EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CHASE-MANHATTAN'S PATTERSON CALLS FOR EXECUTIVE INVOLVEMENT

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Herbert P. Patterson, president of the Chase-Manhattan Bank, recently delivered an address to the New York Commerce and Industry Association which I think is noteworthy. So that my colleagues may have the benefit of Mr. Patterson's remarks, I enter them here:

ONE MANAGEMENT JOB THAT CAN'T BE DELEGATED

I'm very pleased to have this opportunity of appearing at your Forum and am gratified that you preferred listening to me rather than strolling through the park on this last day of summer.

Like most of you, I look forward to the summer months as a time to catch up on my reading. However, I now look back in dismay at the relatively few books and articles I've managed to read thoroughly.

I did find one article especially provocative. It appeared in the July-August issue of The Harvard Business Review under the intriguing title "The Sounds of Executive Silence."

Those of you who read it will recall that author Norman Adler points out that the stridency of both the radical left and the radical right is on the upsurge. The academic community has become increasingly vocal; politicians at all levels of government are rarely at a loss for words on any subject; yet from most corporate executives comes only silence.

The author deplores what he calls "this self-imposed intellectual and social celibacy," and he argues that businessmen make a serious mistake in shunning the national debate on vital economic and social issues—issues that are increasingly determining the well-being of our country and the conduct of our business enterprises.

Mr. Adler pleads his case as a lawyer and former corporate executive concerned with the broad role of business in our society. My own interest in the subject derives from my personal experiences over the past two years in broadening my contacts with government officials in Washington where the "executive silence" is often deafening.

For a few minutes this afternoon, I'd like to draw on these experiences and share with you some thoughts about the increasing need for more constructive dialogue between businessmen and government officials; the means for accomplishing this; and the benefits that can be realized from it.

As for the need, it seems to me that all we have to do is look around us. We see fully as many decisions being made on the future of business and banking in the halls of Congress these days as in corporate board rooms. Legislation on auto safety, air and water pollution, packaging requirements, cigarette advertising and other issues has had a profound impact on scores of businesses.

What Congress and the Executive Branch do over the next several months in implementing President Nixon's proposals may possibly shape our national economy for years to come.

I might say, parenthetically, that—given the drift of inflation and the drain on our dollar reserves—I feel the President had little choice except to act as he did in the emergency. But it is well to recognize that the steps he has taken in Phase One will not, in themselves, solve our economic problems. They will do no more than provide a breather for the country, so it can deal more forcibly with the fundamental causes of its economic malaise. Because controls—and none of us like them—inevitably and rather quickly lose their effectiveness, they are seldom a satisfactory solution for the longer run.

Ultimately, cooperation is the key: cooperation abroad, among the leading currency nations of the world and cooperation at home among labor, business and government. Those of you who must compete regularly against the Japanese have some idea of what the labor-business-government triad can accomplish through cooperation.

At the risk of seeming somewhat naive, I'd also like to suggest closer cooperation between the major political parties in curbing inflation. Bipartisanship in this area is, I know, always easy to talk about and difficult to accomplish. Yet that's what people used to say about our postwar foreign policy until a determined band, led by Senator Arthur Vandenberg, showed that cooperation was possible in bringing to fruition the Marshall Plan and the Atlantic Pact. In my judgment, the need for a similiar bipartisan approach to inflation control is presently urgent and may determine America's economic fate in the Seventies and even beyond. It is simply not possible to plan the course of an economy as vast and complicated as ours within a two-year election cycle.

Some of the main hazards facing the economy in the decade ahead are governmental. As Fortune Magazine pointed out recently, the U.S. cannot have a continuing healthy economy unless it improves the quality of its government. If we in business want to promote this improvement and have a voice in the decision-making process, we must come to know government officials and keep our point of view constantly before them, just as labor and other segments of society are doing.

So much, then, for the need.

What are the best means of meeting this need?

Surely, business associations such as Commerce and Industry perform an indispensable role in furthering better communications between businessmen and government officials. They can be highly effective in handling broad problems that may extend well beyond the reach of individual companies.

But business associations don't relieve the executive of his own personal responsibilities in the government relations area. The time is long past when top executives could rely entirely on others to do their work of communicating with government.

This is a job that's become too important for top management to delegate. It has become a do-it-yourself project. The executive himself can be far more effective in presenting his company's views on major issues than anyone else can on his behalf.

During the past two years, as I indicated earlier, I've tried to practice what I preach by going to Washington every few weeks to talk with Senators, Congressmen and other government officials.

Washington has been described as a marvelous blend of southern efficiency and northern hospitality. Commuting to there may not be everyone's idea of fun. Nonetheless, it is the "Headquarters City" of the world's biggest borrower, biggest lender and biggest spender . . . a "Headquarters City" where each day decisions are made which profoundly affect our business and personal lives.

Moving around Capitol Hill and calling on Federal agencies in downtown Washington is the best way I know of getting a "feel" for which issues are primary and which are secondary. No matter how many "confidential" reports an executive reads, the only way he can absorb the mood of Washington is to be on the scene. Legislators have a pretty good grasp of public opinion, and today's vocal public opinion has an amazing way of becoming tomorrow's legislation.

I've spoken with some businessmen who acknowledge frankly that they are timid about calling on their Congressmen or testifying at Congressional hearings. I must confess that I myself started out with some trepidation, if only because the prime rate was then at its highest level since the Civil War! In fact, my associates wouldn't even let me call on Congressman Wright Patman until my third visit!

However, the reception has always been cordial and the conversation pleasant. You may have to cool your heels while a Congressman shuttles over to the Capitol to cast a vote, or has his picture taken on the steps with a visiting 4H Club from back home, but most lawmakers do welcome visits from concerned businessmen.

A California Congressman explained to me one reason why. "We can read a bill," he said, "and not see that it's going to hit a certain industry. You people know immediately that it would have an effect on your particular business or your community. That's when you should get on the phone or write a letter, or, better, come down to Washington."

As you know, members of our New York Congressional delegation all have offices right here in the area as well as in Washington, so you can often find them in town on Mondays and Fridays when they are home mending fences.

Well, you may ask, why would a Congressman want to see me? What have I got to offer him?

For one thing, you have information—or ready access to it— and that's an extremely valuable commodity in Congressional circles. Too many businessmen assume that legislators are experts on every conceivable subject. That's an obvious physical impossibility, as the legislators themselves are the first to admit. After all, more than 15,000 bills and resolutions have been introduced in Congress just since January. The average Congressman's research facilities are considerably limited, so he's more than glad to have information that will help him do a more efficient job.

For example, I found one Congressman who was deeply interested in the various options open for funding public education, and our economists at the bank provided him with a cost-benefit analysis. A Congressional Committee wanted to know how many new manufacturing plants had been denied natural gas servicing over the past few years, and our Energy Division was able to come up with the answer. During one monetary crisis, a Congressman wanted to explain to his constituents what was going on, so I agreed to appear as "guest panelist" on his local television program.

Admittedly, these are areas that a bank would be likely to have more background on than other businesses. But if you take a hard look at your own field, the chances are you'll find many information sources that could prove very helpful to Congressmen and, at the same time, provide a means of closer communication.

As Senators and Representatives are favorably impressed when businessmen do take the time to plead their case personally, the benefits can be well worth the effort.

This point was underscored a few weeks ago during the Congressional inquiry into the Lockheed case. When Chairman Wright Patman opened hearings on the legislation, no fewer than twenty-four bankers appeared to testify. Mr. Patman insisted that we give our name, rank and serial number. Virtually every man at the witness table was Chairman or President of his particular bank. Many Committee members commented ap-

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

provingly on the willingness of senior executives to participate in the hearings themselves rather than delegating the task.

Another recent illustration of the benefits of personal contact involved the issue of interlocking directorates, a favorite target of corporate critics these days. The current best-seller, "America, Inc.," suggests that a handful of corporations, interlocked with large banks and insurance companies, control our pocketbook, our environment, our health and safety—and—through political contributions—even the machinery of government.

Such extravagant charges and the legislative proposals growing out of them are based on the assumption that interlocking directorates are inherently evil and automatically imply the passing of "inside information." One section of the so-called Bank Reform Act would have made it virtually impossible for commercial banks like ours to attract outside businessmen to serve on Boards of Directors.

The banking community pointed out that, under the bill we would have Boards restricted largely to retired individuals and inside directors. By the very nature of their positions, the latter would be subordinate to the Chairman, so he'd have no real accountability. Many Congressmen saw the validity of this argument, and these features have now been modified considerably in the latest legislative draft.

However, the benefits of Washington liaison work should not be judged solely by the success or failure of one piece of legislation, but by the opportunity it affords to get your story across on a sustained basis. It is important—in fact, imperative—to reinforce the dialogue between business and government, especially when you are not asking for any favorable consideration. In that way the communications channels will be open for the inevitable occasions when you want a Congressman to support your position.

Now obviously, nobody becomes an expert on Washington in two years and I am no exception, but on the basis of what I've learned so far, I would offer two concluding suggestions.

One is that businessmen are likely to fare better on Capitol Hill if they state positively what they are for rather than harping everlastingly on what they are against.

If you approach a Congressman with constructive suggestions you are likely to get a much more receptive hearing. Particularly is this true if you call on him while a bill is in the formative stages, when changes can easily be made.

On two occasions recently, once in Washington and once in New York, Congressmen have discussed with me their initial thoughts on a piece of legislation and asked for comments and even language for the proposed bill. On other occasions our bank has worked closely with the Executive Branch to provide ideas on implementing Congressional action.

Several Congressmen have complained to me that one of the most common mistakes businessmen make is to wait until the last minute and then try to summon them off the House floor to talk just before the final vote. Legislators resent this—and I suspect you and I would, too, if we were in their place.

The only thing worse is to say nothing at all during the weeks a bill is up for committee hearings and debate, then write your Congressman a brusque letter of complaint. More than one Congressman has noted ruefully that after having voted "Yea" on a measure on which his pre-vote mail had been running 5 to 1 in favor—he finds that the post-vote mail abusing him for his stand outnumbers the letters of thanks by 10 to 1!

My second and final suggestion, is that businessmen should be prepared and willing to speak out on social as well as economic issues.

One Congressman put it this way: "The only time I see or hear from businessmen is when there is talk of raising taxes or lowering tariffs. I'd like to see some of them when we're debating significant social issues that may not affect them directly, but will have a much greater indirect impact on their businesses, as well as their personal lives."

Business executives usually don't get where they are unless they are highly able, analytical and articulate about business matters. Why not then apply these same qualities to the world of social and political activity? The alternative may be further waves of restrictive legislation and further shifts of initiative from the private to the public sector.

In summary, I am utterly convinced that we need more activists in the top ranks of our business community—heads of corporations, who are willing to go to "Headquarters City" and become personally involved—thus replacing "executive silence" with raised executive voices on the great issues of the day.

THE STATE OF ALASKA

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, when the Imperial Russian flag was lowered in Sitka and the Stars and Stripes of the United States raised in its place, a vast new territory became American. We know it today as the State of Alaska.

The formal transfer of Russian America to the United States occurred 104 years ago today. It was an event that the Russian civilians regarded with sadness, while most Americans were far from enthusiastic about the acquisition of Alaska.

We can thank Secretary Seward for his "folly," as it was noted then and be grateful for the foresight that was his.

October 18, 1867, was a "bright and beautiful day" in Sitka where the Russian past still lives in the names of her streets, buildings, and many of her citizens.

Though the treaty arranging for the transfer was signed in Washington on March 30, 1867, the actual transfer took place in October. It was at this time American commissioners were sent to Sitka, the capital, with proper authorization to accept the formal surrender of the territory.

The ceremony, which took place on Castle Hill at the Governor's residence was accompanied by a salute to the flag fired by a Russian cannon. With the transfer, Great Britain remained the only European power with possessions on the mainland of North America.

The Federal Government erected barracks at a number of points and for 10 years an Army officer represented the authorities in Washington. After a short time, the army troops were withdrawn and a naval officer stationed at Sitka represented the Government.

Now, 104 years later, Alaska is on the threshold of great development. No one is more pleased than I am to extend my good wishes to the people of the State of Alaska and especially to the people of Sitka where it all began.

FEDERAL CHILD CONTROL ACT PASSED

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, on September 30, by a margin of just three votes, the House of Representatives passed one of the most dangerous pieces of legislation ever to come before Congress—and the competition for that title is keen. By 186 votes to 183, the House approved the Comprehensive Child Development Act as an amendment to H.R. 10351, which originally was limited to continuing programs first authorized by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

This tremendously significant and far-reaching amendment was brought to the House floor with only 24 hours' notice and without benefit of a printed committee report. Normal procedures in handling legislation were thus bypassed and the time available to consider the bill was totally inadequate.

The Senate passed a substantially similar bill September 9. In view of the slight differences between the Senate and House versions, there is little hope that the really objectionable features will be removed in conference committee. The bill can only be kept from becoming law now by a Presidential veto.

Of the 183 Members of the House who voted against the Comprehensive Child Development Act, 134 are Republicans, including Republican Minority Leader GERALD R. FORD. Of the 186 who voted for it, only 21 are Republicans. Clearly, the President's party in the House has spoken against this measure and thereby given the President grounds to veto the entire bill of which it is so important a part. Letters from concerned citizens all over the country could help persuade him to do so, despite the inevitable pressures in favor of the bill from the media, the educators and the bureaucrats.

The Comprehensive Child Development Act is explicitly aimed at children from one to five, below school age. It sets up all the machinery and the financing for a massive governmental invasion of this last stronghold of the home, hitherto untouched even by the immense apparatus of compulsory public education. The fact that the new programs are not immediately to be made compulsory is hardly reassuring to those of us who have watched so many new State and Federal programs begin as "voluntary" and then, once established and increasingly power-hungry, come to be regarded as the natural and inevitable repositories of a steadily broadening scope of compulsory authority.

Therefore, the most important fact about the comprehensive child development programs authorized by this bill is not the powers now given to the agencies that will run them, but the purposes that are set for them. The bill lists 13 separate purposes for which Federal "child development" funds may be used, including—in addition to basic day care—"comprehensive physical and men-

tal health, social, and cognitive development services—specially designed health, social, and educational programs including afterschool, summer, weekend, vacation, and overnight programs—medical, psychological, educational, and other appropriate diagnosis and identification of visual, dental, hearing, speech, nutritional, and other physical, mental, and emotional barriers to full participation in child development programs, with appropriate treatment to overcome such barriers—utilization of child advocates to work on behalf of children and parents to secure them full access to other services, programs, or activities intended for the benefit of children."

All of this refers primarily to children under the age of 6, and all of it is to be carried out by the Government in conformity with policies laid down by a new Office of Child Development in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which this bill would create.

The potential for abuse should be obvious simply from reading the list of purposes. No facet of a child's life is omitted. The intention is clearly to put Government in place of the parent—the ultimate threat to the family.

SBA OFFICE IS HONORED IN NEWARK

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the singular honor and privilege of presenting a longtime friend and excellent administrator, Andrew P. Lynch, with an award for being named district office of the year by the Small Business Administration.

Andy Lynch's Newark office has been named regional office of the year four times and has now been singled out as the best in the country. I know of no public servant who deserves this recognition more than Andy Lynch.

An article follows:

[From the Sunday Star-Ledger, Sept. 19, 1971]

SBA OFFICE IS HONORED IN NEWARK

The Newark District Office of the Small Business Administration has been named national "District Office of the Year."

The district office, headed by Andrew P. Lynch, was organized by Lynch seven years ago as a post-of-duty station with two persons on the staff. It now employs 50 people and serves the entire state. It has been named "Regional Office of the Year" four times since it became a district office five years ago.

Despite the fact the Newark office is surpassed in size by a number of others, its volume of work is second to none. During the past year its financial assistance division interviewed 10,158 prospective loan applicants and approved loans amounting to about $17 million.

Its procurement assistance division helped hundreds of small firms obtain government contracts. Its management assistance division, assisted by volunteer groups, provided management training, business publications and counseling for more than 12,000 persons.

BRIDGES TO TOMORROW

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the good fortune to read the speech which Rabbi Avraham Soltes delivered last spring at the first commencement at the American College Jerusalem. Dr. Soltes is a distinguished American scholar whom I have been lucky enough to know personally over the years.

Rabbi Soltes' message of American-Israeli friendship and the value of education is one that should matter to all Americans. His sensitivity to the traditions of our great country run through his eloquent speech. Perhaps as important as the concepts with which Dr. Soltes dealt last June was the very existence of the American College in Jerusalem. This is a nonsectarian, international school which can play an important role in healing the wounds in the Middle East. The American citizens who created this institution rightfully understood that bridging the communications gap is an essential step in resolving human differences.

I am certain that over the years, with our support, that the American College in Jerusalem will become an even more important center of scholarship and understanding. Because of the relevance of Rabbi Soltes' speech I would like to include excerpts from it in the RECORD at this point.

The excerpts follow:

BRIDGES TO TOMORROW: COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS AMERICAN COLLEGE IN JERUSALEM, FIRST COMMENCEMENT JUNE 13, 1971

(By Avraham Soltes, M.A., M. H. L., Rabbi, D.D., DH.L.)

I deem it a great privilege to stand before you this day and share with you—faculty, students, parents, and members of the American and Israel communities—this historic moment at which we salute the first flowering of a sturdy sapling, whose roots sink deep in the nutritive soil of our nations' ideologies and whose potential fruit may help bring closer the visions of their inspired seers.

Like most firm ideas which are planted in worked-over soil, the concept of an American College in Jerusalem has encountered rocks and boulders that have tended to block the seedling's early growth. Individuals with childish perspectives have tied cans of aspersions to the first budding branches, and politicians with a Bedouin mentality of xenophobia have endeavored to uproot the tender tree as their mental predecessors tried to pull out the first plantings of Israel's youthful Halutzim.

But, like Israel and like the American Pilgrim fathers, the College has survived its impediments. Only deep religious devotion can account adequately for the survival of the Plymouth Colony and for the existence of later Massachusetts Bay, Rhode Island, Maryland, and Pennsylvania colonies. Only an equal devotion to Hebrew ideals of dignity, non-exploitation and love of the land can explain the parallel survival of the Halutzim who restored the swamps and wilderness of this land, its cities and its rocky hillsides, in the face of overwhelming obstacles of nature, of spoliation and the powerful forces of human envy.

AMERICA NEEDS THE COLLEGE

But the American College in Jerusalem has survived and will grow and develop from this day forth, with giant steps, because the need for the College is as essential for the future of Israel and America as its conception is a natural outgrowth of our common historic heritage. Most American colleges established outside the fifty states, as many within American borders, were founded for missionary purposes or as bearers of the "white man's burden" of enlightenment to backward natives. The American College in Jerusalem was born of neither of these two passions. It is nondenominational in concept and spirit; and it comes to a country that enjoys one of the highest proportions of intellectual activity in the world. Israel does not need the American College to educate its sons and daughters in the arts or sciences, or the "democratic way of life." We Americans need the American College in Jerusalem and Israel needs its potential influence because of the blessing and enrichment and broadening of perspective that such an in-depth cultural exchange can offer. Only a college which enlightens students, not with a random ballet performance, with a quick tour of historic sites or clever nightclubs or a smattering of folk songs, but with a regular full-time program of study, can build those spiritual bridges of shared experience and gradual enlightenment that alone can make for genuine peace and mutual respect and affection between peoples.

A thousand American students studying each year at this college in a language and system akin to that which they know at home, sitting at the feet of an international faculty with the opportunity to convey its accumulated expertise and experience in the flexible, linguistic symbols most comfortable for them—such a continuous student body over many years, can help significantly to span the ugly chasm in the true understanding of Israel by Americans—a chasm that is broadened each day by the sensation-seeking media, who search assiduously for titillating gossip of petty hostilities and add by radio and T.V. that which is unfit to print.

A thousand American students a year, some of whom will fall in love with the land or its people and remain to settle, and some of whom will return to their communities in the United States to correct the distortions of the press and its allies, will provide a living bridge between our peoples.

A thousand serious American students coming to Israel each year to learn its life in depth also will provide Israelis with a healthy corrective to the narrow picture of the "ugly American" which so many of them have found—a picture based on the footloose, spoiled, escapist vactionists and sensation-seekers who have comprised much of visiting American youth, and the "show me" adult contributors to Israeli causes and institutions, who fail to realize that financing is one element in a partnership of rescue and rehabilitation that also calls for blood, tears and courage in equal measures.

AMERICAN CULTURAL SOURCES

American culture, like all cultures, has been shaped by the syncretism of many sources and the blending of many elements. In our case, the mixture is so recent, that the major ingredients are easily discernible:

(1) *the land*—vast in size, rich in soil and the fruits of forest and stream; protected by great oceans that wash its coasts with commerce and the treasures of the sea; oceans that isolate it at will from the historic hostilities of its mother countries.

(2) *the people*—the restless, independent elements of older cultures—

The mavericks, the adventurers,

The oppressed and the enterprising.

Individuals who uprooted themselves from the security of the known, who were not content with the limitations of established

forms and doctrines, and who moved out to the dangerous and unknown trails and trials of a new land where all men might be considered equal. It was these dissenters and their heirs who constantly broke new ground in America, pushed out new frontiers as soon as the old wilderness became too fixed, and shaped the ranches and farms character of the American people.
and industries that have made for the open

(3) The third element in this compound, the one that, perhaps, most of all, gave American culture its most distinctive personality and institutions was its *religious heritage*, derived from an anthology of Hebrew manuscript fragments. It was composed two to four thousand years earlier, on this very soil whereon we stand today, and it told the story of a "peculiar" people, fathered by a series of God-intoxicated men who believed they were especially endowed with a blueprint for human society that could bring man close to an ideal pattern of peace and mutual confidence. The American colonists called this collection of historical, hortatory, legal, and poetical fragments the Bible (*the* book.) They read its words with reverence, internalized its teachings, and sought to realize its principles and institutions with an almost fanatical literalness—to build a Bible commonwealth in America, a "wilderness Zion."

SOCIAL STRUCTURE

The Biblical concern for the poor, the orphaned, the underprivileged was transmuted by them not only into institutions that to this day make public welfare and compensation *rights* in America, rather than benefactions, but they rejected the rigid social distinctions of England and the Continent and developed the "proposition" that all men are created equal—respect for the dignity of the individual, regardless of his economic position or biological heritage.

UNIVERSAL EDUCATION

From the first century, when Joshua ben Gamala instituted a system of universal public education in every town in Israel, no nation, until America, developed institutions that would reflect such a strong belief in education's magic powers. No other people has struggled harder to fashion a system that would not infringe upon individual freedom or religious autonomy.

As in the case of the faith of Israel, the absence of an intermediary in worship for the Puritan required the individual to read for himself the word of God described in Scripture and, therefore, demanded a system of universal education. Well into the seventeenth century, the prime purpose of the English university was to supply clergymen for the Anglican Church (which is why we still wear these clericals at college commencements), and grammar schools, headed by clergymen, prepared boys for the Church of England. In America, where the Puritans were building the New City of God, every member required sufficient education to read the blueprints of the city, in the Bible, for himself. The intellectual leaders studied Hebrew, Targum and Talmud, and many baccalaureate theses at 17th century Harvard were devoted to the fine points of Hebrew grammar.

By the time of the Revolution, the leaders of the Continental Congress realized that the American democratic experiment depended upon a vastly expanded educational base. While Jefferson and Madison and the dominating Humanists pushed for a tax-supported public school system, devoid of sectarian teaching, Dr. Benjamin Rush, physician, educator and signer of the Declaration of Independence, championed Bible study in all public schools. His *A Defense of the Use of the Bible as a School Book* argued that the Bible emphasized those democratic principles toward which all Americans were striving—and until recent Supreme Court decisions, the Bible continued in wide use as a public school reader.

AMERICAN LITERATURE

Whether the Bible is appropriate reading for American public schools, there can be little doubt that the spirit and imagery of Hebrew lore have saturated American literature and thinking. I will not burden a well-lettered audience like this with a patchwork of literary allusions to document this thesis—hundreds of essays and volumes have already done so, with great thoroughness: Melville's *Use of the Bible*, Melville's *Quarrel with God*, Melville's *Religious Thought* are but three examples of dozens of analyses of one American author's indebtedness to the Hebrew-concepts and style.

I would like to cite, instead, one American scholar and gentleman who capsulized the influence of Israel's thinking of the American spirit with incomparable clarity. His name was John Jay Chapman, translator of three Greek tragedies, quoted by William James in *Varieties of Religious Experience*, where he called him, "a profound moralist," dubbed by Edmund Wilson, the critic, "an American classic." He was a devout Episcopalian all his life, a vestryman of his church. In *Chapman and His Letters* he is quoted as follows:

"There is a depth of human feeling in the Jew that no other race ever possessed. We do no more than imitate and follow it. These Jews are more human than any other men. It is the cause of the spread of their religion, for we are all adopted into Judah. The heart of the world is Jewish. I'm glad I am a Jew. . . ."

In this world of cynicism and short range self-interest, in which few individuals and still fewer nations seem to operate by principles other than greed and fear, in which political alliances come and go with the inconstant winds of trade, a *genuine* friendship, like that of Israel and America, is a rare jewel, to be constantly polished and held aloft for all the world to see and understand.

TRAIN AMERICAN STATE DEPARTMENT AND CHURCH LEADERS HERE

Would it not serve the best interests of both our countries if future State Department officials and American church leaders received their training in Middle Eastern affairs here, at the American College in Jerusalem, instead of at the American University in Beirut or Cairo where they must constantly prove that they are not imperialists by espousing consistent anti-Israel positions?

Here in the lucid, Jerusalem atmosphere, they might be inspired to remember again that the faith in truth and justice and compassion which has weathered Nevuzaradan and Hadrian, which has outlived Vespasian and Hitler, this faith which America and Israel have shared for centuries, will endure and shine with the rising sun long after the fitful light of self-serving friendship will be buried with the oil an atomic generation will no longer need.

From the highlands of the Hudson, to the hills of Jerusalem, we bring you greetings on this your first commencement day:

Peace, salutations of affection and praise to those across the distance—for they are as dear as those who are near.

WATER POLITICS IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share an article which appeared October 3 in the San Francisco Chronicle-Examiner magazine, "This World," which should be of special interest to all Members from California. It is a concise and fascinating account of the course of water and power in my home State of California. It points out that legislation introduced by the Honorable ROBERT KASTENMEIER will go a long way toward remedying this situation, which is already serious.

The article follows:

THE GREAT TRAGEDY OF OUR WASTED WATER

(By Harold Gilliam)

When the first Northern California water flows through the new Tehachapi tunnel to Southern California next Thursday, the air will doubtless blossom with oratory as florally dazzling as a Pasadena parade float on New Year's Day.

The State Water Project is a mighty engineering achievement unmatched in human history, the orators and press agents will proclaim, a tribute to foresight and ingenuity; it is the world's longest aqueduct system, bringing water to a parched land and making the desert blossom as the biblical rose.

There is considerable truth in these claims. Leaving aside the question as to whether the deserts should be developed, the project is undeniably an immense engineering feat. But the oratory obscures the facts of water, politics and power in California as effectively as the blossoms on the Rose Parade floats hide the machinery underneath.

The State Water Project has been criticized as a misbegotten boondoggle, draining billions of dollars from the pockets of the taxpayers, taking away water needed in the North in order to enrich land speculators, enable promotors to stake out subdivisions in the desert, and make possible another doubling of a Southern California population that is already too large for the carrying capacity of the land.

HOW MUCH WATER?

For better or for worse, however, the current phase of the State Water Project is mostly built, and water will shortly be flowing through it. Nevertheless, Californians still have to make some vital decisions:

How much water should flow south through the system? Should the Peripheral Canal be built, diverting fresh water from the San Francisco Bay—Delta system to improve the quality of water going south through the aqueducts?

Should further dams be built on Northern California rivers, particularly the Eel, Klamath and Trinity, also to provide additional water to flow southward to the San Joaquin valley and Southern California?

Underlying all these problems is a basic question that the proponents of the California Water Plan have never answered: How long can the state go on sending additional water from limited supplies in the North to satisfy the unlimited demands of a continually growing population in the South?

Are promoters entitled to stake out land developments anywhere in the arid regions and demand the government supply them with water?

TRAGIC WASTE

The root of the matter is that water planning in California, like planning for freeways, utilities and virtually everything else, has been single-purpose planning, carried out in a vacuum, without any guiding state policies on how population should be distributed or how land should be used.

The result is a tragic waste of invaluable resources—the paving over of prime soils that should remain in agriculture, the gouging of hills that should be preserved as scenic open space, the subdivision of deserts

that should remain deserts, all at tremendous expense to the taxpayer. Fortunately, a bill has been introduced in Congress to make possible large-scale land planning and also to enable the taxpayers to recover for public purposes some of the staggering amounts that go into water projects. It would affect lands serviced by Federal water projects not state or local projects.

AN OLD LAW

California's principal water systems—the federally-built Central Valley Project and the State Water Project—both distribute water from northern rivers to southern arid regions. But Federal water is cheaper for the user than state water because it enjoys a larger subsidy; agricultural land owners get the water for a fraction of its cost to the Government.

One might wonder how Congress could justify voting for projects that give immense subsidies to large land holders. The answer lies in an old law that has been a fighting phrase in the West for generations—the 160-acre limitation.

Under the law, Federal water cannot be delivered to more than 160 acres held by any one person, unless that owner agrees to sell his lands in excess of 160 acres. (And he must sell the land at the price the property would command without the Federal water.)

The purpose of the law was to prevent big land holders from reaping a bonanza in water subsidies at the taxpayers' expense. The idea was that the "excess" land would be sold in plots of 160 acres or less (or 320 for man and wife), spreading the benefits among "family-sized" farms.

SHORTAGE OF BUYERS

In practice, the 160-acre limitation has not been working very well. One reason is that in some cases there have been few buyers for the excess lands the big land owners are required to sell.

Why the shortage of buyers? The answer depends on your point of view. Those who oppose the 160-acre law claim that a 160-acre farm is too small to pay off in California, where agricultural operations have reached a size unknown elsewhere in the world.

These are the "factories in the field," the huge, mass-production corporate farms running into tens of thousands of acres and using technologies the small farmer presumably cannot compete with.

ABOLISH SUBSIDIES?

Not so, say the defenders of the 160: By forming cooperatives or renting equipment, 160-acre farmers can and do make use of large-scale technology.

So go the arguments. The logical way out might seem to be to abolish water subsidies entirely and require users—whatever acreage they hold—to pay the full cost of delivering the water. Unfortunately, most farmers could not afford the water if they had to pay the full cost.

In 1968 a committee appointed by Governor Ronald Reagan recommended that the 160-acre limitation be eliminated and that owners of holdings larger than 640 acres be billed at higher rates that would pay for a portion of the subsidy. But the taxpayers would still foot most of the bill. And Congress has repeatedly refused to repeal the 160-acre provision.

SOUND LAND PLANNING

The measure now before Congress (H.R. 5236, embodied in a bill by Wisconsin Representative Robert Kastenmeier and identical bills later introduced by five other Congressmen), seems a promising way out of several dilemmas. In areas served by a Federal water project, the Government would buy the excess lands, above 160 acres, at pre-water prices.

(The bill would not affect the present policy of allowing owners ten years to sell their excess lands.)

The Government would then sell or lease the land in 160-acre or smaller plots at post-water prices on condition that it be used in accordance with ecologically sound land planning. The best farm soils could be reserved for agriculture; other lands could be used for urban purposes, including new cities, with ample provision for recreation and green belts.

MONEY FOR OTHERS

The net proceeds from the sales or leases would go into a special "education, conservation and economic opportunity fund." Seventy per cent would go to public education; ten per cent to the existing Land and Water Conservation Fund used for such purposes as national parks; and 20 per cent for Government-sponsored job opportunities for farm workers and similar programs.

The bill has several purposes: It would give excess land owners a guaranteed market for their surplus acreage. It would make ecological land planning possible over large areas. It would recover for public purposes a substantial portion of the multi-billion-dollar public investment in water projects. It would bring some logic into the whole confused field of water planning.

And that, Heaven knows, would be something new.

TRAINING AND CONDITIONING OF ATHLETES

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, my heart bleeds for my favorite football team, the New York Jets, because five of our top men, like Joe Namath, are out due to injuries. Keeping our athletes in shape is a habit with my friend, Dr. Max M. Novich, an orthopedic surgeon, who has spent his life treating athletes who have pulled ligaments, tendons, and have had bursitis.

Dr. Novich and "Buddy" Taylor have published a very practical book for any one interested in athletes; and it is especially valuable to any coach or team physician who wants a valuable reference for a more detailed study of bones, muscles, ligaments, and tendons. Certainly the author has enormous training-room experience which goes back to the days he was on the boxing team at Duke University.

He has written "Training and Conditioning of Athletes," a manual for trainers and physicians, with Henry "Buddy" Taylor who trained our Olympic and Maccabiah Games.

I can recommend this book as the most compact informational manual on the diagnosis and treatment of injuries or illnesses. Of particular interest is the discussion and use of drugs to improve performance.

This book is a must in the library of all lovers of sport.

THE MOSS SURVEY

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, in late August, I once again sought the views of my constituents on a number of major issues facing our Nation. Approximately 26,700 persons participated in my survey which was mailed to every home in California's Third Congressional District.

Results of my poll show crime as the most urgent problem of concern to residents in the Sacramento County area. Ranked behind crime in order of priority issues are pollution and ecology, inflation, welfare reform, unemployment, and the Vietnam war. Drug abuse was also listed as a prominent issue of concern.

The Vietnam war issue ranked third with female respondents, but took a sixth position of importance with male participants. Compared to my 1970 questionnaire, crime has moved from No. 2 concern to No. 1. Last year's results showed pollution and ecology as the No. 1 concern with crime, inflation, the Vietnam war, and drug abuse following in that order.

At this point in the RECORD, I am inserting the list of questions I asked and the results:

MOSS QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

1. Of the following issues, which do you consider to be the most urgent problem? (The results are shown as the respondents ranked the issues.) (1) Crime, (2) Pollution and Ecology, (3) Inflation, (4) Welfare Reform, (5) Unemployment, (6) Vietnam War, (7) Drug Abuse, (8) Race Relations, (9) Health, (10) Consumer Protection, (11) Family Planning, (12) Space Exploration, (13) Middle East Conflict, (14) Housing Shortage.

2. How long are you willing to keep United States troops in Vietnam combat?

(a) no longer (47 percent);

(b) until December 31, 1971 (17 percent);

(c) 1 to 2 years (10 percent);

(d) as long as the President desires (23 percent).

3. My last questionnaire results showed pollution and ecology as the number one national priority issue. With this in mind, are you willing to pay higher taxes and tolerate possible daily inconveniences in order to eliminate the menace of water and air pollution through the enactment of strict federal controls and standards?

Yes (61 percent); No (22 percent); Undecided (12 percent).

4. Do you favor strong anticrime legislation even to the point of reducing individual rights as in allowing forcible police entry to your home, telephone taps, etc. (with court approval)?

Yes (47 percent); No (44 percent); Undecided (5 percent).

5. Would you be willing to see your wages and prices federally controlled in order to combat inflation?

Yes (66 percent); No (18 percent); Undecided (8 percent).

6. Do you feel that peaceful mass demonstrations of dissent by opponents of U.S. policies in Indochina serve a useful purpose?

Yes (38 percent); No (47 percent); Undecided (7 percent).

7. Do you favor the U.S. establishing relations with the People's Republic of China (Red China)?

Yes (64 percent); No (17 percent); Undecided (11 percent).

8. Should the U.S. and Russia insist upon a "solution" to the Israel-Arab conflict even though Israel or the Arab countries might object to the "solution" of the big powers?

Yes (19 percent); No (57 percent); Undecided (13 percent).

9. To attack unemployment, do you favor intensive federal programs of job training, retraining where necessary, and job relocation?

Yes (61 percent); No (21 percent); Undecided (8 percent).

10. Do you favor supplementing our present Social Security System with automatic cost-of-living increases?

Yes (71 percent); No (15 percent); Undecided (6 percent).

11. Do you favor enactment of a comprehensive national health insurance program, essentially patterned upon the model of the Social Security System, to guarantee quality health services for every American?

Yes (59 percent); No (22 percent); Undecided (9 percent).

12. To control increased drug abuse, do you favor an extensive program of education in the schools and more rehabilitation and treatment centers?

Yes (71 percent); No (13 percent); Undecided (6 percent).

13. Do you support the President's proposed changes in welfare based on the two essentials of work incentives and guaranteed annual income?

Yes (43 percent); No (26 percent); Undecided (20 percent).

14. Given widespread dissatisfaction with the present automobile insurance system do you favor a federal "no-fault" system under which your right to compensation for body injury in the event of an accident would be provided by your own insurer without court litigation?

Yes (67 percent); No (12 percent); Undecided (13 percent).

15. Do you feel that the expected participation of millions of new young voters will make constructive social change in America more possible than it is now?

Yes (39 percent); No (40 percent); Undecided (12 percent).

16. To improve our children's educational experience, do you favor increased federal aid to all levels of education?

Yes (54 percent); No (30 percent); Undecided (8 percent).

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

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

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,600 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

BOY SCOUTS ENDORSE YOUTH CAMP SAFETY

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, every summer thousands of children are sent to camp by parents who believe that their children will be properly supervised in a safe and healthy environment. Unfortunately, this is often not the case. Inadequate safety regulations and negligence have frequently resulted in injury and death.

With the rise in camping, there is an acknowledged need for effective and comprehensive recreational safety legislation. The Youth Camp Safety Act has been accepted by the Committee on Education and Labor as an amendment to the Higher Education Act of 1971 and is scheduled to reach the House floor for a vote within the immediate future. Public response to the incorporation of this safety legislation in the education bill has been overwhelmingly favorable. My subcommittee has received the endorsement of not only the American Camping Association, the largest camping representative in the country, but also the Boy Scouts of America which is responsible for the lives and safety of approximately 5 million boys.

Organizations such as the Boy Scouts have afforded the opportunity of safe and educational camping to generations of young boys. However, many camps are not covered by the same high standards which govern the operation of the 600 Boy Scout camps. Few States have established even basic sanitation laws and even fewer States have the enforcement apparatus to prevent the violation of minimal State regulation.

Because of their 60 years of camping experience, the Boy Scouts recognize the urgent need for safety legislation and support the youth camp safety provision of the Higher Education Act. After reviewing my amendment to the higher education bill, the national headquarters of the Boy Scouts wrote me of their support:

> The Boy Scouts of America knows the importance of proper standards in camping. We subscribe to Title 19 of the Higher Education Act, the current revision of the Youth Camp Safety Act. We commend you and the members of the Subcommittee on their efforts in behalf of our youth.

Furthermore, the Boy Scouts indicated their desire to assist in the promulgation of this legislation:

> We will be happy to serve in any advisory role on which we may be called. If this bill is passed, we will be pleased to work with the Secretary of HEW in developing such standards as will carry out the intent of this bill.

