is creating a service which cannot help but become a loser, both for the Treasury and the citizens it is supposed to serve.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 9, 1971]

**CHUGGING ALONG WITH AMTRAK**

We have somewhat mixed feelings about the announcement by Amtrak that it is in the process of putting into service on railroad trains in the East a bundle of passenger cars formerly used west of Chicago. The improvement in the personal comfort of those who choose to travel by train ought to be substantial, so that is something to cheer. But the cheer must be qualified because of the slow pace at which Amtrak is making the changes which it desperately needs if its record is to be any better than those of the railroads which it has superseded.

Amtrak took over the passenger train business, with a few notable exceptions, last May 1 and its impact so far has hardly been what you would call staggering. Part of this, no doubt, was the speed with which the corporation was put together. It had no president when its life began, no firm plans and, as far as we can tell, no real idea of where it was going. So its staggering start is understandable even though deplorable. The situation might have been much better if the incorporators who established Amtrak had gone back to Congress and admitted they needed more time. But that is water over the dam now and the problem is whether Amtrak is going to be able to demonstrate the feasibility of saving passenger service within the time limits given it by Congress.

This switch of cars from west to east is about its first major step. Up to date, the railroads which had been running poor trains in the past have kept on running them under the new label and passengers were hard put to tell much of a difference. But the cars used in the West in the recent past are newer and substantially more comfortable than those to which most Easterners have been exposed. Unfortunately, this alone is not likely to do much for Amtrak's business, particularly now that the tourist season is over, the season in which longhaul trains have their best chance to attract passengers from other modes of travel. There is still a giant selling job to be done.

We trust that in trying to attract people back to the trains the next thing Amtrak will do is to re-think its fare structure. There is something fundamentally wrong with a fare system in which \$43.25 buys you 854 miles of transportation from Washington to

Chicago while \$42.53 gets you 1,153 miles from Washington to New Orleans on the Southern Railway which stayed out of the Amtrak system. Similarly, we don't understand why it costs an additional \$41.29 to rent a sleeping room between Washington and Chicago when it costs only \$19.20 to rent one for 11 hours longer and 500 miles farther between Chicago and Houston. Nor do we understand why a sleeper costs \$21 more than first class air travel between Washington and St. Louis and \$24 less than first class air between Chicago and Denver.

These are some of the reasons why we are inclined to give Amtrak only a little cheer for shifting passenger cars around the country. There is much to be done and it is being done so slowly.

[From the Parkersburg (W. Va.) News]  
**PARKERSBURG-WASHINGTON TRAIN: AMTRAK SAYS, "USE IT OR LOSE IT"**

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Experimental daily train service between Washington, D.C. and Parkersburg, W. Va., will begin westbound on Sept. 7 and eastbound on Sept. 8, it was announced today by Roger Lewis, President of the National Railroad Passenger Corporation.

**PROPOSED SCHEDULE—"THE WEST VIRGINIAN"**

Westbound		Eastbound	
Train No. 5 Monday through Friday	Train No. 11 Saturday, Sunday, holidays	Train No. 8 Monday through Friday	Train No. 12 Saturday, Sunday, holidays
4:45 p.m.	10:00 a.m.	Ar 4:45 p.m.	8:45 p.m.
4:59 p.m.	10:14 a.m.	4:25 p.m.	8:25 p.m.
5:50 p.m.	11:05 a.m.	3:34 p.m.	7:34 p.m.
6:15 p.m.	11:30 a.m.	3:08 p.m.	7:08 p.m.
7:53 p.m.	1:08 p.m.	Lv 1:32 p.m.	5:32 p.m.
7:58 p.m.	1:13 p.m.	Ar 1:27 p.m.	5:27 p.m.
8:34 p.m.	1:49 p.m.	12:51 p.m.	4:51 p.m.
9:33 p.m.	2:48 p.m.	11:52 a.m.	3:52 p.m.
11:00 p.m.	4:15 p.m.	Lv 10:25 a.m.	2:25 p.m.
11:03 p.m.	4:18 p.m.	Ar 10:22 a.m.	2:22 p.m.
11:48 p.m.	5:03 p.m.	9:38 a.m.	1:38 p.m.
2:15 a.m.	7:30 p.m.	Lv 7:10 a.m.	11:10 a.m.

Note: Only full fare tickets will be honored.

"The West Virginian," initially consisting of a coach westbound from Washington, D.C. at 4:45 p.m. during the week; it will leave at 10 a.m. and a coach-diner pulled by a diesel engine, will depart on Saturday, Sunday and holidays. Eastbound, the Monday to Friday train will leave Parkersburg at 7:10 a.m. while the weekend and holiday departure time will be 11:10 a.m.

By operating two separate schedules, Amtrak hopes to attract passengers from three potential sources.

First, general passenger business all along the route which is expected to average about ten people per train mile.

Secondly, passengers living between Cumberland and Washington, primarily a weekday market, only a portion of which is now served by a single B & O commuter train.

And finally residents from the Washington area who want to take one-day excursions to Harpers Ferry, Martinsburg and Cumberland. These potential riders are viewed as weekend business.

Tickets for the service may be purchased on the train, at Washington's Union Station and from the Cumberland ticket agent between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. Agencies in Silver Spring, Harpers Ferry and Martinsburg will also sell tickets. Amtrak is in the process of setting up a direct dial telephone system linking all stations to an open agency in Washington. It will provide information on fares, schedules and arrival times.

Called "The West Virginian," the train will stop at Silver Spring, Harpers Ferry, Martinsburg, Cumberland, Keyser, Oakland, and Grafton. It will operate one trip each way per day with special arrival and departure times on weekends and holidays. The train will connect with Amtrak service to and from New York.

In announcing the service, Lewis said it will operate for a 2-month period during which Amtrak will gather data on potential ridership along a rural-scenic route and it will measure public acceptance of a schedule variance between weekdays and weekends designed to increase business.

The inauguration of the service in September coincides with the re-opening of several schools and colleges along the route as well as the start of fall foliage tours which attract tourists to the region.

Lewis explained that the train will be run under that section of the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970 which permits the corporation to experiment with intercity service outside the basic system.

Such trains are operated on an experimental "use it or lose it" basis and may be discontinued after a reasonable period of time if the public does not utilize the services provided.

**HIGH HOLIDAYS 5732**

**HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the Jewish high holidays begin this year on September 19 and 20 with Rosh Hashanah and conclude on September 29 with Yom Kippur. It is a significant time of the year for those of the Jewish faith because it marks the beginning of the Jewish religious New Year 5732.

All over the world, on Rosh Hashanah, Jews assemble in synagogues to ask God's forgiveness for man's sin and to pray for the unification of mankind. "Unite all of us in the bond of brotherhood" is the beginning of one of the beautiful, thousand-year-old prayers associated with this holy day.