Certainly, the approbation of the Boy Scouts merits great consideration. Who knows better than the expert why camp safety legislation is necessary. Therefore, I would encourage my colleagues to give serious consideration to title 19 of the Higher Education Act and approve it to insure that next summer, young campers will be properly safeguarded.

SOVIET JEWRY CRISIS

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, due to the urgency of the Soviet Jewry crisis, the National Conference on Soviet Jewry is holding sessions October 22 through October 25 in New York City. I submit for the RECORD at this time the following material pertinent to that conference:

WE CAN DO BETTER—TOGETHER!

The tinder that feeds the fires in the streets of Jerusalem is drawn from the hulks of rotting shacks. The critical shortage of decent housing in the State of Israel is dividing a nation between have's and have-not's. It is a greater threat to peace and stability in the land than all the combined military power of the enemy from without.

The arrival of Jewish repatriates from the USSR at the rate of 1,000 to 1,500 per month has only served to aggravate the situation. The rumbles of protest from self-styled "Black Panthers" over alleged favoritism shown to the newcomers is but the token of a deeper more widespread bitterness bubbling beneath the surface. More than 100,000 families in Israel living in the most substandard housing have suddenly been awakened from a 20 year slumber. They are asking hard questions about such things as "discrimination," "priorities" and "second-class citizenship" and they are demanding answers. Should Jewish repatriation from the USSR increase by any appreciable extent over the coming months—as it surely will—without a commensurate increase in new housing construction, the stage will be set for an internal conflict that could well destroy the State of Israel and the future hopes of three and a half million Russian Jews.

We will meet in New York on October 22nd to form a national people's movement devoted solely and exclusively to Russian Jewry. If there is one priority above all others to which that movement must address itself, it is the housing crisis in Israel. For without adequate housing to accommodate them our efforts to achieve the mass repatriation of Soviet Jews to their historic homeland are doomed from the start.

In all fairness, it must be said that Israel has given priority to a solution of the housing problem. The State is fully aware of the potential for tragedy inherent in a situation in which the newcomers must be quickly and permanently settled if their cherished repatriation is not to become a travesty while established residents with far different cultural roots stand waiting and watching in the wings. But the State also faces a defense budget that consumes upwards of 40 cents out of every dollar, a billion dollar trade imbalance, a lack of raw building materials and a dire shortage of skilled construction labor. What it lacks most is money to institute the crash housing program that alone can save Israel from catastrophic social upheaval. Yet that social upheaval is already upon the State. Consider the following random selection of June

cables from the wires of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency:

JTA—June 9th (Jerusalem Mayor Teddy Kollek)—"There are 3,000 families living in absolute inadequate apartments in Jerusalem. I can understand the anguish of a father who could not provide for his children and could not house them adequately. These people clamor for the Government to do more than they have done so far. The Government is making a great effort to alleviate the situation. . . ."

JTA—June 13th—"Youths of Africa and Asian descent who have served in the Israeli Army and are trying to establish families cannot find housing because during 1949–1970 Israel allocated only 6,000 units for young immigrant couples. . . ."

JTA—June 17th—"Rabbi Arthur Hertzberg of Temple Emanuel in Englewood, New Jersey, observed that according to Government statistics, 20 per cent of the families in Israel live below the poverty line. It is difficult to understand the indifference of leaders, rabbis and intellectuals. Solving the poverty problem is no less important than the defense of Israel. . . ."

JTA—June 23rd—"Joseph Shamir, director general of the Housing Ministry told a meeting of the Jewish Agency Assembly's Housing Committee that Israel has 111,000 families in need of adequate housing and to satisfy only half of that need would cost $350 million. Even if the funds were available, it would be difficult to speed up the rate of housing construction because of the shortage of skilled labor."

Now, balance this deteriorating housing situation against the following facts:

The incoming Jewish repatriates from the USSR are *repatriates*. They are *not* displaced persons. They are coming to Israel by *choice;* in some cases, they are making considerable material sacrifices in pursuit of an ideal.

The incoming Russian Jews are for the most part a literate, highly educated group of professionals—doctors, engineers, physicists, chemists, teachers, artists and journalists. They cannot be housed in Maarbarot or put to work sweeping the streets. They bring to Israel talents, skills and ideas sorely needed. Israel must create the conditions that will enable these talents and ideals to flourish.

Unlike their counterparts from the West, the incoming Soviet Jews have lived under a government that for all its totalitarian evils *does* provide housing, jobs and schooling for its citizens as a matter of public policy. Nothing in the background of these Jews has equipped them for the task of competing for these essential services and goods in an open marketplace.

Given these facts, the Government of Israel must become the provider of these basic essentials. And the most basic essential of all is decent housing. It must do this. . . .

despite a critical inability to provide housing for its own native born population,

despite the inevitable intensification of class conflict between Eastern and Western Jewry.

And yet in plain fact, Israel cannot accomplish these ends, under present limitations, without committing social and economic suicide. What then is to be done?

The Research Institute on Soviet Jewry has devoted months of research to this problem. While it has discovered no instant solutions, the burden of its investigations point to one incontrovertible conclusion: American Jewry, aided by other Free World Jewish communities, must assume full responsibility for the resettlement of the Soviet-Jewish repatriates in Israel and in so doing free Israel's resources for use in ameliorating inequities among other sectors of the population. The formula for carrying out this massive responsibility can be expressed under the following heading:

ADOPT A RUSSIAN JEWISH FAMILY

We know that 80,000 Jewish families in the USSR have already made application with the Soviet Ministry of the Interior for exit visas to reunite with their relatives in Israel. They are leaving the USSR at the rate of 1,000 to 1,500 per month. They will continue to leave in perhaps far greater numbers than anyone presently imagines.

Every Jewish community in the United States must institute an emergency campaign to adopt one, two or more of these families. Such a step would carry with it the obligation to provide a completed housing unit—ready and waiting for the family when it arrives in Israel. All of this would, of course, be administered in close cooperation with the Israeli Government.

In a Position Paper published several years ago by the undersigned members of the Research Institute on Soviet Jewry, the authors addressed themselves to the special economic, social and psychological problems arising out of the sudden transition from a totalitarian to a free and competitive society. It was urged at the time that special task forces be created in Israel and other Free World Jewish communities to study the problem and attempt to find solutions. The late Prime Minister Levi Eshkol to his credit did take some action on the matter. Regrettably, however, the response was limited. Israel had more pressing problems at hand at the time and the repatriation of Russian Jews seemed far off indeed.

This study (copies may be obtained free of charge by writing to the Research Institute) has now been updated to include the results of recent research on American methods of tackling similar housing problems currently extant in the U.S. Again, though no instant solutions are to be found, the results all seem to point in one direction: *Modular Housing.*

Modular housing has a number of inherent advantages over the more conventional forms of housing and these advantages are of critical importance for Israel:

It is fast. Components are cut or pre-cast at factory level and simply erected at the building site.

It is comparatively cheap. Pre-casts can be cut out of cinder-block or a variety of other local building materials at hand. Nothing has to be imported.

It requires a minimum of skilled labor. On-site carpenters, masons, plumbers etc. are practically unnecessary for installation of modular housing units.

At a recent modular housing display at the Whitney Museum of Art in New York City, the chief attraction was a modular prototype designed by the architectural firm of Wells/Koetter and built by General Shelter Corporation of Waverly, N.Y. The prototype was awarded top honors at the show. While the Research Institute has no ties of any kind with General Shelter Corp., we have been fortunate in persuading the chief engineer of this leader in the field of modular housing construction to address our October National Conference at the New York Hilton Hotel. His subject, illustrated with slides and film, will be *Modular Housing: Solution to the Housing Problem of the Seventies* with special application to Israel.

During a recent study tour of American housing construction methods by Israeli Housing Minister Zeev Sharef, the Research Institute arranged a private showing of the General Shelter modular prototype for Minister Sharef and his aides. Obviously impressed by what he saw, and its potential for solving Israel's housing crisis, the Minister made special reference to the fact in the course of a news conference held in Jerusalem on August 18th. We quote from the JTA cable of that date:

"We need to learn thorough planning, construction, scheduling and performance control from America, three fields in which we are very weak. None of the architectural or engineering faculties here teach scheduling or execution. *One of the American innovations Israel could adopt is the modular system—entire kitchen and bathroom units that are brought ready made to the building site* . . ."

To recapitulate the Research Institute position, the Family Adoption Plan, of which the housing scheme is an integral part, will, in addition to its electrifying impact on the Russian Jews:

1. Relieve Israel of the financial burden of resettling the incoming repatriates, freeing available resources for use in improving the lot of established citizens.

2. Cement an inseparable tie between American Jewish Community groups and Jewish families in the USSR.

3. Provide a concrete answer to the plaint constantly heard at the grass roots: "What can I do for Russian Jews besides demonstrating and signing petitions?"

4. Convince the Soviet Government as well as our own that American Jewry has cast aside all remaining doubt that the USSR will indeed "let our people go" and that we are determined to play the key role in their peaceful integration into the mainstream of Jewish life within the Jewish national homeland.

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON SOVIET JEWRY

I. REBELS AND STATESMEN

Despite some notable achievements outside the framework of the Establishment, the American Jewish effort on behalf of captive Russian Jewry has been a failure principally because it has had virtually no national impact or nationally directed grass-roots support.

The body that should have been nominally responsible for such an effort, the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry, has proven to be little more than a sounding board for the views of 28 national organizations, none of which has ever listed Russian Jewry as its first order of business. The American Jewish Conference will remain a sounding board and the 28 national organizations will adhere to their well established priorities.

On the local level, the various Councils and other regional and student groups, often in spontaneous reaction to crises that have faced Soviet Jews over the past decade, have done an exemplary job of creating a public awareness of the problem in the communities in which they function. However, because the local demonstrations and other forms of political action have been largely uncoordinated, their impact on the national, not to mention, the international scene, has been minimal.

As has already been noted in the accompanying news release, the Research Institute on Soviet Jewry and other organizers of the October 22–25 National Conference at the New York Hilton Hotel, have assumed no mandate for the creation of a national people's movement dedicated solely and exclusively to Russian Jewry. Such a movement—to be specific, the components of such a movement—already exists among the various regional and student organizations working for the cause. What this movement now requires is national cohesion, national scope, a national program and a national structure. That is what the October 22–25 National Conference is all about.

The National Conference proceeds on two basic assumptions: 1. that the leaders of the regional and student organizations for Russian Jewry recognize the overwhelming need for a national people's movement. 2. that these leaders are prepared, however gradually, to hand over the reins of local community and student leadership to their second in command in order to accept policy making positions on a national slate.

An understanding of the second point, may

ultimately require a greater sense of realism than the first. The fact is there is no "established" national leadership working exclusively for Russian Jewry. There is only a large vacuum. If such a national leadership is to be created, it must come from the ranks of the present regional and student organizational leadership operating outside the framework of the American Conference. In this respect, modesty—real or imagined—on the part of these men and women can only work to the utter detriment of Russian Jewry and its aspirations for repatriation. Leaders must be prepared to lead.

II. AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE NATIONAL PEOPLE'S MOVEMENT

As the organizers of the October 22–25 Conference view the situation of Soviet Jewry, the National People's Movement to be created at the New York Hilton will have 8 principal objectives:

1. To implement all of the recommendations, approved in plenary session, of the five international commissions on Soviet Jewry at Brussels on February 23–25, 1971. (See enclosed compendium).

2. To give public, de jure recognition to the Jewish Resistance Movement in the USSR and to establish permanent working relations with that movement and its representatives.

3. To establish an international secretariat charged with formulating and presenting to the USSR a comprehensive plan for the peaceful repatriation of all Russian Jews who have indicated their desire to return to their historic homeland, Israel.

4. To develop professional task forces in the areas of housing, employment, education and social and psychological adjustment whose sole responsibility will be to assist in the orderly integration of Soviet Jews into the mainstream of Israeli life. (See Position Paper No. 1 on family adoption and housing).

5. To establish an autonomous department for the purpose of organizing the 400,000 Jewish men and women on U.S. campuses into a solid activist front for Russian Jewry and to develop a leadership cadre for this movement.

6. To direct and coordinate on a national level all public demonstrations and protests in the U.S. and Canada on behalf of Soviet Jewry. To achieve national attention such actions must be national in scope.

7. To focus awareness of the objectives of the National People's Movement on the key decision-makers—the President, the Congress and the State Department through a permanent lobby in Washington.

8. To develop liaison with grass roots movements for Soviet Jewry in other countries with the aim of coordinating activities where possible and the ultimate aim of creating an International People's Movement on this issue.

III. STRUCTURE OF THE NATIONAL PEOPLE'S MOVEMENT FOR RUSSIAN JEWRY

The first order of business at the October 22–25 Conference will be the structuring and interim financing of the new national organization.

As already noted in previous position papers, the structure of the National People's Movement will be completely democratic in concept, embracing all constituencies on the Soviet Jewish problem—from the far left to the far right. Elitism has no place in a grass roots movement. Representation will be effected within the framework of a "Congress" which will act as a legislative body for the organization and elect from within its ranks an executive council consisting of a chairman, vice-chairman, president and six vice-presidents. Members of the Congress, representing all of the various regional, student and political activist organizations will be elected by the National Conference on Saturday night, October 23rd. The Congress, sitting as a duly elected body, will elect the nine-member executive council on Sunday, October 24th.

Under the federal system outlined above, the individual regional student and political organizations will continue to retain full autonomy on the local level with funding and assistance from the national organization. National policy, however, will be set by the Congress and carried out by the nine-member executive council.

IV. FINANCING

The national organization will require an initial outlay of $100,000 to begin functioning. This sum, to be raised by the constituent organizations on or before January 1, 1972, will be allocated to the establishment of a national office in New York, the employment of a professional staff and the inauguration of Phase I of a national fund raising program.

The national fund raising program will be launched in 1972–1973 with the aim of raising a total of $5,000,000 throughout the U.S. and Canada for implementation of the national oragnization's eight point program for Russian Jewry.

Under the direction of the national orgaization's financial vice president, detailed programs will be developed for funding all constituent organizations at the local and campus levels, the creation of a national speakers bureau, and the initiation of a national membership campaign through the constituent organizations in each of the 108 U.S. and Canadian cities with Jewish populations of 5,000 or more.

Final details for the above agenda will be completed at the National Conference on October 22–25 at the New York Hilton Hotel.

Bankrupt

The time has come, perhaps, when the few Jewish communities remaining in the world which are still free to make their voices heard and to pray in public should proclaim a day of fasting and prayer for American Jews. No—this is not a misprint. I mean specifically that a day of prayer and of fasting should be proclaimed for the five million Jews now living in the United States. They live under the protection of a mighty republic governed by democratic laws. They move about freely through the length and breadth of the land. The vast majority of them have enough food to eat, clothes to wear and roofs over their heads. And if any wrong is committed against them, they are free to protest and to demand their rights. Nevertheless, they deserve to be prayed for. They are not even aware what a misfortune has befallen them, and if they were to look at themselves with seeing eyes they would realize with shock how intolerable this misfortune is. This misfortune consists of the vacuity, the hardness and the dullness that has come over them; it consists in a kind of epidemic inability to suffer or to feel compassion that has seized upon the vast majority of American Jews and of their institutions; in pathological fear of pain; in terrifying lack of imagination—a horny shell seems to have formed over the soul of American Jewry to protect and defend it against pain and pity. At a time when the American Jewish community is the largest and most influential in the world, at a time when the eyes of millions of Jews in Europe who are daily threatened with the most terrible and degrading forms of physical extermination are primarily turned to American Jewry. This American Jewish community has fallen lower than perhaps any other in recent times, and displays an unbelievable amount of highly suspect clinical "health" and "evenness of temper." If moral bankruptcy deserves pity, and if this pity is sevenfold for one who is not even aware how shocking his bankruptcy is, then no Jewish community in the world today (not even the Jews who are now in the claws of the Nazi devourer) deserves more compassion from Heaven than does American Jewry.

I know how much resentment the above statements will arouse. No one—no organization, no public body—has authorized me to make such an indictment and to publish such a characterization of American Jewry. My own colleagues may very well condemn me for my arrogance in issuing such a "diploma" of miserable moral poverty and criminal indifference to the largest Jewish community in the world. But I do not believe that there exists the person who can disprove the basic fact I am pointing to, even though he may question my right to assume the role of diagnostician or of one who reproaches "in the Gate." The basic fact is evident to any Jew who has the courage to look at the situation as it is: American Jewry has not done—and has made no effort to do—its elementary duty toward the millions of Jews who are captive and doomed to die in Europe!

Some weeks ago a certain important Jewish organization in America (or one that would like to be considered important) received a short telegram from Eretz Israel: "How long have you known what is happening to the Jews in Nazi-dominated Europe?" I do not know how that telegram was answered, but fundamentally that telegram, signed by a Jew who escaped from Poland, did not ask a question. It was a well-merited slap in the face to the entire Jewish community in the United States, with all its organizations, offices, committees, budgets and leaders. In Eretz Israel it is well known that as far back as August, we, here, have received authentic information about the murder of millions of our flesh and blood in Europe. The real question implied in the telegram was: "Why have you wasted so many precious months? And what are you waiting for now, when every day, every hour, every minute counts? Why haven't we heard that you do something, or that you are at least seeking ways to do what may at least *appear* possible to do? Why, from afar, haven't we seen you take those means that are dictated by the present situation when the knife is at the throat of one half of the Jewish people—means none of which is guaranteed to improve the situation, but which must nevertheless be tried with the energy and speed which the desperateness of the hour calls for?"

We, Jews in America, have proved incapable of acting even as a herd of cattle will sometimes act when faced with danger—huddling together for protection. We did not even display sufficient ability to set up (temporarily, for the duration of the emergency only) some kind of General Staff that should meet every day and think and consult and consider ways to engage the help of people who *may, perhaps,* be in a position to help us. Our "assets" are so great that in normal times we do not know how to apportion them among themselves. So we quarrel and we fight. One clique tries to outmaneuver the other—Zionists and anti-Zionists, Congressists and anti-Congressists, Orthodox and Reform, synagogue Jews against secularists, a fiction of oragnized labor against an equally mythical organized all-embracing community. But of what value are all our differences of opinion, all our philosophies, world views, analyses, prognoses and orientations, all our tragi-comically inflated prestige considerations, when the axe of the executioner hangs over the neck of nearly every other Jew in the world? It will never be possible to explain why the chief organizations of American Jewry which regard themselves as called upon to engage in political work—the AJ Committee, the AJ Congress, B'nai B'rith, the Jewish Labor Committee, the Council of Jewish Women—could not do in this dire hour, unequalled even in Jewish history, unite for the purpose of seeking ways to forestall the misfortune or at least to reduce its scope; to save those who *perhaps* can still be saved. What differences or principle can there exist

in such rescue work? What has such rescue work to do with political differences and with the entire ideological claptrap which we have produced during the past couple of generations? Neither the future historians, nor any normally intelligent person today, will ever be able to conceive how it came about:

(a) That the American Jewish Committee should send a mere "observer" to a conference of Jewish organizations convened to deal with the massacre of European Jewry—as if the AJ Committee were still in doubt whether this subject concerns it closely, or it is a peripheral, sectarian matter which does not concern persons of another sect.

(b) That the Jewish Labor Committee should follow in the footsteps of the AJ Committee in non-cooperation, non-action and keeping apart from common attempts to accomplish something.

(c) That an important organization of Orthodox Jews should threaten to withhold its cooperation if, for reasons that are not subject to Jewish control, it should prove impossible to include one of their members in a delegation to a certain important personage or office.

(d) That so far as matters of "prestige" and "credit" and petty jealousies are concerned, the AJ Congress did not fully disregard its own prestige ambitions in the interests of uniting all central Jewish organizations in what I clumsily describe above as a united General Staff for Jewish defense.

Yes, there was one brief moment when all (or nearly all) united for an instant—when there arose the question of sending a delegation to the President. And I cannot refrain from making a cynical observation. The President of the United States is the busiest man on earth, but should another possibility of a Jewish delegation being received in the White House appear tomorrow, there will again be union for a moment, until the trip back from Washington to New York when everyone will go his own old separate way and indulge in mutual spites.

Quite some months have passed since representatives of Jewish organizations have even met to engage in earnest discussion whether and what can still be done for European Jewry. The President made his statement, and then came the declarations of some governments of the United Nations regarding the punishment to be meted out to the guilty after the victory, and most, or is it all, the Jewish organizations were satisfied and appeared to be calmed by it. (It should be noted, that the small Jewish community in England was much more effective in obtaining that declaration than the much larger American Jewish community.) Yet everyone should have understood how much more important it is that millions of Jews be saved before the victory, than that a few thousand Nazis should be punished or executed after the victory. Everyone knew that this declaration had little effect on the situation. And now we are informed that both Warsaw and Vienna are completely Judenrein. Everyone knows, or should know, that in recent weeks mass massacres of the survivors of Galician Jewry have been resumed. But even this did not move the few American Jewish leaders at least to discuss what to do.

The murder of two million Jews (the reader should bear in mind that this essay was written in February, 1943, two years and three months before the rampaging Germans were finally quelled. Ed.) with the most inhuman method of torture and degradation which sadistic fantasy has ever devised, still has not sufficiently impressed those among us who have donned the *shtreimels* of Jewish guardianship, those who have assumed responsibility for Jewish interests so that they could sit down around one table and look into each other's eyes and together try to do something to rescue at least one percent of the doomed millions. There have even appeared some Zionists in our midst who have become reconciled to the thought that it is impossible to stay the hand of the murderer, and therefore, they say, it is necessary "to utilize this opportunity" to emphasize to the world the tragedy of Jewish homelessness and to strengthen the demand for a Jewish National Home in Palestine. (A Home for whom? For the millions of dead in their temporary cemeteries in Europe?) And there have arisen *sages* in our midst who have reached the profound conclusion that the sole response to the mass extermination of our people should be the earliest possible opening of a second front. The delegation of the Bund in America has satisfied the demands of its conscience both as Jews and as human beings, by organizing a protest conference of European socialist leaders and is now boastfully claiming "sole credit" for its own little clique for this great achievement. And only some days ago the Revisionist-controlled Committee for a Jewish Army, succumbing to its own ambitions in an uncomfortable position by publishing huge ads in the newspapers—ads which also seek "to utilize the opportunity"—calling for the establishment of a Jewish armed force of 200,000, knowing very well that this is a mythical figure concocted for purposes of cheap and irresponsible propaganda; that there do not exist 200,000 stateless Jews of military age and phyiscally qualified for an armed force; knowing also that even if it were possible to establish such an armed force, all the Jews in Europe, to the last one, would be murdered long before such a force could be recruited, organized and trained for front line duty; knowing very well that if all the combined allied armies are still not in a condition to start an invasion of the European continent, a Jewish armed force would not do it either, even if it were to consist of 200,000, knowing that if such a Jewish army existed today, it would not be free to operate at will and would be subject to the orders of the American and British General Staffs.

Every "Committee" cherishes its own committee-interests, its sectarian ambitions, its exclusively wise stragedy and its "power position" in the teapot of Jewish communal competition.

Never before in our history have we displayed such shamefully "strong" nerves as we do now in the days of our greatest catastrophe. We have become so dulled that we have even lost the capacity for madness and—may God not punish me for my words—the fact that in recent months Jews have not produced a substantial number of mentally deranged persons is hardly a symptom of health. It is characteristic that when at a session of the Jewish Labor Committee a colleague from Poland permitted himself to express a few sharp words of rebuke on the subject of their indifference and passivity, he is shouted down publicly as a "hysteric"—as is a state of Hysteria is today not more normal for Jews than dull even temper and an attitude of "business as usual."

No less characteristic is the fact that such a highly reputable organization as the American Jewish Committee could hold its annual conference one week ago, at the end of which there was issued a declaration dealing with all the bakers' dozen areas in which they differ from the Zionists or other Jews, but not mentioning with even a single word the extermination of the Jews in Europe and what the American Jewish Committee proposes to do now, today, without delay, so that after the victory there should remain someone across the ocean whom the Committee could defend in accordance with its own program and ideology, someone whose rights and human dignity they could protect.

The only Jewish organization which, formally at least, remained on guard and tries to create the impression that it does something, is the American Jewish Congress. But it would be criminal negligence to conceal from the public the fact that at a time when the Angel of Death uses airplanes, the AJ Congress employs an oxcart-express. The AJ Congress too, does not display that will and that tempo which it should manifest at such a time. The AJ Congress delegated rescue work in Europe to a special committee—the so-called Planning Committee. The idea behind this committee was that people who are not too loaded down with Congress routine work should devote themselves to this task. But also this committee permits itself the luxury of not meeting *for weeks on end*. And when it does meet, and it decides to do something, this is still far from proof that it will carry out its own decisions. So they set up a sub-committee and empowered it to contact American Christian clerics to discuss a one-time large scale action on the part of religious bodies throughout the world. (Personally, I believe that such an action would be more effective and would make a greater impression in Germany than the threatening declarations of the democratic governments.) And a chairman was appointed for the sub-committee, one who has the necessary qualifications and contacts for that task. So what came of it all? That sub-committee was not convened for once in *more than two months*. This, in itself, would not have been such a calamity—a subcommittee more, a sub-committee less—let those who enjoy committee meetings grieve over this—had the chairman "usurped" all the work and done it himself. But the chairman is a very busy man, preoccupied with many matters (important, very important matters, to be sure) and after he had obtained the promise of a number of prominent clerics to cooperate in this project, he abandoned them. Since this chairman undertook his office, he had time to attend conferences in two remote cities (once again, very important conferences indeed, but having nothing to do with the Jewish emergency), he even had time to tour the country on behalf of a project which could easily have been postponed or assigned to another person who had not undertaken emergency duties. But he lacked the time to utilize his connections, and the new contacts he had recently made, in order that the planned action should materialize.

On the eve of Christmas, a number of German-Americans were persuaded to issue a manifesto against Hitler's persecution and massacre of the Jews. This was supposed to have been the first step in a campaign to mobilize public opinion among German-Americans. It was felt that once it became known in Germany how German-Americans condemned the extermination of the Jews in Europe, this would create a powerful impression, and it might even compel some Nazis to consider what they are doing. But this promising activity was limited to a few score Americans who had to be reminded that they were of German extraction for, with a few exceptions, they had consciously and in terms of their social interests lost all touch with specific German issues. In order to produce an impression in Germany, it was necessary to mobilize the sympathy of broad layers of German-American society (German fraternal and charitable organizations, culture and art clubs, sports clubs and German Lutheran churches). But this has not been done to this day. It is no doubt a difficult task, but no one has yet demonstrated that if the required amount of energy had been invested in this effort, it would not have brought results.

The only direct Jewish appeal to the Pope that he should intervene with his moral authority came from Eretz Israel and was made by the Chief Rabbi of that country. But to the best of my knowledge not even the AJ Congress took the necessary steps to move the Vatican to greater, more open and direct condemnation of Nazi cannibalism, despite the fact that millions of Catholics live in the United States, and there are

many liberals among the Catholic clergy. Again, no one can prove that the Vatican could be influenced from America to take more drastic measures than it has taken to date. But this does not mean that we have the right *a priori* to renounce attempts to reach an understanding with certain Catholic forces in this country. This so far has not been done, at least not to the extent nor with the intensity that were called for.

There is a shortage of qualified people, and when a suitable person is found, he is busy and overwhelmed with a hundred other matters and of course he cannot be everywhere at the same time, even though some of these "other matters," of undoubted importance, could very well wait, should have been made to wait. And when the AJ Congress sent an emissary to Washington, to stay there more or less permanently in daily contact with various government offices—perhaps something might still be done to rescue even a handful of European Jews to no matter what place of asylum—this emissary, with all due respect for his abilities and intentions, is a foreigner who cannot always exert the necessary influence in our capital. (For such an assignment, in Washington of all places, no suitable *American* Jew could be found; everyone is busy with more important and more urgent matters, of course...). During the past year, the AJ Congress twice sent emissaries to South America on organizational and financial missions, but in recent months, when each day brought its burden of tragic news from Europe, no time was found to send a suitable person to Argentina. Argentine Jews must have some influence, so why was no attempt made to utilize the connections which a neutral American country still had with Germany? Perhaps something could have been accomplished through such mediation?

Yes, also the AJ Congress, the only Jewish organization which did not remove the subject of the extermination of the Jews in Europe from its agenda, has proven to be criminally slow and lacking in tempo and temperament, in its rescue work. It displayed a lack of the courage of despair, of that "aggressiveness of spirit" which characterizes the hour of doom, of the ability to act on its own on a suitable scope or to attract people from other circles and activate them for such a generally self-evident cause as the attempt to rescue those who can still be rescued.

I confess that I am unable to draw concrete, practical conclusions from the above. If it is still objectively possible to do anything, then I do not know who should do it and how it should be done. I only know this, that we are all—all five million of us, with our organizations and committees and leaders—politically and morally bankrupt. And I refuse to understand how and why all of us here have fallen to such a state of shameful degradation.

An end to bankruptcy

In Febr. 1943, while Adolph Hitler stirred the cauldrons that were to dissolve two thirds of European Jewry, the eminent Yiddish polemicist, Chaim Greenberg published a monumental monograph entitled "Bankrupt!" In it, he proceeded to weigh the unprecedented act of mass murder taking place in Europe against the response to that act on the part of each of the members of the American Jewish Organizational Establishment.

The comparison, needless to say, was appalling. But, of course, this is readily admitted today even by the staunchest Establishment apologists—mea culpa has become the fashion of the times. To rest the case here, however, is to ignore the essence of the crime that was committed on this side of the Atlantic and thereby to learn nothing of relevance for our present era.

To read Greenberg's indictment in the perspective of 28 years is to be shocked, not so much by the failure of the Establishment to rise to the dreadful challenge hurled down by the Naxi genocidists, as by the deceit and duplicity they exhibited in their failure. Failure in the wake of a genuine effort to save lives that were being snuffed out with assembly line efficiency might ultimately have been absorbed in that bottomless crucible of tears known as Jewish History. It could never have been excused. The murder of one and a half million Jewish children does not come under the heading of forgiveable acts. Such indulgences belong to God, not to men. But there was something far worse than failure implicit in the actions of the establishment during those fateful years when Europe became a killing ground for six million Jews. There was infamy—and on a level never exhibited by the Jewish nation from the time of Abraham in Chaldees.

If one can imagine a "Jewish War Crimes Tribunal" convened in 1945 once the full horror was known, then the logical venue for it would have been New York and the leader of every major Jewish organization in the land would have been fit to have been placed in the dock. Such a tribunal would have brought forth two salient facts: 1. that these organizations and their leaders took virtually no action to prevent the greatest tragedy ever to befall our people; 2. that these organizations and their leaders willfully employed untold millions of dollars and billions of words in a massive public relations effort to convince themselves and the entire American Jewish community that they had taken every conceivable measure to arrest the hand of the executioner.

Inaction, let it be known, was the least of their crimes. What history will indict them for in generations to come was their success in deceiving the mass of American Jewry—a mass that might have moved with heroic determination it had been aware of the truth—into believing that the situation was well in hand. The conspiracy that took place while six million died was not merely a conspiracy of silence. It was also a conspiracy of word.

We are now 26 years removed from those events that numbered civilized humanity and we have before us a document published by the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry entitled "Summary Report of Activity During 1970" with the subtitle, "Submitted to the World Conference of Jewish Communities on Soviet Jewry Held February 23–25, 1971 in Brussels, Belgium."

Reading through its 26 single spaced pages couched in the ennuitic prose so characteristic of organizational literature, one is struck by the eerie sensation of having passed this way before. It is as though a window was suddenly opened and a chill wind had entered the room. One reaches instinctively for protective cover. The time is 1971 not 1943; the issue is no longer Polish Jewry, or German Jewry, or Hungarian Jewry, but Russian Jewry. Yet the words have such a dreadfully familiar ring. Bear witness if you will:

From page 4 . . . "All 28 national member organizations of the AJCSJ stepped up the frequency of memoranda, programmatic recommendations and directives to their memberships to embrace Soviet Jewry activities locally and nationally. News feature material was provided to editorial writers, TV and radio stations and other channels—depicting the worsening situation of Jews in the Soviet Union—on a larger scale. . . ."

From page 5 . . . "To communicate solidarity with Soviet Jews, thousands of Rosh Hashana greeting cards were sent to synagogues in the Soviet Union . . ."

From page 11 (Anti-Defamation League) . . . "ADL establishes ongoing contact with members of the U.S. Senate and Federal Government to supply them with petitions and literature on Soviet Jewry . . ."

From page 13 (Hadassah . . . "Hadassah chapters and groups throughout the United States . . . are kept regularly informed of the situation on Soviet Jewry through fortnightly bulletins from the national office, and are directed to initiate any/or cooperation in community programs designed to arouse public opinion in the United States . . ."

From page 15 (Jewish Labor Committee) . . . "We issued informational material periodically from labor sources to Community Relations Councils and Welfare Funds on this issue . . ."

From page 17 (Mizrachi Women's Organization of America) . . . "Individual members of our organization and staff demonstrated during the Leningrad trials . . ."

From page 17 (National Council of Jewish Women) . . . "Contacts have been made with local clergymen to enlist their support for the cause of Soviet Jewry . . ."

From page 18 (Pioneer Women) . . . "Our programming for the year included many programs directly geared toward Soviet Jewry, and our Speakers have been instructed to include this subject in all their talks . . ."

From page 18 (Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America) . . . "At a recently held Biennial Convention of UOJCA, the main plenary session was on Soviet Jewry and featured two Soviet Jewish emigrees.

"An appropriate resolution was passed . . ."

From page 21 (Zionist Organization of America) . . . "ZINS, the official publication of the World Zionist Affairs Committee of the ZOA, devotes regular space in its weekly editions to news of Soviet Jewry . . ."

From page 22 (American Zionist Federation) . . . "The Executive Committee of the AZF picketed the Soviet Embassy (sic) on East 67th Street in New York City on December 15, 1970 . . ."

From page 24 (American Jewish Committee) . . . "Through its affiliation with the International League for the Rights of Man, the Committee helped make that organization and other non-governmental organizations at the UN more sensitive to the plight of Soviet Jews . . ."

Alexsandr Solzhenitsyn, in an appeal in the New York Times on Wednesday, June 16th in connection with the Paris publication of his new novel, "August 1914," cites his refusal to write the word "God" without a capital letter among the reasons for the Soviet Government's denial to him of publications rights in the USSR. "To this indignity," he declares, "I would not stoop."

What Solzhenitsyn infinite wisdom and infinite courage would not do, the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry and its 28 members have done with an amore propre worthy of temporal lords. In 26 pages they have succeeded in writing the name of God in letters exceedingly small. They have reduced him to a recording secretary of "appropriate resolutions" at Biennial Conventions, a scribbler of "memoranda and programmatic recommendations and directives" to the membership, a composer of Rosh Hashana greeting cards to those for whom tomorrow was yesterday, an emissary to the local clergy, a raconteur instructed to include the subject of Russian Jewry, if not too indelicate, in his next talk to the ladies breakfast club.

The outrage is compounded by the knowledge that we have been here before, that we have once before been sucked into this vortex of words and gestures designed to create the impression that great deeds are afoot in the house of the living dead.

Ilya Mogilever, age 7, is taunted at school with the cry: "Your father is in jail!" Vladimir Mogilever, from a cell he may never be privileged to leave, has the audacity to address an appeal to the United Nations Committee on Human Rights affirming his intention to "emigrate to the historic motherland

of the Jewish people—to Israel." He demands "the natural right of every free man to live where he wishes." The Mogilevers, father and son, will be comforted to learn that the American Jewish Committee through its affiliation with the International League for the Rights of Man is trying to make that organization "more sensitive to the plight of Soviet Jews."

Lily Budman, age 5, saw her father arrested and put aboard a train at the Serveskaya station in Leningrad last June. She has not seen him since. Hillel Budman's crime consisted of teaching Hebrew and Jewish history to those who had the desire to learn. He was also indiscreet enough to address some correspondence to friends at Kibbutz Ruhama in Israel. Lily, who does not sleep well at night, should be informed that Hadassah is now issuing fortnightly bulletins to keep its chapters appraised of the situation of Soviet Jewry.

Davidka Dreizner, age 6 months, has no memory of his mother. On the day of his birth she suffered a "nervous breakdown" and was taken to the Bekchterev Neurophychiatric Institute, which is noted for its treatment of "nervous breakdowns" of an ideological nature. Davidka is being cared for by his father, but now his future is uncertain. Solomon Dreizner was arrested and taken to jail directly from work after writing a letter to Pravada expressing how "immeasurably dear to us is our Jewish State, reborn and developing, gathering under its roof our scattered people. We want to live there." Take heart, Davidka. The American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry is sending you a Rosh Hashana greeting card and the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America is sure to pass another "appropriate resolution" at its next "biennial convention."

Bankrupt! Bankrupt in 1943. Bankrupt in 1971. Nothing so becomes the American Jewish Establishment as the consistency of its moral insolvency. It will neither pay its debts nor enter into honorable receivership. It prefers instead to issue its yearly quota of worthless promissory notes. While Jews from Leningrad to the Urals, defying every threat the Soviet Union can summon to silence them, proclaim for all the world to hear that they will accept nothing less—nothing less!—than the right to go home, the eminent Professor Hans Morgenthau informs us that the real issue is not repatriation but cultural accommodation. To the cry of freedom and motherland, Professor Morgenthau is ready to respond with an armful of books.

This critical distortion of priorities is unfortunately not limited to Morgenthau, though he remains its chief theorist. Behind him stand legions of self annointed "leaders" and "intellectuals" ready at this later hour to insist that the agony of Leningrad, Riga and Kishinev and the cell blocks of Central Asia and Siberia can be relieved with a Yiddish musical performance. They would have you believe that Vladimir Mogilever and Hillel Budman sit in jail for the right to read Yiddish poetry, that Lila Dreizner languishes in an insane asylum because she demanded a package of matzos.

It is precisely this brand of intellectual insanity that turned the Brussels Conference into a glittering failure by refusing to create the permanent international instrumentality required to carry out its resolutions, that even at this moment is completely insensitive to the tragedy implicit in the potential mass entry of Russian Jews into a nation almost totally unprepared to meet their special economic, social, educational and psychological needs.

Honorable and worthy ladies and gentlemen of the Establishment, what would you do if tomorrow morning a manifesto were to be issued from the Kremlin *expelling* the 80,000 Jewish families who have already applied for exit visas? Not telling them they *can* go, but *ordering* them to go. Is there housing for them in Israel? Are there jobs for them, absorption centers, schools for their children, a detailed program to bridge the social and psychological gap created by the sudden transition from a closed to an open society? Where are your contingency plans for such an eventuality? Who will build the housing, create the new industries to provide the jobs, expand the educational plant and raise the money for such an immense undertaking? Or are you under the impression that Israel in its present economic state with a back breaking defense budget, a $2 billion trade gap, and a socialist-monopolistic system that refuses to work, will do the job? Ladies and gentlemen, you have no plan, you have no program and you have no intention of initiating any. In fact, you are betting your lives on the permanent incarceration of three and a half million Russian Jews. You are betting on the death of a nation; not its rebirth.

Well, once again you may have made the wrong bet. For reasons of internal stability, or out of pure calculated desire to destroy the State of Israel, it is not inconceivable that the Kremlin could issue that order. In your present state of preparedness, the result of such an act would not be difficult to foretell. It would be an utter disaster.

Already, with a mere 1,000 Jews a month emerging from the Soviet Union, the warning signals are flashing. A Russian Jewish artist, unable to afford the materials of his trade and unfamiliar with the business of selling his paintings in the open marketplace, has quit Israel in disgust for Paris. Chalk up a victory for the USSR. Russian Jews by the scores are grumbling that their children are being short-changed on educational opportunities, that jobs are unavailable to them in the skilled trades and professions, that the housing they are receiving in Israel is no more adequate than the hovels they left behind in Moscow and Riga. Must the entire world be witness to the spectacle of a Sephardic family of 11 forcibly occupying an apartment in Jerusalem designated for Russian Jews? Is there no room in the collective imagination of 28 national Jewish organizations for a master plan that would provide decent living accommodations both for that Sephardic family which has had its fill of second class citizenship and that Soviet Jewish family which is getting its first introduction to citizenship? Apparently not.

Ladies and gentlemen, by your refusal to act now, you are handing to the Russians on a platter of gold, the power to shatter three and a half million souls and to destroy the State of Israel. You are building the foundation for a calamity of unimaginable proportions. For if the Russians—for whatever motive—should grant the release of those hundreds of thousands clamoring at gates and rotting in the jails, and if the State of Israel is not ready to receive them, if indeed they should have to return to that land of their doom, then you will have created a calamity equal to the Holocaust. And make no mistake, we cannot endure another tragedy of such dimensions and still survive as a people.

Who is considering these matters on this fine June day in 1971? Who is preparing the machinery to facilitate this awesome task? Who is creating now—not later—the 100,000 housing units, the 100,000 jobs, the schools, the reception centers, the hospitals, the clinics, the adult education centers—the entire massive complex of services and facilities that will be necessary to absorb a literate, educated, professionally-trained population arriving in such numbers? The answer is no one.

The American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry is, by its own definition, a "coordinating instrument" for the views and actions of 28 national Jewish organizations, not one of whom considers the future of Russian Jewry its first order of business. Under its proposed reorganization, it will remain a coordinating instrument. It has neither the will, the independence, or the wherewithal to assume the paralyzing burden of responsibility facing us in respect to mass Soviet Jewish repatriation. It freely admits the fact. What Russian Jewry must have at this perilous hour is a genuine national grass roots movement with the imagination to forge a blueprint for its survival and the power to go directly to the six million Jews of this nation and demand the money for its implementation. It must be an organization devoted solely and exclusively to Russian Jewry, beholden to none and independent of all, including the Government of Israel. Above all, it must be an organization with no illusions about its raison d'etre: *the swiftest possible repatriation of Russian Jewry to its national homeland, Israel.*

Such a national movement must also have the strength and will to carry out the task the Brussels Conference failed so shamefully to implement: the creation of a permanent international body with permanent headquarters equipped to enter into negotiations with the USSR for the peaceful, orderly evacuation of every Russian Jew who has expressed the desire to go home. Professor Morgenthau and his followers can then have the field clear to concern themselves with the future cultural conditions of those who choose to remain behind. It is indeed an important consideration, but it is not a primary goal of such a grass roots movement. Ours is solely and exclusively the concern for the hundreds of thousands who have already chosen and the millions more who are certain to choose to live as Jews in a Jewish State.

The hour is late. The Ilya Mogilevers and Davidka Dreizners of this world are too precious to be sacrificed to senseless bureaucratic skirmishes. They are the last of their line. There will be no others to take their place. Let us this once prove ourselves worthy of the courage of their fathers who spent whatever small freedom they had left in the hope that their deeds might strike a resounding chord in this land. If we are ever to redeem the past, if we are ever to act as free men, it must be now. For Russian Jewry, there may be no tomorrow. For American Jewry, tomorrow was yesterday.

THE LATE HONORABLE BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the passing of former Senator Bourke B. Hickenlooper, of Iowa, came as a shock to all of us who knew and admired him for so many years. I had the privilege of serving with Hick on many conference committees on appropriations over the years and always regarded him as one of the more able Members of the other body. He was a man of strong conviction and although we differed substantially sometimes on political philosophy I always admired his determination and honesty. Bourke Hickenlooper was a leader for all of the 24 years he served in the Senate. Important legislation in the fields of foreign relations and atomic energy bearing his name is witness to his record of achievement. He was a man of warm humor, a man of great conscience, and above all a man dedicated to public service and the preservation of the precepts upon which this Nation is based. His son and daughter have my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

THE MILKMAN GOETH

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, as Members of the Congress we hear assessments of the plight of our farming population from many different sources. Some of the discussions are highly technical and difficult to understand unless you grew up in farming country or on a farm. Some are so filled with emotional rhetoric that it is difficult to get a clear, objective picture of what is happening to the segment of our population which does such a magnificent job of providing food and fiber for the millions of our Nation.

During the second annual meeting of the Associated Milk Producers, Inc., in Chicago, newscaster Paul Harvey presented an address which I feel clearly sets out the economic and political plight of our farmers. Because I feel that many of my colleagues will find what he had to say informative, I include excerpts from this speech in the RECORD:

THE MILK MAN GOETH

Now—farmers:

You talk about a disadvantaged, underprivileged, discriminated against minority; you're it!

But that's changing.

The number of Americans living on farms has declined one-third in ten years. Our nation is down to ten million farmers. Less than five-percent of our population.

That five-percent vote has had little leverage in Washington but they're going to get some from another source.

Our American farmer has taken very good care of us, though we have been paying him half as much for his wheat and corn as 20 years ago.

City food bills are higher mostly because of the increasing cost of getting the food from the farmer to the housewife. That cost is up 160% in 20 years.

That increase notwithstanding, our store-bought food bill averages only 16½% of our take-home pay.

In Western Europe, 25% of your income would go for groceries.

In Russia, 50%. In the Far East, as much as 80%! Ours, 16½%.

So our farmers, constantly improving and increasing per-acre production, have taken good care of us.

Because of higher prices for everything they buy and lower prices for most everything they sell, farmers have had to consolidate. Small farmers were forced out of farming. Today it takes an investment of $50,000 to create one farm job. So the trend to fewer and larger farms continues.

And pyramiding population, 90% of it concentrated on 8% of our land, is more and more spilling over onto the countryside.

Foolishly we are planting houses on much of our most desirable agricultural land. We should put houses on the hillsides and crops in the valleys, but it's easier for the bulldozers and builders to mass produce houses on the level land.

So 700,000 farms have "disappeared" since 1960.

Thus arable acres shrink. And soon, sooner than most realize, the era of food surpluses will come to an end.

That is going to put the shoe on the other foot.

As is, the farmers' average per-family income is $5,401.

That is about half what the rest of us average.

His investment in starting capital is $100,000 to $200,000.

He deserves a proper return on that investment. When our increasing appetite catches up with his production, he's going to demand a fairer slice of the pie—or else.

And uninvited but inevitably—three billion people are coming to dinner.

We'd better pray that in the difficult year ahead, the farmer will be more considerate of us than we have been of him.

I'm not proud of some segments of the news media for their recent snide remarks about dairy men spending money to convene while asking higher dairy farm prices.

Unfortunately that is a typical, however unbecoming, attitude of some city dudes, demonstrating their utter lack of appreciation for the source of their sustenance.

There is not one newsman in this nation who works for less than you do.

They are guaranteed a minimum wage higher than yours.

Yet some would bite the hand that feeds them.

If they knew what they were talking about, you would be congratulated, praised, applauded—for straining your limited resources to mobilize your forces.

The Harveys' farm. We've not earned the right to call ourselves farmers, but we do farm.

Angel and I operate a thousand red-ink acres in Arizona and run a barely black-ink white-faced herd in Missouri, but I have to stay in the broadcasting business in order to afford to farm.

If I don't smell much sour silage, I do understand the bottom line.

Fortunately a few of today's Senators and Congressmen were farm boys, but the next generation there won't be many if any.

You're going to have to have some competent spokesmen in Washington to educate 'em.

There are a lot of women milking cows today; their husbands are in Chicago and somebody has to.

Cows don't GIVE milk. Only city dudes think a cow GIVES milk. Somebody has to go out there to the barn and take it away from her—twice a day—seven days a week.

And those somebodys for two generations have been working for less than the national legal minimum wage.

No wonder "the milk man goeth."

Twenty years ago our nation had two million dairy farms; today fewer than 400,000.

It's not mystery. The dairy farmer's son has shared that seven day week from dark to dark to push productivity up . . .

Has helped make dairying a six billion dollar industry . . .

Nourishing a nation and benefiting an army of middle men . . .

But the farmer's son is left with a handful of udder and less than a dollar an hour. You drive that boy into our asphalt jungle and I promise you'll not help our problems and you'll not solve his.

So we all have a stake in this. Every depression in our nation's history has been farm bread and farm led. You starve the farmer, you starve our nation's largest producer of steel products, petroleum products . . .

With harder work and long-shot gambles the desperate farmer has pushed upward his total productivity three times faster than other industry, but he's fed up with shovelling for nothing what city-itian lawnscapers pay a dollar for in the store.

He's simply fed up!

Now, what can you do about it?

The story goes that American prisoners of war were to be broken to harness by a cunning torture. Starving, they were seated at a fully prepared banquet table—but the food was in deep dishes—and their hands were tied behind their chairs.

All that food to see and to smell and no way to eat.

Hours later the tormentors returned to discover each man had a fork in his teeth—and was feeding the guy nearby.

They'd have starved to death if they'd not got organized. But they associated themselves together and, each helping the other, they all ate.

The time's overdue for you guys to organize.

I don't endorse any specific organization ever. I don't know about the AMPI.

But I'll tell you this, it's better than nothin'—and you've tried nothin'!

You've tried bigger herds on less acres and you went backward.

You've tried dumping milk in ditches and piecemeal boycotts and local coops and you're still at the mercy of a whimsical marketplace.

And let's face the real problem or we haven't a prayer of finding solutions.

Cow farmers, bless your free-wheeling, independent, individualistic, patriotic hearts—you are as cantankerous, as temperamental, as unpredictable as your cows.

Getting together requires some measure of *mutual agreement* and you guys can't even agree on what time it is.

Now, as we say in my Missouri Ozarks, "let's shuck right down to the cob."

Our nation's dairy farm population is getting "stripped", and it's down to less than half a million and shrinking.

In Washington, D.C. the name of the game is "numbers."

You got no numbers you got no clout unless you get organized.

Yours is the only basic industry I know which operates in all fifty states—but scattered your political impact is diluted. Your individual letters to individual congressmen about immensely important considerations are pitifully ineffectual.

What you don't need is a city dude prescribing specific remedies. I don't know.

But five minutes from now you're going to hear from somebody who does know. Don't walk around while he's talking. The proposals you are about to hear may turn this industry upside down and bring the cream back to the top where it belongs.

MIDDLE EAST ROULETTE

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues attention to an excellent editorial in the New York Times of October 18 entitled "Middle East Roulette" which points out the dangers of any new escalations of the Middle East arms race and the dire need for both the Soviet Union and the United States to recognize each other's interests in the area and the adverse effects of further arms deliveries on the pospects for peace:

MIDDLE EAST ROULETTE

Moscow and Washington are playing Russian roulette again in the Middle East. A new Soviet pledge to "further strengthen the military might of Egypt" and Secretary of State Rogers' retaliatory promise to "carefully reconsider" United States military commitments to Israel—a promise backed by the petition of 78 members of Congress—threaten a dangerous new escalation of the arms race in the area. Such an escalation would further

reduce the prospects for peace and increase the peril of a fresh outbreak of fighting that would almost inevitably involve both major powers.

It is not at all clear that the Russians have agreed to give the Egyptions the offensive weapons that Egyption President Sadat reportedly sought during his three-day visit to Moscow. In any event, Moscow knows full well—as does Washington—that no amount of new Soviet arms of any kind can overcome in the foreseeable future the decisive military advantage the Israelis continue to hold over the Arabs. That advantage is based in large measure on factors that cannot be imported—such as morale and technical competence. It is also strengthened by such Israeli-made weapons as the new Jericho missile, said to be capable of reaching Cairo and beyond with nuclear warheads.

More Soviet arms will not alter the balance of power in Egypt's favor. But they could tempt Egypt's hawks, whom President Sadat has so far held in check, to rash action in the Middle East. If that should occur, it is difficult to imagine how Soviet ground and air crews deployed in the Egyptian defense system could escape direct involvement.

In the event of an Israeli-Soviet confrontation, no amount of American jets could overcome Israel's fundamental disadvantage. In spite of Israel's claims of self-sufficiency, an underlying assumption of Israeli policy must be that the United States will intervene to stand off the Soviets in such a crisis. A fresh commitment of Phantoms from the United States at this time would tend to strengthen that belief and to encourage Israeli hawks.

Both major powers are being pushed toward a confrontation that neither wants and that has little relation to the long-range interests of Washington and Moscow. Israel's reluctance to give up substantial areas of Arab territory only serves to abet Soviet penetration of the Arab world. At the same time, Egypt's stubborn insistence on a full return to Sinai, including the restoration of Egyptian military forces to that perennial cockpit of conflict, helps perpetuate a stalemate that effectively blocks Russian access to the Persian Gulf and beyond through the Suez Canal, an old Western artery that has become a vital Soviet interest. The major powers need to recognize that in their game of Middle East roulette the odds are running against them both.

COLUMBUS DAY 1971

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, on October 9, 1971, Mr. J. Phillips Richley, director of highways for the State of Ohio, gave an interesting and informative talk at the Columbus Day dinner in Youngstown.

In his talk, Director Richley discussed the meaning and relevance of Christopher Columbus for America in the 20th century. Mr. Richley also presented some little known facts about this great explorer.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that Mr. J. Phillip Richley's speech be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time for the consideration of my colleagues in the House and Senate.

The speech follows:

COLUMBUS DAY 1971

It's interesting to note that, while things seem to change all around us constantly, they really stay basically the same—the life and fortunes of Christopher Columbus—or is it Christopherus Columbus—or Don Cristobal Colon—or Christoforo Colombo—is a case in point—

Even the observance of the holiday in his honor, the day commemorating his discovery of our great land—is fraught with question and doubt—

Historians tell us that Columbus was *not* the first non-Indian to set foot in the Western Hemisphere. They say Norsemen were in Nova Scotia and Massachusetts centuries before, and a Mongolian Monk preceded them—

And in 1892, when Congress decided to make Columbus Day a national holiday, some precisionists brought up the problem of the change in calendars in the 400 years that had passed since the discovery of the new world—

They maintained that October *23* should be the date of the holiday—because that is the day that corresponds to October *12* on the old calendar that Columbus used.

—And as if that weren't enough controversy, a respected historian now maintains that the great navigator was not Italian at all; that although he was born and raised in Genoa, his family had years earlier beeen forced to flee from *Spain*, their home, because they were *Jewish!*—can you imagine that!

According to this historian, who by the way is Spanish himself, Columbus' father came from a wealthy Jewish family from the north of Spain, but lived in Genoa as a humble weaver—

The discoverer, in his lifetime, raised himself to the heights of human achievement, gaining the titles of admiral, viceroy, governor, and *Don*, the Spanish title of nobility—

He was even promised that his children would all bear the rank of admiral along with their noble titles—

But he died friendless, penniless and disillusioned in a monastery—his only possession—the chains in which he was brought back to Spain in disgrace from his new colonies.

And so we see that, with all the changes, all the achievements in his life, Christopher Columbus was born poor and humble, and he died that way—

"The more things change, the more they remain the same." So said the noted French writer Alphonse Karr, and he couldn't have been more accurate—

For as we review the history of mankind, we see many great changes and many great deeds and great men, like Columbus and his discovery of the new world—

But if we look deeper, we find that these great deeds and great men are only markers of their times—that the great changes are really only superficial. That mankind itself does not change—it remains the same—

For although the discovery of the new world brought Europe out of the dark ages and encouraged further exploration and discovery, it also was cause for more wars of greed—and more persecutions of fellowmen in the name of religion—

And the same things went on thousands of years before Columbus—and that same things are going on today—and unfortunately it is safe to predict that the same things will continue to go on—unless we decide to *do something about it*—unless we convince ourselves and others—that *something can be done* to bring mankind out of the dark ages in which it has *always been*—

Despite the discovery of the lands of the western hemisphere—despite the colonization of the Americas and the establishment of this great country of ours—despite the industrial revolution and the automobile and the airplane—despite the harnessing of atomic power and despite the *landing of man on the moon*.

Because despite all the advances of what we call *civilization*—we have yet to solve the *real* problems—the basic problems—the problems we encounter when we take a look at the *other* side of *civilization*:

One seventh of our population, 30 million people . . . have incomes below legally defined levels of poverty—

Nearly 2 million of our citizens—the citizens of the richest nation on earth are forgotten in the squalor of outdated, overcrowded mental institutions—each year, thousands and thousands of our young people—tomorrow's leaders—have become dependent on drugs; synthetic and unnatural tools of death. This nation has demands of 500,000 housing units per year . . . and these demands are going virtually unheeded.

And, as if that is not enough, we arrest annually nearly 6 million persons for acts of crime—and the sad part is that most of these are under the age of 24. And at the same time, we release over 200 million tons of harmful emissions into the air we breathe—and continue to despoit over 20 billion gallons of domestic and industrial wastes into our streams and rivers each day.

All of this—with unemployment hovering near 6 percent—while at the same time we have expended more than 20 billion dollars per year in an unconscionable, devastating war, wasting away almost 55,000 young promising lives—

Where does this end? A wasted, crumbling earth with no life? I don't think so. I have a great and relentless and undying faith in this Nation of mine that received me as a child—that in spite of the ills, the frustration, the despair and the malaise that engulfs us, we shall within the frame work of our established governmental and legislative process—accomplish the enlightened change that is so urgently needed. Our system often works slowly and inefficiently—but somehow, the job gets done—and the system does work—

Our society today is a society that has perhaps lost its perspective—perhaps its direction, maybe its goals and perhaps even its morality—but it has not lost its will to live—

And as the days, weeks and months pass, one thing has prevailed—man has survived. By his own will and spirit, the process of Government and the systems of representative democracy, we have been able to live in America without fear of foreign invasion, free from the threat of authoritarian government, from the threat from the extreme right and the threat from the extreme left—

There is still time to create that better nation, a better world—as Alfred Lord Tennyson wrote; "Come my friend, 'tis not too late to seek a newer world."

And a United States Senator, former United States Attorney General, Robert F. Kennedy, who was shot down in cold blood on the eve of great victory said, "Some men see things as they are and say why? I dream things that never were and say, why not?"—

These are not hollow words. They are the nuts and bolts of great character—words by men who experienced that "extra vision"—men who knew the need for change and believed in it. And in the words of the great John Kennedy—"When it is necessary to change, change is necessary."

Are these things we're saying just vague abstractions? I don't think so. I believe that this is the stuff that life is made of—and it's more meaningful now than ever before.

Ladies and gentlemen—there is still time—time to weld together socially, racially, religiously, economically and politically. All the needs and wants of our society into a nation and a world of people in the search for enlightened truth—this is no easy chore. But with the hopes, dreams and faith in man's ability to reason, and most of all—with open minds—we can succeed and will—

With the strength and fortitude of Columbus, with the persistence and perseverence that drove him to try and try until he obtained sponsorship for his courageous undertaking—in the face of ridicule and scorn from the most respected and authoritative quarters—

And with the strong conviction that we are right and that we will succeed—the same conviction that drove Columbus on through the angry, uncharted seas—and allowed him to rise above the fears and threats of his unwilling crews—

We can and will accomplish our mission just as he did—

By forgetting our differences—by forgetting our prejudices—by putting away stigmas and bigotries—

And thinking only of our common goals—the goals of mankind—

Because history teaches us that success—the kind of success we're talking about—comes only through a meeting of the minds—not through force or coercion or demonstration of superiority.

A meeting of minds—that's what Columbus had going for him, and he kept it going naturally through his attitude of acceptance and understanding.

For although his family and his people had been victimized by religious prejudice—driven from their homes and their homeland in a holocaust not duplicated until Hitler's time.

Columbus sailed from that same land with a crew that was a coalition of many diverse ethnic groups. He had drawn upon the resources of many nations to achieve success—he borrowed from the knowledge, wisdom, finance, advice and comfort of many people.

For while Christopher Columbus was an Italian born in Genoa, Italy—

The woman he married in 1479 was Portuguese—

And his first son in 1480 was born in Lisbon—

And his second son was born in 1482 of a Spanish wife—

And the astromer who in 1481 advised Columbus was Italian—

And his geographer who gave him considerable advice was French—

And his voyage was financed by Queen Isabella of Spain—

And his official interpreter on that first voyage was a Jew, who spoke many tongues including Arabic and some African dialects—

And it was a *Portuguese* who first sighted land in the Western Hemisphere and gave his name to the two great continents discovered through the cooperative efforts of that great and diverse coalition—

This is the kind of assimilation of ideas, peoples, and nations, that was required for successful global progress in 1492, and is also the kind of relationship that is absolutely necessary for meaningful and lasting progress today—

And in America more than anywhere else, we have for 200 years had the opportunity to prove a basic point—and that is that no two people are alike and that our superficial differences are a definite, positive *asset—not* a liability, *not* a basis for judgment.—

For these superficial differences, differences of color, language, culture, and background—are the elements that have come together and been melted and mixed into a strong, flexible and durable alloy—*the United States of America.*

Ladies and gentlemen, even the most American of Americans will concede that this Nation—its leaders—and its people have made mistakes—and that we have not yet perfected the whole of society—but this Nation's soul is not corrupt—this Nation continues to be credible—for the vast majority of its people are decent people—who abide by the law—and work hard—and fear God as did their forefathers—they are aware of the imperfections in the system but they are trying desperately to secure needed improvements—

I say to you—let the historians argue about the Norsemen from Nova Scotia and the Mongolian monks from far off Tibet—because while they argue the Congress of the United States declared Columbus Day, for the first time this year, as an *official* national holiday which will be commemorated on October 11.

This is extremely important. First of all it recognizes officially the actions of that supreme navigator and interepid explorer as the discover of the New World—and secondly it establishes Columbus as the first Italian-American to set foot in the New World.

Ladies and gentlemen—those of us of Italian-American heritage have a special thanks to give—because we can hold our heads high with a special pride and dignity—for our people, from Columbus to the present, have given the world and our country a great deal—because in addition to Columbus, the great explorer—our people have given us—

1. Inventors—Such as Leonardo daVinci, Galileo.
2. Superstars in sports—Such as Joe DiMaggio, Phil Rizzuto, and Rocky Marciano.
3. Arts—Michelangelo—Verdi.
4. Explorers—Vespucci and John Cabot.
5. Police work—Charles J. Bonaparte who founded the F.B.I.
6. American Revolutionary Hero—Joseph Bigo.
7. Do you know who originated "All men are created equal"?—Joseph Mazzei.
8. Financial genius—Founder of the Bank of America—Amedio Gianini.
9. Signer of Declaration of Independence—William Peca.
10. The greatest patriot of them all—Giuseppe Garibaldi.
11. The Father of Nuclear Energy—Enrico Fermi.
12. And how about our women—Gina Lollobrigida, Virni Lisi, Sophia Loren, and Josephine DiCarlo.

This is a remarkable area of history and greatness—That has contributed to the improvement of our society—and it represents a challenge to all of we Italian Americans to continue to lead and to excel, in every field that we can, and to be proud and to have humility and to have compassion and to have dignity and to have grace and to have understanding.

And we Italian Americans have a special obligation and a special responsibility to help our country become greater because of its discovery by one of our own forefathers.

Ladies and gentlemen—We are a great people—Ohio is a great State and America is a great Nation.

And we must have the vitality, the exuberance, the courage, the vision, the vigor and the energy to become even greater—and to move ahead with optimism and hope and humility—We can become as great as we want to be or we can regress and move backward in desolation and despair.

It may have been Columbus who discovered the New World—

But it is up to you and I to rediscover America.

THE CHINA EXPERTS AND OUR NEW CHINA POLICY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, most Americans are by now well aware that the new China policy has been ushered in by a well-financed and coordinated publicity campaign. Many are still wondering how and why there has been a complete reversal under the apparent leadership of President Nixon. An interesting and most informative document which throws considerable light on the new China policy appeared in the Herald of Freedom for September 1971.

The documented Herald of Freedom report confirms what informed Amerimans have known and others suspected for years—that is, our State Department cannot make a mistake in favor of the United States so long as it follows the advice of experts who are Peiping's dear American comrades. No country could prevail in diplomacy by following a surrender blueprint prepared by its enemies.

It makes one wonder what happened to Mr. Nixon's pre-election promises that when elected President he would clean out the State Department.

I include the September 3 issue of the Herald of Freedom:

[From the Herald of Freedom, Sept. 3, 1971]

CHINESE COMMUNISTS, FRIENDS, AND SYMPATHIZERS

The fact that the Attorney General of the United States has failed to add the names of Communist-front organizations to his Subversive List during the last fifteen years does not mean that the Communists have ceased to follow the instructions of Otto Kuusinen, secretary of the Communist International, in his report at the Sixth Plenum of the Executive Committee of the Communist International:

The first part of our task is to build up, not only Communist organizations, but other organizations as well, above all mass organizations, sympathizing with our aims, and able to aid us for special purposes. . . . We must create a whole solar system of organizations and smaller committees around the Communist Party, so to speak, smaller organizations working actually under the influence of our party. (Quotations taken from the Communist, May 1931, pp. 409–423.)

Although the Federal Bureau of Investigation has referred to the Attorney General over 50 organizations, groups and special cases over the past 15 years, almost none of these cases has ever been referred to the Subversive Activities Control Board. Communist-front organizations (as defined by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities) "are characterized by their common origin, the rigid conformity of these organizations to the Communist pattern, their interlocking personnel, and their methods generally used to deceive the American public. Being part of a conspiratorial movement, their essence is deception."

A new organization which is obviously a Communist front (Chinese) but which, like its predecessors during the last fifteen years, will fail to be added to the Attorney General's List, is the U.S.-China Friendship Association. Using the address of P.O. Box 40738, San Francisco, California 94140, Volume 1, No. 1 of their "Newsletter" was issued June 12,

1971. Page one contained a "Statement of Principles," clearly indicating their pro-Chinese Communist orientation, and "Greetings" which stated:

Greetings from the newly formed U.S.-China Friendship Association. We officially opened at Glide Memorial Church in San Francisco. We had an exhibit of posters, woodcuts, and other items from China. Films from China were shown throughout the day. People who have been to China gave informal talks.

The U.S.-China Friendship Association was initially formed as a coalition of people who are interested in promoting friendly relations between the people of the U.S. and China. In the future we will sponsor film showings, study groups, talks about China, and will continue to publish a monthly newsletter. We are particularly interested in reaching people who do not have easy access to materials of this sort, such as the majority of the working people of this country.

We welcome your participation, please join us in getting underway.

Glide Memorial Church in San Francisco, where the U.S.-China Friendship Association "officially opened," has quite an unusual background and was written up in the Wall Street Journal of March 17, 1967. According to the article, "It sponsors a retreat for clergymen and homosexuals, a dance for male prostitutes. . . . If spurned by some laymen, Glide's activities seem to have met with at least tacit approval from the Methodist hierarchy. The bishop of California is one of Glide's trustees. . . ."

Glide has five ministers, four white and one Negro, Rev. A. Cecil Williams. Rev. Williams and two other Glide ministers, Rev. Ted McIlvenna and Rev. Lewis Durkham, were among the sponsors of a ball attended by nearly 600 homosexuals and their friends which was broken up by the police, according to the San Francisco Chronicle of January 3, 1965.

Another organization promoting the cause of Communist China is called the Citizens to Change U.S.-China Policy, 110 Maryland Avenue, N.E., Washington, D.C., 20002, Telephone 202-544-1763. Their release dated June 14, 1971 states, "More than 100 scholars in Chinese affairs from 50 colleges and universities in 19 States called today for seating the People's Republic of China in the UN. In a New York Times advertisement, the scholars stated their opposition, moreover, to 'any effort by the United States to impose a formula for dual representation without prior agreement of both claimants to China's seat.' The statement also declared that 'the future of Taiwan and of Washington-Peking relations are complex issues whose resolution will require time, negotiation, and accommodation.' "

Professor Allen S. Whiting from the University of Michigan is chairman of the Citizens to Change U.S.-China Policy. In the statement, Professor Whiting noted, "This is the first time since the scourge of Senator Joseph McCarthy swept the China field in the early 1950's that American scholars have spoken out on a political matter central to their concern."

Among the signers of the U.S.-China scholar's statement were Dick Bodde of the University of Pennsylvania; Claude A. Buss of San Jose California State College; Helmut Callis of the University of Utah; Oliver Edmund Clubb of New York; Rhoads Murphey of the University of Michigan; Arthur F. Wright of Yale; S. Bernard Thomas of Oakland University; John K. Fairbank of Harvard and Harold R. Isaacs of the Center for International Studies at MIT.

According to published reports, Professor Dirk Bodde has a record of over 30 affiliations with Communist fronts including China Welfare Appeal, Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, Far Eastern Spotlight, Institute of Pacific Relations, and even an appeal on behalf of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

Professor Claude A. Buss is shown in the Institute of Pacific Relations Hearings as having been a writer for the subversive publications Far Eastern Survey and Pacific Affairs, both issued by the IPR. Buss is shown as having attended a round table discussion along with John K. Fairbank, Owen Lattimore, and Lawrence K. Rosinger, all of whom are shown in the IPR hearings as having been identified as Communists. Among others at the round table discussion was John D. Rockefeller, III.

Prof. Helmut G. Callis is shown in the IPR hearings as having been identified as Communists. Among others at the round table discussion was John D. Rockefeller, III.

Oliver Edmund Clubb has numerous references in the IPR hearings and was ordered dismissed from the State Department by a loyalty board but the decision was overruled by Dean Acheson.

Professor Rhoads Murphey wrote articles for the subversive publications of the IPR as did Professor S. Bernard Thomas.

Professor Arthur F. Wright was affiliated with the IPR and wrote articles for their subversive publications. He interceded with Owen Lattimore on behalf of two German scholars who were ordered to be deported from China.

Professor John K. Fairbank was identified by Louis Budenz as a member of the Communist Party.

Harold Isaacs has been identified as a Communist and member of the Sorge Spy Ring.

Two days after the ad appeared in the New York Times on behalf of Red China by these so-called "U.S.-China Scholars," Senate Resolution 139 was introduced which reads in part as follows:

"That the People's Republic of China should be granted its legitimate seat in all principal and subsidiary organs of the United Nations as the sole government of China; that the United States should make no effort to impose a formula for dual representation by the People's Republic of China and the Republic of China (Taiwan) in the United Nations without the prior agreement of those two governments to such a formula. . . . that pending the resolution of these issues, the People's Republic of China should be granted its legitimate place in the United Nations."

Accompanying Resolution 139, was an address which stated in part:

* * * * *

The resolution is based on the brief but extremely significant policy statement issued earlier this week by a distinguished group of 110 American China scholars, led by Prof. Allen S. Whiting of the University of Michigan. The signers of the statement include scholars at 50 colleges and universities in 19 States, and represented a broad cross-section of academic opinion in many different regions of the country.

The essence of the resolution I have introduced is the proposal that the United States should adopt a "one China" policy toward Chinese representation in the United Nations, and that only the People's Republic of China—the Peking Government—is entitled to designataion as the Government of China for purposes of such representation.

The resolution specifically rejects the adoption of a "two China" policy. . . .

Moving swiftly to get the ball rolling, the Committee on Foreign Relations held hearings and among the "experts" who testified in closed secret hearings in connection with the Communist China issue were John Stewart Service, John Paton Davies, and John K. Fairbank, all of whom had been active in handing China over to the Communists in the first place.

Born in China of American parents, John Stewart Service went into the U.S. State Department on June 23, 1933. Over and over again U.S. intelligence services reported the pro-Communist attitude and activities of Mr. Service and also that he maintained a close contact and personal association with individuals known to be Communists, Communist sympathizers, and others under investigation as Soviet intelligence agents. A report appeared in the Congressional Record of March 30, 1950 (with the consent of the Senate) on the activities of Mr. Service. It reads in part:

To indicate to the committee the importance of this man's position as a security risk to the Government, I think it should be noted that he is one of the dozen top policy makers in the entire Department of State on far-eastern policy.

He is one of the small, potent group of untouchables who year after year formulate and carry out the plans of the Department of State and its dealings with foreign nations; particularly those in the Far East.

The Communist affiliations of Service are well known. His background is crystal clear . . .

John Stewart Service was involved in the "Amerasia Case," theft of a total of over 1700 documents, many of them top secret. The report on Service continues:

Later this man—John Service—was picked up by the Federal Bureau of Investigation for turning over to the Communists secret State Department information. Strangely, however, he was never prosecuted. However, Joseph Grew, the Under Secretary of State, who insisted on his prosecution, was forced to resign. Two days after Grew's successor, Dean Acheson, took over as Under Secretary of State, this man—John Service—who had been picked up by the FBI and who had previously urged that communism was the best hope of China, was not only reinstated in the State Department but promoted. And finally, under Acheson, placed in charge of all placements and promotions.

Congressman George A. Dondero of Michigan, commenting on the Amerasia case at the time, pointed out that Mr. Service, along with Philip Jaffee, Kate Mitchell, Andrew Roth, Mark Gayne and others, was arrested on charges preferred by two very responsible Americans, J. Edgar Hoover and Under Secretary of State Joseph Grew; the charges generally referred to as the Amerasia case or State Department espionage case which alleged violation of espionage laws. The charges were brought before the July 1945 grand jury but for some reason a change of grand jury was obtained by the attorneys for Service, Mitchell and Gayne. The August grand jury failed to return indictments because of insufficient evidence against the three. "As I have charged several times previously on the floor of this House," said Mr. Dondero, "there is ample reason for the belief that the August grand jury never was presented the full evidence against Mr. Service, Miss Mitchell, and Mr. Gayne."

A secret State Department Loyalty Review Board was convened and in spite of overwhelming evidence involving John S. Service in espionage, he was cleared by the special Loyalty Review Board. The names of the members of the board have been a top secret in the State Department and have not been made available to any Congressional Committee. Reliable confidential sources advise, however, that the three men who cleared Service were Dean Acheson, Nelson Rockefeller, and Selden Chapin.

In a radio broadcast (published in the Congressional Record on May 26, 1950): Columnist Henry J. Taylor, who later became a U.S. Ambassador, stated:

The same forces for protection which closed in around the then unknown Alger Hiss are now closing is around John S. Service. All of which makes me leery. For I love

this country as you do. But it is being eaten out from within.

Just as Secretary of State Acheson promptly bled for Alger Hiss, so the Deputy Under Secretary of State now promptly takes it upon himself to announce—and I quote—that the sympathy and good wishes of the entire State Department go out to John Stewart Service.

Mr. Taylor observed that because of Service's pro-Communist activities, he had been ordered back from his State Department assignment in China by U.S. Ambassador Patrick J. Hurley. Mr. Taylor commented, "When Service reached America, he was arrested by the FBI. . . Was Service detached from policy decisions? Well, hardly. After this, Service was assigned to Japan to tell General MacArthur, of all people, how to negotiate with Russia. General MacArthur reportedly rejected Service."

John Service was active in the Institute of Pacific Relations. The IPR hearings mention that John Carter Vincent and John S. Service met with Communist leaders Chou En-lai and Lin Piao in November 1942, according to Service's own report, and the Communists told Vincent and Service what they would like the U.S. to do with respect to the "situation" in China.

Expert No. 2, John K. Fairbank, had been a Rhodes Scholar, Rockefeller General Board Fellow in China, a Guggenheim Fellow for study in Southeast and East Asia. He was active in the IPR and Council on Foreign Relations. In addition to having been identified as a Communist, Fairbank was on the advisory board of the American Committee in Aid of Chinese Industrial Cooperatives (INDUSCO), a Communist front, and was on the board of directors of the China Air Council, also a Communist front.

Fairbank married Wilma Cannon; her sister Marion married Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. The Cannon girls' father, Walter B. Cannon, a Harvard professor, had 32 affiliations with cited Communist fronts.

The third China expert, John Paton Davies, had a long history of pro-Chinese Communist activities as shown in the IPR reports. Former Communist Elizabeth Bentley, testified under oath that she was told Davies was sympathetic to the Communist cause and his reports which she read verified this. His reports went through the Nathan Gregory Silvermaster espionage group. Davies is now at the CIA-financed center at MIT, having received a top secret security clearance. Also here are Communists Harold Isaacs and document-stealer Daniel Ellsberg.

Previously utilized information and advice came from Joseph R. Starobin, now of York University in Toronto, who interviewed Communist officials at the Paris Peace Talks, was a friend of Ho Chi Minh and made recommendations for U.S. policy to ——— as well as Henry Kissinger, whom he saw both in Washington, D.C. and San Clemente, Calif. Starobin is known to have been an active Communist in excess of twenty years and was former foreign affairs editor of the Communist paper Daily Worker.

It will be noted that a number of the so-called Asian scholars and expert witnesses have been affiliated with the Institute of Pacific Relations, which organization was cited on July 2, 1952 in Senate Report 2050 of the Senate Judiciary Committee as follows: "The IPR was a vehicle used by the Communists to orientate American far eastern policies toward Communist objectives." "Members of the small core of officials and staff members who controlled IPR were either Communist, or pro-Communist." The Communist Party and Soviet officials considered the organization "an instrument of Communist policy, propaganda and military intelligence."

The same individuals who played such an important part in turning China over to the Communists, and whose subversive activities were thoroughly exposed, are now being used as a basis for action.

In the June 1971 Veterans of Foreign Wars magazine, J. Edgar Hoover warned of the infiltration of Chinese espionage agents into the U.S. and the pro-red Chinese orientation of groups in the U.S., including the Progressive Labor Party and the Revolutionary Union. He stated that the FBI investigations reflect that Revolutionary Union members have accumulated weapons and have engaged in firearms and guerrilla warfare training. As late as July 25, 1971 Chou En-Lai, in a message to Fidel Castro, reiterated Chinese Communist solidarity with the Castro regime "against U.S. imperialism and its running dogs," and stated that the Chinese government and people will fight shoulder to shoulder with them against the "U.S. aggressors through to the end."