This year, the beginning of the 26th session of the United Nations General Assembly on September 21 coincides almost exactly with the beginning of the Jewish high holidays. And as the United Nations reaffirms the principles of individual freedom, world peace, brother-

hood, and the opportunity for greater spiritual growth for all people, so do Jews all over the world during the high holidays rededicate themselves to social justice, the sanctity and dignity of human life, and the brotherhood of mankind.

On Rosh Hashanah, or New Year, the shofar, or ram's horn, is sounded. The sound of the shofar is, at the same time, an affirmation of the joy of life and a reminder that the coming year requires a serious reexamination of purpose, thus opening up the way to a richer and fuller existence.

September 29, Yom Kippur, the Day of Atonement, climaxes 10 days of penitence with which the Jewish New Year commences. This is the most sacred day of all—for on this day the Lord judges each individual. Worshippers abstain from all food and drink for 24 hours, and a candle large enough to burn for 24 hours is lit in each home in memory of the dead. Jews ask forgiveness from the Lord, and in turn, freely forgive their neighbors and look forward to a good life.

The Jewish tradition of setting apart one day in every year to concentrate to the utmost on the spiritual advancement of man is without parallel in the history of humanity. And the fact that for thousands of years Jews all over the world have united in prayer and repentance on the same day is immeasurable in its significance, particularly when so many obstacles throughout the centuries have been placed in the way of Jewish religious observances.

In recent times, the Soviet Union has imposed severe restrictions on the religious freedom of the Jews residing within the Soviet Union. Therefore, when the 92d Congress convened in January of this year, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 8, to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion, and also, House Concurrent Resolution 245, requesting our President to take immediate and determined steps to persuade the Soviet Union to permit persons of the Jewish faith, who express the desire, to emigrate to a country of their choice. By the passage of these resolutions, we can reaffirm to the world community and especially to the Soviets our belief that mankind has the inalienable right to religious freedom.

During the celebration of the Jewish high holidays, we recall once again the suffering endured by the Jewish people and mankind's conscience cries out against the betrayal of human rights which they have so tragically experienced. In the coming year, I do hope that the Jewish people may enjoy freedom from persecution, peace, and prosperity.

As the Congressman for the Seventh District of Illinois, where many of my friends and constituents of the Jewish faith reside, I take great pleasure in extending to them my greetings and best wishes for the new year.

CKVII—2031—Part 24

## TEACHERS AND THE WAGE-PRICE FREEZE

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, as teachers resume their vital task of preparing our youth to meet the challenges of this complex age, they are confronted with acute financial problems resulting from the wage freeze. The Cost of Living Council has decreed that most contracts agreed upon in the last school year, to become effective with the opening of school in September, are not to be honored; nor will teachers receive the increments that are part of the long-established salary schedule.

I am confident that their fellow citizens will agree that the teachers' case meet the criterion of gross inequity set by the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970—Public Law 91-379. The American Federation of Teachers has submitted to the Cost of Living Council a cogent brief encompassing its arguments on teacher salary schedule increments which I am inserting below. I commend it to the attention of our colleagues and urge that they join me in informing the Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness of their support of the teachers' just cause:

TEACHER SALARY SCHEDULE INCREMENTS: THEY ARE PART OF THE TEACHER'S WAGE, THEY HAVE LITTLE OR NO ECONOMIC IMPACT, AND THEY ARE NOT "RAISES".

(Submitted by American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO)

### I. SCHEDULE INCREMENTS ARE TECHNICAL

Today, almost all teachers are paid accordance with "salary schedules", "ranges", or "guides". Teachers without experience enter at a low, threshold salary step and progress, usually at the rate of one step a year, until the final or maximum step has been reached. In most instances, progression from one step to another is automatic. Progress from one increment step to another may be interrupted for disciplinary purposes, in some cases, and in some school systems perfunctory evaluations and course credits are required but it is rare that an increment is withheld.

The concept of a *single salary schedule* which incorporates both experience and educational preparation as the basis for automatic salary increases was widely adopted as early as the 1920's. The advantages of this type of schedule (with *automatic annual increments*) were identified by Professor Elsbree in 1931 as follows:

"Automatic increments have a virtue of being impartial, thus removing all possibility of political pressures in the determination of salaries and eliminating petty jealousy and bickering among teachers. This plan makes teacher-rating unnecessary for salary purposes, thus relieving the supervisory corps of a substantial burden."

By 1950 the schedule as a method of paying teachers was firmly established in all public school systems. True, there were a very small percentage of systems where various forms of "merit" pay were practiced. However, even in these instances, more often than not, the merit pay was a bonus given in addition to the normal increment, again

supporting the view that the increment is an integral part of a wage and does not in itself constitute a salary increase or raise in the usual sense of the term.

### II. SALARY SCHEDULES ARE ANTI-INFLATIONARY

The salary schedule method of paying teachers has an economic rationale quite apart from the administrative convenience stressed by Elsbree.

Teaching is marked by characteristics which distinguish it from other occupations. For instance, more than two-thirds of the nation's teachers are women. Teachers are employed on an annual basis. Their work year almost universally begins in September. During the first three years or more of employment the question of whether or not a teacher will remain in teaching is considered moot. As a consequence of these influences, there is a great deal of turnover during the first few years.

As younger teachers drop out they are replaced with new raw recruits from the teacher training institutions. The salary schedule takes economic advantage of this fact by requiring teachers to work for a relatively low wage during the first few years of employment. In effect, the schedule device delays the achievement of full earning power for many years. New, inexperienced teachers enter into a long apprenticeship which delays their payment at "journeyman's rates".

The underlying budget-balancing purpose for paying teachers in accordance with a schedule rather than paying them on a flat rate basis is seldom admitted. Instead, writers stress the salary schedule as a recognition of the increasing productivity of the teacher as experience is gained.

Whichever rationale one accepts, however, there is no escaping the fact that the schedule increments are an integral part of the teacher's wage. The "wage" is actually a sliding scale or salary range.

### III. TEACHER RAISES ARE DISTINCT FROM INCREMENTS

When teachers negotiate they usually seek percentage, across-the-board or lump sum increases to be applied on top of the existing salary schedule and its increments. The increment schedule itself changes very slowly and of course where such changes have been negotiated, the new schedule would constitute an increase to the extent that the increments themselves had been increased. Some increment schedules have remained the same for 25 to 30 years even though salary ranges may have doubled and tripled during that time.

To give an example, in 1950 "School District A" had a salary schedule under which a teacher with a Bachelor's degree progressed from a beginning salary of \$2,500 to a maximum salary of \$5,100 in 13 annual \$200 increments. By June of 1971, beginning teachers were entering the system at \$8,400 and progressing to a maximum salary of \$11,000. There were still 13 annual increments of \$200.