* * * * *

HAWAII SOLDIER NAMED "ARMY AVIATION SOLDIER OF THE YEAR," AN HONOR RICHLY DESERVED

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, last February the front pages of newspapers across the country told of the heroic deeds of Army Sp5c. Dennis Fujii, a native of Hawaii, during the Laotian withdrawal operation.

Specialist Fujii, although wounded himself, gave up his place on a medical evacuation helicopter to those more seriously wounded. He stayed for 5 days at a South Vietnamese landing zone, sending other wounded soldiers before him on other rescue helicopters, and directing American artillery and air support operations for the South Vietnamese.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to point out that Dennis Fujii resides in my former hometown of Hanapepe, "the biggest little town" on the island of Kauai, and that I have known his family since I was a child.

Last week, Dennis was presented an award in honor of having been named "Army Aviation Soldier of the Year." This was an honor he richly deserved.

It is important, Mr. Speaker, to note that Dennis Fujii is being acclaimed for being a hero under conditions of war, rather than being a war hero in the usual sense; his efforts last February were directed primarily toward saving lives, not destroying them.

Mr. Speaker, I offer for inclusion in the RECORD a news article describing the award and the story behind it:

[From the Washington Daily News, Oct. 15, 1971]

GALLANTRY DURING LAOS WITHDRAWAL—VIETNAM WAR HERO HONORED HERE

A Vietnam war hero—who took over a South Vietnamese communications post after giving up his place on a medical evacuation helicopter during the Laotian border withdrawal last February—was named "Army Aviation Soldier of the Year" at ceremonies here yesterday.

Spec. 5 Dennis M. Fjuii of Hanapepe, Hawaii, received the award from Army Secretary Robert F. Froehlke at the 13th annual meeting of the Army Aviation Association of America at the Sheraton Park Hotel.

The young, lanky soldier stayed five days at Landing Zone Ranger, sending more wounded out on successive evacuation choppers and directing U.S. artillery and planes supporting South Vietnamese troops because he spoke English better than his Vietnamese companions.

He was finally rescued by another helicopter and sent to a hospital because of shrapnel wounds. His action won him the Purple Heart, the Air Medal, the Silver Star and the second highest award for gallantry, the Distinguished Service Cross. In September he was presented the Vietnamese Cross of Gallantry, the equivalent of the Silver Star.

After staying in Washington a few days, Spec. 5 Fujii plans to fly back to Schofield Barracks on the island of Kauai "to be discharged the day I arrive."

He then plans to return to school, probably at a community college in Honolulu.

Having spent a total of two and a half years in Vietnam during his three years and eight months in the service, he thought he would be grounded after his experience in Laos.

"I went back and flew for three months," he said. "Then they came around and said, 'you have been flying too long, it's time to quit.' "

THE ALASKA NATIVE LAND CLAIMS BILL—SUPPORT FOR THE BILL AS REPORTED BY THE INTERIOR COMMITTEE

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, this week, the House will act on H.R. 10367, the Alaska Native land claims bill. During the past week, I have communicated with all Members regarding my strong support of this bill as reported by the House Interior and Rules Committees. I have also written to inform Members of my specific opposition to a number of amendments which will be proposed relating to land planning, wildlife refuges, and St. George and St. Paul Islands.

My opposition to these amendments and the opposition of the Alaska Federation of Natives is well-known and based on the judgment that the amendments are appropriate to this legislation, and not in the best interests of Alaska's Native people. It is my feeling, and that of the Alaska Federation of Natives, that the bill should be passed as it was reported by the Interior Committee. The indepth consideration of this committee over a period of years and the deliberations of the committee during the 92d Congress provide a strong foundation for a fine bill.

Other important interests also support the bill as reported and oppose amendments. This includes the State of Alaska, through Gov. William A. Egan, the AFL-CIO, the Seafarer's International Union, and the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, among many other groups. For the interest of all Members, I include the statements of those mentioned above in the RECORD at this point:

JUNEAU, ALASKA.

Hon. NICK BEGICH,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Passage of H.R. 10367 as reported by the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and by the House Rules Committee is in the best interest of the American people, the State of Alaska, and all its citizens, native and non-native. We urge your support for H.R. 10367 as reported to the House by the above referred-to committees.

WILLIAM A. EGAN,
Governor of Alaska.

AMERICAN FEDERATION
OF LABOR AND CONGRESS
OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D.C., October 15, 1971.

The AFL–CIO supports H.R. 10367, the Alaska Native Land Claims Settlement Act, as reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

This legislation, also supported by the Alaska Federation of Natives, the State of Alaska, and the Administration, represents a compromise providing equitable compensation for the long-standing land claims of Alaska's Eskimos, Aleuts, and Indians. The bill authorizes $925 million and 40 million acres of land for the natives and is a vast improvement for the natives over previously proposed legislation.

Opponents of the legislation, mainly environmental groups, apparently will attempt to add a restrictive land-use planning amendment when the bill is considered on the House floor this week. The AFL–CIO opposes any such amendment that would result in negating the benefits to Alaskan natives by imposing economic restrictions on the rights provided them under H.R. 10367.

The AFL–CIO supports national land-use planning legislation in contrast to a proposal that would single out one state for unique treatment. Hearings are now being held by the Interior Committee's Environment Subcommittee on a number of bills calling for nationwide comprehensive land-use planning. We are convinced that this legislation requires handling as a complete and separate issue.

Underlying the expected floor fight on H.R. 10367 is the so-called "pipeline" issue. The AFL–CIO supports construction of the Alaskan pipeline, but does not believe this legislation should be the battleground for a pipeline fight. Those opposed to the pipeline have full access to the courts and this access will not be impaired by passage of H.R. 10367. In the meantime, Alaska's natives will not be denied their long withheld economic rights.

For these reasons, the AFL–CIO urges you to support, without crippling amendments, the Alaskan Native Land Claims Settlement Act.

Sincerely,

ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,
Director, Department of Legislation.

The AFL–CIO Maritime Trades Department and the Seafarers International Union strongly urge your support of H.R. 10367 as reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. We oppose restrictive land use planning amendments which we understand will be offered by opponents of the legislation and will have the effect of negating the benefits to Alaska Natives. Planning issue should be handled as separate matter in hearings now being held by Interior Committee's Environment Subcommittee. H.R. 10367 also is supported by AFL–CIO, Alaska Federation of Natives, the State of Alaska and the administration and we join them in calling for its passage as reported by the committee without amendment.

PAUL HALL,
President.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
October 17, 1971.

Congressman LLOYD MEEDS,
Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Alaskan Native Claims Settlement Act, H.R. 10367, would restore rightful property to one of our Nations most deprived minorities. We understand the settlement in this bill is satisfactory to Alaskan Natives. The leadership conference on civil rights and its 125 national participating organizations support the bill as reported and opposes any amendments that would jeopardize unfair settlement. We are sure you will do all in your power to see that the House passed this important bill.

CLARENCE MITCHELL,
Chairman, Legislative Committee.

GEN. "CHESTY" PULLER

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, last Monday the most decorated marine in the history of the corps died at the age of 73. Gen. "Chesty" Puller fought for our Nation from Nicaragua, to Guadalcanal, to Inchon. He commanded a regiment of the 1st Marine Division in Korea during a battle which has been described as, "the greatest in the history of American arms." During the battle of Chosin Reservoir the 1st Marine Division effectively destroyed an entire Chinese Communist army consisting of 12 divisions.

During his 37 years as a fighting marine "Chesty" Puller was awarded the Navy Cross five times for heroism and gallantry in action, the Distinguished Service Cross, and numerous other decorations. He had the quality of bravery which never goes out of fashion if a nation is to remain free, the quality of courage which formed the final rampart the enemy could never breach. He never sought glory but rather battle, and in the bloody business of the day glory found him. He gave his all for his country and in always seeking victory helped bring the peace which lies at the end of war.

He was a great marine and a great American. He would have been at home at Valley Forge and volunteered unsuccessfully for Vietnam. His fighting spirit spans our history and forms an important part of it. He will be remembered and missed.

The following stories are from the Washington Star, the New York Times, and the Los Angeles Times:

[From the Washington Star, Oct. 13, 1971]

CHESTY'S LAST BEACHHEAD

With the death of Lieutenant General Lewis B. Puller, the Marines, Virginia and the nation have lost an almost mythic figure. The most decorated Marine in the history of the Corps was not a man for all seasons; nor will be remembered as one of the great military thinkers of this or any other time.

What "Chesty" Puller was was an incomparable fighting man, a small-unit leader (he never commanded anything larger than a regiment in combat) without peer who cared for nothing except victory and his men. Enlisted men are not given to adoration of their generals, but there were few Marines who would not have tried to establish a beachhead in hell at a nod from Chesty Puller. The reason was simple: As his old friend General Lewis Walt once put it, Puller "didn't send them into battle, they followed him in."

His Marines knew, too, that once in battle, Puller, who bore the scars of a dozen wounds, would see them through. When his 1st Marines were hard-pressed at Chosin Reservoir, Puller vowed that in future years he would hold the regiment's annual reunions in a telephone booth before he would permit so much as the body of a single dead Marine—not to speak of the wounded—to be abandoned on those frozen Korean passes. He made good on that vow and the 1st Marines came out together, the living and the dead, bringing with them the shattered remnants of other units.

The retired—but not retiring—general never learned to suffer fools gladly and, as a consequence, his stars came late and he was denied the higher combat commands to which he aspired. But there never was a better Marine than that barrel-chested, lantern-jawed, hard-drinking rifleman from West Point, Virginia, "Chesty" Puller.

[From the Washington Star, Oct. 13, 1971]

MARINE GEN. "CHESTY" PULLER; WINNER OF FIVE NAVY CROSSES

(By Jeremiah O'Leary)

Lt. Gen. Lewis B. (Chesty) Puller, one of the toughest and most decorated Marines in the history of the corps, died yesterday at Kecoughtan Veterans Administration Hospital in Hampton, Va. He was 73 years old.

Puller was a roaring and fearless combat soldier whose courage won him unprecedented five Navy Crosses for heroism. He was also a figure of controversy because of his outspoken comments on the virtues of whisky and the failings of the U.S. Army.

He was the hero of dozens of battles from the "banana war" skirmishes of Haiti and Nicaragua when he was a young officer to his more flamboyant roles in the battles against the Japanese in World War II and the Chinese and North Koreans in the early 1950s.

Wherever he served, Puller was the ideal as well as the champion of the enlisted Marines. Over the nearly four decades of his service, Puller was known to more enlisted Leathernecks than any other officer.

He was a profane, barrel-chested man of medium height but recognizable anywhere by his pouter-pigeon stance and the out-thrust jaw that were his trademarks. Puller was not a handsome man but Marines have always admired anyone saltier than themselves, as "Chesty" proved to be repeatedly all his life.

War was the most honorable profession Puller could imagine and he practiced it with almost incredible flair. Born in Virginia's Northern Neck, the son of a wholesale grocer, Puller left Virginia Military Institute after one year to enlist in the Marines in 1918 in order to fight the Germans. The armistice came before Puller got to France.

In the intervening years before Pearl Harbor, he battled hostile forces in Haiti and Sandinistas in Nicaragua and in 1941 commanded a Marine battalion in Shanghai against the Japanese Army.

Little more than a year later, the war had started and Puller was on Guadalcanal commanding a battalion of the 7th Marines. He was struck seven times in the body by shrapnel which gave rise to the legend that Puller's posture was due to a silver plate implanted in his chest. A corpsman tried to hang a casualty tag on Puller and he roared, "Take that thing and hang it on a bottle. I'm still in command here."

In the nine months after the victory at Guadalcanal, Puller became the regimental

executive officer which to him was practically a rear-echelon assignment.

But he got back into front line combat three days after Christmas Eve in 1943, landing with the 1st Marine Division on New Britain Island.

In November 1950, Puller commanded a regiment of the 1st Division in Korea when six Chinese divisions surrounded them in what became the Battle of Chosen Reservoir.

The United Nations forces were retreating in disorder all along the front. But Puller growled, "Those poor bastards. Now they've got us just where we want them."

It is history that the Marines marched out from "frozen Chosin" in temperatures 30 degrees below zero, fighting every inch of the way. They brought out with them every man, dead or alive, and every vehicle that would move. The Marines became considerably richer in transport than they were at the start by salvaging most of the abandoned trucks and jeeps of a shattered U.S. Army division.

Puller became a brigadier general and assistant division commander in 1951 and was the leading spirit of the counterattacks in April which decisively defeated the Chinese along the 38th parallel.

Puller became a great favorite of the press in Korea because of his acerbic directness and the reporters protected him from the consequences of his opinions.

He was fond of telling how he had handled Gen. Douglas MacArthur when the "great man" sent word that he wanted to decorate Puller for his role in the conquering of Inchon. Puller, who was in his command post atop a mountain, sent word that if MacArthur wanted to see him he would have to come up to the front.

But when he left Korea to return to the United States in mid-1951, Puller was met by reporters he didn't know in Honolulu and they quoted him on things he had been saying all along.

The crusher was when he said he saw no reason why a man old enough to fight shouldn't be old enough to have some beer and whisky. The WCTU and America's mothers raised a national storm and Puller's career went into eclipse.

He was forced to retire in 1955 because of high blood pressure and all his roars of protest did him no good.

The last 15 years were quiet ones for Puller, whose greatest pleasure was to sit on his porch at Saluda, Middlesex County, Va., talking of old campaigns and half-forgotten battles with the men who served with him. He had suffered a series of strokes and entered the hospital in July.

He leaves his wife, the former Virginia Montague Evans, of Saluda, and three children, Virginia, Lewis B. Jr. and Martha.

Services will be held at noon Thursday in Christ Episcopal Church in Christchurch, Va., with burial in the church cemetery.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 13, 1971]

GEN. CHESTY PULLER DIES; MOST DECORATED MARINE; COMMISSIONED AT 20, HE WON FIVE NAVY CROSSES—LED UNIT AT INCHON

HAMPTON, VA., October 11.—Lieut. Gen. Lewis B. Puller, the most decorated member of the Marine Corps, died Monday after a long illness. He was 73 years old.

TOUGH, PROFANE AND LOYAL

During a long and stormy career, Lewis Burwell Puller acquired the nickname Chesty, a reputation as the toughest marine in the Corps and nearly every medal for valor awarded by the services, including a record total of the Navy Crosses.

He was a blunt, profane, cigar-chewing officer who walked with his beribboned chest thrown out like a bantam rooster and with a belligerent thrust to his jaw. He had an intense, almost noisy, loyalty to his service and a fierce contempt for weakness in men, and he reveled in fighting as other men do in leisure.

General Puller was called as a defense witness in the 1956 trial of a Marine Corps drill sergeant, S/Sgt. Matthew C. McKeon in the drowning of six recruits in a training accident at Parris Island, S.C. The sergeant was found guilty of negligent homicide but acquitted of the more serious charges of manslaughter, oppression of troops, and conduct detrimental to the service.

General Puller's testimony that the tough training march was not oppression was regarded as a strong factor in the verdict.

The general's courage and his roughness were Marine Corps legends that had inspired soldiers for more than three decades—from Nicaragua to Wonson. Yet he had gentler virtues, too. He was quietly religious, a devoted family man, an officer who inspired love as well as respect from those who served under him, and a man who read not much but well.

His ideal was Andrew Jackson, a man he regarded as "fitted for war by natural instincts, by study and by self-discipline." And when he went into battle, along with his courage and profanity, he carried around his neck the Crusader's Cross of the Episcopal Church and in his pocket a copy of Caesar's "Gallic Wars."

General Puller was born June 26, 1898, and was reared in the Virginia town of West Point, virtually weaned on the stirring tales of Confederate veterans.

ENLISTED AS A PRIVATE

As a youth he entered the Virginia Military Institute, time-honored path to a military career, but left when World War I broke out to enlist as a private in the Marine Corps because he could get a commission at the age of 20.

He did, but his aptitude for military life kept him in this country training troops, a fate that developed in him the command of picturesque profanity for which he later became noted.

When the war ended he was retired to inactive duty, but immediately re-enlisted for service in Haiti, where some sharp jungle fighting was going on. There, as a corporal in the Marines and a first lieutenant in the Haitian gendarmerie, he battled revolutionaries and won the Haitian Military Medal.

After five years and some 40-odd fighting engagements, he was again commissioned a Marine second lieutenant and was transferred to Hawaii to take charge of the rifle range.

Bored with this, he asked for transfer to Nicaragua, where a bandit named Sandino was stirring up trouble. As a captain in the Nicaragua National Guard he did his best to restore order and led his troops in at least 60 battles. In two of these he so distinguished himself that he won the Navy Cross for each.

By the time of the attack on Pearl Harbor, General Puller was back in the United States commanding the First Battalion of the Seventh Marines at Camp Lejeune, N.C. Against the sharp resistance of his regimental commander, he insisted on training his men in jungle fighting and personal camouflage tricks.

The training paid off in 1942, when his battalion landed on Guadalcanal and fought a stubborn battle against wave on wave of Japanese troops to hold Henderson Field. After weeks of attrition his unit was down to 500 men holding a 2,000-yard line—but they held, and General Puller won a third Navy Cross.

A month later he was hit by a shell when he was trying to repair a telephone line. Though his foot and leg were filled with fragments, he stubbornly refused to go to the rear until, as he noted in his combat journal, "I found myself unable to keep up with my battalion."

He won the Bronze Star and, after his leg was repaired, returned to this country for a lecture tour at Army schools. But he went back to the wars again in December, 1943, as a staff officer on Cape Gloucester in the Pacific. For his heroism there he won a fourth Navy Cross—a record in the Corps.

At Peleliu, where he won the Legion of Merit, he ran into the toughest fighting he had seen. As commander of the First Marine Regiment, he relentlessly drove against the Japanese holed up in the caves of Bloody Nose Ridge. His regiment lost 60 per cent of its men and 74 per cent of its officers.

Peleliu was his last fight against the Japanese. Trouble from his old wound came back and he had to return to the States for treatment. He finished out the war training replacements at Camp Lejeune.

When the Korean war broke out General Puller was commanding the Marine Barracks at Pearl Harbor. For a man whose blood was thinned by years in tropical posts the bitter cold of Korea was a dreadful ordeal. But it did not quench his courage.

General Puller was the leader of the First Marine Regiment at the famed Inchon landing in 1950. After a stiff battle with heavy casualties at Yongdonpo, his regiment reached the city gates at Seoul and then fought a block-by-block battle to regain the city. General of the Army Douglas MacArthur rewarded him with the Silver Star. Later he won a fifth Navy Cross for his action at the Chosin Reservoir in Korea.

With every medal for valor given by the services, except the Medal of Honor, he won his general's star early in 1951. He gave up his regiment to take over as assistant commander of the First Marine Division. But two months later he was recalled to the United States to take over command of the Third Marine Brigade in training at Camp Pendleton, Calif.

RICOCHET OF HEADLINES

General Puller's return, which started as a triumph, turned out to be the bitterest experience in his life. He was angry over many things in Korea, as were many others, and he was a man given to speaking his mind. He had not yet learned the ricochet of headlines.

From Pearl Harbor to his home in Saluda, Va., his flight back left behind a trail of headlines and public uproar.

At Pearl Harbor he said that fighting men needed to be trained better. "I want them to be able to march 20 miles, the last five at double time, and then be ready to fight," he said.

In San Francisco, between planes, he derided the frills of some training camps and it was clear he was talking about the Army. Get rid of the ice cream, candy and girls, he said, and "give 'em beer and whisky."

By the time he reached his home the uproar from the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Women's Christian Temperance Union, preachers, priests, parsons, mothers and even veterans was deafening. He was deluged with vituperative mail, and the Marine Corps itself finally had to come to his defense with an official statement.

Thereafter General Puller continued in training commands, first at Camp Pendleton and later at Coronado, Calif. in 1953 he was promoted to two-star rank as a major general, and the next year he took command of the Second Marine Division at Camp Lejeune.

General Puller is survived by his widow, the former Virginia Evans; a son, Lewis Jr., who lost both legs and parts of six fingers while serving as a marine in Vietnam, and two daughters, Mrs. William H. Dabney and Mrs. Michael P. Downs.

He will be buried with full military honors Thursday in Christchurch, Va.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Oct. 13, 1971]

GENERAL PULLER, MOST DECORATED MARINE OF THREE WARS, DIES

HAMPTON, VA.—Retired Lt. Gen. Lewis B. (Chesty) Puller, 73, a crusty, sometimes uncouth marine whose actions in two world wars and Korea made him the corps' most decorated man, died Monday night after a long illness.

Puller, received 56 decorations during service in the Marine Corps from 1917 until his retirement in 1955. He requested reactivation for service in Vietnam at age 67 but was turned down.

He was the only man ever to win five Navy Crosses.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur personally awarded Puller the Silver Star in Korea in 1950.

When MacArthur strode up a hill to Puller's command post overlooking a battle below and pinned the Silver Star on him for conducting a "magnificent operation," Puller grunted, "Thanks."

Then, ignoring protocol, Puller said, "Excuse me, General, if I don't conduct you to your car. But my job is up here."

On an occasion when Chinese Communist surrounded Puller's troops in Korea, Puller remarked to subordinates, "Those poor bastards. They've got us just where we want them. We can shoot in every direction now."

Puller had been in ill health since suffering a stroke several years ago. Death came at 7:55 p.m. at Kecoughtan Veterans Administration hospital here.

On a visit in December, 1968, to Virginia Military Institute—which claimed him as one of its own—Puller recalled his year at VMI as a "rat" in 1917.

That was the year, he said, "the Army took all our rifles. I figured if they needed our rifles, they needed me."

So he left the cadet corps to join the Marine Corps as a private. He retired as a three-star general 38 years later.

His career included command of the 1st Marine Division in World War II and later in Korea.

SON IS STUDENT

His son—Lewis B. Puller Jr.—lost both legs in the fighting in Vietnam and was in critical condition for months. He since has become a law student at the College of William and Mary, and in July of this year he was in the news when he announced that he had sharply changed his thinking on the Vietnam war. "If I were drafted and given orders for Vietnam, I would not go," the younger Puller said.

Born in West Point, Va., June 26, 1889, Puller served in the Marine Corps from 1919 to 1924 in Haiti as an officer in the Gendarmerie d'Haiti, joined the Nicaraguan National Guard Detachment in 1928 and won the Navy Cross for outstanding service in an action against bandits.

He returned to the United States in 1931 but went back to Nicaragua in 1932 and won a gold star in lieu of his second Navy Cross for outstanding services in action against bandits. Later he served in China.

In World War II, while commanding the 1st Battalion of the 1st Marine Division, he won a second gold star in lieu of his third Navy Cross at Guadalcanal in 1942. In 1943, while serving in the Cape Gloucester operation, he received a gold star in lieu of his fourth Navy Cross. The following year he was awarded the Legion of Merit for outstanding services after participating in the capture of Peleliu.

OTHER DECORATIONS

Other decorations include the Silver Star won in Korea in 1950; the Army Distinguished Service Cross; the Bronze Star and the Purple Heart, both at Guadalcanal in 1942; Presidential Unit Citation with two Bonze Stars, Guadalcanal—1942 and Peleliu—1944.

At Guadalcanal, in one attack Puller led against the Japanese, he was wounded seven times but continued fighting.

The nickname "Chesty" was derived from Puller's ramrod straight back and his inflated chest.

His associates recognized him as a tough uncouth and profane marine.

BAPTISTS OPPOSE PRAYER AMENDMENT

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, as evidenced by the following statements, all major Baptist groups in this country are opposed to the proposed constitutional amendment regarding prayer in public buildings.

The statements follow:

BAPTIST JOINT COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Participating groups:

American Baptist Convention.
Baptist Conference of Canada.
Baptist General Conference.
National Baptist Convention.
National Baptist Convention, U.S.A. Inc.
North American Baptist General Conference.
Progressive National Baptist Convention, Inc.
Seventh Day Baptist General Conference.
Southern Baptist Convention.

A RESOLUTION ON RELIGIOUS FREEDOM AND THE NONDENOMINATIONAL PRAYER AMENDMENT

(SEC. 1. Nothing contained in this Constitution shall abridge the right of persons lawfully assembled, in any public building which is supported in whole or in part through the expenditure of public funds, to participate in nondenominational prayer. H.J. Res. 191)

Whereas, there is currently before the House of Representatives a proposal (H.J. Res. 191) to amend the Constitution of the United States so as to authorize participation in nondenominational prayer in any public building; and

Whereas, this proposal, by authorizing participation in nondenominational prayer, opens the door for government to determine what is acceptable prayer; and

Whereas, we are vitally concerned to maintain religious liberty, without any infringement by governmental regulation of any form, as now provided without qualification by the First Amendment to the Constitution;

Be it therefore resolved that we, the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs, assembled in formal session on October 6, 1971, hereby record our opposition to H.J. Res. 191, and support our stand with the following reasons:

1. We are sympathetic with the sincere desire of many people to preserve the right to all persons to engage in genuine prayer. We deny, however, that any elected body or governmental authority has the right to determine either the place or the content of prayer, as is implied in the proposed constitutional nondenominational prayer amendment.

2. Moreover, we foresee that to authorize government by a constitutional amendment to intervene in the sacred privilege of prayer, long enshrined in the character and tradition of our nation, is to make of government a judge of theology and an administrator of religious practice.

3. We fear that, if such a proposed amendment should become a part of the Constitution of the United States, a new religion of "nondenominationalism" would in a measure become established which could threaten the integrity of both church and state.

4. The amendment could enable government to impose the limits of "nondenominationalism" on religious practices in any building that is built in whole or in part by public funds—a school, a hospital, a day care center, a nursing home, a children's home—thereby nullifying the constitutional right of the free exercise of religion.

5. We affirm the right of school children or any other segment of the population to engage voluntarily in their own prayers without government authorization or supervision. This right, we believe, is protected adequately by the First Amendment as it now stands:

Article 1. Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; . . .

6. Finally, it is our opinion that the proposed amendment is offered in view of a misinterpretation of the so-called "prayer and Bible reading" decisions of the Supreme Court in 1962 and 1963, which properly prohibited government intrusion into the religious activity of school children. At no time has the Supreme Court prohibited voluntary prayer but has only ruled against governmentally prescribed prayer and governmentally sponsored religious exercises.

AMERICAN BAPTIST CONVENTION: SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE

(Voted at the annual sessions of the American Baptist Convention, May 22, 1964.)

Baptists believe that religious faith must involve a vital encounter between man and God and that religious form cannot be substituted for this encounter.

The viewpoints of Baptists (in particular, John Leland) with regard to religious liberty and the necessity for the separation of church and state had its influence on the writers of the Bill of Rights and resulted in the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States which has become the cornerstone of religious liberty.

Thus Baptists have long opposed any compulsion to conformity in religious belief or in the practice of religion. The first amendment has supported this freedom. The proposed change in that amendment could weaken it and bring the power of the State to bear on individuals to conform and to participate in prescribed religious practices.

An amendment to permit compulsory Bible reading and prayer in the public schools is not only a danger to the freedom of nonbelievers, it is also a threat to the religious well-being of the believer. It is because of a deep respect for worship, and the recognition that prayer is essential and should be a vital encounter between man and God, that Baptists oppose devotional exercises that are more rote than worship. Therefore we reaffirm our belief in the separation of church and state as written in the first amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

And we reaffirm our historic Baptist belief that religion should not be a matter of compulsion and that prayers and religious practices should not be prescribed by law or by a teacher or public school official;

We further urge that American Baptists develop present programs and explore new and more effective ways of reaching children and youth for Jesus Christ who are currently not being reached; and

We also urge American Baptist churches and families to give special study this year to our historic Baptist position in the context of current issues in church and State relations.

BAPTIST GENERAL CONFERENCE

Lloyd W. Dahlquist, general secretary, board of trustees, Baptist General Conference, May 11, 1964.

There is no question in our mind or heart as to our desire to have all people read the Bible, for it is the abiding word of God. However, we must exercise care on how we get people, children or adults, to read the Bible. If our Bible is forced upon anybody by government regulation, then we may be forced by legislation to have the writings of other religions in our schools. We need to have both the immediate and ultimate perspective.

We are living in days of prophetic fulfillment, so clearly seen in the paganizing and secularizing of our society. It is against this total trend that we must bend every effort in personal life, homelife, and church. The deep-seated tragedy is that the Bible and prayer have so little meaning to the average Christian and church member, Conference Baptists included.

The remedy is not legislation, but the government of the Holy Spirit in our lives, homes, and churches. We need revival fire to burn at the home base, then it will spread to others, affecting every area of life, schoolwork, business and play.

O God, so let it be! Amen!

NATIONAL BAPTIST CONVENTION, U.S.A., INC.

J. H. Jackson, president, the National Baptist Convention, U.S.A., Inc., April 24, 1964.

It is my position that the Supreme Court interpreted properly the Constitution in dealing with the issue of prescribed prayer and Bible reading in our public schools.

I do not favor any constitutional change in this matter, for the church does not need government to assist her in the propagation of her faith. I believe firmly in the separation of church and state, and a constitutional prescription involving the matter of prayer and Bible reading is putting government in the business of religion * * *.

NORTH AMERICAN BAPTIST GENERAL CONFERENCE

Frank H. Woyke, executive secretary, North American Baptist General Conference, August 1962

Much excitement has been stirred by the recent Supreme Court decision declaring unconstitutional the prayer adopted by the State Board of Regents of New York for use in all public schools in the State.

A storm of protest greeted the decision * * *. There was a widespread impression that this decision proved the Supreme Court to be against prayer, antireligious, and in favor of the secularization of American life.

What are the facts?

1. The Supreme Court did not declare opposition to prayer. It simply said that prayer "composed by governmental officials as a part of a government program to further religious beliefs" is unconstitutional. The Court held that the regents' prayer in New York was an "official" prayer and thus violated the rights of citizens under the 1st and 14th amendments.

2. The Court did not eliminate God from our public life. It simply stated that the establishment of religion has a tendency to destroy government and to degrade religion. The Court also declared that governmentally established religions and religious persecution go hand in hand. Is this not what all those who prize religious freedom have been saying all along?

PROGRESSIVE NATIONAL BAPTIST CONVENTION, INC.

A STATEMENT OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM AND VOLUNTARY PRAYER

The people called Baptists have always believed in and contended for the principle of religious liberty for all and the fact that prayer, to be genuine, must be voluntary . . . for prayer is communion with God.

The Progressive National Baptist Convention, Inc., adheres to this principle and believes further that prayer should neither be hindered nor compelled by any governmental or ecclesiastical authority.

We believe that the First Amendment to the Constitution which states, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," is a sufficient guarantee of religious liberty for all. The Supreme Court of the United States has rendered decisions which fairly and adequately interpret this amendment.

We believe further that another amendment to the Constitution relative to religion in general and prayer in particular could becloud the clear statement of the First Amendment and afford an opportunity for courts in the future to interpret the First Amendment differently. Therefore, we oppose a prayer amendment to the Constitution.

S. S. HODGES,
Executive Secretary.

Progressive National Baptist Convention, Inc., Washington, D.C.

SEVENTH DAY BAPTIST GENERAL CONFERENCE

Harley D. Bond, executive secretary, Seventh Day Baptist General Conferenece, May 5, 1964.

The first amendment to the Constitution very clearly permits free exercise of religion, and safeguards against the establishment, by law, of any specified religion. The Supreme Court, in the decision which made unlawful the prescribing of prayers by a political subdivision (and we assume by the National Government), upheld the safeguard. Unfortunately the decision of the Supreme Court has been grossly misinterpreted.

The time factor has not permitted the Seventh Day Baptist General Conference to consider House Joint Resolution 693. However, as one member of that minority group, I wish to express my personal opposition to House Joint Resolution 693 or to any other constitutional amendment which would affect the safeguards of the first amendment. House Joint Resolution 693 would be an enactment in opposition to the nonestablishment of religion. Ironically, it implies a permissiveness to Bible reading and prayer, both of which are implicit in the first amendment.

SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION

ON VOLUNTARY PRAYER

Whereas, There is a continuing national discussion on the relationship between public agencies and the advancement of religion and

Whereas, Baptists have made a major contribution to the world by insisting on religious liberty for all and by emphasizing that a genuine religious experience is a voluntary response to God, and

Whereas, Prayer is one of the most intimate and sacred relationships to God and must be kept free from governmental or ecclesiastical intrusion, and

Whereas, Prayer is not a genuine response to God unless it is voluntary. Therefore, be it

Resolved, that the Southern Baptist Convention in session at St. Louis, Mo., June 2, 1971, reaffirm its resolution on Religious Liberty approved by the Convention at Atlantic City, N.J., May 22, 1964 (see page 80. SBC Annual 1964), and

Be it further *Resolved*, that we do hereby reaffirm our belief in voluntary prayer on the part of all people and that we urge the churches to teach their members the true nature of prayer and the role of the Holy Spirit in helping people to pray, and

Be it further *Resolved*, that the Southern Baptist Convention encourage its constituency to participate in prayer experiences that are voluntary and uncoerced by governmental or ecclesiastical authorities.

RESOLUTION NO. 2—RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

In this anniversary year we are grateful for the witness which our Baptist movement has been privileged to bear. The discernment of the call of God in Christ has led us to a glorious experience of evangelism and missionary outreach through the power of the Holy Spirit.

Our leaders and our people have firmly rejected the use of the coercive powers of government in the realm of religion. Baptists had much to do with writing the First Amendment into the Constitution of the United States and have been in the forefront in preserving the religious liberty that our nation has enjoyed. We have unflinchingly declared our desire for separation of church and state in resolutions, in sermons and in policies and practices.

1. We, the messengers of the Convention hereby affirm our support for the concepts and the vocabulary of the First Amendment including both its prohibition upon government roles in religious programs and its protection of free exercise of religion for the people.

2. We enunciate our concern that public officials and public servants of all types shall have the same free exercise of religion as other citizens, but that this freedom does not entitle them to use public or official powers for the advancement of religious commitments or ideas. In applying this principle to the field of public education, we affirm the historic right of our schools to full academic freedom for the pursuit of all knowledge religious or otherwise.

3. We appeal to the Congress of the United States to allow the First Amendment of the Constitution of United States to stand as our guarantee of religious liberty, and we oppose the adoption of any further amendment to that Constitution respecting establishment of religion or free exercise thereof.

4. We urge all our channels, leaders, and churches to involve themselves thoroughly in study of the biblical, the historical, and the contemporary issues related to religious liberty to the end that our heritage of freedom and responsibility under God may be clearly understood and appreciated by the next generation and by ever larger proportions of the world's peoples.

CONGRESSMAN BOB SIKES IS A NATIONAL LEADER

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the other day I received in my mail the October 8 edition of the Florida Poll which is a publication edited by my fine and able constituent Joe Abram, and which has for years been making observations on national and local governmental matters. In this recent edition, a very fine tribute appears to our beloved colleague BOB SIKES and I am happy to include it at this point in the RECORD:

BOB SIKES

Bob Sikes, colorful and able "Congressman" from Crestview and big game hunter among the 10 most powerful men in "Congress". Sikes has brought many projects and installations to our state and as a strong senior member of the Armed Services Com-

mittee and chairman of the Contract Committee has caused him to be listed as one of 10 most powerful men in America.

I am sure that one of the best known and respected in Congress today is the ever smiling Dean of Florida's Delegation in Congress from Crestview, Bob Sikes. Bob is a former newspaperman, Publisher and I believe carries a union card as a former Telegraph Operator. Sikes has now joined the ranks of "Big Game Hunters" returning from Africa with a top Hunting Group from the United States with some valuable trophies to hang in his office. Congessman Sikes represents Florida's First Congressional District now made up of Escambia, Santa Rosa, Okalosa, Walton, Holmes, Jackson, Washington, Bay and Gulf Counties. Wherever you go in his District he is loved by all and has received Citations and Honors from Catholics, Protestants, Greek and Jewish groups and is as strong among the blacks as he is among the whites. Bob Sikes is Truly the "All American" man in Congress who has worked harmoniously with all Committees to keep the "NASA" Program going and to help keep America strong. It is men like Sikes who has made Florida a great State and you will see him and his work standing out for the poor, the sick, the needy and all peoples. I doubt that Congressman Bob Sikes will have any opposition next year and if someone dares oppose him he will be the "winner" in landslide figures. My way of thinking based on talking to people all over the state that Florida needs more men like civic leader, former publisher and newspaperman, church leader and now "big game" hunter Bob Sikes. . . . If Bob had been living in Ohio, New York, Illinois or even Penn., he would have been President of the United States.

VIETNAM

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I was wondering, in view of the events of the past few weeks in Saigon, if any Member of Congress or any member of the executive branch would care to say he or she is willing, from this day forward, to give his or her life, limb, sanity, or freedom—POW even for another day—further to prop up the Saigon dictatorship.

Other Americans are being ordered to do so today.

Following is the language of House Resolution 630, which I introduced on September 30, 1971:

Whereas the President of the United States on March 4, 1971, stated that his policy is that: "as long as there are American POW's in North Vietnam we will have to maintain a residual force in South Vietnam. That is the least we can negotiate for."

Whereas Madame Nguyen Thi Binh, chief delegate of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam stated on July 1, 1971, that the policy of her government is: "If the United States Government sets a terminal date for the withdrawal from South Vietnam in 1971 of the totality of United States forces and those of the other foreign countries in the United States camp, the parties will at the same time agree on the modalities:

"A. Of the withdrawal in safety from South Vietnam of the totality of United States forces and those of the other foreign countries in the United States camp;

"B. Of the release of the totality of military men of all parties and the civilians captured in the war (including American pilots captured in North Vietnam), so that they may all rapidly return to their homes.

"These two operations will begin on the same date and will end on the same date.

"A cease-fire will be observed between the South Vietnam People's Liberation Armed Forces and the Armed Forces of the other foreign countries in the United States camp, as soon as the parties reach agreement on the withdrawal from South Vietnam of the totality of United States forces and those of the other foreign countries in the United States camp."

Resolved, That the United States shall forthwith propose at the Paris peace talks that in return for the return of all American prisoners held in Indochina, the United States shall withdraw all its Armed Forces from South Vietnam within sixty days following the signing of the agreement: Provided, That the agreement shall contain guarantee by the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam of safe conduct out of Vietnam for all American prisoners and all American Armed Forces simultaneously.

CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1971

Mr. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand today and join my many colleagues in paying tribute to Christopher Columbus. This year for the first time the Nation is paying official tribute to Columbus, as we have proclaimed the second Monday to be a Federal holiday—Christopher Columbus Day—an objective I have sought through legislation in my many years in Congress.

I would like to thank the senior member of my New Jersey delegation (Mr. RODINO) for allowing us this opportunity to speak in honor of Columbus.

It can be said that Columbus was not the first to reach America. The Vikings may well have sent explorers to our shores, and certainly the American Indians were settled and established on the North American continent prior to Columbus' landing in 1492.

Yet every American schoolboy and girl knows the name of Christopher Columbus—and with good reason—for his was the voyage of discovery that counted.

It was the great Italian idealist who set out from Europe against the advise of scientists and heads of state in search of the northwest passage to the Orient and found instead the New World. This was the discovery which led to the colonization of the Western Hemisphere and to the ultimate growth of a great Nation. The characteristics he exhibited, inquisitiveness, conscientiousness, and perseverance, have surfaced time and time again in American history, but they were first exemplified in America by Christopher Columbus.

The Italian-American community has much to be proud of in its first favorite son. The history of America is studded with the deeds and virtues of Italian Americans, who stand today as one of the most productive and patriotic of the many ethnic minorities in the American melting pot.

When one pays tribute to Columbus, one must at the same time pay tribute to the Italian-American community. I am proud today to pay such tribute to both.

MINNEAPOLIS HEALTH HEARINGS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the children and youth projects, established under Public Law 89–97, have provided comprehensive child care to a number of children in Minneapolis. This act was truly an innovative idea in the delivery of health care to children as it focused on preventive care. As the following two statements show, the programs have provided preventive care at less cost.

Dr. Vernon E. Weckwerth at the University of Minnesota has been the director of the systems development project. This project had a mandate to develop a management system for assessing the impact on children of these projects. In his statement Dr. Weckwerth develops eight points concerning health care especially as it is related to the children and youth projects.

Of even more significant interest is the statement by Dr. Tor Dahl. Dr. Dahl has been associated with Dr. Weckwerth in evaluating the children and youth project in Minneapolis. Dr. Dahl has reached some truly startling conclusions in his study. For example, the average citizen of the United States spends $375 per person per year for health care. There are no accurate figures for the cost for children but it is assumed to be $200 per person per year.

As Dr. Dahl points out, the preventive care provided by a children and youth project results in an estimated annualized cost for the year ending June 30, 1971, of $129.81. This cost saving approaches 35 percent over the regular cost for each child. The conclusion is self-evident; the children and youth projects provide preventive care at less cost per child per year.

Because of the importance of the findings developed by Dr. Dahl and Dr. Weckwerth at the systems development project, I am including all of Dr. Dahl's statement in the RECORD at this point. A more complete technical view of the cost analysis program is available should anyone wish to see it.

The statement follows:

I am Vernon E. Weckwerth, Ph. D., Professor, Program in Hospital and Health Care Administration, School of Public Health, College of Health Sciences, University of Minnesota. I speak only for myself and not as a representative of any agency, society, organization or institution.

For the past 4½ years, in addition to other duties as well as a full teaching and faculty load, I have been Director of the Systems Development Project—a project charged with

development of a management system for assessing the effect of organization of the delivery of health care services to children living in families of low income in the depths of central city, urban and rural slums across the nation.

These 67 demonstration projects enabled under Title II of PL. 89–97 are showing 67 unique ways to deliver complete, continuous, personalized, appropriate, available, accessible, acceptable health care services in an effective, efficient and timely manner which is responsive to human demands and yet in which people and organizations are accountable for the care and the resources, both human and economic, being used. This program is a living example of a large scale organization of the delivery of care to the most deprived children in the United States. It is a program for which the facts are in telling where it's been, and where it is and for which it can be predicted, where it's going and how much it will cost—but all dependent on legislation to continue Federal Funding.

Because each of several points I will cover would take a hearing in itself, it will be impossible to give the necessary background to develop each or to show the inter-relationships among them as well as the effect each has on the other.

I am also taking literally your statement that these hearings focus on "the federal government's role in *reforming* and *financing* the delivery of health care services."

The eight points I will mention are:

1. Implications of the lack of stated objectives in what was to be accomplished in health programs enabled by legislation passed during the 1960's.

2. The next crisis in health care delivery will be from the fear of and actions from malpractice suits.

3. It is a fallacious assumption that reimbursement mechanisms, like Medicare and Medicaid, will solve the delivery system's problems.

4. The major constraints on health care delivery capacity are archaic licensure practices and vested interest customs which restrict health workers from applying the knowledge and skill to the jobs they are already prepared to do.

5. Current government financing rewards delivery of care for time and effort of inputs rather than rewarding delivery for outcomes of care—i.e., it rewards activities whether they produce an effect or not.

6. If the intent is to try to reform delivery of care, a far out alternative that should be tried is to have the local pharmacist serve as an independent purveyor of ambulatory episodic care services.

7. If reformation of the delivery system occurs there will need to be a consistent reformation of on-going continuing education programs for health care workers.

8. A synoptic statement of the nationwide Children and Youth Comprehensive health care delivery program which covers nearly ½ million poverty children now face termination of care unless Federal legislation is initiated to continue the program.

I would be willing to answer questions on any parts of the statement.

1. During the decade of the 1960's a flood of social legislation inundated the usual conduits through the bureaucracy which had historically channeled legislation into programs to the populace. Because of the idealism and platitudes of both the legislation and the regulations used to implement programs, it is impossible to judge whether what was accomplished was what was intended. One must question whether the vagueness was accidental or intentional.

The vogue word of "change" failed to state "change from what to what" and, as a result it is impossible to render a valid assessment of the effects because the basis for such assessment is unknown. The best description of nearly all health programs enabled in the 1960's is to label them as "rocking chair" activities—giving people a sense of movement but no sense of direction.

The role of the federal government should be to state clearly the objectives to be accomplished which are accomplishable rather than creating undue expectations in peoples minds; and to state the basis on which it would accept whether the programs have accomplished what was intended.

2. Currently malpractise suits are rising dramatically in both frequency and dollar amount. Insurance coverage is being both terminated for massive numbers of professionals and, for those who can obtain it, at exponentially increasing premium rates.

The effect on care delivery is multiple. Two major effects are these:

a) the professional, particularly physicians, are demanding increasingly greater number of tests and other diagnostic inputs in order to protect themselves against errors of both commission and omission;

b) because of the fear of malpractise and because of recent court decisions holding them legally liable for all care, they are increasingly less willing to delegate tasks to other workers, more crucially to reforming the system to support other workers—particularly the whole cadre of relatively new allied health workers—do the jobs that they could do.

The practise of medicine as well as all health care services is both a science and an art. It is subject to the risks of errors of human judgement. It is characterized by massive degrees of uncertainty of the specific health problem possessed by an individual. Yet more and more there is a demand to make errorless decisions which will deny both their right to be wrong and force increased consumption of unnecessary resources as well as restrict other prepared workers to provide care.

The role of the federal government should be to a) create a compensation structure for torts, b) create protection under the law for malpractise coverage.

3. A fallacious assumption has been made that solving financing problems for health service delivery solves health service delivery problems. For example, Medicare and Medicaid were not and are not, regardless of what some naively choose to believe, health care delivery mechanisms which have poured additional dollars into purchasing services which have been historically in short supply, therefore, doing what some of us predicted 6 years ago—inflating costs at an accelerating rate.

In essence, most of the National Health Insurance proposals are merely extensions of Medicaid mentality. They will merely inflate the price of services rendered and possibly even worse, create a delusionary unfulfillable expectation of access of care, constraint of costs and maintenance of quality in the minds of the American Public.

The role of the federal government should be to assure that resources be allocated to increasing capacity to deliver care and in no way to express or imply that payment for services rendered or insurance will equalize access, constrain cost or maintain quality.

4. Currently our mental set in American Health Care Service Delivery is to have the best qualified person do the job. Reduced to absurdum this would mean only one person as a care deliverer could exist.

The solution to the problem of capacity and distribution must include a change in the mental set that the least qualified person, but with the minimum knowledge and skill to perform the activity, must be permitted to do this job.

This means that healing arts laws must be changed. In particular, that licensure as it now exists must be eliminated since currently it is the single greatest constraint to any *re-forming* of the delivery system. In addition, it is conveying a fradulent security to the public that a person, once licensed is certified to lifelong competence merely by a dollar payment to buy a yearly certificate. In its place must exist the organizational accountability to certify to the knowledge and skill of each health worker to perform the job to be done and that that organization have both the responsibility and the authority to certify such competence while being accountable organizationally for such performance.

The role of the Federal Government should be a) to provide model laws to implement such changes in each state, b) to require states to have annual recertification of all health care workers who are receiving any compensation from federal monies and that that annual recertification process be done by the accountable care delivery organization, society or institution without regard to any existing licensure in the state.

5. At present, performance in the entire health field is based on input data of service rendered rather than on outcomes of care. In effect it judges and pays on hours expended, visits made, days hospitalized, etc. rather than on the results of those inputs in terms of the recipient of care.

If reimbursement is to be continued, it should be based on the results not the inputs of service. In principle, reimbursement should be made on a less than cost basis for time and effort of inputs, with an additional payment made for results.

The role of the Federal Government should be to provide payment to service deliverers on behalf of the recipients at an incentive rate if the recipients health status were improved (or maintained if degenerative) and for preventive services which show that on a cohort basis that health status and reasons for seeking service have reduced preventable conditions.

6. A far out proposal which would effect a re-formation of care delivery is sketched in the following paragraphs. First, let us look at expressed desires by and behavoir of the public.

a) Health is not a value. Absence of health is.

b) The one most important health service desired by the public is emergency care for the relief of pain and disease.

c) More Americans seek relief of pain and disease from their local pharmacies than from any other purveyor.

If you would like to try a dramatic reformation of the delivery structure, one for ambulatory care delivered at the local pharmacy should be tried.

Although this proposal would need massive man hours for development, a sketch would be that the local pharmacist match presenting signs and symptoms with the pharmacutical he knows would provide relief. Pharmacists currently use little of their years of education and experience because by law and custom they are constrained in great part to prescription filling.

In the demonstration, alternatives such as including low-cost minimultiphasic machines located in the pharmacy to provide additional input to the signs and symptoms, if needed, could be used as well as the possibility of involving workers with some nursing skills could also be tried.

The pharmacists would serve as triage decision makers—referring those who should receive medical, dental or clinical treatment, relieving those who do not need such service, and disuading or merely giving placebos to those who could as well do without.

The effect would be to open a route to care which is now blocked, to reduce the waste of professional time now required for a large proportion of proforma prescriptions, to utilize the knowledge and skill of pharmacists as health professionals and to make service available for widely expanded hours, accessible because of proximity and accept-

able to the public because that is where they already choose to go. Obviously, this proposal would receive massive opposition from the current system and the vested interests of those of us who choose to believe we know what is best for the public.

The role of the Federal government would be to enable such demonstrations.

7. Currently, I am involved also with an on-going continuing education program for full time employed administrators of hospitals and nursing homes in the regions of Montana, South Dakota, North Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa and Manitoba in Canada. It is only part of what must exist for all health care workers to update, augment, append and enrich knowledge and skills specific to performing current duties.

If *re-formation* of care delivery results in a rational method of having people do the job which must be done, then a reformation of education and training must precede it for all health care workers.

Currently federal monies to support even the disciplines that schools of public health have been preparing are being reduced.

The role of the Federal government in allied health worker education must be to provide massive amounts of dollars to such schools for continuing education with the constraint that a full spectrum of short-term skill programs to many-yeared professional degrees be included with entry and exist permitted at any level, freed of "time on campus and hallowed soil heritage" and done cooperatively with high schools, junior colleges, vocational technical schools as well as the employers and employing agencies, institutions or organizations.

8. Currently the Comprehensive Health Care Service Delivery Programs for Children and Youth have demonstrated that they can reduce preventable illnesses; that such care has been delivered at an annualized cost for these children who were the most deprived of health services of any group in the nation at costs below the national average of costs for episodic care only, yet they are only demonstrations with no clear future in terms of Federal funding.

They are another example of Federal legislation to "demonstrate" something and I fear will go the way of uncounted other demonstrations—no follow through with required on-going federal funding beyond the demonstration stage. Without clear federal commitment during this congress to continue them, these 500,000 of the poorest children face a termination of services to them.

Since these projects have demonstrated 67 unique ways of organizing care delivery, have a management information system which identifies and measures performance and requires self corrective action based on measures of results, which no other health program has, it would be an immeasurable social loss to fail to generalize this structure beyond merely a demonstration program.

A critical attribute of these projects is that each is tailor made to the local area it serves—the piece of living evidence of diversity at this point in time when I fear that there is a one-way-to-do-it mentality which will nationalize a program that will only by coincidence fit a rare few areas in this diverse nation. Thus defeating, what has made this nation great, the local initiative, innovation and creativity necessary to respond to the human differences across this great republic.

The role of the Federal Government should be a) to provide both an extension and an expansion of the Children and Youth Program, b) to require similar management performance indicators for all funded health programs; c) to set measures on what results of care should be and d) to allocate those federal dollars to accountable delivery organizations which have the authority and the responsibility to get the job done as best fits the local context be it central city, urban or rural in its setting.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA,
Minneapolis, Minn., February 21, 1971.

Hon. DONALD M. FRASER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FRASER: Thank you for your pleasant letter.

Your request for information pleased me greatly; so far the results of this most anonymous of all federal programs have been a seemingly closely guarded secret. It is a fact, however, that the Children and Youth Comprehensive Health Care Programs (Section 502 of Title V, Part V, Public Law 89-97) contained controversial provisions which, had they been more financially visible, would have caused major concern among health care officials, primarily, the act instituted not only a *reimbursement authority* for comprehensive health care, but funded a large-scale experiment on *delivery systems* for comprehensive health care. Furthermore, for the first time grants were made directly to medical schools and teaching hospitals—forcing academically oriented institutions to become directly involved in community concerns, and mobilizing impressive intellectual resources against inner city health problems. Finally, grantees were accorded a freedom to experiment unequalled in any other national service program. Two of the 67 operating units of this program are located in the City of Minneapolis. (The Community University Comprehensive Health Care Clinic, sponsored by the University of Minnesota, and the Minneapolis Health Department Comprehensive Health Care Program for Children and Youth).

The amount of information available on the Children and Youth Program is overwhelming. I shall just have to report some very selective highlights, and then perhaps refer you or your staff to some of our publications for more specific information.

COST

A major concern in 1965 was the concept of "Cadillac Care" being provided to the sickest children in the United States. Such care, including all medical (plus hospitalization), dental, psychological, social service, nursing, nutritional, occupational therapy, physical therapy and speech and hearing services were estimated to cost $500.00 per child per year.

The present (1970) U.S. per capita expenses for health are $345.00, but representing far less comprehensive care than what was outlined above.

On page 10 in the enclosed report, you will find that the annualized cost per registrant for 1968 (Quarters I-IV) was $201.26. These costs are properly adjusted for capital items (depreciated), and represents a correctly weighted average for the C & Y Program as a whole. They include *all* reported costs, federal as well as local matching funds.

Notice the trend—next annualized moving average drops to $194.67, then to $182.91, and so on through the estimated annualized cost for the year July 1, 1970 to June 30, 1971: $129.81.

The figures are *not* adjusted for inflation, indicating that the cost trend is even more surprising than it appears.

The program data show the traditional effects of a comprehensive health care program (dramatic reduction in hospitalizations, e.g.) but also the fact that a wide variety of costs exists *across* the program. (Program differences in one quarter range from $47.00 to $1,000.00 per patient per year). However, regression analysis "explains" these cost differences with more than 90% accuracy, if only a small set of key variables are known, such as location, size, capacity utilization, number of functional areas, etc., it is possible to predict costs with 93.5% accuracy.

PERFORMANCE

A complex management information system allows the project directors to monitor the progress of the registrants as they move through the stages of care: Registration, Health Assessment, Treatment and Supervision. As of June 30, 1971, the Children and Youth Program is estimated to be serving 479,000 registrants, where 368,000 will have been brought to the health supervision stage in the medical functional area.

The reporting system permits an eerily accurate projection mechanism: Since 1968 we have been able to predict the number of new registrants entering the C & Y Program with 99.95% accuracy as much as a year in advance. Furthermore, models predict the speed with which registrants move through the stages, backlogs, terminations, well child rates and reassessment intervals, and relate these variables to cost. At this point it seems that:

Growth Rates, Well Child Rates, and Speed of flow determine Backlogs.

Backlogs, Reassessment Intervals, and Episodic Care Rates determine cost per patient.

Eventually, we shall isolate what other variables determine the above measures, and a comprehensive health care model, where experimentation on a computer, instead of people, can predict efficient modes of health care delivery throughout the United States.

OUTCOMES

The dismal failure of the health care sector to relate inputs to outputs is to a large extent responsible for inefficiency and costliness. The C & Y program is set up to measure (among other things) changes in *health care status*, as well as changes in the *distribution of episodic care conditions* as registrants move through the stages of care.

We now know that comprehensive health care changes the health care status of its recipients—after only two full years of data collection, we can show that

a) health status improves from initial health assessment to recall health assessment

b) preventable episodic care conditions are reduced relatively to chronic conditions as comprehensive health care measures take hold.

The futuristic implications of the analysis could be as follows: Given an effective and relevant information system, we can study the *present disease distribution*, estimate what it will cost to change the distribution, and What It Will Cost Not To Change It Since an inferior disease distribution invariably is costlier to maintain than a more preferable disease distribution, the *health care gap* is expressable in dollars.

WOMEN'S EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, due to fog conditions at the Arcata airport, in the First Congressional District in California, I was unable to return to Washington to cast my vote in favor of the equal rights amendment and against any weakening amendments to it. The visibility conditions were below landing minimums, as we waited for Air West Airlines, thereby requiring them to cancel the flight. This made it impossible for me to be on the floor during the time of the vote.

It was particularly disappointing that I was unable to be present inasmuch as I have introduced this legislation and, in addition, supported it last year when it was before the House.

The substantial margin of approval the bill received from the House of Representatives is gratifying to me and I certainly hope this measure will be given the same prompt and favorable consideration by the Senate. Thus sending it on to the States for ratification.

I take this means of permanently recording in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the position I would have taken had I been able to be present on the floor and voting.

A DOCTOR TALKS OF KANSAS

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, Dr. William J. Reals, president of the Kansas Medical Society, has written an interesting and inspirational article on Kansas which appeared recently in the Journal of the Kansas Medical Society. Dr. Reals has described very well the assets and attractions of Kansas for those who seek new opportunities, forward-thinking people, clean air, and a good place to raise children. Although Dr. Reals' message is directed to his colleagues in the medical profession, he has done an excellent job in helping all of us sell Kansas.

I include in the RECORD the message written by Dr. Reals:

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

DEAR DOCTOR: "To the Stars Through Difficulties". . .

This motto, which appears on the Great Seal of Kansas, is the subject of my message this month, because recent events have underscored for me a couple of facts about our state:

First, no state can surpass Kansas' history of overcoming any obstacle or hardship in its path to greatness.

Second, while we've reached the stars, our national image is still in the dust.

It was during the AMA convention in Atlantic City that this was most recently brought home to me. The president of another state society (who shall remain nameless), when he learned I was from Kansas, made a number of disparaging remarks about Kansas, its climate, terrain and people.

I argued briefly with him, then lapsed into silence, knowing the futility of trying to educate a geographic snob. But I was stunned by his pointless, mindless attack on our beautiful and productive state, and I brooded about it on my drive home from the crowded, polluted and cluttered East Coast.

As we came west, the dirt and clamor began to fall away. The cities became more open, the towns more attractive, the skies clearer and the people friendlier.

And, as I crossed the Missouri-Kansas border, Kansas greeted me with a warmth and honesty I had missed on my trip back East.

The wheat harvest had not yet begun in the section I traversed, and the golden fields rippled in the breeze under the bright blue sky.

I was home. And I was glad.

No one who ever got to know Kansas could make those comments I hear frequently in my travels . . . comments that infer we are backward people living in a dust bowl. This image reflects not just on the citizens in general, but on physicians in particular, upon their type of practice, their hospitals and universities.

And it's all undeserved.

For a "backward" state, we've done pretty well at producing some of America's most forward-thinking persons. Dwight D. Eisenhower is a product of our state, and chose its soil as his final resting place. Industrialist Walter Chrysler, athlete Jim Ryun, playwright William Inge, and musician Stan Kenton had their origins in Kansas.

The Menninger Foundation and Clinic in Topeka is internationally known and respected as the center of psychiatry. It was founded by native sons.

The Hertzler Clinic at Halstead is known around the world, as was its founder, Arthur Hertzler.

More than half the light aircraft manufactured in the world comes from Wichita. Two Kansans, Walter Beech and Clyde Cessna, founded this vital industry.

Kansas is the breadbasket of the world, producing enough wheat each year to feed half the world . . . producing more than one-fifth of America's beef, and serving the nation through more than 630 food processing firms.

The list is endless.

Anyone who has ever driven the Flint Hills in the spring knows the verdant beauty of that section of our state. The rolling plains of Western Kansas reach to the Rocky Mountains—their well-ordered farms and ranches a tribute to the sturdy pioneers who broke the sod and made a state . . . "to the stars through difficulties."

I didn't mean to become rhapsodic. But my point is this:

Our concern in Kansas is providing enough physicans to treat the people. We have a great state and its story must be told to physicians who seek a better life, a clean, crime- and pollution-free life for themselves and their families.

Unless you and I tell the story of Kansas as it really is, we'll suffer a chronic loss of young physicians to other states.

The job of selling Kansas is the job of every individual.

Doctor, are you telling the true story of our state to other physicians who might want to practice here?

TRIBUTE TO MARINE GEN. LEWIS BURWELL PULLER

Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday, our colleague Congressman COUGHLIN of Pennsylvania, called to our attention that passing of Gen. Lewis Burwell Puller, U.S. Marine Corps. I would like to join with Representative COUGHLIN in paying tribute to the life of a truly outstanding American, dedicated serviceman, and abiding father. He held high the principles of patriotism and service to country which is attested to by the five Navy Crosses for valor in battle and 56 decorations for bravery in battle. General Puller exhibited those qualities of leadership, dedication, and love of fellowman that made America the great Nation it is today. I know his life will be an inspiration to others.

THE CAUSE OF COMMUNISM IN AMERICA

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the lessons of history are quite clear—revolutions occur whenever the little man in a society is forgotten, ignored, or exploited.

Such is the case in America today—our great corporations jump at the chance to invest huge sums of money in underdeveloped Communist-controlled countries because the U.S. Government has set up an agency "to provide insurance for companies with big overseas investments." It is no wonder that the giants of American industry jump at a chance to invest in foreign countries. They have nothing to lose. Competition is nil and if their plant is seized, their investment is insured by the tax dollars of the individual American citizens.

Ford Motor Co. and International Telephone and Telegraph can sit back, as they did for years, and reap huge profits from such countries as Chile. They know that when the inevitable nationalization of their interests does come, they can file an insurance claim and the American taxpayer will reimburse them for their loss—regardless of the amount of their profits over past years.

Chile is a case in point. Already the Overseas Private Investment Corporation—a U.S. Government agency—has paid Ford Motor Co. $910,000 to cover their losses in the Chilean nationalization of U.S. copper firms, and ITT has filed a $108.5 million insurance claim in connection with the Chilean Government's takeover of Chile Telephone Co., in which ITT had a 70-percent interest.

This Government is directly furthering the cause of international communism when it allows such things as this to take place. Furthermore, it is laying the seeds of its own destruction. Somebody in the administration forgot to cut a piece of the pie for the little man. Even though he made it with his own toil, he does not get any—the goodies are reserved for the vested interests.

Until this Government frees itself from the control of the vested interests—from the stranglehold of the huge corporations—the threat of a Communist takeover in America is very real indeed. The big corporations are building it and the taxpayers are insuring it. After all, when this great Government formed to protect the rights of every American and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and to our posterity fails us, where else is there to turn? This must be a reason why communism is appealing to the little man. They wonder what they have to lose.

I include a related news article in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 15, 1971]

ITT ASKS $108 MILLION FOR TAKEOVER BY CHILE

NEW YORK, Oct. 14.—International Telephone and Telegraph Corp. says it has filed a $108.5 million insurance claim in connec-

tion with the Chilean government's takeover of operations of Chile Telephone Co., in which ITT had a 70 per cent interest.

ITT said Wednesday that it had filed the claim with the Overseas Private Investment Corp. (OPIC) an agency set up by the U S. government to provide insurance for companies with big overseas investments.

The Chilean government took over management of the telephone company Sept. 29. ITT estimated that its investment in the company was worth $153 million.

ITT said it had maintained OPIC insurance on a substantial portion of its investment in Chile Telephone Co. since 1965 and had paid more than $5 million in premiums for such coverage.

In Washington, OPIC said it had paid $910,000 to Ford Motor Company under an insurance policy covering the reconversion to dollars of local currency representing capital. The Chilean Central Bank had refused to remit Ford funds to the United States because of a dispute between the Chilean government and the U.S. company.

KILLING WITHOUT HATE

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the Chicago Tribune, written by Vernon Jarrett, has been brought to my attention. What seemingly starts out as an interesting little bit of local color turns into a raging indictment of human impulse in the 20th century.

This article, Mr. Speaker, touches all of us in the Congress. It says something to both sides of the aisle, both ends of the philosophical spectrum. In a time when every citizen is upset about the developments in Vietnam and in the slums of our cities, this article strikes at the very heart of the problem.

I am happy to submit this article to the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, in hopes it may touch other Members of the body with the same impact it did me.

The article follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 12, 1971]

TWO GENERATIONS VIEW KILLING WITHOUT HATE

(By Vernon Jarett)

The Queen of the Sea is one of Chicago's most popular soul food restaurants and it's very easy to explain its prosperity. Its food is consistently cooked and seasoned just right for people with cultural attachments to the black South.

I frequent several soul food places on the South Side—Gladys', Army & Lou's, the H & H Cafe and Izola's—and over the years I've noted a few behavior patterns about the customers of these places, particularly around the noon lunch and the evening dinner periods. There usually are no serious arguments—not even between religious and political crusaders or sports fanatics.

A FAMILY DISPUTE

But last Wednesday night at the Queen of the Sea on South Stony Island Avenue, that absolutely fantastic smorgasbord couldn't negate sharp disagreement within what appeared to be a very close-knit black family. The argument never reached a disturbing pitch, but it was audible to those of us seated near the family.

The subject was violence and murder, the senseless killing of young and old in America as well as on the battlefield. The discussion started when the mother suddenly reflected on the recent killing of two white teenagers in a racially tense area on the South Side.

"It's a shame, isn't it, about those two children being shot down? . . . I don't like to think about it; I feel sorry for their parents," she commented.

This caused the woman's son in law to glance over at his wife, who was wiping a crumb from their small baby's face, "I don't approve of killing either," the younger mother answered, "but I wonder how many white folks would feel bad if somebody killed my baby."

"I don't know, and I don't care what white folks feel," the older mother answered quickly, as tho she had thought it out in advance. "I'm thinking about my own soul, and if white folks want to act like beasts they can go right ahead, I ain't joining them."

"Mama," the daughter retorted, "I don't approve of people going around killing children. It's just that white folks don't waste no feeling for us when they kill us, and I don't see why I got to waste my feelings on them."

"Some white folks feel bad about what's happening to us," answered the mother.

"But how many?" the daughter came back quickly. "And what do they do about it? You and dad were talking last night about the way those white boys jumped that Palmer kid a few years ago and murdered him for just walking down the street. . . . And dad, what about that black man who was visiting Chicago and had a flat tire in the Back of the Yards neighborhood and those white folks battered him to a pulp? Did they get the chair?"

No, said the mother, who admitted that she could not think of any whites ever being sentenced to death or life in prison for killing a black. "But God is going to take care of sins of the wicked," she explained. "We don't have to go around killing white children. God is going to bring the white man to his knees and the Lord will even punish many generations of his children."

Then for the first time the older father spoke: "Your mama's right about that. Just look at what's happening to young white folks right now. And that's just the beginning. . . ."

WHAT SCARES HIM

"But you know what scares me?" he continued. "It's folks who can kill you without even hating you, without even knowing you. I'm talking about whites and blacks. . . . Other day we were driving down West 18th Street and a carload of white boys cut in front of an old white man and he cussed at them. They wheeled around and curbed him and used baseball bats to bash in all the windows of his car. They could have blinded him or killed him. But some were laughing.

"These gang killings in our neighborhood don't make any sense," he continued. "Seems like all over the world killing is so easy. But let's change the subject. This fellow here saw enough of that overseas."

The old man was talking about his silent and tense son in law, a Viet Nam vet.

FORCED BUSING—NO POPULAR SUBJECT

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, forced busing is not a popular subject among black or white people. It is a great burden on many, and I would like to share with my colleagues a statement on this subject from the Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal of October 11:

INTEGRATION OVERDONE

In the news of the past few days have been several items reflecting the extremes to which some of the bureaucrats, some of the courts and some of the school boards have propelled us in their failure to recognize the distinction between desegregation and integration of public school systems.

At Jackson, Miss., James Meredith, the first black to crack the race barrier at the University of Mississippi, expressed nothing but scorn for massive forced busing of pupils for the sake of racial balance. As he put it, the resort to "busing for this so-called purpose of achieving racial balance is nonsense." He pointed out that "busing to integrate and busing to segregate are two entirely different things, not necessarily related at all."

Viewed realistically, the situation as Meredith sees it is this: "If all the black schools were left open and the school district lines were drawn straight and without gerrymandering, you would have integration in every school district, because blacks live everywhere in Mississippi. And everybody would go to the schools nearest their homes."

Now what Meredith said may not apply fully in every place because the distribution of Negroes is not uniform all over. But the principle he was speaking for should be valid everywhere. If the lines are drawn fairly there should be no barriers to desegregation. Add to that the provision that blacks may attend schools of their choice and you have an equitable arrangement.

Next look at this predicament. A crew of 15 high school students from Gadsden in West Tennessee went to Memphis for the purpose of dismantling two brewery buildings no longer in use. These will be transported to Gadsden.

Reason? Two years ago the Crockett County school system was ordered integrated in such a way that its black high school and three black elementary schools were closed. This has resulted in such crowding in the other schools that the portable brewery buildings are being obtained to provide more space. Does that sound like proper housing for quality education?

And in Washington the director of Nashville's schools, Dr. Elbert Brooks, told the U.S. Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity that the Tennessee capital's compulsory busing program will collapse this winter unless more funds are made available in the form of federal aid.

"Our school system is presently operating on an emergency basis," he testified. "I see little hope that the present integration plan can be carried through the winter months unless funds for additional transportation and operational equipment and operational costs can be obtained."

So the money, if it comes at all, must come from that inexhaustible source the prodigious national debt.

Is there not something frightfully wrong in the overall picture of which these three items are but small parts?

HIGHER EDUCATION LEGISLATION

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, later this week during consideration of the higher education legislation, my colleague, Mr. QUIE, will be offering an amendment to modify the regulations concerning educational opportunity grants.

A constituent of mine, Mr. Ted Downey, who is currently here in Wash-

ington receiving academic credit for his work with the National Student Lobby has written me urging support of the Quie amendment. Mr. Downey is a student at Sangamon State University in Springfield, Ill., serving as a member of the university assembly as well as the school's representative to the student advisory committee to the Illinois Board of Higher Education. Because of these positions and the convenient location of Sangamon State to the Illinois General Assembly, Mr. Downey has had numerous opportunities to present testimony to committees of the general assembly in the field of higher education legislation and thus he does speak with some experience in matters of this kind.

I insert the text of his letter in the RECORD at this point.

NATIONAL STUDENT LOBBY,
Washington, D.C., October 14, 1971.

Congressman ROBERT H. MICHEL,
Rayburn Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MICHEL: I am writing this letter as a constituent to call your attention to what I consider to be one of the most important pieces of legislation affecting federal aid to college students to be introduced during this session.

Currently, I am a student at Sangamon State University in Springfield. I am participating in the College Work Study program and the Illinois Guaranteed Loan Program. I am a member of the University Assembly at Sangamon State, as well as the school's representative to the Student Advisory Committee to the Illinois Board of Higher Education. Prior to attending SSU, I was an officer in the student division of the Illinois Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Because of these positions, and the convenient location of Sangamon State to the Illinois General Assembly, I have had numerous occasions to present testimony to committees of the General Assembly regarding higher education legislation. The research for that testimony, as well as conversations with students, faculty and financial aid officers across the state have given me a fairly good grasp of some of the problems confronting students seeking federal financial assistance during the course of their college careers.

I am here in Washington receiving academic credit for my work with the National Student Lobby. It is through this affiliation that I became acquainted with the efforts of your colleague, Albert Quie, to modify the regulations concerning Educational Opportunity Grants.

As I understand it, Mr. Quie's proposal is being referred to as the "Quie Educational Opportunity Grant Proposal" and is an alternative to the recommendations put forth in H.R. 7248.

It is my opinion, as a student, that the EOG program is in need of revision. A sound program, it seems to me, should advance certain principles, which would include, among others:

EOG's should be available to eligible students wherever they do the undergraduate work;

A student's financial resources should be evaluated alike by all institutions;

A student's need should reflect the actual costs of attending the institution of his choice;

Students with similar need should receive similar EOG's;

Whatever Congress appropriates, students with the least financial resources for higher education should receive the grant aid before other, more wealthy students.

The Quie proposal, in my opinion, seems to effectively implement these principles. It will establish a uniform national method of determining eligibility. According to the proposal, *any* student (who is qualified) would receive a grant determined by his family size and financial resources. Of course, there is a maximum grant for the most needy students of $1400 per year, or half the cost of attending college, whichever was less.

This formula is without a doubt, far easier for students to understand than the present formula, or the formula recommended in HR 7248. But I couldn't expect you to support a bill because it is easy for student to understand.

What distinguishes the Quie proposal from all the others that I am familiar with, is that it enables a student to be able to predict, with a fair degree of accuracy, the amount of monetary assistance he can expect to receive should he elect to attend college. As things stand now, a student doesn't know if he is going to receive aid in many cases until a day or two before actual registration. I think that this is an unfair situation both to the student and to his parents.

Further, the Quie bill assures all eligible students that they will receive at least some substantial financial assistance.

Another problem addressed by the Quie proposal is that of evaluation of a student's financial resources. Currently, each institutional financial aid officer can exercise his own discretion in determining a student's need. I cannot complain about my own experiences with the financial aid officer at Sangamon State, Mr. Vince Charro, because he has treated me very fairly, but I have friends attending other Illinois colleges and junior colleges who have been unable to obtain EOG's for one or another of many nebulous reasons, even though other students whose financial resources were greater obtained grants. Quie's proposal will remedy this situation because it will establish uniform analysis criteria. I cannot understand how a financial aid officer could object to this provision, for it would seem to ease his difficult task of determining student financial needs.

A very distinctive feature of the bill is that it will enable junior colleges, such as Illinois Central or my alma mater, Illinois Valley Community College, to offer adequate financial aid packages to needy students. Often times, junior colleges receive the scraps of EOG appropriations because larger universities with larger student populations receive large EOG monies, even though these universities have access to a host of other government grants and privately funded scholarships.

It is my judgment that Mr. Quie's bill will answer all of these problems and deal with the issues equitably. I would hope that you have found my arguments convincing enough to join with Rep. Quie in voting for the passage of his Educational Opportunity Grant Proposal.

Sincerely yours,

TED DOWNEY.

PRESIDENT'S NIXON'S TRIP TO PEKING

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the growing and perfectly predictable interest in President Nixon's trip to Peking has been the subject of numerous articles, too many of which are not based on an objective and realistic appraisal of the possible situation. However, an article by columnist Harry Homewood, in the Suburbanite Economist, Chicago, on Sunday, October 3, in my opinion is one of the more practical discussions of the general subject that I have to this point seen.

May I add that Mr. Homewood, who is a veteran newsman and political commentator, is also a news analyst for Radio Station WAIT in Chicago.

The article follows:

HARRY HOMEWOOD COMMENTS

Some indication of what President Nixon will face when he goes to Peking has come out of Britain. A British sales team for Hawker-Siddeley Aircraft Corp., has returned from Peking. The sales team sold almost $50,000,000 worth of commercial airliners to Red China. The experiences of the sales team provide some indication of what Mr. Nixon will face.

The British reported that the Red Chinese never waste any time on non-essentials and were absolutely meticulous about details that were of interest to them. The marketing director of the British aircraft firm said, "After we had talked about something for hours they would politely thank us for our brief introductory remarks."

The British found that dealing with the Red Chinese was, in their words, completely different from the normal pattern of any sales effort. The Chinese never told the British what other aircraft firms they were competing against, never told them what purpose they wanted the planes for. Everything was done at arm's length. In a very real sense, that is what the Red Chinese can be expected to do when Mr. Nixon visits Peking.

The diplomatic talks between the leaders of Red China and Mr. Nixon can be expected to be far different from any other talks Mr. Nixon or his state department advisers have ever experienced. And it is quite possible that when the United States has made its position clear on any number of important issues the Red Chinese will thank everyone politely for their "introductory remarks" and suggest that things now get down to business. Business in that case meaning what the Red Chinese want to talk about.

Japanese merchants who have been dealing with the Red Chinese for some years report that the Chinese are extremely tough negotiators, that they listen with the utmost courtesy and close attention. But if they are not hearing what they want to hear they simply give no indication that anything has been said. The Japanese also report that the Red Chinese give the impression of being flexible in negotiation. In reality, they flex only sufficiently to get the matter back to an area where they can dominate the negotiation.

Admittedly, Mr. Nixon is not going to Peking to try for any great break-through. His visit is a preliminary affair, to break the 22-year-old ice jam that has frozen U.S.-Sino relations. The President does have a right to expect some progress, but the odds are the Red Chinese will be perfectly content with a great deal of preliminary maneuvering without commitment on any major issue, or for that matter, on any minor issue.

THE REAL RED CHINA AND THE UNITED NATIONS—A REMARKABLE EXPOSURE

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, as the United Nations consider the admission of Communist China, and the expulsion

of the Republic of China, there are some pertinent facts about the Peking regime that are obstinate and will not go away. This is a time when those facts should be repeated and subjected to the glare of the midday sun.

That needed exposure is contained in a letter dated October 6 from Gen. Ho Ying-chin, president of the United Nations Association of the Republic of China, addressed to the President of the United Nations. Under leave to extend my remarks I include a copy of General Ying-chin's letter in order that it may be read by all who are interested. It is factual and in many ways a remarkable document:

OCTOBER 6, 1971.

H. E. DR. ADAM MALIK,

President of the 26th Session of the UN General Assembly, and The Delegates of All Member Nations, United Nations, New York, N.Y., U.S.A.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT MALIK AND THE DELEGATES OF ALL MEMBER NATIONS: The purpose of the United Nations is to find effective means to establish an ever-lasting peace in the wake of two disastrous world wars. The objectives of the U.N. Charter are the prevention of international aggression, maintenance of world peace, respect for human rights and freedom, and improvement of the living conditions of the people everywhere. To insure the attainment of these goals, member nations are required to abide by international justice and the principles of international law and are particularly forbidden to encroach upon the territorial integrity or sovereignty of another nation by the use of coercion or force of arms. This is the fundamental spirit of the U.N. Charter. The violation or abnegation of this spirit in any way would inevitably shake the United Nations at its very foundation and bring about the threat of an unprecedented disaster to the human race.