In negotiations during the summer the union rather than negotiate across-the-board raises, succeeded in raising the increments to \$250 each. The beginning salary remained the same and the maximum salary under the impact of the increased increments would have risen to \$11,650. However, the effective date for the increase was to have been September 1.

The negotiated increase was the \$50 per increment cumulative up the scale, and in accordance with the Cost of Living Council's rules logically should not be allowed. However, the former basic salary schedule with its \$200 increments should be allowed to remain in effect. Only the increase in the increments would have constituted an increase in salary level.

#### IV. ECONOMIC IMPACT OF INCREMENTS IS MINIMAL

Teacher salary schedule increments have little or no economic impact. Increases in the salary budget accounts of school districts are due almost entirely to increases in personnel and across-the-board or percentage increases. In all except recently formed districts the proportion of teachers on the various steps of the schedule stays about the same year in and year out. As teachers retire at the maximum step they are replaced by teachers at the minimum step of the schedule. Hence, the budget salary account is not economically effective and increments do not result in increasing the total amount of employee purchasing power.

The fact that there may be temporary imbalances in newer districts, or due to peculiar local conditions in others, does not alter the basic fact that economically speaking, when considered in their nationwide aggregate, increments do not have economic impact.

In all previous impositions of economic controls—in World War II and during the Korean crisis, for instance—teacher salary schedule increments were not interfered with, thus reinforcing our position that such increments do not have economic significance in the aggregate.

#### V. COST OF LIVING COUNCIL'S RULINGS

Denial of teacher salary increments is not consistent with other rulings made by the Cost of Living Council. If we accept the effective date of the freeze as August 15 and disregard some of the rather strong legal objections which could be raised, there are only two logical alternatives: either a teacher began working under a new salary schedule before August 15, or he did not.

Teachers who began work in accordance with a new schedule prior to August 15 do, of course, receive their increments along with their raises. Teachers who did not start working on a new schedule before August 15, therefore, should be paid in accordance with the old schedule, because that was the status quo ante. Teachers should receive their increments in accordance with the schedule which prevailed for them before the freeze (see example in III above).

Teachers are particularly affected by the denial of increments because of the peculiar seasonal nature of their employment. There are some other occupations where wages are embodied in the schedule but very few of these, if any, are so immediate and adversely affected by the effective date. Therefore the number of employees other than teachers which might also be affected by recognition of the fact that salary schedule increments are not raises is not nearly as drastically limited by this consideration.

Denial of salary schedule increments to teachers has aroused widespread resentment because teachers are not impressed by the logical basis for this denial. As a matter of fact, they feel and rightly so, that teachers are being asked to make sacrifices which go far beyond the sacrifices other groups are being forced to make. Denial of increments actually constitutes a salary cut.

#### VI. INCREASES ARE NOT LONGEVITY INCREASES

Some confusion has been introduced into the teacher salary question by use of the term "longevity". "Longevity" has a very precise meaning in the discussion of teachers' salaries. Longevity increases are understood to be above and beyond the normal salary schedule. They are awarded to teachers who live a long time and stay a long time on the salary schedule maximum. To give such teachers "something to look forward to", longevity increments are awarded at the end of 20, 25, 30 or 35 years of service. While such adjustments may be automatic they occur at much longer intervals than annual incre-

ments and they do not constitute a schedule.

The normal schedule increments are experimental, rather than a survival benefit. A 22-year old teacher who moves from step 1 to step 2 of a salary schedule does not progress as a result of "longevity".

#### VII. ALLOWING NORMAL INCREMENTS WILL ELIMINATE CONFUSION

Allowing normal salary schedule increments would be consistent with other Cost of Living Council rulings. For instance, the Council has already granted that increments based upon added training-course requirements—are permissible even though the granting of such increments is "automatic" and not "promotional" in the sense that a managerial judgment is involved. Qualifying for an increment by means of experience is simply another method of advancing along the schedule.

There are 17,000 local school districts in the United States. There is a great deal of confusion among them on the increment question. Some districts have allowed increments to be paid, others have allowed increments to be paid providing the teacher signs a statement to the effect that if the increment later is ruled "illegal," a refund will be made. Still other school districts have allowed the increments to be paid if the salary schedule was adopted by the board of education prior to August 15. We know of one case where a new schedule was adopted by the board of education to be effective July 1. One teacher out of a teaching faculty of more than 800 worked during the month of August; the salary schedule was validated and all teachers below maximum are receiving their increments. In another district, the month of August is assumed to be paid vacation and on this basis teachers accrue salary credit which is reflected in checks which are given to them on the opening of school. They get their increments.

As one examines the various hair-splitting "differences" from one school district to another, one must conclude that the fairest and most reasonable way to end the confusion is to concede that normal salary schedule increments should be paid as planned.

#### INDICATIONS OF THE QUALITY OF AMERICAN MEDICINE

##### HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, the quality of research being done by Americans in the field of medicine has improved substantially over the past 20 years and has now gained high recognition throughout the world. Since 1950, for example, Americans have won Nobel Prizes in physiology and medicine in 16 of the 21 years.

A recent article in the Rhode Island Medical Journal takes note of the quality of American medicine. At this point in the RECORD I would like to insert a copy of this article and I urge my colleagues to take a moment to read it:

#### INDICATIONS OF THE QUALITY OF AMERICAN MEDICINE

The Nobel Prize in Physiology and Medicine is recognized throughout the world as one of the highest awards in medicine. Since 1950 Americans have won awards in 16 of the

21 years. Further, in the 20 year period prior to 1950, Americans had won awards on 9 separate occasions. By contrast, from 1910 to 1930, Americans had won Nobel Prizes in Physiology and Medicine in only 3 of the years.

Since the beginning of the Nobel Prize awards in 1901, American Medicine has steadily improved and is now a frequent winner among the countries of the world. Our most recent laureate Doctor Julio Axelrod, a 1970 winner, has maintained the tradition of American medicine with his excellent work on the mechanisms which regulate the formation and inactivation of norepinephrin.

This year's Lasker Awards suggest a high level of sophistication in American Medical research. Doctor Earl W. Sutherland, one of the two Lasker Award winners, described a new chemical intermediary, cyclic adenylic acid (AMP), and demonstrated that it participates in a wide range of biochemical and physiological control and regulatory mechanisms. The other winner, Doctor Robert A. Goud, "transplanted bone marrow cells into immunologically deficient children, thus reconstituting both systems of immunologically active cells and saving the children from heretofore uniformly fatal infection."

As an appropriate climax to these gratifying events Oxford University in Great Britain recently reached across the Atlantic to invite Doctor Paul B. Beeson of Yale University to assume a chair in its medical school and the prestigious title of Nuffield Professor in Clinical Medicine.