The Republic of China had fought aggression single-handed for five long years when the Second World War began. With the victory over aggression finally won, the Republic of China joined its wartime Allies to give birth to this world organization for peace and, in recognition of its contributions, was justly awarded a permanent seat in the Security Council alongside the four other principal Allies which is clearly stipulated in Article 23 of the Charter. The full name of this country "The Republic of China" stipulated in the aforementioned Article which cannot be usurped by any illegal means. As China made the biggest sacrifice prior to the birth of the United Nations and considering the difficulties pertaining to the organization of the world body, we consider it our inalienable duty to safeguard the integrity of the principles on which the U.N. Charter was drawn up.

The Government of the Republic of China was legally constituted through popular elections as provided in the Chinese constitution. In this same Constitution it is specified that respect for the U.N. Charter shall be the cornerstone of the nation's foreign policy. Practising constitutional democracy internally and faithfully carrying out the obligations of the U.N. Charter externally, this government has enjoyed the unanimous support of the Chinese people at home and abroad and is internationally recognized as a government of responsibility.

On the other hand, the Chinese Communists are a rebel group. Since its usurpation of power on the mainland of China, the regime has been tramping on human rights in its domestic administration while pursuing a policy of aggression in international affairs. The atrocities committed by the regime have been getting worse over the past years. Here are some of the notorious crimes committed by this group of gangsters.

1. Twenty years ago the Peiping regime attacked the Republic of Korea by force, for which the Security Council meted out the penalty of collective sanction and the regime was formally condemned by the General Assembly as an aggressor.[1] The condemnation still stands. Instead of curbing its aggressive acts, the regime has stepped up its international brigandage. Besides playing the role of an instigator in the Viet Nam conflict, it has engaged in infiltration and subversion in other parts of the world. Today the hands of the Chinese Communists are clearly discernible in every local insurgence in Southeast Asia, the Middle East, Latin America and Africa. Furthermore, the regime has repeatedly proclaimed its attempt at a "world revolution" by means of violence. Despite its recent smiling offensive, the Peiping regime still regards the United States as its arch enemy and has openly reaffirmed its determination to support the Communist forces in Viet Nam, Khmer and Laos to perpetuate the war against the United States.

2. Essentially a gang of terrorists, the Chinese Communist regime has earned the deep hatred of the Chinese people for imposing upon them a system that is diametrically opposed to the Chinese cultural traditions. This accounts for the endless uprisings against the regime since its inception over twenty years ago. In order to suppress the resistance movement and to uproot the Chinese traditions, the regime has resorted to a reign of terror and wholesale massacre. The pogrom in Tibet in 1963 has been unsurpassed both in scale and brutality. According to reliable statistics, as many as 63,000,000 Chinese people have been butchered by the Chinese Communists, and more than 2,500,000 Chinese people have fled from the mainland to escape Communist persecution. The internal power struggle within the Peiping regime is far from over. These developments have given lie to the assertion that the Peiping regime is in effective control of the mainland.

3. Dedicated to an expansionalist policy, the Peiping regime has been squeezing the captive people of their last trace of material possession in its frantic preparation for war. During the turmoil created by the devilish Red Guards, production ground to a halt and rural areas were plunged into a state of bankruptcy. The upshot has been an economic crisis that is getting steadily worse. In an attempt to wriggle itself out of the difficulties resulting from international isolation, the regime has of late adopted a smiling offensive and is using trade as a bait to lure the Western countries into its political trap. It is a known fact that free trade is impossible under the economic system of the Chinese Communists. They are merely using trade as a cover for their political plots. The only "foreign trade" the Peiping regime has been pushing with earnest in the past twenty years is the export of narcotics to undermine the physical and mental health of the people in the free world. According to data collected by the *Weekly Review* of London, the peasants on the Chinese mainland have been ordered to plant poppies on a massive scale with the total acreage reaching 5,830,000 hectares. There are thirty "special products processing factories" engaged in the processing of narcotics for dumping overseas. In 1970 alone the Peiping regime exported $800 million worth of narcotics, including opium, morphine and heroin. Peiping's trade with "friendly" Japanese business firms has further facilitated its narcotics shipments to Japan. According to the statistics of the Japanese National Narcotics Control Commission, Peiping's annual narcotics export to Japan has reached 60 billion yen. If left unchecked, the regime's evil policy of exporting narcotics would completely wreck the cultural foundation of the great democracies and corrupt the moral fibers of their people in ten years. Those who are enthusiastic about doing trade with the Chinese Communists would do well to consider the consequences thereof.

All these point up to our conviction that the Peiping regime is at the root of all troubles in Asia and the whole world. Each and every act of the regime has violated the principles of the U.N. Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Furthermore, the Chinese Communist leadership has time and again poured venom against the United Nations and vowed to form a "Revolutionary United Nations". These and other pronouncements have unmistakably shown the regime's determination to destroy the existing United Nations. The irony of all those has been that Albania, Peiping's European satellite, and several other countries, in complete disregard of the sanctity of the United Nations Charter, have regularly submitted to the General Assembly the preposterous proposal that the Chinese Communist regime be admitted to the family of nations at the expense of the Republic of China. The fact that the Albanian proposal was invariably voted down by the General Assembly during the past years indicated eloquently that we, China and our friendly Powers, fought against the admittance of the Peiping Communist regime, to the United Nations not only for the purpose of safeguarding our own legal rights and privileges in the United Nations but also for the purpose of upholding the sanctity of the Charter as well as the security of the United Nations Organization. However, we cannot help observing again with apprehension that the clamor for admitting the Peiping regime has again gained currency lately amidst a rising tide of international appeasement. It has even been suggested that China's permanent seat in the United Nations Security Council should be given to the Peiping Regime. If such an absurd idea, so obviously at variance with the principles of the U.N. Charter, were to be translated into reality, it would be tantamount to rewarding aggression in total disregard of international justice. Since a development would be like the United Nations signing its own death sentence.

In view of the fact that the present session of the United Nations General Assembly will debate and decide on the so-called "China Representation" issue and that the decisions of such debate would have serious consequences on the future security of the United Nations, this Association has reached an unanimous resolution to appeal to Your Excellency and the Delegates of all member nations to the present United Nations General Assembly Session to effectively respect the sanctity of the U.N. Charter and to resolutely prevent the Peiping Communist regime from entering the United Nations for the purpose of upholding international justice and the preservation of world peace.

Yours sincerely,

HO YING-CHIN,
President.

[1] Resolution adopted by the 327th general meeting of the General Assembly, February 1, 1951.

THE PENDULUM IS SWINGING

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, in a recent address before the Rotary Club of San Francisco, Richard G. Capen, Jr.,

eloquently presented the current state of our national defense. His remarks ring with the sound of reality and truth, as they should, since Mr. Capen is the former Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense and his is firsthand experience and knowledge. He is now the vice president of Copley Newspapers and I would like to give my colleagues the benefit of his remarks:

THE PENDULUM IS SWINGING

This is my first speech in the Bay Area since returning to California after serving two and a half years as an appointee in the Department of Defense. Like my associates at the Pentagon, I was proud and honored to serve under the dynamic leadership of Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird. President Nixon could not have selected a better prepared, more dedicated or more effective leader for that demanding post.

It takes much more than computers to run the wide-spread Defense Department, as complex as it is. Secretary Laird inspired a teamwork approach and dedication to service unmatched in the Pentagon's history.

His understanding of key defense issues, his ability as a persuasive communicator, and his style of leadership have contributed significantly to improved understanding of critical national security issues—particularly those beyond Vietnam.

And all this has been accomplished at a time when the Defense Department has been under constant criticism—some constructive, much of it irresponsible.

From the outset, the Nixon Administration made it clear that it would avoid debating whether the United States should have gone into Vietnam in the first place, or once doing so, whether our professional military leaders were given proper authority to execute that war as promptly and successfully as our capabilities would have permitted in the early 1960's.

President Nixon's goal was to conclude American presence in Southeast Asia. That objective is rapidly being met as we move toward a generation of peace. I believe President Nixon and Secretary Laird have been eminently successful in terminating our country's involvement in Vietnam—given the rather sad circumstances they inherited in January 1969.

What were those circumstances? First, there was no plan for ending the war other than through negotiations. No one understood that reality better than the enemy, and the pathetic record in Paris is testimony to the other side's lack of incentive for serious negotiations.

By January 1969, we had cashed in a key military chip when President Johnson halted the bombing of North Vietnam—just four days before the 1968 Presidential election—with little in return from the enemy.

When President Nixon came into office, the American troop ceiling Vietnam was 549,500, and increasing rapidly. As many as 500 Americans were dying each week and the war was costing in excess of $28 billion a year.

These were the sad realities in January 1969. The options to President Nixon were extremely limited, to say the least. But what has happened since that time?

First, we are getting out of Vietnam. By this fall, more than 365,000 Americans will have been withdrawn, a figure representing more than two-thirds of the American troop strength that existed when President Nixon took office.

At the same time, U.S. casualties have been cut from some 500 a week to less than 15 a week. Even one casualty is too many, but I believe this progress is significant. With these substantial troop cuts, the cost of the war has been reduced by 75 percent thus permitting a reordering of priorities at home.

Today, national polls indicate that the war is fading rapidly as an issue in America. Unfortunately, those who have built their national reputations as obstructionists, linger on the sidelines, trying to keep the war issue alive for their own selfish goals. Tragically, their only result has been to give aid and comfort to the enemy.

Congressional critics meet with the other side in Paris, issue reports on alleged conditions for peace, only to have them immediately rejected by the enemy. It is a simple matter to pass resolutions, to make sweeping pronouncements, or to write editorials calling for more rapid withdrawal rates and fixed deadlines.

Certainly, it is easier to demogogue national policy from the sidelines, but it takes real courage to face up to reality with constructive solutions that will contribute to lasting peace, not political expediency.

Time and again President Nixon and Secretary Laird have shown that courage.

How ironic it is that some of those who have led the criticism of President Nixon's Vietnamization program were the very policy makers who got us into the war, who did not have a program for ending it while they were in office, but who now expound all the answers from the privacy of their law offices or from some far-off campus.

In the early 1960's our country had the tools to win the war decisively. But our elected leadership was unwilling to generate the national will to do so. We fought that war on a "business as usual" basis, building up huge deficits each year because our government was unwilling to establish national spending priorities. Many of today's economic problems are a direct result of that policy of the mid-1960's.

At this point, history will judge those who got our country into Vietnam, just as that history will also judge whether the Nixon Administration took the responsible course to get us out.

In either instance, the ultimate responsibility must be assumed by our elected civilian leadership, not by our armed forces. Our military leaders implement national policy, not set it. For too long the man in uniform has been made the scapegoat for decisions made by civilians.

Our dedicated men and women in uniform provide the backbone of our national security and they deserve our respect.

Only through sufficient military strength can we hope to deter reckless acts by potential adversaries. They must clearly understand and respect that we have the will to win and the tools to do the job. It is pure folly to believe that, once the last American has left Vietnam, our problems are over and further cuts in defense spending possible.

Despite what some suggest, we cannot legislate peace by unilaterally crippling our defense posture in Congress. Why? Because our adversaries are moving in exactly the opposite direction.

Today, the Soviets are moving ahead of us in virtually every category: missiles, aircraft, ships, military research and conventional forces.

While we were bogged down in Vietnam—at a total cost of $125 billion—the Soviets were able to sustain North Vietnam for something less than $12 billion. They did not use that ten to one difference, however, to fund domestic programs in Russia. All during the 1960's Soviet military budgets were roughly at the same level as defense spending in America which included the burden of Vietnam. Just look at the record.

The Soviets increased their submarine force by more than 400 percent. They have increased ICBM launchers by over 500 percent and currently 45 percent ahead of the U.S. in total number of ICBM nuclear launchers.

They built a modern Navy that now shows the Soviet flag in the Mediterranean, the Indian Ocean, off our Atlantic and Pacific coasts, in and out of Cuba, and around Hawaii.

In the Mediterranean, for example, the Soviet Navy will steam some 18,000 ship-days this year. In 1966, they were present a total of 750 days.

In military research and development, the Soviets are spending at about twice the rate as we in the United States. This trend should be of grave concern to all Americans because it measures the importance the Soviets place on reducing our technological lead within the next five to seven years.

Even while the Soviets push this military and political expansion policy, the U.S. moves to curtail its overseas commitments, partly as a result of our national weariness over a long and costly war.

The Nixon Administration is facing up to this disturbing Soviet military buildup by insisting on sufficient funding of defense programs while insisting that our allies contribute more to their own national security requirements. The latter philosophy is part of the Nixon Doctrine whose goal is a generation of peace through partnership, strength and a willingness to negotiate.

The United States can no longer serve as policeman of the world. Our needs at home are too high and the demand for our material resources too great.

Since the end of World War II, we have operated on the philosophy that the United States could do more for its allies than they could do for themselves. We have literally rebuilt economies of the victorious and vanquished alike. We have given billions of dollars in foreign aid and have sent thousands of troops in scores of countries around the globe.

Through the Nixon Doctrine, we have insisted that our allies assume more of these mutual security burdens, particularly in the area of military manpower. As a result of this philosophy, more than 400,000 American troops have been withdrawn from overseas. The bulk, of course, have come from Vietnam. But, the Nixon Doctrine has been applied elsewhere as well.

In Korea, U.S. troop strength has been dropped by over 20,000 men. This is a reversal of a commitment to that country where we have maintained more than 60,000 Americans for some eighteen years.

Likewise, reductions in U.S. forces have been carried out in Japan, Thailand and the Philippines. In NATO, the concept of burden sharing is being developed, again on the principle that our allies must assume a greater defense responsibility.

An important element of the Nixon Doctrine has been a willingness to negotiate, doing so from a position of sufficient strength. Again, the record of accomplishment has been impressive.

The United States is pursuing a delicate course of negotiation in the volatile Middle East crisis. We have negotiated the turnover to Japan of Okinawa, a most sensitive issue for the Japanese.

The President has proposed new treaty provisions to prohibit the placement of nuclear weapons on the ocean floor. He has carried the nuclear non-proliferation treaty through to ratification and he has renounced the use of biological weapons.

In addition, the Nixon Administration is vigorously pursuing a sucessful conclusion to the SALT talks. The goal of these important negotiations is to curtail the arms race which as I indicated earlier has been rapidly accelerated by the Soviet Union.

And most dramatically, in this spirit of negotiations, the President has moved forward to revise our country's relationships with Mainland China, an area involving one-fourth of the world's population.

Certainly we hope for success in the diplomatic efforts to limit the arms race and to improve relationships with our potential

adversaries. That success will come, however, only if those who oppose us respect our national determination to remain strong militarily.

I believe most Americans not only support a strong U.S. defense posture but will insist upon it in the years ahead. However, our voices must be heard.

That is not to say the strength of the United States depend solely on its men in uniform or on its weapons, as important as those capabilities are. I believe the strength of our nation in the 1970's must be based also on the wisdom of our foreign policy, on the strength of our economy, and on the will of our people.

The day is past when we can hope to provide most of the defense for our allies. They must share in this burden.

The day is past when we can afford to assume the primary role in solving all of the problems of the Western World. That responsibility also must be shared more equally with our allies.

This does not suggest that we can afford to build a wall around our country, withdrawing from the competition and security needs of the world. Those who clamor to bring all American troops home forget that their very presence abroad has not caused war but rather has helped to maintain peace.

During my service in Washington, I was involved in some of the most complex, difficult problems faced by this country. But it was a source of inspiration to be surrounded by those who were confident in their course, and who respected a higher national priority extending beyond any temporray expediency.

The negative thinkers have had their day. They have marched in the streets. They have built false hopes. And they have comforted our detractors at home and adversaries abroad.

Those who have built their national image on such obstructionist attitudes are finding it difficult to shift away from the tired, divisive approach of the past.

Young people today cry out for constructive leadership in an atmosphere of optimism. They seek positive approaches and personal involvement in efforts to build a better America.

Like you and me, they resent the tarring of all America because of a few shortcomings. How ridiculous it is, for example, to charge—as one Senator recently did—that all America is sick because our prisons are sick. We have had too much of that destructive approach in the past.

One of our greatest national strengths is our ability to face up to problems openly and candidly. We banner our shortcomings across our newspapers and TV sets for the whole world to see. Our critics at home and abroad delight in exploiting these weaknesses as a symbol of a crumbling America.

What these critics forget, however, is that as we identify a problem, as we debate it publicly, we work to solve it—and succeed in doing so. As a result, we have built, on balance, the best and most successful way of life ever known to man.

We have been confident that our problems could be corrected; that dreams could be embodied in action, and that a better life would be achieved. But we have always known, as we do today, that we would have to work for it.

Over the years, we have been successful, not by thinking we would lose but rather by believing we would win. Too often, we have sold our country short with an almost national guilt complex.

I have little tolerance for those who thrive on self pity or who drop out of society in protest against problems they say they did not create. Dreams of self fulfillment cannot be found through heroin, in a commune or on a wrecking crew. Most young people know that.

Today's young generation no longer lives in an overwhelming atmosphere of war and violence. Our task is to capture their imagination and involvement in our endless search for a better America. There are new goals to set, new records to break, new problems to solve. A new day is dawning and America's optimism to meet those opportunities is building.

Yes, the pendulum is swinging.

J. A. LIVINGSTON'S ECONOMIC GLOSSARY

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, J. A. Livingston, professor of economics at Temple University and economic columnist for the Philadelphia Bulletin, provided a useful glossary of terms from the newly popularized lexicon of international finance in his column of Sunday, October 10.

The glossary of terms follow:

BRUSH UP ON CONNALLY—GET TO KNOW THE WORDS

(By J. A. Livingston)

The one-week meeting of the International Monetary Fund has ended, but the main business has only begun.

World prosperity is at stake as finance and trade officials of the United States and other countries negotiate on what to do about the dollar, the persistent U.S. balance-of-payments deficits, and the world monetary system.

During the next few months, arcane terms will become as commonplace as cost-of-living unemployment rate, Gross National Product, and Dow-Jones industrials. This glossary may come in handy for future reference:

Group of ten, or G–10, often referred to as the Paris Club or the Rich Man's Club. It consists of the free world's major nations—Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Sweden, United Kingdom, and United States, with Switzerland participating as an observer.

G–10 deputies, under-secretaries of treasuries or finance ministries, assisted by representatives from their central banks, are planning to meet Oct. 19 and 20 to prepare for negotiation—hard bargaining—by the . . .

G–10 ministers (Secretary of the Treasury John B. Connally, for the U.S.; Chancellor of the Exchequer Anthony Barber, for Great Britain; Minister of Economy and Finance Valery Giscard d'Estaing, for France; Minister of Finance Miko Mizuta, for Japan, and so on) who may meet in November. Objective: To reach an agreement on removal of the U.S. . . .

Surcharge—On Aug. 15, President Nixon boosted tariffs on U.S. imports by 10 percent. Dual purpose: One, to raise prices of goods from abroad so as to make American products more competitive and to lift domestic production and employment at the expense of foreign production. Two, to provide a bargaining lever. The U.S. wants major industrial countries such as Japan, Germany, the Netherlands and others to . . .

Revalue their currencies—raise the official price, or parity. As an example, the parity of the Japanese yen had been 0.278 cents, or about 360 to the dollar, prior to Aug. 15. A 15 percent revaluation has been suggested, which would raise its parity to 0.32 cents, or 313 to the dollar. This would be equivalent to a 13 percent devaluation of the dollar against the yen. In contrast to Revaluation is . . .

Devaluation, lowering the parity of a currency. The dollar can be devalued by reducing its gold content. This raises—revalues—the price of gold. If the gold content of other currencies remain the same, then the value of such currencies increases vis-a-vis the dollar. Currency relationships can also be altered by . . .

Revaluation-Devaluation—If Japan were to revalue the yen and the U.S. to devalue the dollar, a two-way (or combined) change in the relationship between the currencies would occur. Such a change can be achieved independently or by agreement. Revaluation-devaluation is a contentious issue between the U.S. and its major . . .

Trading Partners, nations to which a country exports and from which it imports. Members of the Group of Ten argue that the U.S. should contribute to readjustment of parities by raising the gold price, say 5 percent or 10 percent. Incidentally, a rise in a currency's parity devalues—lowers the price of—gold. G–10 hopes to achieve an effective . . .

Realignment, or readjustment of parities, not only of the yen, mark, pound, franc, guilder, etc., to the dollar, but also to one another either through direct negotiation or through . . .

Floating—The determination of parities by market forces—the supply and demand for marks against the dollar, or yen against the dollar, and so on. Minister of Economics and Finance Karl Schiller, of Germany, has "embellished" the nomenclature with . . .

Dirty Floating—Government interference with the free movement of currency prices in the Foreign Exchange Market, which prevents a currency from floating upward or downward to its "natural" level relative to other currencies. The Japanese have bought dollars and sold yen to prevent the yen price from rising too rapidly and too high. This contrasts with . . .

Free floating or clean floating—the untethering of a currency from government apron strings. The dollar is free floating in the sense that the U.S. is not intervening in the foreign exchange market by selling dollars and buying foreign currencies to force the price of the dollar down.

However, the 10 percent surcharge distorts this free float, insofar as it slows down U.S. imports and thus reduces the supply of dollars (the money the U.S. would pay out to other countries) flowing into the foreign exchange market. The U.S. has urged the free floating upward of the currencies in order to realign parities and eliminate the persistent deficit in the U.S. . . .

Balance of payments—the net plus or minus of a nation's external expenditures against receipts—exports against imports; services rendered versus services received—shipping, insurance, banking, etc.; tourism to, as against tourism from; overseas investment against investment from overseas, usually referred to as Capital Movements. Historically, America's balance-of-payments strength has been its . . .

Trade balance—exports against imports. Since 1893, U.S. exports have exceeded imports, but this year, based on data for the first nine months, the U.S. Trade Surplus (formerly called a "favorable balance of trade") will become a . . .

Trade Deficit ("unfavorable balance")—U.S. projections presented to the Group of Ten indicated that a substantial swing in trade will be required in 1972 if the U.S. balance of payments is to be brought into equilibrium. The U.S. has also urged . . .

Burden Sharing—shouldering by European nations and Japan of more of the cost of U.S. military outlays for their defense and of more aid to Less Developed Countries (LDCs.) The negotiations are referred to as the . . .

International Poker Game, in which the stakes are trade balances among nations, and the cards are assumptions and assertions

fortified and rebutted by statistics and projections. Each negotiator, at some juncture, will be expected to disclose what his country is willing to contribute toward a reduction in trade barriers and a realignment of currencies.

This is a new deal. Never before have so many exchange rates been on the table in a multilateral negotiation. Immediately prior to the October meeting of the G–10 deputies, the balance-of-payments position of the U.S. and trading partners will be reviewed by . . .

Working Party No. Three (WP–3)—a work force of the Economic Policy Committee of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). The OECD comprises 23 nations—G–10 plus Australia, Austria, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Luxembourg, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Switzerland, and Turkey. WP–3 economists and technical experts include the G–10 deputies. This is multilateral surveillance—an analysis of trends and developments so that representatives of involved nations observe first-hand what is happening. The ultimate objective is the restructuring of . . .

Bretton Woods—The monetary system which was agreed to at Bretton Woods, N.H., on July 22, 1944, and became effective on Dec. 27, 1945 after ratification by the participating nations. It established the . . .

International Monetary Fund (IMF), which now has a membership of 118 nations, to "promote international monetary cooperation . . . facilitate the expansion and balanced growth of international trade . . . promote exchange stability . . . eliminate foreign exchange restrictions . . . shorten the duration and lessen the degree of disequilibrium in the international balances of payments." To discharge its responsibilities, the IMF became the guardian of the parities of currencies which were to be . . .

Convertible—Exchangeable or transferrable at a fixed price, or rate of exchange with other currencies. Such convertibility would be confined to a . . .

Range of Band of 2 percent. That is a 1 percent Margin on either side of parity. As a practical matter, most governments have confined currency fluctuation to plus or minus 0.75 percent or a range of 1.5 percent. Under consideration now is a . . .

Wider Band, or Wider Range. This could be as much as 6 percent, or a margin of 3 percent. Purpose: To provide leeway for nations to readjust parities. If a currency consistently were to rise in the market to the upper limit of the band, the parity would be raised; if it were to fall consistently to the lower limit, parity could be reduced. Heretofore, a country governed the fluctuation of its currency—kept it within the 2 percent or 1.5 percent band—by using the dollar as an . . .

Intervention Currency—IMF members would buy their own currencies with dollars when their currencies threatened to go below the band and sell their currencies in exchange for dollars when they threatened to go above. Only the United States, among IMF members, undertook to maintain the parity of its currency by acquiring dollars for gold at $35 an ounce or surrendering dollars for gold at $35 an ounce.

Since the U.S. has suspended convertibility of the dollar into gold, its price relationship to other currencies depends on what others are willing to pay for dollars. But the dollar still is an important . . .

Vehicle or Transportation Currency—The money commonly used in foreign trade and international financial transactions; until recently, prices were frequently expressed in dollars in contracts between businessmen of different countries, say Japan and Australia. The dollar's universal acceptability in this regard progenerated the . . .

Eurodollar—A dollar deposited in a foreign bank, such as Barclays in England, or the Dresdner Bank, in Germany. Normally, a person in England would have deposits in pounds; in Germany, in marks. But Multinational Corporations, which do business around the world, found it useful to keep dollars on deposit in banks outside the U.S. The U.S. bank, holding the original deposit of dollars, doesn't know the ultimate owner. On its books is only the name of the foreign bank.

Such dollars are not readily subject to regulation or control by either the Federal Reserve Board in the U.S. or the central banks in Europe. They can be shunted rapidly when interest rates change, or when fears of devaluation cause holders of dollars to rush into marks or yen or pounds.

The wider band is expected to moderate such currency movements. Instead of a maximum 2 percent loss from the bottom of a band to the top, a speculator could suffer a 6 percent loss. Despite its universal use, the dollar's status as a . . .

Reserve Currency has been impaired. During the 'fifties and the forepart of the 'sixties, the dollar rivaled gold as a reserve asset. It could be exchanged for other currencies at parity. Many governments preferred the dollar to gold as a reserve. It could be invested to earn interest. Now the European nations and Japan propose replacing the dollar as a reserve asset with . . .

Special Drawing Rights (SDRs)—often referred to as "Paper Gold." SDRs can also be called Fiat Gold. They were created by fiat—let it be done—by the members of the International Monetary Fund, and are distributed to members according to their quotas (investment) in the IMF.

The intent was to assure an annual increase in reserve assets and thus diminish dependence on dollars and metallic gold. A recent proposal calls for a special issue of SDRs to retire excess dollars held by central banks. This would elevate fiat gold's importance in the international monetary system. However, an asset does not gain . . .

Reserve Status by decree—only by acceptance. Gold achieved such status because of its beauty, durability and relative scarcity. Later, reserve status was "wished on" the pound sterling because of its wide use as a vehicle currency. After World War I, the dollar was not chosen by the U.S. Government as a reserve currency, but by businessmen, commercial bankers, and central bankers, who cherished it for its Liquidity as a readily transferrable store or purchasing power.

AMBASSADOR YOST ON OUR DUBIOUS VIETNAM POLICY

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I believe that Charles W. Yost is one of the most distinguished living Americans to have served as Chief U.S. Delegate to the United Nations. He held this post from 1968 to 1971, under both President Johnson and President Nixon. This fact alone is a strong testimony to his outstanding ability. Obviously, his advice in matters of international policy is not to be taken lightly.

In an article appearing in the Akron Beacon Journal on October 12, 1971, Ambassador Yost observes that, following the travesty of the South Vietnam presidential election, the U.S. administration is basing its Vietnam policy on three very dubious assumptions. The most dubious, he says, is the assumption that Vietnam will not be an important political issue in the United States in 1972.

He points out that there is an underlying and growing resentment, not only among students and liberals but among those who fought and are still fighting in Vietnam, against an administration which in 1968 promised to get us out and in late 1971 is still keeping us in. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that every poll taken in my part of Ohio continues to show that our Nation's presence in Vietnam is still the No. 1 political issue, far ahead of inflation, unemployment and every other issue.

Ambassador Yost's article is worth every Member's attention as we approach a crucial vote on the Mansfield amendment. The text of the article follows:

(By Charles W. Yost)

President Thieu has now completed the electoral process which was supposed to represent the exercise of self-determination by the people of South Vietnam, for which the armed forces of the United States have been fighting for the past six years. Obviously this process has been a travesty, almost as much so as elections conducted in North Vietnam, our totalitarian adversary.

Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker no doubt did his utmost to persuade Thieu that a fair and contested election would be in our common interest, though the ambassador presumably was not authorized by Washington to go beyond persuasion to sanctions. Which might serve to remind us that there is far less danger of our being considered "a pitiful helpless giant" by our adversaries, than by clients to whom we have so totally committed ourselves that they can afford to ignore our advice and interests.

President Thieu clearly falls in that category. He has chosen to play the same game that Diem played successfully for nine years—until nemesis overtook him.

The United States administration has, moreover, now redoubled its commitment to Thieu by threatening to cut off all aid to Vietnam in case of a military coup. It also still insists that it intends, to quote President Nixon's statement last month, "to bring the American involvement to an end in a way that will leave South Vietnam in a position to defend itself from a Communist takeover."

That means, if it is to be taken seriously, that we guarantee Thieu invulnerability: He will not allow himself to be removed by election and we will not allow him to be removed either by his own generals or by the enemy. With this end in view, the administration still refuses to fix an early date for total withdrawal of United States forces, even in exchange for a North Vietnamese commitment to release all our prisoners of war by that date.

It is true that Communist statements in Paris on this point, following our failure to seize upon their initial offer in July, have become increasingly equivocal. Perhaps we have waffled too long and missed the boat. However, Communist equivocation could soon be either ended or exposed by an unequivocal public offer from the United States to commit itself to rapid total withdrawal if North Vietnam would commit itself to release our prisoners within the same time span.

The administration seems to base its inflexible policy on three assumptions. The first is that we still have a vital national interest in maintaining any sort of non-Communist government in power as long as possible, no matter what the continuing cost to both Vietnamese and Americans.

The second is that the Thieu government is the best we can hope to have in Saigon and we must continue to support it no matter how it flounts our advice and interests.

The third is that, as long as Thieu stays in power and gradual withdrawal of American forces continues, Vietnam will not be an important political issue in the United States in 1972.

All three of these assumptions are very dubious, but perhaps most of all the last one. While Vietnam seems in recent months to have subsided as an acute domestic issue, appearances may be misleading. There is increasing evidence of an underlying and growing resentment, not only among students and liberals but also among those who have fought and are still fighting in Vietnam, against an administration which in 1968 promised to get us out and in late 1971 is still keeping us in.

It is obvious that more and more South Vietnamese want the war to end and blame the Americans for preventing its ending. There are likely to be an increasing number of hostile acts against Americans, not so much from the enemy as from many of those for whom we are supposedly fighting.

As our troop strength declines, moreover, it appears we shall try to protect those that remain by more aerial bombardment, including bombing of North Vietnam. This could provoke reprisals either against our troops or against our prisoners.

As our troop strength declines, our leverage for either the release or the safety of our prisoners will also decline correspondingly.

As long as we retain any military presence in Vietnam, we will continue to appear to be responsible for whatever happens there—no matter how little control we may actually have—and the administration will be blamed by very large numbers of Americans for what does happen. Vietnam will therefore remain a significant, perhaps a decisive, domestic political issue in 1972.

REDIMENSIONING CONGRESSIONAL SUPPORT

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, one of the Nation's foremost proponents of effective utilization of automatic data processing systems is Robert L. Chartrand who heads the Data Processing Office of the Congressional Research Service in the Library of Congress.

Mr. Chartrand authored a most illuminating article recently which appeared in the June 14th issue of the Jurimetrics Journal entitled "Redimensioning Congressional Information Support."

This article is of particular significance to the Members of Congress as well as to those who are concerned with the modernization and the efficient operation of the Legislative Branch of our Federal Government.

I am pleased to attach Mr. Chartrand's article to these remarks for reproduction:

REDIMENSIONING CONGRESSIONAL INFORMATION SUPPORT*

(By Robert L. Chartrand, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress)

As we near the 200th anniversary of our national existence, it sometimes seems that the Jeffersonian dream of tolerance, tranquility, and prosperity will never be realized. And yet, at a time when change—change affecting our institutions, laws, and mores; change derived from internal forces and not external impact—has become a way of life, there is a growing perception that a redimensioning of our society is a process. Perhaps nowhere is this perception more acute than in the Federal Congress.

Throughout the past quarter-century, increasing numbers of Americans, within the Congress and across the land, have sought a reexamination of congressional structure, procedural practices, and general effectiveness. While congressional "performance" may be judged by numerous criteria and in the light of many biases,[1] it is generally agreed that certain bedrock characteristics may be named:

1. Efforts which result in the furtherance of national policies, or the attainment of national goals;

2. Enactment of public laws fashioned to meet commitments or needs on matters of international, national, or regional concern;

3. Carrying out the congressional duties to oversee executive branch activities; and

4. Fulfillment of responsibilities to constituents.

The pressures upon the contemporary Congressman are legion, and have their origin in the structure of our democracy. Ours is a nation of unrestrained mobility, with all that this implies in a burgeoning urbanocracy—a saturation of public services and new demands on those who must prepare the plans, programs, and budgets which are responsive to the societal conditions. There are more and more citizens, and never has the principle of *vox populi* been more significant to the members of elected officialdom. As the tale is told by the 1970 census, the average constituency for a member of the House of Representatives is pushing the 500,000 mark. Some Senators may be responsible for as many as 20 million state inhibitants. Members of Congress must know the law, be flexible enough to change it, and possess the faculty to explore and decide upon dozens of issues, large and small, concurrently.

Little wonder, then, that congressional leaders are looking at every possible approach—whether traditional or innovative—to enhancing the performance of the federal legislature: in the chamber, in committee, or as a function of the individual member office. Technology, which has spawned many of the severe problems of the age, including environmental pollution, transportation snarl, and the health-education-welfare triad, in many instances has the ameliorative power to reduce or remove some of these irritants. In particular, the logic and acumen inherent in systems analysis and operations research, supported by the storage and manipulative capacities of the electronic computer and associated microform technologies, would seem to hold a great potential for legislative operations, as well as their application to the melange of social and community problems.[2] There has been a marked willingness on the part of a growing number of Congressmen to determine how, where, and to what extent such techniques and devices can and should be utilized.

Indicative of the legislators' search for "technical assistance" in some of their legislative and administrative tasks has been the commissioning of various studies, or participation in symposia and seminars, dealing with the role of systems technology in selected problem situations, including the Congress itself. Serving as primary references for those members or staff concerned with improving the quality of information provided for decision making is an early collection of twelve papers published as *Congress: The First Branch of Government*,[3] and a subsequent (1968) dialogue involving representatives of university, industry, Congress, and other government elements.[4] These efforts, often instigated by interested elements within the private sector, were complemented by the introduction of a variety of bills within the Congress[5] calling for the establishment of a data processing facility to serve its membership. Gradually, then, the orientation and education process continued, and a clearer definition of the information needs of the Congress emerged.

STATED: INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS FOR THE CONGRESS

Available to the Congressman are many sources of expertise and written information. In addition to his own personal staff or that of the committees on which he serves, he may turn within the legislative branch to the Congressional Research Service (formerly the Legislative Reference Service) of the Library of Congress or to the General Accounting Office. Other readily accessible resources are lobbyist organizations, executive branch departments and agencies, state and local governments, and university, industry, or foundation groups.

In order to pinpoint the information needs of the Congress, surveys and studies have been undertaken that have provided at least a partial picture of member and committee requirements.[6] Most recently, a survey was conducted under the aegis of the House Special Subcommittee on Electrical and Mechanical Office Equipment; its objective was to "ascertain the information and analysis needs of the Members and staff" of the House of Representatives.[7] A total of 284 offices participated in face-to-face interviews with members and staff, and/or the completion of special questionnaires by staff personnel. The survey, conducted by senior legislative analysts and academic consultants, was carried out with the highest degree of objectivity possible, and the Center for Political Studies, Institute for Social Research (University of Michigan) performed the analysis of the questionnaires. Based on a study of the stated needs, certain salient considerations were manifest.[8]

1. "Evaluative and interpretive information" on national issues, and possible alternative solutions to these issues, is a top priority need. Included in this category are data on federal assistance programs—what are they? qualification criteria? congressional district allotment? status of funding?—and the impact of proposed legislation on existing federal law and programs; another area of concern involved Supreme Court decisions relevant to pending legislation.

2. Procedural information, while not quite so critical in the eyes of the members, received overwhelming support for early implementation. Virtually everyone interviewed cited the need for an information system to "maintain current, reliable, complete, and accessible information about the House committees and to provide more expeditious access to legislative histories."

3. The actual content of documents proved to be of less vital concern to members, primarily because of the lack of time to read them. However, the value of computerized data bases, such as the *United States Code*, was recognized and a retrieval capability sought.

Although the role of computer technology was discussed with each member and staff person, it still is imperfectly understood. Indeed, only time will reveal which areas can be best served by the sophisticated processing power of the computer. Only as each need is analyzed, and the possible answering services assessed, can these areas be determined from the perspective of the potential users, the manager of the projected serv-

---

*January 1971. The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and are not necessarily those of the Congressional Research Service nor the Library of Congress.

Footnotes at end of article.

ice, and the systems designers, implementers, and operators. A separate scrutiny of the impact of any new "systems" or services on the laws and the precedents of the House of Representatives has been completed, with an emphasis on the provision of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970.

It is noteworthy that many of the data bases and information services are heavily oriented toward legal or quasi-legal functions. In other instances, legislative information must be based or rely upon existing laws, regulatory directives, or related administrative documentation. The Congressman and his advisors must know not only the federal statutes, but those of the states or comparable city-county governmental units. Increasingly, he must remain current on executive branch (e.g., Office of Management and Budget, individual department) directives or progress reports. The plethora of written material, combined with the other demands upon his time, is impairing the effectiveness of the individual, hence the committee and the chamber, as a deliberative body.

LEGISLATIVE AND LEGAL DATA NEEDS AND SERVICES

A recurring theme in any examination of the Congress' expression of its own information needs—and a theme, it must be said, which is far from muted—is that of having pertinent legislative information "at the fingertips" of member and committee offices. An elaboration of the potential services supporting the legislative process, and this would be equally applicable in either chamber of the Congress, would include these elements.[9]

1. Legal retrieval—automatic search and retrieval by subject from the federal or state statutes and codes, Supreme Court and other court decisions, etc.)

2. Bill drafting aids—computer assistance for the storage, revision, comparison, editing, and printing of proposed legislation.

3. Bill comparison—determination of whether a new bill is identical or similar to other current or past bills, in either chamber.

4. Bill status and content—improved method of acquiring and disseminating selected information on the status and content of any public or private bill or resolution, including its position in the legislative process, calendar information, similar bills, forward scheduling, witness activity, etc.

5. Floor activity—automatic retrieval from the *Congressional Record* by name or subject (and improved indexing of that document).

6. Legislative histories—assistance in the storage and retrieval of data and documents which comprise legislative histories.

(A graphic depiction of these potential services describing the interactions between the system elements appeared in the original article.) [10]

In determining which categories of legal data would be amendable to automatic data processing, several legal professional organizations have begun to consider the role of man-machine techniques and advanced retrieval capabilities featuring computers and microfilm devices in handling legal type information. Among these organizations are the American Bar Association—whose Standing Committee on Law and Technology has been active for nearly a decade,[11] the Federal Bar Association, the World Peace Through Law Center,[12] the Association of American Law Schools, and the Association of American Law Libraries. A few university schools of law now recognize the importance of computers to the lawyer, and have instituted curricula changes and commenced to treat the subject in their journals.[13] A consensus arrived at from reviewing the treatment of the new technology and the law would show these categories of legal data as candidates for computerized handling:

*Statutes.
*Court decisions.
*Administrative decisions.
*Administrative orders, Title records.
Mortgages, liens, and similar recorded instruments.
*Legislative history.
*Legal periodicals.
*Trademarks.
*Patents.
*Cases and judgments in courts of record.
*Files, records, and evidence in significant cases.

Thus, while several applications of computers to legislative and legal information are well along in development—notably statutory retrieval, information on the status and content of pending legislation, bill drafting and comparison—other uses of the new technology are in the offing which can furnish the Congress with long-awaited support for issue research and committee action.

THE LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1970

When President Nixon appended his signature to Public Law 91-510, many key legislators and other behind-the-scenes workers could have a long-concealed sigh of relief. For it was 1946 when the LaFollette-Monroney bill went into effect,[15] and the hue and cry for further congressional changes had been long upon the land. In 1965, a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress was established.[16] Extensive hearings were held and numerous documents, articles, and other communications were received by the Joint Committee. Among the areas in focus was that of information support for the Congress. Many suggestions were heard from representatives of labor, management, academe, and government (including the members of the Congress). A summary listing of possible applications of ADP to congressional operations, prepared during this period of experience and opinion sampling, is shown in Figure 2.[17]

FIGURE 2.—*Summary listing of projected applications*[1] *of ADP in support of the Congress*

The Congress as a unit:
Status of pending legislation.
Lobbyist activity information.
Direct access to legislative research.
Legal literature/information.
Automated index/catalog of congressional documents.
Payroll accounts of employees of Congress.
Up-to-date legislative telephone directory.
Each Chamber as an entity:
Current information on issues up for vote.
Postvote analytical information.
Electronic (remote) voting by Congressmen.
The committee or subcommittee:
Current schedule of committees meetings and hearings.
Histories of committee action.
Exclusive file for each committee.
Information on Federal contract awards.
Appropriations statistics and information.
The individual Congressman:
Exclusive file for each Congressman.
Selected readings of interest to Congressmen.
Constituent information.

Already those responsible for providing legal advice and counsel to the Congress, such as the Legislative Counsels and the American Law Division of the Congressional Research Service, are commencing to draw upon the services available from the Project LITE (Legal Information Through Electronics) service center in Denver and from some of the private corporations which specialize in legal retrieval. ASPEN Systems Corporation, for example, has developed a massive data base containing the statutes of all 50 states. Although none of these service groups presently offers on-line service to one of the more comprehensive files, such as the *United States Code,* Mead Data Central has placed the Ohio State Bar Association case file in quick-access storage for scanning and retrieval using a videoscreen terminal. The preparation of Keyword-in-Context (KWIC) indexes or other special listings is well within the scope of the services offered by several governmental agencies which now have machine-readable information which can be made available to external users. Regulatory agencies such as the Federal Communications Commission and the Federal Aviation Agency keep certain files of decisions and reports in computerized form, and the Internal Revenue Service has established its information system (RIRA) which assists its General Counsel's office in coping with voluminous pending transactions.[14]

After an abortive effort in 1967 to bring the bill out—the Senate *did* pass S. 355 by an overwhelming vote—a new effort was mounted in the 91st Congress with the creation of a Special Subcommittee on Legislative Reorganization, chaired by Rep. B. F. Sisk of California, by the House Committee on Rules. New reorganization bills were introduced, and the Special Subcommittee examined congressional reorganization proposals introduced by more than 200 members of Congress. Additional testimony and suggestions on the subject were obtained from members and representatives of the then Bureau of the Budget, General Accounting Office, Legislative Reference Service, the news media, broadcasting industry and Capitol guides.

Among the purposes of the bill (H.R. 17654) was to:

Provide Congress with new sources of information and research, including development of an automatic data processing system, expansion of the Legislative Reference Service into a Congressional Research Service, provisions for additional budgetary information, and an increase in committee staff.[18]

The role of automatic data processing in legislative operations soon became the center of controversy, as the question of who should control this capability, and the concomitant vestiges of power which accrue to those who control or monitor information sources, became fully appreciated. As the result of a full debate on the floor of the House, the provision for a Joint Committee on Data Processing was stricken from the bill. In a successful argument to delete this item, Rep. Joe D. Waggonner, Jr. of Louisiana, chairman of the House Special Subcommittee on Electrical and Mechanical Office Equipment, pointed to the extensive work of his group in developing a plan to provide ADP service for the House:

If the Members want to proceed now and get a system, which we have to have, which is something as important to this Congress as it was years ago to establish a Library of Congress, then I say we should not undo this work . . . If the Members reject this they are going to be 3 years getting back to where we are now, and make no mistake about it.[19]

And so, while the bill which enjoyed passage did not contain a directive providing for the establishment of a congressional overseer of computer technology, there are other provisions which identified the importance of the new tools and techniques. Budgetary and fiscal data, for example, are to be collected, maintained, and analyzed in an executive branch ADP-oriented system. The system hopefully will upgrade the ability of its managers to make "more meaningful comparison between the costs of Federal programs and their benefits" while permitting "the extrac-

Footnotes at end of article.

*Noted as being of probable value to the Congress.
[1] Entries are not necessarily exclusive.

tion of many other types of specialized information about the fiscal aspects of Federal activities." [20]

In authorizing the significant expansion of the Congressional Research Service, which has borne the brunt of member, committee, and constituent needs for research and interpretive commentary support,[21] several new duties were defined which encompassed both a refinement of analytical and advisory services and a clear implication that better files, selective retrieval from a variety of indexes, digests, and full text forms, and perhaps an increased reliance upon advanced technology would be required.[22]

1. Assist committees in analyzing, appraising, and evaluating advisability of enacting legislative proposals and alternatives thereto and estimating their probable results; maintain continuous liaison with committees.

2. Inform committees of programs and activities scheduled to expire in current Congress.

3. Provide committees with lists of subjects and policy areas suitable for analysis in depth.

4. Upon request, prepare concise legislative histories of measures upon which committee hearings are to be held.

Such full scale information services, in addition to those previously initiated and in some cases computerized, can scarcely be developed without an attempt at maximizing coordination and information exchange with other information systems already in being or in a design phase elsewhere within the legislative branch. The chronicle of activity in this area in the House of Representatives and the Senate lends a certain urgency to ensuring that multilateral communication, both formal and informal, be established and maintained between all those charged with perpetuating the effectiveness of the first branch of government.

HOUSE AND SENATE DEVELOPMENTAL ACTIVITY

The inception of the movement to bring computers to the Congress often is dated from the introduction late in the 89th Congress, by Rep. Robert McClory of Illinois, of the first bill to establish an ADP facility for exclusive use by federal legislators. Soon afterward, he joined with Rep. William S. Moorhead of Pennsylvania in hosting a special seminar at The Brookings Institution which was to serve as the first such orientation session for interested members. A "literature" on the subject of congressional adoption and adaptation of computers and systems analysis became identifiable as the role of the new technology in the political science and legal milieus was no longer viewed as a fad. A tendency to investigate the applicability of the innovative technology to assorted committee and constituent problems resulted in a series of studies being commissioned during the 1966–1970 time frame:[23]

Systems Technology and Judicial Administration.

Application of Automatic Data Processing in Legal Information Handling.

Computers for Congress.

The Federal Data Center: Proposals and Reactions.

The Origins and Evolution of the Federal Planning-Programming-Budgeting System (PPBS).

Automatic Data Processing and the Small Businessman.

Systems Technology Applied to Social and Community Problems.

Automatic Data Processing and the American Political Campaign.

With no action seemingly possible via the customary bill passage route, Rep. John Brademas of Indiana determined to activate the House by introducing a resolution which was subsequently endorsed by the Democratic Caucus:

Resolved, that the Committee on House Administration be fully supported by Democratic members in efforts to improve the efficiency of operations of the House of Representatives, and we urge that these efforts include, but not be limited to, the use of computers and of a centralized mail processing system.

This resolution, then, served as the vehicle for placing the House in motion. At the direction of the Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on House Administration took steps to carry out the directive, assigning the responsibility for action on the resolution to the Special Subcommittee on Electrical and Mechanical Office Equipment. In the spring of 1969, a Working Group on Automatic Data Processing was created, comprised of senior personnel from the Office of the Clerk of the House, the General Accounting Office, and the Library of Congress.

In establishing this *working* staff, the Special Subcommittee chairman, Rep. Waggonner, stressed that both successful and unsuccessful efforts to develop information systems would be studied carefully by the House planners:

We are aware that many [systems] have fallen far short of original promises, that they have taken years longer than originally estimated and that their costs far exceeded original budgets. We have taken note that some of the basic qualities include inadequate planning, poor requirement determination and definition, and failure of the top managers to participate actively . . . we will do our best to establish standards and ground rules to provide the coordination needed to create a system we can all be proud of.[24]

The "First Progress Report" of the Working Group to the Special Subcommittee appeared in October, 1969, and featured a review of past and current suggestions and recommendations regarding the congressional employment of computers and associated systems methodology. Also, this report looked at possible approaches to forging the requisite services into a "system" with management tasks and day-to-day functioning of the system components to be delineated. While the recommended approach called for the development of a "unified, compatible system geared to serving the Congress," [25] there also was a firm requirement for compatibility and standardization, to the extent feasible, with executive branch information systems.

Exactly one year later the "Second Progress Report" was published, containing detailed information relative to the continuing planning effort and summarizing the findings of the previously described survey of House members and staff aides. A second major facet of the Working Group activity early in 1970 involved an intensive evaluation of the experience and capabilities of 65 contractor organizations who might contribute to the development of long-range plans and possibly participate in the implementation of any projected services and systems for the House of Representatives. In June of 1970, the Committee on House Administration awarded contracts totaling $450,000 to eight companies to assist the Working Group in further studying the information and analysis needs of the House and to develop "a plan for managing the design, implementation, and operation of the services." [26] One facet of this effort involved an in-depth study of a computer-supported addressing and mailing system for the House; a "Special Report" containing detailed information relative to the plans and research for the development of this specialized system was approved by the committee in December (1970).[27]

A recognized factor in the gradual education of House members regarding the utility of computers and a more scientific management of accounts has been the Office of the Clerk of the House. As a former member of that body, William Pat Jennings understands the information needs of the individual members and committees. Having established a medium-sized computer facility, his staff is in a position to perform a variety of legislative and housekeeping services for the membership.

In the Senate, meanwhile, the impetus to decide upon the proper role of the new technology in legislative matters has developed more cautiously. Functioning within the echoes of Senator Hubert H. Humphrey's voice which in the early sixties called for the use of computerized information handling techniques, the Senate amended the earlier version of the Legislative Reorganization Act (S. 355) to include the provision introduced by Senator Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania for an ADP facility for Congress to be situated within the Legislative Reference Service. At that time, Senator Scott, in seeking to allay the fears of those who see the electronic marvel as a threat to the human decision maker, offered his view of the new tool:

The electronic computer and the systems techniques connected with its use are simply tools for use by the decision maker. They are designed to help provide that information which is necessary to make balanced, accurate decisions.[28]

With the demise of the Senate-passed reorganization bill in the House during the 90th Congress, little attention was given the topic of computerized support until the Sisk Special Subcommittee began its formulative efforts, at which time Senators Scott and Edward M. Kennedy, both new in leadership posts, sent letters expressing a firm interest in the potential uses of computers by the Congress to Rep. Sisk and his colleagues. A parallel development has found the Secretary of the Senate, Francis R. Valeo, arranging for an analytical study of the activities under his control. This critique, prepared by a special consultant, reportedly [29] includes a careful assessment of the ADP-supported addressing and mailing system controlled by the Sergeant-at-Arms, and a look at those "operating functions" which should be established and operated within the Senate itself.

As the traditional guardian of Senate housekeeping duties and services, the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, chaired by Senator B. Everett Jordan of North Carolina, is concerned with any plans for that chamber's use of computers. In April, 1970 the committee authorized a study of the role of data processing in legislative operations, and in August of that year established a Subcommittee on Computer Services. Upon the occasion of announcing this action on the floor of the Senate, the chairman remarked that "it is the hope of the subcommittee to update Senate procedures wherever feasible so that we do not fall behind the times in the use of available technology." [30]

Thus, the record remains largely unwritten concerning House and Senate use of computer technology and systems analysis in the more advanced application areas. Valuable lessons have been learned as relatively routine tasks such as payroll and inventory were transferred from a manual to an automated mode of operation. In this way, and through involvement in symposia and committee investigations where technology might be a factor, numerous legislators have become better versed in what computers can (and cannot) do. The resulting interest and more often voiced query "Why don't we use computers to help ourselves?" has permeated the consciousness of the congressional leadership, causing it to look more closely at the "new" devices and techniques. Also noteworthy, and what might be called a "sign of the times," is the increasing number of new members who gained a familiarity with computerized services existing in their state legis-

Footnotes at end of article.

latures. Underlying all of these fragmentary factors is the unrelenting struggle of the member to find enough *time* to fulfill all of his obligations—through his presence on the floor, in performing committee duties, and in staying abreast of constituent casework—and to discover better ways of getting the job done.

COMPUTERIZED INFORMATION SUPPORTS THE CURRENT STATUS

While the future of computer systems on Capitol Hill holds a promise of bedazzling networks of television and voice terminals providing instantaneous recall of myriad facts or the manipulation of statistical files, there is at present a rather substantial computerized support element within the legislative branch. Both chambers now have computer facilities, as do the Library of Congress, General Accounting Office, and Government Printing Office. True to form—and the pattern is the same wherever automatic data processing has been introduced—the commitment of staff, money, and space has inevitably increased with each passing year. And in most cases, the number of services provided has multiplied.

The initiative of the Clerk of the House in developing a utilitarian ADP support capability, as previously noted, has resulted in modernizing many of the routine administrative functions of the chamber.[31] Using an IBM 360 Model 50 configuration, full-time support is provided for: a payroll of 7,000 employees (including such niceties as monthly statements on allowances and expenditures, and the automatic handling of state tax deductions); an inventory and accounting system for 8,000 pieces of electrical and mechanical equipment, including history and maintenance records; an on-line tally record of votes cast, maintained through a videoscreen unit in the Tally Clerk's office; and an inventory of 43,000 pieces of furniture and property. The facility staff is providing support to the House Committee on Banking and Currency in preparing its annual report on savings and loan institutions' activities for the Internal Revenue Service. Nearly complete is an accounts payable application for the House Recording Studio, and slated for near-term implementation are ADP-supported inventory and accounting procedures for the House Stationery Room, and budget support for the Finance Office. It is generally expected that the clerk's facility will be the site of the projected addressing and mailing system for the House. An information retrieval system capable of tracking legislation, supporting selected committee activities, and dealing with federal agency and budget data is a featured part of the system of the future.

Computerized support activity within the Senate has been centered in the establishment of an addressing and mailing system, using an IBM 360 Model 40 installation. Although drawing upon outside expertise in designing and experimenting with the system, the Office of the Sergeant-at-Arms now exercises full control, and is servicing nearly three-fourths of the senatorial offices. A few individual members have contracted for studies of their office operations, and several committees currently are exploring the potential of ADP support in legislative calendar preparation or the creation of extensive indexes to their hearings' documentation files.

The development of computer-assisted services for the Congress began in the then Legislative Reference Service late in 1967. Typewriter terminals operating under the Administrative Terminal System (ATS) were used in preparing material for the bi-weekly *Digest of Public General Bills and Resolutions*. Legislative analysts prepare key identifying information—sponsor(s), bill number, title, date introduced, committee to which assigned and a brief digest of the content for each bill. Recall and editing of the computer stored material, plus special indexes, precede preparation of the final copy for photo-composition publication by the Government Printing Office. Eventually the "Bill Digest" magnetic tapes will be inserted directly into the GPO Linotron device which performs offset printing without "hot type" input. Another CRS product is the *Legislative Status Report*, containing current information on "major" bills' status and content. A third major use of computer support in providing a service to the Congress features the capture of key information on recent English-language acquisitions, including government publications, magazines, special foundation studies, and some books. Basic bibliographic elements are stored in the computer, and CRS researchers are notified of the new materials on the basis of an "interest profile" created specifically for each staff person. Long known as a Selective Dissemination of Information (SDI) system, and in the congressional environment as a "Current Awareness" service, this offering is being extended during the 92nd Congress to all Senate and House committees. In addition to the notification service, which may be followed up by providing the actual source document to an interested user, special overnight computer searches may be made according to a topical request (e.g., "Provide citations on all written sources received since January of 1969 on the subject of 'demonstration cities.'")

Committee support thus far has been limited to assisting House committees in their handling of legislative calendar information. This effort was originated as the result of a request by Rep. Wright Patman of Texas, chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, for technical assistance by CRS information specialists. Installation of terminals and operational experience gained during the 91st Congress have resulted, according to committee personnel, in a more current, useful product published at considerable monetary savings. With the opening of the 92nd Congress, four House committees were either operational or testing the terminal system; four Senate committees also are considering this service.

Through the development of these, and other, services and products, the Congressional Research Service, supported by the analysts and programmers of the Library's Information Systems Office, has reached a higher plateau of sensitivity regarding congressional information needs which will be most useful in the future. With a facility featuring twin IBM 360 Model 40 units, voluminous disk storage, and an array of 35 terminals for CRS and committee use, the researchers and advisors are strongly positioned to provide the range of new and expanded services called for in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970.

LOOKING AHEAD

The challenges facing the Congress and nation are of such severity that President Nixon, in his State of the Union message, emphasized the need for vision, a reshaping of the forces of government, and responsive action by the Congress allowing America to "enter its third century as a young nation new in spirit, with all the vigor and freshness with which it began its first century."[32] If Congress is to accept this challenge as an unprecedented opportunity, approaching the laborious and complex tasks with vigor and ingenuity, then it must have at hand information resources of nonpareil integrity and substance. It will have to develop within its own membership, and the ranks of those who advise and counsel, a willingness to experiment, to dissect and discard shibboleths, and to reshape those laws and institutions which impede the attainment of our national goals.

In years to come, these times may be known as the Age of Readjustment. As our conditions of life change, the governing media and the rationale for decision making change apace. We expect the unexpected, less hesitantly accept the abberations in our pattern of living brought about by technology, and consciously or subliminally are transformed. Writing in *The Heavenly City of the Eighteenth-Century Philosophers*, Carl L. Becker commented upon life in a machine age:[33]

Fresh discoveries and new inventions are no longer the result of fortunate accidents which we are expected to note with awe. . . . Novelty has ceased to excite wonder because it has ceased to be novelty; on the contrary, the strange, so habituated have we become to it, is of the very essence of the customary. There is nothing new in heaven or earth not dreamt of in our laboratories; and we should be amazed indeed if tomorrow and tomorrow and tomorrow failed to offer us something new to challenge our capacity for readjustment.

Within this context, then, the Congress of the United States must retain its mastery of those constitutional guidelines and duties which are above compromise. A concurrent control and use of technology, in all shapes and forms and at all levels, is an absolute prerequisite for those to whom responsiveness to the people is the unequivocal *raison d'etre*.

FOOTNOTES

[1] For an excellent discussion of congressional performance, *see* Salama, Congress and the New Politics 12–27 (Boston, Little, Brown and Co., 1969).

[2] A recent reference work on this subject is Chartrand, Systems Technology Applied to Social and Community Problems (N.Y., Spartan Books, 1971).

[3] De Grazia ed., Congress: The First Branch of Government (Wash., D.C., American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1966).

[4] Chartrand, Janda, & Hugo eds., Information Support, Program Budgeting, and the Congress (N.Y., Spartan Books, 1968).

[5] For a listing of 89th, 90th, and 91st Congress bills, *see* U.S. Cong., Comm. on House Administration, First Progress Report of the Special Subcommittee on Electrical and Mechanical Office Equipment (91st Cong., 1st Sess., October 1969).

[6] Of special interest is the Arthur D. Little special report, *Congress Needs Help* (November 24, 1965), a management study of the U.S. Congress commissioned by NBC News. Also, *see* Saloma, *supra* note 1, at 170–190, which includes comments on earlier (and sometimes unpublished) findings. An earlier study was reported on in O'Leary ed., Congressional Reorganization: Problems and Prospects—A Conference Report (Hanover, N.H., Public Affairs Center, Dartmouth College, 1964).

[7] U.S. Cong., Comm. on House Administration, Second Progress Report of the Special Subcommittee on Electrical and Mechanical Office Equipment (91st Cong., 2d Sess., October 1970), at 3–12.

[8] *Id.*, at vii–viii.

[9] *Id.*, at 12–13.

[10] *Id.*, at 13, Chart I.

[11] Recently issued by the Standing Comm. on Law and Technology of the American Bar Association is the second edition of Computers and the Law (Bigelow ed., N.Y. Commerce Clearing House, Inc., 1969).

[12] Commencing in January 1969, the World Peace Through Law Center has published a monthly journal, Law and Computer Technology. [Beginning with volume 4 (January/February 1971) this journal is issued bi-monthly.]

[13] An example of a university's taking note of the new area is found in the creation of the Rutgers Journal of Computers and the Law, first issued Spring 1970, by the Rutgers Law School.

[14] Freed, *Administrative Law*, in Computers and the Law (2d ed.), *supra* note 11, at 100.

[15] The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (P.L. 601 of the 79th Cong.).

[16] The Joint Comm. on the Organization of the Congress was created by S. Con. Res. No. 2, 89th Cong., 1st Sess.

[17] U.S. Cong., Joint Comm. on the Organization of the Cong., Organization of Congress: Hearings before the Joint Comm. 89th Cong., 2d Sess., pursuant to S. Con. Res. 2 Part 15, Appendix: *Automatic Data Processing for the Congress*, by Robert L. Chartrand, at 2314 (1966).

[18] U.S. Cong., Comm. on Rules, Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970: Report of the Comm. on Rules on H.R. 17654 (91st Cong., 2d Sess., H.R. Rep. No. 91-1215, 1970), at 3.

[19] 116 Cong. Rec. H8880 (daily ed. Sept. 17, 1970) (remarks of Representative Joe D. Waggonner, Jr., during debate on the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970).

[20] U.S. Cong., Comm. on Rules, Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, *supra* note 18, at 11.

[21] During calendar year 1970, CRS received 173, 171 requests for assistance from congressional offices. Information provided by Virgie D. Finley, Administrative Office, Office of the Director, Congressional Research Service.

[22] An excellent treatment of the provisions of the Act affecting committees is found in Kravitz, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970: Summary and Analysis of Provisions Affecting Committees and Committee Staff of the House of Representatives (Wash., D.C., Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, Dec. 28, 1970).

[23] These studies, prepared by Robert L. Chartrand, have appeared as LRS multilithed reports and, in most instances, have been selected for insertion in the Congressional Record or included in committee documentation.

[24] Joe D. Waggonner, Jr. Remarks contained in the transcript of the videofilm presentation at the Fall Joint Computer Conference, Las Vegas, Nevada, November 18, 1969, at 29-30.

[25] U.S. Cong., Comm. on House Administration, *supra* note 5, at 1. Special attention has been given to congressional utilization of Project Lite and the Department of Justice legal information retrieval system called "JURIS" (Justice Retrieval and Inquiry System).

[26] U.S. Cong., Comm. on House Administration, *supra* note 7, at 1. The funds for these contracts were obtained from the House contingency fund through the passage of H. Res. 710 on November 25, 1969.

[27] U.S. Cong., Comm. on House Administration, Special Report of the Special Subcom. on Electrical and Mechanical Office Equipment on a Computerized Addressing and Mail ing System for the House of Representatives (91st Cong., 2d Sess., December 1970).

[28] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 113, pt. 3, p. 3732. (Remarks of Senator Hugh Scott during debate on the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1967).

[29] Andrew J. Glass, *CPR Report/Congress Moves into Computer Age But Divides Control of New Systems*, National Journal (Wash. D.C., Center for Political Research, May 30, 1970), at 1153, n. 22.

[30] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 116, pt. 21, p. 28428. (Remarks of Senator B. Everett Jordan in the Senate, Computer Services).

[31] Information provided by Thomas E. Ladd, Methods and Systems Analyst, Office of the Clerk of the House.

[32] State of the Union message of President Richard M. Nixon, quoted in the Washington Post, January 23, 1971, at A12.

[33] Becker, the Heavenly City of the Eighteenth-Century Philosophers.

LEAD POISONING IN NEW YORK CITY

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, childhood lead poisoning remains the scourge of our Nation's inner cities, claiming the lives of 200 young children each year and afflicting some 400,000 others.

The occurrence of this dread disease in New York City and the actions being undertaken to combat it were presented in an article by Vincent Guinee of the Bureau of Lead Poisoning Control, New York City Health Department, which appeared in the May 1971 edition of "Transactions of the New York Academy of Sciences."

I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

LEAD POISONING IN NEW YORK CITY *

(By Vincent F. Guinee, Bureau of Lead Poisoning Control, New York City Health Department)

PROBLEM

Lead exposure is one of New York City's major pediatric problems. It is estimated that 450,000 apartment units in New York City are in such a state of disrepair that a child living in them will be exposed to the hazard of lead paint poisoning. Approximately 120,000 children are currently living in these dwellings, and it is estimated that 6,000 to 8,000 of these children have significant levels of lead in their blood. Almost all areas of New York City report some lead poisoning cases, because any dwelling with lead-painted interior surfaces can become a source of toxic lead.

Health officials in New York City banned the use of high-content lead paint on indoor surfaces in 1959. However, dangerous buildings containing toxic levels of lead were generally built before World War II. It is in such older buildings that a young child gains access to paint that contains high levels of lead.

Reported deaths due to lead poisoning have dropped sharply over the past ten years in New York City. There were 12 in 1959 and two in 1969. Two deaths attributed to lead poisoning have occurred in 1970. At the same time, the number of lead poisoning cases reported to the Health Department has increased over the last ten years from 171 in 1959 to 727 in 1969. In the first 11 months of this year, approximately 2,500 cases have been discovered.

By our current definition, any child with 0.06 mg per 100 ml of lead in his blood is considered to be a "case." This value is accepted as a significantly abnormal level of lead in the blood. These children as a rule do not have symptoms, but this level of lead in the blood does indicate two things: first, that the child has access to lead in his environment and, second, that the child is taking the lead into his system, probably by eating. This level of blood lead, therefore, signals a potentially harmful situation.

The incidence of lead poisoning cases by month in New York City is presented in Table 1 and Figure 1 (not printed in RECORD). Cases are detected in all months of the year but have come to medical attention more often during the months of May through September. Although the seasonal variation has been the subject of speculation by many authors, the cause is not yet apparent.

Cases of lead poisoning have been found in all health districts of New York City, as is seen in Table 2. There is marked variation in the incidence of lead poisoning among the boroughs of the city and also among the health districts within each borough. It is sobering to compare the incidence of recent cases with reports of ten years ago. Many of the same health districts are still affected.

More cases of lead poisoning are reported among two-year-olds than any other single age (as seen in TABLE 3). The next years most likely to be affected are ages one and three. Few cases occur beyond age five years.

APPROACH

Our approach incorporated several considerations. First, we recognize lead poisoning to be causally related to deteriorating housing. To the best of our knowledge, lead poisoning does not occur in modern, well-kept housing units. The long-term solution will be to replace the deteriorating housing of the inner city with decent housing. This will take time, and in the interim we feel the focus of our approach should be the child who is in danger of lead poisoning today, whose home should be first in line for repair. This child should be protected while society determines how best to solve the housing crisis.

In contrast to the individual-patient approach, which tends to expend program energies on known cases, the Bureau of Lead Poisoning Control has taken responsibility for all cases present in the city. A year or two ago we in essence waited for a child to walk in and declare, "I have pica." Now we actively seek out cases in dim-lit corridors of deteriorating buildings and worry *most* about those cases not yet found.

TABLE 1.—NEW YORK CITY INCIDENCE OF LEAD POISONING CASES BY MONTH, 1969 AND 1970 [1]

	1969	1970
January	71	29
February	58	44
March	50	85
April	59	112
May	85	177
June	84	325
July	77	376
August	72	471
September	55	383
October	43	251
November	33	217
December	40	179
Total	727	2,649

[1] Revised after presentation to include December 1970.

TABLE 2.—INCIDENCE OF LEAD POISONING CASES BY NEW YORK CITY HEALTH DISTRICT

	[1] 1969	[2] 1970
Manhattan total	84	260
Central Harlem	15	89
East Harlem	17	47
Kips Bay-Yorkville	2	1
Lower East Side	11	28
Lower West Side	1	21
Riverside	10	39
Washington eights	5	35
District unknown	23	
Bronx total	210	461
Fordham-Riverdale	7	22
Morrisania	66	204
Mott Haven	85	114
Pelham Bay	1	1

* This paper was presented at a meeting of the Section of Environmental Sciences on December 8, 1970.

	[1] 1969	[2] 1970
Tremont	30	116
Westchester	7	4
District unknown	14	
Brooklyn total	372	1,324
Bay Ridge	1	2
Bedford	101	217
Brownsville	79	331
Bushwick	57	241
Flatbush	9	10
Fort Greene	63	263
Gravesend	1	22
Red Hook-Gowanus	7	95
Sunset Park	6	68
Williamsburg-Greenpoint	11	75
District unknown	37	
Queens total	27	199
Astoria-Long Island City	0	1
Corona	2	28
Flushing	1	8
Jamaica East	10	55
Jamaica West	9	105
Maspeth-Forest Hills	1	2
District unknown	4	
Richmond	2	11
Total	695	2,255

[1] Only those cases where address was known (695/727 cases).
[2] January-October 1970.

TABLE 3.—AGE DISTRIBUTION OF NEW YORK CITY LEAD POISONING CASES, 1969 AND 1970 (THROUGH OCTOBER)

Age—Years	Number of cases		Cumulative percent	
	1969	1970	1969	1970
0		16		0.7
1	120	469	19.3	21.5
2	266	627	63.5	49.3
3	122	409	83.5	67.4
4	58	326	93.0	81.9
5	28	213	96.5	91.3
6	6	105	97.5	96.0
7	7	46	99.0	98.0
8	8	24	100.0	99.1
9 and over		17		99.9
Unknown	112	3		100.0
Total	727	2,255		

We have ignored asking the classical screening question, "Does your child have pica?" and instead stressed the dangerous environment. The information we now seek is: "Do you have a young child who is exposed to a deteriorating housing environment?" We accepted the fact that a history of pica was significant, but we rejected the fact that the absence of such a history was significant in deciding which child should be screened.

We have attempted to remove guilt from the mother of the potentially lead-poisoned child. A child can eat paint chips within minutes, and every two-year-old child is out of sight of its mother, minutes at a time, many times during a single day. By keeping such reality in mind we do not force a woman to put her reputation as a mother on the line when she brings her child to be tested. The last thing we want is for a mother to feel that if her child has an elevated blood lead level she has been proved "scientifically" to be a bad mother.

When the medical community is presented with large numbers of children with elevated lead levels, the diagnosis of lead poisoning can no longer be characterized as a medical-center curiosity. It is now recognized as a practical problem of everyday pediatrics in New York City. The first step in frequent diagnosis is awareness.

In the long run we hope that a blood test for lead poisoning will become part of a routine childhood examination at the child's regular health facility. It is expected that as the prevalence of lead poisoning in the community around a hospital is demonstrated, each hospital in the city will respond by incorporating screening tests into its available services.

PROGRAM

All hospitals in New York City has been called on to screen young children who may have been exposed to deteriorating housing. In addition, 95 permanent facilities for testing are currently in operation, as well as mobile units and special door-to-door neighborhood programs.

When a child in New York City is found to have a lead level of 0.06 mg per 100 ml or greater in his blood, the Health Department notifies the agency or physician submitting the specimen. A Health Department nurse and sanitarian visit the child's home. The nurse discusses the situation with the family and helps them plan for medical care. The sanitarian takes samples of paint and plaster from the apartment to determine sources of lead available to the child. If the laboratory finds any paint samples with more than one per cent lead content, the owner is ordered by the Health Commissioner to correct the condition within five days. If the owner fails to comply, the Emergency Repair Program of the City's Housing and Development Administration is requested to send a repair team to do the work. When the work is done, the owner is billed.

To implement this program, the Bureau of Lead Poisoning Control has approximately 200 people and an annual budget of $2,400,000.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The accomplishments of the Lead Poisoning Control program so far this year are presented in table 4. Nearly 80,000 blood specimens have been analyzed by the Health Department's Bureau of Laboratories. Approximately 2,500 new cases have been uncovered. The apartments of these children have been inspected, and 2,344 lived in some suspicious location, from which a sample of paints was taken for laboratory analysis. Two-thirds of these apartments had at least one location where lead paint was found in excess of the legal limit for lead content. So far this year, almost 1,000 apartments have been repaired by either the landlord or the Emergency Repair Program.

TABLE 4.—NEW YORK CITY HEALTH DEPARTMENT LEAD POISONING CONTROL PROGRAM, JAN. 1, 1970, TO DEC. 1, 1970

Blood specimens analyzed	79,245
Positive cases	2,469
Primary inspections, including supplementary apartments	[1] 2,801
Apartments from which samples taken	2,344
Paint test results reported	2,306
Positive apartments	1,564
Orders sent to landlords	1,528
Reinspections	1,374
Apartments repaired by landlords	208
Assignments to emergency repair program	1,092
Apartments repaired by emergency repair program	759

[1] The figure of 2,801 represents 2,370 primary inspections plus 431 primary inspections of supplemental apartments.

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?

One of the interesting things we have observed might be termed the "effort effect." If one were to spell this out in a law it might go something like this: the appearance of reality varies in proportion to the intensity of observation. As is seen in TABLE 1, toward the latter half of 1970 we were finding six times the number of cases reported in the same period just one year before, and if one were to look for a seasonal peak in 1969, it would have been in May and June, whereas in 1970 it was in August. Geographically as seen in TABLE 2, the Flatbush Health District in Brooklyn had the same number of cases in 1969 and 1970, whereas in the Williamsburg-Greenpoint area cases increased seven times.

The age distribution was also affected. In 1969, 63.5% of all cases were in children under three years of age, whereas in 1970, 49.3% were in this age group. Based on 1969 data, a program concentrating on children through age four years seemed to cover 93% of the cases. Our 1970 data show only 82% of the cases in this age bracket.

One of the most interesting shifts in data that has appeared concerns the distribution of blood lead levels (as seen in TABLE 5). One of the current controversies in the field of lead poisoning centers about the question "What is a normal level of lead?" Some investigators even question: "Is any level of lead normal?" Another way the question can be posed—"What is a lead level high enough to demand medical attention?" In 1969, about 25% of tests showed 50 mg per 100 ml or greater, while in 1970 a total of only 11% were in this range. In 1969, children received blood tests for lead when there was a strong suspicion of lead poisoning. In 1970 they were tested if they lived in an environment that made lead poisoning possible. A third set of percentages, which we do not as yet have, would be taken from children in buildings where lead poisoning is considered unlikely. This latter group should further extend the shift to the lower values.

TABLE 5.—NEW YORK CITY DISTRIBUTION OF LEAD LEVELS IN BLOOD, 1969 [1] AND 1970 (THROUGH JULY)

	Number of specimens		Percent of total	
	1969	1970	1969	1970
Blood level (micrograms):				
10		88		0.2
10	157	2,907	5.9	8.1
20	552	13,007	20.8	36.1
30	738	11,182	27.8	31.0
40	556	4,899	21.0	13.6
50	319	2,092	12.0	5.8
60	156	979	5.9	2.7
70-100	135	838	5.2	2.3
110 and over	35	79	1.4	.2
Total	2,648	36,071	100.0	100.0

[1] Blood levels for coded laboratory slips.

We have gained a new appreciation of the vagaries of definition. If we review statistics from year to year and city to city, epidemiologic patterns are portrayed that differ more in definition than in substance. The study of lead poisoning has been hampered by, and obscured by, semantics. When we speak of a case of lead poisoning, "case" has a connotation of symptoms and "poisoning" has a connotation of damage. Neither is necessarily true. Yet, the phrase "case of lead poisoning," whether it is the Chicago definition of 50 mg or New York City definition of 60 mg per 100 ml, can precipitate the same reaction, and this reaction may or may not be appropriate.

For example, 60 μg has been chosen as an apparently safe cut-off point, but we use it as a threshold in defining a case. Now, some children with levels of 40 or 50 μg develop levels of 60 by the time of retesting. If we recognize 60 as a safe level, this is acceptable. If we regard 60 as an area of damage it is not acceptable. In deciding the question of how often a child with a level 40 μg should be retested, we must keep in mind what we are retesting for: the possibility that a child may reach the other side of an administrative cut-off point or that he is in danger of harm.

Another term even less well defined is "recurrence." Several investigators have spoken of almost 100% permanent damage resulting from a recurrence of lead poisoning. As might be imagined, this refers to a symptomatic recurrence, most often with a definite neurologic component. Permanent damage cannot now be predicted on the basis of a fluctuation of the blood level, though we may now administratively consider a specific fluc-

tuation to be a recurrence. The definition that will distinguish between an asymptomatic recurrence and a meaningless fluctuation of the blood lead level has not yet been determined.

When a child returns to a hospital with an elevated blood level, after treatment has resulted in a lower level the physician most often terms the situation a "reexposure." The connotation of reexposure suggests an external causal factor, the home environment that still harbors lead, thus reexposing the child. Yet it is very possible that in at least some instances the source of lead is the child's own bones. Treatment has simply cleansed the blood of its lead content, which is soon replenished by the process of equilibration with bone. The connotation the scientific community sees in the word reexposure will determine the possible preventive and therapeutic actions to be taken under consideration.