Each year a stream of the graduates of foreign schools is attracted to the United States for training in general medicine and the specialties. In some foreign countries the chances for promotion are markedly increased if one has had at least part of his training in the United States. The large volume of excellent medical research in America as reported in medical journals of world-wide circulation and the names of famed teachers and investigators are a powerful attraction for these temporary visitors. Some foreign graduates who receive their post doctoral training in America return to their own countries and become world renowned in their own right. One such individual is Christiaan Barnard. The great medical centers of North America now offer the attractions which were once the hallmark of England and the continent.

#### NATIONAL HISPANIC HERITAGE WEEK

##### HON. ROBERT B. (BOB) MATHIAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Speaker, the week of September 12 through September 18 has been proclaimed National Hispanic Heritage Week by President Nixon. This week includes the Independence Days of the Republic of Mexico and five Central American nations which are celebrated on September 16.

I think it is important that we devote this week to recognizing the contributions and accomplishments of our citizens of Hispanic descent.

America is indebted to the Hispanic culture for its influence on our traditions, customs, and environmental surroundings. In addition, our Mexican-

American citizens have made notable contributions to the industrial, agricultural, artistic, intellectual, and political life of the Southwest.

It would be difficult to measure the accomplishments of the Mexican Americans in my congressional district. We are daily reminded of their rich heritage and of the vital part they play in the economic, political, and social life of the area.

By providing their own particular strengths and charm to the American way of life, the men and women of Hispanic descent have helped to make America great.

I am happy to pay tribute to the heritage of our Mexican-American citizens.

#### BILL TO AID SINGLE TAXPAYERS

### HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, last year over 25 million Americans paid a premium in the form of higher taxes, simply because they were unmarried. Under present law, taxpayers who are single pay at a rate which is as much as 20 percent more than a married individual with the same taxable income. Similarly, widows and divorcees who may qualify under the "head of household" tax table are assessed 10 percent more than marrieds filing a joint return.

The accelerated tax rates used for non-marrieds fail to accurately reflect a fair assessment of the financial burdens that many of these individuals encounter. While a widow or divorcee supporting one or more children is entitled to a standard deduction for each dependent, their tax based on the adjusted income is higher than that of a married couple which is childless.

Today, there are literally thousands of widows who are adversely affected by an unfair tax schedule. More often than not they are older people, nearing the end of their earning years, who in addition to suffering the loss of their spouse are striving to provide for their children on a reduced income. I propose that we should amend the law so as not to penalize them in their efforts which are so difficult already.

Mr. Speaker, now is the time to strike down discrimination, in the form of higher taxes levied against those citizens who are not married. Taxes should reflect an individual's financial responsibilities for dependents and clearly the most effective means to do this is through standard deductions.

Thus my bill acts to equalize the income tax of all people by eliminating the "head of household" and "singles" tax divisions. It provides that everyone will be subject to the same rates which presently are available only to married couples filing joint returns.

I would hasten to add that while there

will be a reduction for singles, this measure does not raise taxes for married people. As a matter of fact, most couples will still pay a smaller stipend than the rest of the population because after the standard deductions, their taxable income will be less.

My position is that the standard deduction should be increased and I welcome the President's proposal to do so. However, after standard deductions are subtracted from gross income, the percentage of tax on taxable income should be the same for all.

After all, our graduated income tax system was designed in order to tax everyone on their ability to pay. Differentiated tax schedules based on marital status alone are not consistent with this principle. This approach is too simplistic for a complex area such as Federal income tax regulations. The premise that a single person should pay higher taxes on the same income, after deductions, as his married neighbors is patently unfair.

Until recently it was possible for singles to pay as much as 40 percent more but, as a result of the Tax Reform Act of 1969, the difference was limited to a maximum of 20 percent. While this is an improvement, there is no reason for a discrepancy of any form. My measure will serve to continue the trend initiated in 1969 and, therefore, I hope that it will receive the careful consideration of the House.

#### MEXICO'S INDEPENDENCE DAY

### HON. ELIGIO de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, today is Mexico's Independence Day. Last night in Mexico City the President of Mexico, His Excellency Luis Echeverria, following the tradition of his predecessors, gave the cry for independence, the now world-famous "Grito de Dolores." This was done the night of September 15, 1810, at the little village of Dolores, Guanajuato, by Father Miguel Hidalgo.

This, Mr. Speaker, was not rebellion for personal gain; it was an aspiration of the soul of man desiring to be free. Allow me to quote from Father Hidalgo, writing to the rector of Guanajuato on September 21, 1810:

Our movement is a large one, and more so when it intends to reclaim rights which are holy, given by God to the Mexicans.

Father Hidalgo further states in his letter:

We wish to be independent of Spain in order that we might govern ourselves.

I cannot help but think, Mr. Speaker, that the Mexican patriots were well aware of our cry for independence and our struggle here in the United States.

Those of us who are of Mexican descent, and very proud of being so, have great love, admiration, and respect for the land of our ancestors and share their rejoicing on this day.

Further, Mr. Speaker, those of us who are native to this our great country of the United States of America can bring greater respect and admiration to the country of our ancestors by being good citizens and conducting ourselves in such a manner that when we say we are proud to be of Mexican descent, the people of Mexico in turn be proud of us.

#### GOVERNOR ASKEW CALLS WATER MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE

### HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be able to say that my State of Florida is privileged to have a most dynamic and forward-looking Governor in the Honorable Reubin Askew.

In the few months that he has been in office, Governor Askew has grappled with a number of problems which have long plagued our State and he has set them on a course toward solution. Now he has again exerted his leadership in dealing with a major problem and has called a Governor's conference on water management in south Florida to be held in Miami Beach from September 22 through September 24.

As Governor Askew has pointed out—

In less than two years the Everglades region of South Florida has experienced both extremes of nature with respect to rainfall. Early spring of 1970 saw near record rainfall, and less than a year later record deficiencies were experienced in the same area. Because of this, problems running the gamut from drowning wildlife to muck fires have beset us.

But even these problems, as serious as they are, are short-range ones and are only symptoms of the larger, long-range problems we face. There are signs that Lake Okeechobee is becoming eutrophic, salt water is intruding into our well fields, and a water shortage in South Florida is predicted in a few short years.

The list of questions which will be discussed at the conference is comprehensive and penetrating. I include it here to give our colleagues an idea of the problems which south Florida faces; they are serious and they are pressing:

#### GOVERNOR'S CONFERENCE ON WATER MANAGEMENT IN SOUTH FLORIDA

##### I. LONG TERM PROBLEMS

1. Water Supply (Quantity). a. What are the expected fresh water supply problems for the urban areas which depend on the basin for water? If there are shortages expected, what do we do to prevent them?

2. Water Supply (Quality). a. What fresh water quality problems does the basin now have or can expect? What can be done to retain fresh water of high quality?

3. Land Reclamation.

a. Should we drain wetlands in the basin for land reclamation?

b. If so, for what purposes?

c. Should we re-flood any of the previously drained lands? Which areas?

d. What can we do to stop the loss of muck?

e. What can we do to replenish the source of muck?

4. Population.

a. Is there a limited number of people which the basin's fresh water can support?

b. If the answer above is affirmative, how do you determine these maximums?

c. If there is a limit, what do we do about it?

5. Ground Water.

a. What areas have ground water problems?

b. What actions should be taken to alleviate these problems?

6. Geographical Considerations. a. What should our specific objectives be with regard to:

- 1) Kissimmee Valley.
- 2) Lake Okeechobee.
- 3) Everglades outside the park.
- 4) Everglades National Park.

#### II. SHORT TERM PROBLEMS

The three conservation areas and Lake Okeechobee are all below schedule and it is late in the wet season. We may have all the following problems next winter and spring. How should we respond to the following matters?

1. Fire prevention and control.
2. Intrusion of salt water.
3. Establishment of water priorities.
4. Regulation of water use in cities.
5. Desirability of cloud seeding.
6. Schedules of water levels in Lake Okeechobee and the conservation areas.

#### III. MANAGING AGENCY

1. What type of agency is needed to effectively manage the resources of south Florida?

a. Should it be federal, state, regional, county or a combination?

b. What should the governing structure be?

2. What geographical boundaries should be included within the management area?

3. What should the resource management responsibilities of the agency encompass?

4. What authority should this agency have to carry out its responsibilities?

5. How would this authority relate to other existing governmental bodies?

The Governor's Conference will bring together scientists, Government officials, and knowledgeable laymen for the purpose of providing scientific recommendations for a regional program of water management.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Governor Askew for taking the initiative in calling this conference and am looking forward to the positive results and recommendations which I trust will come out of it.

#### NO NEW TAXES

### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a real grassroots commentary on the President's wage-price freeze and how it affects the average American citizen will hopefully be appreciated by my colleagues in Congress.

The point made in the Sunday, September 12, editorial statement of the Suburbanite Economist, Illinois, was that increased expenditures must be extracted in the form of taxes from our constituents.

The editorial follows:

#### NO NEW TAXES

The best thing that can be said for President Nixon's wage-price freeze at this time is that it has been a political master-stroke. By adopting some of the measures his opponents have been urging he has taken the wind out of their sails. It is not unlikely that other acts designed for the same purpose—a date for complete withdrawal from Viet Nam, for example—will be announced in due time.

Whether the wage-price freeze will have the desired effect of bringing the country out of its economic doldrums is another matter. Only time will tell. Economists, who are supposed to know about these things, are far from agreed. Naturally, we hope for the best.

One thing that seems eminently clear and fair to us, however, is that if wages and prices are to be frozen so should taxes. Certainly no new taxes should be imposed without a referendum. We think any public agency would be reluctant to suggest a tax increase of any kind at this time, but if the need is considered urgent they should be willing to put it to a vote and let the taxpayers themselves decide.

Why should everything but taxes be frozen?

#### SOS

### HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, when a radio operator at sea hears the dots and dashes of the Morse code come into his earphones, SOS, it is recognized as a call for help from those in distress.

Missouri's elderly people, particularly those in our rural areas, seem justified in issuing such a distress signal. It is my privilege and pleasure to be able to report that, for the area that is known as west central Missouri, the call for help is being answered.

The SOS sent out by our lonely senior citizens living in the rural areas has been heard and partially answered. The West Central Missouri Rural Development Corp., under a program approved by the Office of Economic Opportunity, has its own SOS. It has organized a senior opportunities and services center—SOS—in an area which includes Bates, Cedar, St. Clair, Henry, Vernon, Morgan, Johnson, Benton, and Cass Counties.

In a recent article published by the central office of the Office of Economic Opportunity entitled "Missouri's Elderly" a tribute was paid by the agency to the work of the West Central Missouri Rural Development Corp., with particular emphasis on its SOS program. In our judgment, this program is so worthwhile that there are enough compliments and commendations for everyone involved. First there is Mr. William Krudwig, president of West Central; and next its executive director, Charles Braithwait, who has been a tower of strength in all of the operations that are funded by OEO in the rural areas of west central Missouri. To be included for praise are, of course, Harry Neptune, president of the area SOS Senate; Mrs. Ethel McMillan of Versailles, who is president of the Con-

gress for Senior Opportunities and Services and also a delegate to the Senior Citizens Action Council; Mrs. Helen Kling, who helped organize the program and is technical adviser to West Central Missouri SOS; Mrs. Corrine Avery of Clinton, Mo., who is president of a senior center and also representative to the area board of directors for West Central Missouri Development Corp. Last, but by no means least, Mr. Wilfred Dugan of Montrose and Mr. Jack Bray of Lowry City, deserve plaudits as those who secured the buses to provide transportation to the meetings of the Senior Opportunities and Services Senate, which meets in a rotated order within each of the nine counties served by the West Central Missouri Development Corp.

The recent article entitled "Missouri's Elderly" is well written. It is most descriptive of the work being done to help with the problems of the elderly poor in rural areas. In my judgment, no truer words were ever spoken than by the author of the article who said:

It is bad enough to be poor, but to be old and poor and to live in a rural area means that problems are tragically compounded.

Rural Missouri is no different than other rural areas of America in that many old people live alone with no means of transportation and certainly without public transportation and, in many instances, without telephones or television.

The most inspiring portion of the article is that part which sets out the fact that the SOS staff of community aides who make home visits to search out needy older people are all low income themselves and are all 60 years of age or older, while the oldest aide serving in the west central Missouri area SOS is 74.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Congress will be called upon in the near future to consider an extension of authority for the Office of Economic Opportunity, I, for one, was glad to learn about this worthwhile activity for the benefit of our older citizens in the rural areas. Since the advent of the poverty program, most of the complaints against the program are to the point that the lion's share of funds are poured into the big cities, largely for the benefit of minority groups. I have opposed the poverty program in the past because of its exclusively big city orientation to the exclusion of other activities. It was refreshing to discover an instance of such potentially beneficial activities by the OEO in a rural area. Because of the necessity to soon consider an extension of authority for the poverty program, it becomes my privilege and perhaps an obligation to share with my colleagues what, in my judgment, is an outstanding example of a good program operated for the benefit of the elderly in the rural areas. The article as it appeared in the August-September issue of the OEO publication Opportunity is as follows:

#### MISSOURI'S ELDERLY

While a lady close to 70 years old played the fiddle, a woman of perhaps 65 tapped her feet and could barely restrain herself

from dancing a little jig. Her friends teased her about it afterwards and she said, "Well, when I'm in church I know I have to keep my feet still. But when I'm here at our Senate meeting, I feel like I can let them go."

Pleasure in seeing each other and high spirits were the order of the day at the June meeting of the West Central Missouri Senior Opportunities and Services (SOS) Senate in the little town of Versailles. More than 200 low-income men and women over 60—some in their nineties—came to the meeting as representatives of 34 Senior Centers in nine rural Missouri counties. With a scattering of grandchildren to take it all in, they entertained each other with music and poetry, shared accounts of their activities at the various senior centers, prepared and ate food together and talked about how they could influence local, state and national policy concerning the aging.

The company, the plentiful food, the dignity of taking a positive role in society are things these older Missourians appreciate deeply because they have been denied them. The area SOS program, begun in 1968 to help the older poor help themselves, has meant a very real change in their lives.

With headquarters in Appleton City, Missouri, the West Central Missouri SOS serves more than 2,500 low income people over 60. It is one of 200 such programs instituted by the Office of Economic Opportunity in the country to deal with the problems of the elderly poor.

The West Central Missouri SOS, part of the West Central Missouri Development Corporation headed by Charles Braithwait, operates in Bates, Cedar, St. Clair, Vernon, Henry, Morgan, Johnson, Benton and Cass Counties. Young people from these rural counties continuously have migrated to urban areas, leaving behind the old in a pattern familiar to so much of rural America.

"We are proud of our older people's program," Braithwait said. "We were skeptical at first as to how it would work because it is so hard to organize rural people. But it has exceeded our expectations."

Helen Kling, who helped organize the program and is now technical advisor to it, said, "At first there seemed to be little community interest—there was a denial that there was need. But when people began to see what the older poor could do to help themselves, and to understand their problems, the feeling changed—many community groups and individuals have become extremely cooperative. The churches especially have been helpful in providing places for groups to meet."

A major achievement of the program has been community recognition of the older poor's existence and their plight.

It is bad enough to be poor, but to be old and poor and to live in a rural area means that problems are tragically compounded. Rural Missouri is like many other rural areas in America in that old people can be found who barely exist on pensions or social security with no family, or seemingly abandoned by living relatives. Mrs. Kling said, "we keep finding old people living in the worst poverty who are not even aware that they are eligible for welfare or food stamps, and sometimes even social security." Many old people live alone with no means of transportation, and in rural areas there is rarely any public transportation. Many have no television or telephone.

Often, pride is all that the older person has left. A profile of the older poor person prepared by the Office of Economic Opportunity says: "The older poor person is often bitter over the necessity of receiving social welfare services after having worked all of his life with nothing to show for it. He is reluctant to face the necessity of asking

for help and considers even starving (independence) as the last refuge for his pride."

The word "poor" applies only to the financial situation of many older people eligible for the SOS program. Their resources vary greatly. Some with little income have comfortable homes, community contacts and family and good health. But many are entirely alone, with almost no resources and chronic ailments. Through the SOS program, such older people learn about each other and those better off help those in greater need.

The basis of the Senior Opportunities and Services program is the local Senior Center, of which there are 34 in the nine-county area. Each Senior Center elects two delegates to a County Congress, and two more voting delegates to an area Senior Citizens Senate. Both meet bi-monthly. The Senate, which consists of officers and delegates from all the centers, meets monthly. Any older person who wants to can attend any of the meetings, take part in the discussion and serve on committees.

But the local center is the hub of activity for most of the participants. Finding a place to meet is the first challenge of an oldsters group. The SOS has very little money for rent or renovation. Thus, some of the meeting places are unused churches or old houses that the older people repair and clean up themselves, or houses loaned by members of the community.

Mrs. Kling describes one center:

"Bear Creek holds its meetings in a white frame church no longer used for services. It is located on top of a rocky Ozark hill, six miles from the nearest town of Osceola. It has an oak-shaded cemetery and in the yard are long picnic tables left from years past. Inside, the women quilt every Thursday, while the men visit, or make repairs to the church, or keep the cemetery raked and tended."

There are 11 SOS Staff Community Aides who help organize the centers, make home visits to search out needy older people and provide or arrange for transportation to the center meetings when needed. The aides are all low-income themselves and 60 years of age or older. The oldest aide is 74.

Most centers are open every day for various activities, which vary according to the wishes of the members. "All SOS participants are not members of the centers," Mrs. Kling said. "Some are invalids, or for some other reason are unable to get out, and others, although they participate in activities such as crafts and quilting, prefer not to try to go to meetings." Most centers average from 15 to 60 members, some being much larger than others.

An important activity at most centers is the preparation and serving of hot meals. SOS Centers get certain surplus foods such as flour, butter, and rice, which the participants use to prepare meals for themselves, for larger meetings and for shut-ins. Volunteers and SOS aides carry food cooked at their center to people who are unable to get out and who do not often enjoy a good hot meal, either because they are not able to fix it or can't afford it.

Eating at the center is a social occasion and the food is delicious. Centers have hot meals as frequently as they can afford it, which may be weekly or every other week. "These people really know how to get a dime out of ten pennies," said Mrs. Kling. Popular foods include cornbread, rice pudding and assorted pies. The centers usually buy turkey or ham for meat because they will go farther. "When fresh garden vegetables are available and with the surplus commodity foods, they prepare real banquets," Mrs. Kling said. The commodity and garden foods are supplemented by food paid for out of the SOS budget.

Next to getting enough to eat, medical

needs are of prime concern to the elderly poor. Thus, several of the centers have started screening clinics.

This program was begun by Mrs. Hortense Shockley of the Butler Senior Center who got tired of trying to find someone to take her to the doctor's office for weekly blood pressure readings and the long wait when she got there. "Why can't this be done at our center?" she asked. The doctors agreed that it could, and tuberculosis testing and diabetes screening were added as well. Now, volunteer registered and practical nurses come to the centers on a regular schedule to provide these needed services.

Older poor persons who have a positive reaction to the TB test are taken by SOS thus to the state tuberculosis sanitarium at Mt. Vernon where they can get x-rays for two dollars, paid for by SOS.

While SOS provides medical supplies and materials needed by the clinics, all the labor is donated by community people.

Since idleness and lack of money are problems which go together for many of the elderly, craft programs are a natural way for them to help themselves. This is especially true for many of the older people who are skilled at making things with their hands. Thus, making crafts for pleasure and for sale is becoming an increasingly important center and home activity for the SOS participants. There are now four established SOS craft shops—the first and largest is Sac-Osage, where the Sac and Osage rivers meet. The others are the Wagon Wheel shop at Warrensburg, the Old School shop at Butler, and the Bittersweet Corners shop in Benton County.

To help the craft shops get established, the Methodist Fund for Reconciliation gave the SOS \$500 the first year and \$800 the second year.

Craft articles made include handsome quilts, wooden picture and quilting frames, games and shelving. Apple head dolls and cornhusk dolls are popular with tourists, as are sun bonnets, aprons and linens with beautifully detailed needle work. "One woman was able to double her income by selling what she made," Mrs. Kling said. "That only meant she had \$80 a month, which isn't much but was better than what she had before."

Old time looms are being rethreaded, renovated and delivered to those centers whose members are interesting in making rugs for sale. Two rooms at the Sac-Osage Craft Shop are filled with donated machinery which craft cooperative members use to make salable articles.

Also sold at the craft shops are antiques and collectors' items, such as old telephones, shoe lasts, irons, harness parts, wash boards, butter molds, dishes.

Finding a building easily accessible to tourists to house the craft shops was a problem. Sac-Osage is temporarily located in a building which used to be an old cheese factory, but has been condemned by the Corps of Engineers to clear land for the soon-to-be-built Truman Dam and Reservoir. The Senior Center group had to fix the leaky roof, replace windows and put in new wiring. Much of the work was done by the older people themselves.

The four craft groups' rules require that exhibitors be participants in the SOS program, and unless excused by illness or age, contributes at least one day's work each month tending shop. Each exhibitor receives 90 percent of the sale price of the articles he or she enters with 10 percent going to the governing board to pay utilities. A yearly family membership costs one dollar.

In season, produce is also sold at the co-ops. Green beans and sweet corn, pumpkins and bittersweet tomatoes, cabbage, Christmas trees, and (often) home-baked bread, rolls, cakes, pies are offered. Pawpaws can be

bought at the Sac-Osage shop in the autumn, and the good sweet seed-filled Ozark persimmons. Home-made soap, garden-grown sage, green peppers and wild gooseberry jam are also sold.

Other activities include classes in First Aid, how to cook nutritious meals with surplus food, and life saving. Frequently, community volunteers help out with classes, cooking and transportation. Other SOS activities include a telephone check system—elderly people living alone call each other every day to see if they are all right. Those who don't have phones use some other signal, such as raising a window shade by a certain time. Recently, whistles were distributed to old people living alone to use if they should fall and be unable to reach a telephone to call for help. "Whistles can be heard farther away than a yell," Mrs. Kling said.

The joy of human companionship is reason enough for many of the older people to participate in the SOS program. But by coming to the centers, many also get caught up in solving complex problems, and enjoy, for the first time, having a voice in the community.

"For some of the older poor, SOS meetings are the first time they have participated in an organization that elects officers and uses parliamentary procedures," Mrs. Kling said. "Some centers didn't see the necessity for parliamentary procedures and bylaws at first, but after haggling over how long certain people should stay in office, they saw the necessity for clear-cut rules."

As they realize what they can achieve, the elderly members become increasingly sophisticated about their business sessions.

Under the guidance of the Senate, several committees have come into being as a need was recognized by Senate members. A consumer Education Committee studies reports on consumer protection and other matters of special importance to low-income elderly. This committee also arranged for a speaker from the Federal Trade Commission to discuss the Fair Packaging Law and the Truth in Lending Law before the Senate. The committee members also got a representative of the television industry to speak on Truth in Advertising, and a representative from the Food and Drug Administration to conduct a Senate meeting.

As a result of this committee's work, some consumer fraud cases have been exposed and some victimized older people have received redress.

In one case, an insurance check for \$156 was returned to an elderly lady after she was assisted in writing to the State Department of Insurance describing the pressure and unfulfilled promises of an itinerant salesman. The company had ignored her letters, including a registered one, but they paid prompt attention when the State Department of Insurance wrote to them.

The Social Concerns committee holds training sessions to inform the participants about the state agencies, elected officials and commissions which are available for assistance to the elderly.

This committee had petitions circulated in which older poor asked for relief from some tax burdens on older home owners and renters, and for free hunting and fishing licenses. "The people who most need to hunt and fish for food can't afford the licenses," Mrs. Kling said.

The Social Concerns Committee also keeps track of legislation being introduced at both state and national level and explores how these bills, if passed, will effect them.

Communication and interaction with other human beings—not just older poor but with the community-at-large—is one of the primary rewards of the SOS. "Some of the people who come to the centers had never been away from their home communities in their lives," Mr. Kling said. Just to be able to go

somewhere is a treat for many members. One project all the centers are joining in is saving money to buy a bus to be used both for transportation to area meetings and for longer trips. They are planning sightseeing visits to various cities and tourist attractions. At the June Senate meeting the members rejected a proposal to get a secondhand bus, preferring a new one even if it took two more years of saving. To earn money, they are collecting cans which are sold for a penny apiece to a local can opener factory, which uses them for experiments with a new product. They are also collecting trading stamps and coupons toward the purchase of the bus.

But the reward of increased communication is more than simple pleasure. These older people's pride is evident as they listen to reports of their members who have attended state conferences concerning the problems of the elderly. Harry Neptune, Senate president, is an officer of the newly-formed Missouri Senior Citizens Action Council, whose members are low-income elderly from the 18 Community Action Programs throughout the State of Missouri.

This Council works on problems common to elderly poor from both urban and rural sections of the State. Neptune was also invited by the National Council on Aging to be on a panel for one of their cluster training meetings held in Wichita, Kansas.

Older persons in all the centers of the SOS program have been participating in the events leading up to the White House Conference on Aging in Washington, D.C. in November. They were vocally involved in local community forums where they listed the most pressing needs of the aging in their communities. Eighteen of the SOS participants were elected delegates to the State White House Conference on Aging held in Jefferson City in May.

As isolated human beings, who are often neglected and ignored, older poor persons frequently feel ineffective and powerless. Common too is a feeling of resignation and despair. But as they become part of a group and learn that there are 20 million older Americans of which one in four is living in poverty, they realize that they are not unique or necessarily alone. The West Central Missourians who are part of SOS are, some for the first time, beginning to influence the society in which they live.

#### MINNEAPOLIS HEALTH HEARINGS

### HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on July 1, 1971, I included in the Extensions of Remarks information I had received at the recently concluded Minneapolis health hearings. The information included new ways to use computers in delivering health care. At that time, I included a letter of Mr. Bruce Boraas discussing a program utilizing geostatic mapping. I inadvertently failed to include the information provided me by Dr. John Harris, the head of the ophthalmology department at the University of Minnesota. Dr. Harris, in cooperation with Mr. Boraas and Dr. Ivan Voss, a medical sociologist at the University of Minnesota, has developed a technique for showing the need for health care areas of the North Central States.

The geostatic mapping program involves the use of four variables: First, identifying the physician in terms of his distance from population centers; second, identifying the number of physicians per 100,000 citizens; third, utilizing the medium family income, in this case the lower quartile; and fourth, adding to it the visual morbidity, since this original program was geared toward developing and discovering the need for ophthalmological services.

The computer then prints out a map showing various degrees of need for these services. Dr. Harris is to be commended for his action in developing this extremely useful technique for improvements in comprehensive health planning programs.

I am reprinting Mr. Boraas letter which explains this technique in more detail:

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA,  
Minneapolis, Minn., February 26, 1971.

HON. DONALD FRASER: We at the Division of Health Computer Sciences, University of Minnesota, wish to call your attention to the powerful computer analysis tool we refer to as Geostatistical Mapping. We have developed this at the initial request and support of the Vision and Visual Science Manpower Survey, partially supported by the National Eye Institute.

It is nearing completion and will include the 48 contiguous states of the continental United States on a region-by-region, state-by-state, county-by-county basis. Since its initial inception as a research and analysis tool, we have extended the data base to include many health-related parameters specifically for Minnesota.

This effort is directed toward analysis support for the Vital Statistics Section of the Minnesota State Health Department.

Once the initial analysis programs are completed, any geographical data base may be established for the system. Currently, we have the U.S. Census Bureau 1960 data on a national level. These have been corrected by mathematical algorithms to adjust for subsequent years, for the State of Minnesota. For example, there are adjustment factors in the programs to present the population distribution in Minnesota for 1968. We are currently preparing to update the population data base to include the 1970 U.S. Census Bureau population data base.

The purposes behind the development of this analytical tool were: (1) to assess health care needs based on a geographical setting; and (2) to assess health care manpower based on a geographical setting.

The project began by attempting to identify geographically the location of ophthalmologists, optometrists, eye-ear-nose-throat specialists, and their relationship to the population density and incidence of blindness. We next expanded this data base to identify population rates for causes of death recorded on death certificates at the Minnesota State Health Department. This death certificate data base is on a year-by-year and county-by-county basis. Next, it was expanded to portray geographically the distributions of licensed nursing homes, general hospitals, and specialized hospitals (such as mental institutions, tuberculosis sanatoriums, etc.) in the State of Minnesota, relative to population density. We are currently promoting the use of this analytical tool in assessing the distribution and effectiveness of emergency ambulance service in the State of Minnesota. There are numerous possible applications of this geostatistical mapping analysis just within the area of ambulance service alone. For example, there are approximately 100,000 calls for ambulances in the State of Min-

nesota per year. One question this mapping analytical tool could contribute an answer to is, "Are the ambulances distributed effectively within the geographical clusters from which most calls occur over a period of time?"

Once these data bases are established, the user of the geostatistical system can interrogate the computer on hundreds of different combinations of variables. For example, the group of 55-75-year-old males with primary cause of death listed as stomach cancer on a county-by-county distribution overlay can

be interrogated and displayed. The computer then generates this combination of data in minutes, and the combination is plotted out by the computer in less than twenty minutes.

We at the Division of Health Computer Sciences are proud of this analytical tool. It represents a high degree of the state of the art and certainly represents one of the most comprehensive tools for obtaining a meaningful analysis of health care needs and health care delivery. It not only supplements voluminous tables, but often super-

cedes their informative value by displaying more succinctly what tables are unable to display.

I thank you, Mr. Fraser, for expressing an interest in our capabilities and ongoing contribution to health care need and health care delivery analysis, and I trust this will be of considerable additional interest to your colleagues in Washington.

Respectfully,

BRUCE A. BORAAS,  
Assistant Director.

## SENATE—Friday, September 17, 1971

The Senate met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, ruler of men and nations, teach us the clear truth that our civilization cannot survive materially unless it is redeemed spiritually. Kindle the fire of faith in each of us to make us just and kind and pure that redemption may begin in us. Keep us steadfast and true to the highest revelation of Thyself and Thy will which Thou has made known to us. Enable us to draw upon the latent reserves of humanity, humility, and humor which are part of our heritage. Above all else keep us "a nation whose God is the Lord"—Lord of our homes, Lord of our schools, Lord of our churches, Lord of our ballot boxes, Lord of our government halls, Lord of our peace tables, Lord of our lives.

For it is in the name of the Lord we pray. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, September 16, 1971, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### SENATOR FROM VERMONT

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I present the certificate of appointment of the Honorable ROBERT T. STAFFORD as a Senator from the State of Vermont.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The certificate of appointment will be read. The legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CERTIFICATE OF APPOINTMENT

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that, pursuant to the

power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of Vermont, I, Deane C. Davis, the governor of said State, do hereby appoint Robert T. Stafford a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein, caused by the death of Winston L. Prouty, is filled by election as provided by law.

Witness: His excellency our Governor Deane C. Davis, and our seal hereto affixed at Montpelier this sixteenth day of September, in the year of our Lord 1971.

By the Governor:

DEANE C. DAVIS,  
Governor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Senator-designate will present himself at the desk, the oath of office will be administered to him.

Mr. STAFFORD, of Vermont, escorted by Mr. AIKEN, advanced to the desk of the Vice President; the oath prescribed by law was administered to him by the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER); and he subscribed to the oath in the official oath book.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

### RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair, for the purpose of greeting our newest Member.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Thereupon, at 9:04 a.m., the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reassembled at 9:06 a.m. when called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield the 3 minutes allotted to me under the standing order to the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I was very glad to present to the Senate the Honorable ROBERT T. STAFFORD, who has been designated by Gov. Deane C. Davis, of Vermont, to succeed the late Senator Winston L. Prouty as a Senator from Vermont.

Governor Davis has made an excellent selection. By this appointment, the Senate will have acquired a Member of sterling, if not ironclad character.

BOB STAFFORD is known to most of our Members. He has been an important Member of the House of Representatives for over 10 years. Until today he has been

a member of the Armed Services Committee and vice chairman of the House Republican conference.

Previous to that, he was Governor of Vermont. Before that, he served as Lieutenant Governor and attorney general of the State of Vermont.

BOB STAFFORD's military record is highly commendable, since he served in both World War II and the Korean conflict. He is married to the former Helen Kelley, of Bellows Falls, Vt., and they have four very attractive daughters.

As a lifelong Vermonter, Bob possesses the traits for which the State of Vermont is well known; namely, commonsense, understanding, and love for his State and country.

I might also add, he does not like to be pushed around, but prefers to make up his own mind.

Sometimes he agrees with me and sometimes he does not. That is one reason why I like him.

I wish to commend Governor Davis for his wise judgment in making this appointment.

On behalf of my wife and friends, I welcome Bob and Helen to the Senatorial arena, which is normally a very dignified place, and to which I expect him to make wise and constructive contributions.

### ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT) is now recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, if I may, first, be recognized for the usual 3 minutes under the standing order for a different purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I join the dean of Senators on this side of the aisle, the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN), on behalf of all of us, in welcoming Bob STAFFORD to the Senate of the United States.

This is one of those occasions when we celebrate a setback for the other body. It is a loss to the other body that Bob STAFFORD will not be there; but it is our gain, the country's gain, and Vermont's gain.

Mr. President, it has been my great pleasure to know Bob STAFFORD for a very considerable period of time, ever since he came to the House of Representatives. He has been a member of his party's leadership in the House. He has furnished wise guidance to House Members