WHAT IS THERE YET TO LEARN?

If we look to the future and consider what is yet to be learned our questions fall into two categories—concerning the child and his environment. One wide area for research must deal with how the individual child reacts to his lead burden—to determine answers to such questions as: How does the prognosis of his condition vary with blood level and age of onset? Is it feasible to attempt to measure psychological damage secondary to lead ingestion? Which child should receive treatment, and what is the satisfactory end-point of that treatment? How do we assess the child's environment? Paint is put on one layer at a time. It is removed and ingested 15 or 20 layers at a time. How do we reasonably measure the hazard and enforce the law?

The staff of the Bureau of Lead Poisoning Control is optimistic. We feel if the medical profession is aware and if society knows, steps will be taken toward solving these problems. The combined efforts of city planners, economists, and physical and social scientists will be needed.

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF NATIONALIST CHINA

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the Bronx County Committee of the New York State Conservative Party recently passed a resolution in support of retention of Nationalist China in the United Nations.

I have expressed my strong feelings on this subject in the past. If the United Nations is to be any sort of an international organization at all, it cannot exclude Nationalist China. Moreover, Taiwan was one of the founding members of that body. If Nationalist China should be excluded, then this country will have to seriously consider its continued membership in the UN.

For the benefit of my colleagues I will include the resolution at this point in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Republic of China, under the leadership of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-Shek, has been a faithful, effective and persevering ally of the United States during and since the time of the Second World War, and

Whereas the Republic of China, as a Charter member of the United Nations, has fulfilled its obligations to that organization with the greatest dignity and integrity, and

Whereas the recent change in the policy of the United States in regard to the Government of Communist China has already wrought grievous damage to the cause of the struggle against Communist aggression in every part of the world,

Resolved that the Bronx County Committee of the New York State Conservative Party calls upon the President of the United States to declare without delay that the exclusion of Free China from the United Nations would be followed by the immediate withdrawal of the United States of America from that organization; and, should such exclusion nevertheless ensue, that the President proceed forthwith to implement this declaration.

PRISONERS OF WAR

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, it is my solemn obligation to bring to the attention of the Members of the U.S. Congress, and the entire Nation, that it is now 7 years and 206 days since the first American servicemen were captured in Indochina to be held as prisoners of war under the ruthless Communists of South Vietnam, North Vietnam, and the Vietcong. It is the duty of the U.S. Congress to declare their concern for the defenders of their country by insisting upon securing the end of their imprisonment.

It is now obvious that any indication on the part of Hanoi that they are willing to agree upon terms for the release of American prisoners is a sham. During the past 3 years of talks in Paris, the Communists have merely used the American prisoners as their pawns in attempting to persuade the United States to negotiate under terms favorable to the Communist objectives. It is time for the media, the President, and every public official to concentrate full attention on this issue and denounce the pretense of the Communists. These hardened war criminals, who are negotiating on a take-it-or-leave-it basis with the full support of both Moscow and Peking, will cruelly exploit our American prisoners whenever and wherever it gives them the advantage. The American people are appealing to the Members of Congress to bring their men home and we must stop allowing this Government to be misled by the smooth-tongued proposals of this hardened enemy.

Mr. Speaker, let me recount the experience of the French in dealing with the Communists. At the 1954 Geneva Conference, with the Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities in Vietnam, the French and Vietminh set a deadline for the liberation of all prisoners of war 30 days after the effective cease-fire date. The French released 65,477 Vietminh POW's. The Vietminh offered to return only 9,138 French Union POW's while French sources claimed 40,172 of their personnel were missing. Eight years later, on November 17, 1962, Radio Hanoi reported the North Vietnamese regime had approved a French plan to repatriate and transport French Union POW's. Only a hundred-odd personnel were then released. The Library of Congress study of this matter concluded:

Taking even the lowest estimate of missing French personnel and the highest estimate of released POW's would still leave the fate of more than 20,000 missing French Union forces unaccounted for.

My colleagues, for the sake of the families of these captive Americans, let us pray fervently and continuously for the safety and protection of their loved ones, but, at the same time, let us not base our hopes for their safe return of unrealistic thinking.

PRAYER AMENDMENT

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the House shortly will have an opportunity to vote on the prayer amendment to the Constitution as a result of a completed discharge petition.

I was an early signer of that petition because I believed and still believe that there must be decisive action if we are to overcome the current maze of misunderstandings and legal maneuvers.

There are some who seem to feel we are stuck with the narrow court decisions on prayer which have been broadly interpreted.

I do not believe we are—in fact, I believe that is exactly where Congress has a responsibility to step into the picture.

We need to act to bring order out of utter chaos, making it crystal clear that no one's rights are endangered by our action but, rather, that everyone's rights are being insured.

Mr. Speaker, the general director of the National Association of Evangelicals, Clyde W. Taylor, has laid out the issue in its simplest form in a letter which I include with my remarks:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EVANGELICALS,
Washington, D.C., October 15, 1971.

Hon. THADDEUS DULSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DULSKI: The U.S. Supreme Court decision concerning prayer and Bible reading in the public school has been a live issue for the past nine years. The concerted effort to get corrective action through legislation has varied but the public has had a sustained interest in a Prayer Amendment since 1962.

Contrary to what is usually reported the "practices at issue" which the Court found to be unconstitutional were voluntary on the part of the participants. Justice Douglas was careful to note this in both of his concurring opinions. In the *Engel* case he said:

". . . there is no element of compulsion or coercion in New York's regulations . . . No student is compelled to take part . . . Provision is also made for excusing children . . . from saying the prayer or from the room in which the prayer is said . . . Students can stand mute or even leave the classroom, if they desire."

Again in the *Schempp* decision Justice Douglas noted:

"In these cases we have no coercive religious exercise aimed at making the students conform. The prayers announced are not compulsory . . . coercion, if it be present has not been shown."

So the "practices at issue" were outlawed because they were "religious" and not because anyone was forced to participate. In the light of this many have pressed for administrative and legal decisions which border on the ridiculous.

In the absence of any protest by parent or child, little children in Public School 184 (Queens, N.Y.) were forbidden to say, "God is great, God is good, and we thank Him for our food" before they ate. The same prohibition was imposed upon the students in DeKalb, Ill., with another nursery rhyme without the name of God in it because it sounded like a prayer. Both cases were upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court.

The Washington Star commenting on the DeKalb case said editorially:

"There was a good bit of speculation a few years ago about the lengths of absurdity to which the court might go after its initial attack on the recitation of prayers in public schools. Now we know. Its ruling in this case is the end of the line."

But the Star was wrong. Several subsequent decisions have gone further. In Netcong, N.J., high school students have been forbidden to voluntarily meet before school started to hear a prayer read from the Congressional Record. The Supreme Court of New Jersey also ruled unconstitutional a similar arrangement in Leyden, Mass., for prayer outside of school hours.

Equally absurd, we think, is the suit to enjoin the traditional erection of a Creche on the Elipse each year at Christmas time and a plethora of other cases which seem to be an expansion of the doctrine established by the Supreme Court in the prayer and Bible reading decisions.

The primary interest most of us have in this matter is to see religious freedom restored. It may well be that prayer and Bible reading no longer has a useful place in the public schools if it ever did. But that is not the point. To outlaw everything that is "religious" we believe is wrong if the "free exercise" clause of the First Amendment means anything at all. Yet that seems to be the construction that is put upon the *Engel* and *Schempp* decisions by the courts at all levels. We sincerely believe that corrective action is necessary and overdue.

The drafting of a language for a Prayer Amendment is very difficult, but we believe you legislators are capable of refining the wording of the currently proposed Amendment if need be. The substance of it reads as follows:

"Nothing contained in this constitution shall abridge the right of persons lawfully assembled, in any public building which is supported in whole or in part through the expenditure of public funds, to participate in nondenominational prayer."

The word "nondenominational" seems to confuse a lot of people and we think it might be deleted altogether without changing the intent of the Amendment. If a qualifying adjective is considered desirable the word "corporate" would probably be less controversial than "nondenominational." The sole issue of the legislation is the exercise of freedom. It is not a question of whether people should or should not pray, or how they pray, but their freedom to pray under appropriate conditions and circumstances.

If enacted the proposed Amendment will restore the freedom of persons to pray in public places when and if it is appropriate. It will leave absolutely undisturbed the freedoms secured by the First Amendment and the entire Bill of Rights.

It will not promote or inhibit prayer by anyone.

It will not impose responsibility upon any public official or individual to pray or not to pray.

It will not require anyone at any time or place to initiate or supervise prayer.

It will not deprive anyone of any rights or privileges he now enjoys.

As everyone knows such legislation cannot become law until it has been ratified by three-fourths of the states. Every poll taken on the subject during the past nine years has indicated an approximate 3 to 1 majority in favor of the Prayer Amendment notwithstanding the rather large number of religious leaders who are voicing opinions contrary to their constituency. Congress has an obligation to let the people decide the issue by the due process provision of amending the Constitution. Surely this should never be done hastily or without due consideration, but there is no other issue on the current scene that has had as long or a more sustained interest by the public than the Prayer Amendment.

There is no other level at which this matter can be resolved. The U.S. Supreme Court seems adamant. Scores of attempts have been undertaken at the state and school board levels to devise a way whereby the need could be met within the structures imposed by the courts but to no avail. Just recently the Pennsylvania Senate unanimously passed a bill that would permit brief periods of silent prayer or meditation in the public schools. This is being strongly opposed by the ACLU which contends that the measure is "patently unconstitutional." In opposing the bill, the ACLU said the New Jersey Supreme Court held an almost identical law to be unconstitutional in 1970 and the U.S. Supreme Court refused to review its decision.

It is hoped that you will not only support the Prayer Amendment with your vote but that you will also contribute your expertise as a legislator and persuasive speaker to encourage other support as well.

Sincerely yours,

CLYDE W. TAYLOR,
General Director, National Association of Evangelists.

THE HUMAN COST OF COMMUNISM IN CHINA

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, with the debate on the admission of Red China beginning today in the United Nations, the American public has an excellent opportunity to judge the degree of responsibility, or lack thereof, of the various member nations of that international body. While the possible expulsion of the Nationalist Government and the "two-China" policy of the United States both obscure the basic issue of whether the barbarous regime of Red China should be brought into the United Nations, it remains to be seen how many nations will accentuate the bloody history of the Red leaders against the unfortunate Chinese people. While the barbarity of Hitler and the Nazis against the Jewish people is universally recognized and emphasized, and rightfully so, the genocide of Mao and his cohorts is suspiciously ignored in some circles.

The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee recently released a timely study by Dr. Richard L. Walker, an expert on China, on the price the Chinese people have paid for their "liberation" since the 1949 takeover by the Reds. This report, obtainable from the subcommittee free of charge or from the Superintendent of Documents at the Government Printing Office at a nominal price, outlines the basic reason why admitting the Red regime to the U.N. is a mockery of the U.N. Charter. This report was summarized by Human Events, the Washington weekly which expertly covers the field of current events, in a special supplement entitled, "The Case Against Red China," featuring various arguments by experts on the China question. The Walker report, plus the Human Events special supplement, offer ample material to prove why Red China's admission to the U.N. is fraught with danger for the free nations of the world and could possibly signal the beginning of the end for this international body supposedly dedicated to the pursuit of world peace.

I insert at this point the article "The Human Cost of Communism in China" from the recent Human Events special supplement, "The Case Against Red China":

THE HUMAN COST OF COMMUNISM IN CHINA: MAO TSE-TUNG'S BLOODY RECORD OF RED DESPOTISM REVEALED

NOTE.—At the initiative of the late Sen. Thomas J. Dodd of Connecticut, the Senate Internal Security subcommittee requested Prof. Richard L. Walker, a lifetime student of Chinese affairs, to prepare a study on "The Human Cost of Communism in China." Prof. Walker, who serves as the distinguished director of the Institute of International Studies at the University of South Carolina, has produced a scholarly piece of work that is particularly timely in view of the President's proposed journey to Peking. The study, we think, is a useful antidote to so many of the journalistic accounts now emanating from Mainland China which come close to exalting the Red Chinese regime. (Excerpts from the Walker report follow.)

On July 1, 1971, the Chinese Communist party celebrated half a century of existence. These five turbulent decades have been filled with prodigious changes, but also with weighty tragedy for great numbers of the inhabitants of the Middle Kingdom. It can be doubted whether the 12 young revolutionary idealists who gathered in a girls' school in Shanghai in 1921 to set their party in motion could have foreseen the impact which their actions would have upon China.

One of the 12, Mao Tse-tung, was to occupy the center of the stage in the Chinese Communist movement for more than 35 years. During the period of protracted conflict which led the Communists to power, Mao was, in many respects, the Lenin of China. Shortly after accession as chairman of the People's Republic of China in 1949, Mao's role seemed to take on more of the characteristics of a Stalin.

MAO STALIN PARALLEL

This parallel with the Stalin era deserves our sober attention. Aspects of it are uncomfortably precise. There has been the same monumental inhumanity and the same commitment to political terror as a means of crushing the opposition. There is an aura of mystery surrounding the activities and whereabouts of the "great supreme commander"; the cult of personality has at times reached ridiculous extremes; his whims and arbitrary decisions have made his associates tremble and have caused untold suffering for his people.

There has been the intellectual isolationism of his country, now a great bulwark and fortress for the spreading of *his* truth. And, above all, there has been distrust and suspicion focused against the very people who could help to gain support for the leader and

and aid the progress of the country: the intellectuals and students.

There is yet another aspect of the parallel between the Mao and Stalin periods deserving of attention—the treatment of their rule among the scholars and journalists in the outside world.

It is difficult for many to remember the praise heaped upon Stalin in the 1930s, but we are made acutely aware of the fascination with Chairman Mao, through a surfeit of scholarly and journalistic attention which helps to build his cult and his image as a sort of superman. It is not surprising that Stalin is still a great hero in Communist China. (His picture was prominently displayed in Peking on Oct. 1, 1970, the 21st anniversary of the People's Republic of China.)[1]

For more than two decades those few voices in the West who attempted to call attention to the realities of Stalin's terror were drowned out by the strident chords of praise sung by the "intellectuals" in the outside world who were fascinated with the grandiose experiments in the "land of socialism."

Those who called attention to the mass executions or to the facts of slave labor or to the incredible cost of collectivization were frequently ridiculed or demeaned; it was asserted they did not seem to understand that some sacrifices have to be made for revolutionary progress. Even the show trials of the great purges were pronounced as signs of growing democracy.

Such myopia seems almost incredible to us today in the wake of subsequent revelations from the USSR itself, the outpourings of works like those of Solzhenitsyn, and the wealth of refugee testimony which became available after World War II.

But it was the Khrushchev "Secret Speech" of February 1956 which really jolted those who had for decades apologized ritualistically for crimes against humanity in the Soviet state. The American Stalin Prize winner, Howard Fast, was moved to deep soul-searching:

"It is a strange and awful document, perhaps without parallel in history; and one must face the fact that it itemizes a record of barbarism and paranoid bloodlust that will be a lasting and shameful memory to civilized man. . . .

"Where I failed miserably and where I swear by all that is holy that I will not fail again, was . . . [in failing] to see that . . . to abandon the holy right of man to his own conscience, his own dignity, his right to say what he pleases, to speak freely and boldly for the truth as he sees the truth—and fearing no man, whether right or wrong—is no victory at all . . . I knew that writers and artists and scientists were intimidated, but I accepted this as a necessity for socialism. . . .

"This I can never accept again—and never again can I accept as a just practice under socialism that which I know to be unjust. . . . Never again will I remain silent when I can recognize injustice—regardless of how that injustice may be wrapped in the dirty linen of expediency or necessity. Never again will I accept the 'clever' rationale, which appears to make sense but under scrutiny does not."

Howard Fast's statements in 1956 make an eloquent point of departure and a warning for those who might still be tempted to hold up double standards—those who are prone to excuse the crimes and terror practiced against humans in the name of socialism and yet are in the forefront in fighting other injustices.

NAIVE SCHOLARS

Fast also centered in on some of the very items which tend to set humans apart from other living creatures—the independence of the human intellect, the striving for freedom, and the standards of decency and individuality which dare not be sacrificed.

The China scholars in the West have not yet had the equivalent of a Khrushchev "Secret Speech" detailing Mao's many crimes against his fellow Chinese and Communist comrades. Perhaps for this reason many still harbor those same sentiments which caused the Howard Fasts to ignore Soviet realities in Stalin's time; but surely the accumulated evidence as well as the example from the Soviet experience should give pause.

For the sake of the Socialist "higher goals" many of these scholars have been prone to excuse massive injustices on the questionable assumption that these injustices were only temporary.

Since the founding of the People's Republic of China, not a few American "Chinawatchers" have hastened into print to denounce Chiang Kai-shek's government for this or that injustice, such as the imprisonment of Lai Chen, the editor of *Free China* in September 1960 (the author joined in protesting what seemed to be a clear case of political persecution). But those same "Chinawatchers" have turned admiring eyes on the Chinese Communists and have either remained silent about some of the human costs described in the pages which follow, or have rationalized that these are a necessary part of some vague "inevitable" Chinese revolution.

With good reason the People's Republic of China (PRC) has been called "the largest enterprise in the history of mankind." The problems of adjusting the world's longest lived, richest and most traditional culture to the demands of the age of the computer, atomic energy or jet aircraft are indeed unprecedented for any regime. These, too, are factors that have weighed heavily in the minds of intellectual sympathizers.

Further, there is the factor of the guilt complex of the Western world toward China because of the period of imperialism in China. This has tended to make many Western observers more inclined to suspend judgment of the Chinese Communists and to hold to those double standards which for so long blinded the outside world to the realities of the Soviet system. And yet, can the world ignore the monumental human cost of Mao's China or its Stalinoid features, especially since the "Great Leap Forward" of 1958?

It is my considered judgment, after following Communist China closely for more than two decades, that the cost of progress achieved under Communist rule is too high for the conscience of the world to absolve its perpetrators. In terms of destruction of moral and cultural values this cost cannot be condoned by any rationalization. The high Chinese Communist party leaders who sit down at convivial banquets with visiting Americans may be guilty of as great crimes against humanity and their own people as were Hitler and Stalin and their followers.

On the eve of the final Communist victory in China in 1949, Mao Tse-tung paused on the 28th anniversary of the founding of the CCP to survey the past and plot the future. The first 28 years had seen the party single-mindedly, through reverses and successes, pursue its one overriding goal—the capture of state power.

In his commemorative work *On the People's Democratic Dictatorship*, Mao promised to continue in the path which had brought success. He warned that the "people's army, people's police, and the people's courts" would be used to defend the dictatorship which was being established and to aid with the completion of the revolution.

DICTATORSHIP DEFINED

In this work Mao defined "the people" who were to be exercising the dictatorship as consisting of four classes: the peasants, the proletariat, the national bourgeoisie, and the petite bourgeoisie—all under the leadership of the "working class and the Communist party." All others were, in an Orwellian sense, "unpeople." And he warned that the latter, whom he termed "reactionaries," were to have no rights and that if "they speak or act in an unruly way they will be promptly stopped and punished. . . ."

In one of his earliest published works in March 1927, Mao had warned: "A revolution is not a dinner party, or writing an essay, or painting a picture, or doing embroidery: it cannot be so refined, so leisurely and gentle, so temperate, kind, courteous, restrained and magnanimous."

He continued that for the revolution to succeed, "To put it bluntly, it is necessary to create terror for a while in every rural area. . . ." The leader of the Communist party of China was a good Stalinist who believed in the efficacy of terror for the sake of the ultimate goal.

In 1949 the Chinese people were indeed deserving of peace and an opportunity to unify and reconstruct their ravaged country. The more than two decades of Communist power, however, have brought no surcease to struggle, violence, warfare, or misery for China.

There have been external wars such as in Korea (1950-53), with India (1962), and along the Soviet borders (1969); there have been formidable conflicts with areas where minority nationalities are situated, particularly in Tibet where hostilities assumed major proportions in 1959 and have continued sporadically since; there have been the struggles waged in the wake of the Cultural Revolution, such as that in Kwangsi in the summer of 1968 where an estimated 50,000 were killed in the city of Wuchow alone.

But perhaps even more tragic has been the pattern of rule which Mao and his fellow Communists have used to bring about political control of the Chinese people and the development of power for the Chinese state. Since 1949 China has been subjected to a pattern of wave after wave of mass campaigns breaking upon the countryside and only gradually receding.

The naming of some of these campaigns is enough to evoke apprehension among refugees in Hong Kong, where a minimum of two million Chinese have moved to escape from Chinese Communist rule.

---

[1] It is probably not inaccurate to say that a great number of China specialists in the West have been almost as instrumental in building up the image of Mao the superman as were the Soviet specialists who analyzed Stalin's supposed brilliance in the 1930s. The Stalin-like features of Mao Tse-tung have been brilliantly analyzed by Arthur H. Cohen. See *Problems of Communism*, 15.5 (Sept.–Oct., 1966), pp. 8–16 and 16.2 (Mar.–Apr., 1967), pp. 97–9. Cohen clearly has the better logical and academic position in an exchange with Stuart R. Schram, a Mao biographer and contributor to the image of the all-wise leader. The Western "analysts" of Chairman Mao frequently devote page after page to explorations of the workings of his mind in such a way as to indicate that he thinks in all fields and solidly at least 72 hours per day. The frequent visitor to Communist China and a semi-official biographer of Mao, Edgar Snow, has through his writings and reporting been probably the chief contributor to the romanticized view of Mao as a humanist revolutionary concerned about the fate of mankind. Snow hardly deigns to mention the almost constant persecution of creative intellectuals by a Mao who has been grasped up into the cortex of his own infallibility. As Cohen has noted in the second of the pieces cited: "Most totalitarian rulers (including Hitler, Stalin and Mao) have justified their actions—to others, and no doubt to themselves—in terms of some greater good which their actions would supposedly bring to their subjects. What Mao shares with Hitler, however, is the frank and explicit rejection of 'humanism' as a motive or goal for his policies."

There was the Agrarian Reform of 1949–52 which brought about the execution of several million landlords.

Then came the campaign against counterrevolutionaries of 1951–52 during the first 12 months of which it was estimated that one and one-half million were executed.

The three-anti and five-anti campaigns of 1951–53 purged the business, finance and industrial circles with executions and a wave of suicides. All of these were linked to bandit suppression campaigns from 1949 to 1956.

In connection with the purge of Kao Kang and Jao Shushih in 1955, Mao launched yet another campaign against "hidden counterrevolutionaries" in 1955. Following this, he moved on yet another front with a drive for collectivization of the peasants in "agricultural producers' cooperatives" which he demanded be completed by the end of the First Stalin-type Five-Year Plan (1953–57). It was at the end of this period that he finally persuaded the intellectuals and others who had joined in the united front of 1949 to speak up and voice criticisms in the spring of 1957. Their vehemence against the Communist party and Mao's leadership resulted in an anti-rightist campaign which terrorized China during the ninth and tenth years of Communist rule, and fused into the "Great Leap" of 1958–1959.

PUBLIC EXECUTIONS

Millions were executed in the immediate post-power seizure period in Communist China. Many of the executions took place after mass public trials, in which the assembled crowds, whipped up to a frenzy by planted agitators, called invariably for the death penalty and for no mercy for the accused.

The first example below is of public trials which took place in Peking (as, indeed, in all major cities in Mainland China) during the spring of 1951. It is taken from the China Missionary Bulletin, a Hong Kong monthly, of May 1951 and quotes extensively from the official Chinese Communist sources:

MASS MURDERS IN PEKING

The bloody terrorism erupted in Peking on March 24 and 25, and was imitated immediately by other large cities. A terrifying mass display was staged on the 24th of March under the slumbering trees of the Central Park in Peking. According to the Communist report, more than 5,000 people were present, representatives of political parties, of factories, commercial firms, religions, schools, etc. The band of "anti-revolutionaries," those to be executed, were led to the meeting to be charged publicly. Thus the typical *K'ung su hui*, so widespread in the countryside, appeared in a slightly different guise in the large cities.

Here, instead of accusations arising from the masses, they were made by the mayor of Peking and the various department heads of the city government. With each speech the bitter hatred was blown more white hot. In all, the meeting lasted five hours. At the end the mayor of Peking, P'ang Cheu, again stood before the emotionally worked-up audience and in a dramatic speech asked them to pass sentence: "Comrades, what should we do with all these criminals, bandits, secret agents, evil landlords, heads of reactionary Taoist sect organizers?"

The crowd unanimously roared "Shoot them!"

The mayor continued: "Should we have mercy on them?"

"No mercy!" the crowd shouted back.

The mayor commented: "Truly, no mercy for them. If we would pardon them, that would be a sin on the part of the government."

The next question was: "Is it cruelty to execute all these criminals?"

The answer came back: "It is not cruelty!"

The mayor commented: "Truly it is not cruelty. It is mercy. We are protecting the lives of the people whom they harm."

The last question was put: "Comrades, are they right or are we right?"

And the last answer: "We are right," started the cheering for the mayor and Mao Tse-tung.

The mayor concluded: "We are here representing the people. It is our duty to do the will of the people. We suppress the anti-revolutionaries. This act we perform according to the law. Those who have to be killed, we kill. In cases where we could kill or not, we do not kill. But when it has to be killing, we kill. . . . Now you all want them to be suppressed. Tomorrow the court will pronounce the judgment and they will be executed." (*Jen Min Daily*, March 25, 1951.)

The next day a big meeting was held outside the city walls (although it is not clear who were present) and the executions took place and were broadcast over the radio. (*Jen Min Daily*, April 3.)

TRIAL OF "LANDLORDS"

The second example comes from an official Chinese Communist book distributed in English to the outside world in 1951. It is Peking's version of one of the trials of the "landlords" whom Mao had decreed should be eliminated as a class. The executions of many innocents in the countryside were also accomplished through mass meetings and demonstrations.

With raised fists, the audience below shouted in one voice, "Down with reactionary landords!" "We demand that Peng Ehruhu be shot!"

The masses again shouted in unison. "Down with criminal landlords who hide and disperse their properties!" "Long live the unity of the peasants!"

It had started raining. But the tense atmosphere did not in any way lessen . . .

By four o'clock over 20 peasants had poured out their grievances from the platform. Mass sentiment had surged to the boiling point. Over and above there was a curious hush of expectancy. Not one person left or took shelter in spite of the terrific downpour.

(Then the people's tribunal met to deliberate.)

"Peasant comrades!" The judge's voice was grave. "We have just heard some of the accusations made by local peasants. From these accusations, it ought to be clear to everyone how the landlord class has always worked hand in glove with the enemy of the peasants—whether it was Japanese imperialism or the KMT [Kuomintang]—to oppress the peasants themselves. The same motive has prompted them to act as fawning lackeys to American imperialism, since American imperialism is directly opposite to the people's interests too.

"Our verdicts on the three criminal landlords are as follows: . . . Pen Yinting, age 49, native of Hsinlu Village, has caused the deaths of patriotic youths during the Resistance War. After liberation he organized superstitious societies and spread rumors to delude the public. Also he has hidden firearms with the intent to plan for an uprising. The sentence for him is—death. Do you all agree?

The sound of applause that came from below the platform was deafening. . . .

With one arm sheltering his tear-stained face, Pen Yin-ting was hurried along. . . . When Grandma Li, with her bony fist clenched, edged her way through the crowds and tried to hit him on the shoulder, the guards immediately stopped her. A cordon was quickly formed by them around the prisoners as more blows were about to shower from all directions. . . .

The prisoners were escorted to the graveyard south of the temple. From the back of the graveyard came the sound of several shots.

The sound shrilly pierced through the thick, moist atmosphere enveloping Huiling hsiang. Sights of relief were heaved as justice was meted out to the convicted.

"Down with the reactionary landlords!"

"Long live the emancipation of the peasants!"

"Long live the Communist party!"

"Long live Chairman Mao Tse-tung!"

The masses, for the first time freed from their dread and restraints, let out these slogans with a voice stronger than ever.

The third account of the mass executions which have characterized Communist rule is of particular significance because it was written by one of the leaders who initially participated in Mao's coalition government and after several years escaped to Hong Kong.

The gates of the Public Security opened, and out came a police truck with about 20 policemen standing on it, guns in hand, followed by 20-odd trucks, carrying prisoners and four police guards each. The trucks went slowly past our hostel, and I saw that every prisoner had been stripped to his pants and had his wrists tied behind his back. They were crouching on the trucks, still and lifeless, and, at first glance, gave one the impression of so many pigs going to slaughter. The loudspeakers began to boom, "Shoot the counterrevolutionaries" and the crowd shouted and clapped. All around me, people were calmly chatting and laughing. After the trucks went by, the huge crowd closed in after them and followed them to the execution ground.

That day, more than 400 so-called counterrevolutionaries were shot. I did not go to the execution ground, but I was told that the place was packed, and that after each execution, the crowd, under direction, applauded.

That night, I borrowed a copy of Dickens' *A Tale of Two Cities* from another member of the Mission who happened to be a writer. As I read, I could understand why it was possible for the French to derive pleasure from killing. They hated the French aristocracy. But what I had seen that day was different. The masses had no quarrel with those who were executed, yet they shouted and applauded the government-sponsored massacre. I think in their hearts they must have been frightened.

During this early period Mao and his colleagues made no effort to conceal the violent course being followed. On the contrary, the most gruesome and detailed accounts were printed in the Communist press and broadcast over the official radio for the purpose of amplifying the condition of mass terror the trials were clearly intended to induce.

GREAT LEAP FORWARD

The second decade of Chinese Communist rule began in the midst of the "Great Leap Forward." This mobilized tens of millions of the Chinese to smelt iron in primitive and ineffective backyard furnaces (a testament of the Chairman's ignorance of the modern scientific world) and sought to push the Chinese peasants into communal-type militarized living replete with, in some cases, separation of sexes and families, communal dining halls, and abandonment of all personal and family items.

The human cost of this grandiose Maoist scheme in terms of wasted energy and resources, suffering and death can probably never be reckoned. Not surprisingly, even this found apologists in the West, including Edgar Snow, who claimed that the movement was spontaneous and voluntary on the part of the Chinese peasantry and people and that it was a success in terms of teaching modernization as well as productivity.

In 1965–66 Mao launched yet another great campaign, the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, which lasted until 1969. This, too, brought in its wake executions, purges and terror.

This brief recounting of the Maoist "rule by drives" is enough to make one marvel at the resilience of the Chinese people. Already in 1959 there were estimates that the first decade of the People's Republic of China had brought the extermination of 30 million people. The additional cost in casualties and suffering since the Great Leap Forward and the Cultural Revolution have yet to be measured.

The table above offers in extremely rough form, possible parameters of the estimates of the direct cost in human lives occasioned by the movement which Mao and 11 others started in 1921 to "liberate" the Chinese people. It is entirely possible that a reasonable estimate would be that the figure approaches 50 million Chinese—also members of the human race.

The question which must concern us also is not whether this or that figure is exaggerated, but the extent to which mass unstructured killings have been and continue to be a part of the mode of rule in Communist China.

What sort of rule is this which occasions the execution of untold numbers of young people, such as those whose bodies floated into Hong Kong in 1968 and again in 1970? Where is the consistency of apologists who maintain that the rule of Mao has brought new spirit to China, and then argue about the disfigured, tortured and bound bodies floating into Hong Kong, that the Chinese have always been that way?

It is worth remembering that at the very moment in June 1971, when reporters were commenting on Mao Tse-tung's creation of the new Chinese man (see, for example, Seymour Topping's dispatches in the New York *Times*), troops of the People's Liberation Army were machine-gunning scores of their fellow Chinese who were attempting to escape to Hong Kong from Mao's new paradise.

Many of the youth drowned in the attempt, and others—the few—who made it told stories which were reported in the Hong Kong press, but were omitted in the euphoria that surrounded the first American direct access to Communist China for journalists and a few specialists in more than two decades. The number of casualties occasioned by attempts to flee China, though not included in the preceding table, cannot be considered insignificant.

The correspondent of the Baltimore *Sun* reported from Hong Kong on Sept. 19, 1970, that yet a new wave of public executions and show trials was in progress again in Mainland China. There were a few futile signs of resistance to the high cost that the Chinese people were paying for Communist rule.

One of the most interesting was the arrival in Hong Kong in the spring of 1970 of some bamboo flutes for sale in the British Crown Colony. The workmen who made the flutes in Kweichow had carved some traditional verses in classical calligraphy on them. As Stanley Karnow noted, the flutes reflect "the feeling of quiet desperation that must grip sensitive, educated Chinese striving to survive amid the turmoil convulsing Communist China." One of the poems reflected a reaction to Communist violence and terror:

"That I was born into this world is too foolish.

"Turning my head towards my motherland, I am overcome with grief and despair,

"I came to this world to create but am stifled.

"I seek to become a monk and cannot.

"Who can see my silent weeping in the darkness?"

Surely one of the high human costs which the Chinese people have paid for rule by the Communist party has been the system of "Reform Through Labor Service," a euphemism for forced labor or slave labor. This has been a part of the Chinese Communist political system from the outset, though the formal 77 regulations—worked out with the aid of Soviet "experts" sent by Stalin—were not drawn up until June 27, 1952 and not officially promulgated until Aug. 26, 1954.

During the early years Peking talked quite openly about this system, which it was confident would help to remold the class character of those former enemies whom it hoped to "save."

On the score of forced labor, as with casualties, figures are imprecise. The United Nations' report of 1955 listed some 20 to 25 million in regular labor camps and another 12.5 million in corrective labor camps. One scholar in the West estimated the number at about 14 million in 1954.

It is probable that the Chinese forced labor camps have exacted a higher toll in human life than the mass executions—as Robert Conquest has shown to be demonstrably the case in the Soviet Union.

Food supplies and the precarious nature of life in China anyway hardly offered hope for decent treatment for slave laborers. Reporters who visited the Chinese mainland from the United States in the spring and summer of 1971 and were entertained at sumptuous banquets by an affable Chou-En-lai were hardly likely to raise the impolite question of slave labor or the arbitrary movement of personnel to forced labor brigades. But escapees give an almost constant stream of gruesome details about the system, for those who are inclined to listen.

There is general agreement that in our quest for peace and security we must, perforce, deal with the Chinese Communists. But in doing so, it is important that we not allow a temporary tactic or a Chou-En-lai smile to obscure our understanding that the top leaders of the Chinese Communist party remain committed to their faith and to their past record.

In a dinner party with American correspondents in Peking on June 21, 1971, Chou argued that the American protective shield should be withdrawn from Taiwan so that the Taiwan problem could be solved as a strictly internal manner. He assured his guests that no revenge would be inflicted on the mainlanders in Taiwan who would be permitted to return to their homes, and he was quoted as saying, "Far from exacting revenge on them, we will reward them."

Such words sound convincing to those Americans who are anxious to disengage from responsibilities in the Western Pacific and who have short memories. But these were just the terms which Chou-En-lai and Mao Tse-tung promised to the former Nationalists and third-party intellectuals who joined the Communists on their accession to power in 1949; yet they were among the first victims who are now statistics in the sobering table of casualties given here.

These, too, were the terms which Mao offered in the "Hundred Flowers" period of 1957; yet in the anti-rightist campaign which followed, a vindictive revenge was exacted.

Would this same Chinese Communist leadership whose record has been detailed above be likely to behave in any different manner once they had, by their current soft line, won the very concession from the United States which they have sought for two decades by a hard line?

CASUALTIES TO COMMUNISM IN CHINA

	Range of estimates	
1. First Civil War (1927–36)	250,000	500,000
2. Fighting during Sino-Japanese War (1937–45)	50,000	50,000
3. Second Civil War (1945–49)	1,250,000	1,250,000
4. Land reform prior to "Liberation"	500,000	1,000,000
5. Political Liquidation Campaigns (1949–58)	15,000,000	30,000,000
6. Korean war	500,000	1,234,000
7. The "Great Leap Forward" and the Communes	1,000,000	2,000,000
8. Struggles with minority nationalities, including Tibet	500,000	1,000,000
9. The "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution" and its aftermath	250,000	500,000
10. Deaths in forced labor camps and frontier development	15,000,000	25,000,000
Total	34,300,000	63,784,000

THE NATIONAL INTEREST IN ALASKA

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House considers H.R. 10367, the Alaska Native land claims bill, which will settle the long-standing land claims of the Eskimo, Indian, and Aleut peoples, and assure them the means to preserve their way of life and to participate fully in the economy of Alaska.

One point should be made clear here at the outset. I cannot—and will not—support any bill or amendment which I deem patronizing or paternalistic to the needs and lives of any group of citizens. I wholeheartedly support, and have cosponsored, legislation which I believe is in the best stated interests of the Alaskan Native peoples.

However, I also would be troubled if I felt that I was supporting legislation—and thus, directly, national policy—which eased the way for growing and continuing exploitation of persons and natural resources by purely private interests. Time and time again, the oil companies, the coal companies, and other assorted "resource developers" appear before us to say how well they are doing for the national interest, while unseen to us at the same time, they maim, gorge, and despoil irreplaceable national assets.

I am sure the bill's basic objective of justice for Alaska's Natives will not be attacked by any Member of this body. But, in realizing this long overdue goal, we should not overlook implications of this bill, which determine patterns of landownership and use of millions of acres of public lands. These millions of acres contain areas of the utmost scenic, wildlife, and recreational importance to the people of this country. They represent a priceless national treasure. So we must be certain, as we resolve claims of the Alaska Natives that we do not at the same time jeopardize the future of the remaining public lands.

For H.R. 10367 does not just settle the claims of our Native Americans. It also contains procedures governing the remaining 78 million more acres of land to be selected by the State of Alaska, and the millions more acres of our public lands to be disposed of under classifications by the Secretary of the Interior.

Unfortunately, the bill sets up a system of priorities that places the Native and the national interest behind the in-

terests of the State of Alaska and the private developers. Native interests have been ignored by the State in the past as shown by the manner in which the State selected the oil-rich lands on the North Slope of Alaska and other lands near villages elsewhere in Alaska; Native claims to the same land were simply not considered. On conservation matters, the present State administration has compiled a record of complete opposition to new State and national parks, and to wilderness classifications for existing national parks and refuges.

Private interests, including most notably oil and gas interests, have worked hand in hand with a State administration dedicated to the rapid and completely unplanned disposal of millions of acres of State-selected lands into private ownership. Private developers, moreover, have benefited from a Federal classification policy that to date has been primarily oriented toward disposal for private use under public land laws originally enacted in the last century.

These two interests, State and private, are given priority by H.R. 10367. Native villages are to select approximately 18 million acres around their villages, which number about 200. The amount selected by the villages is based on population of the villages—and in no way relates to the value of the lands surrounding the villages. Some villages may be lucky, others unlucky in the lands they must select. There are other inequities, most notably differential treatment accorded villages that lie within various Federal withdrawals.

At the same time as village selections are being made, the State will resume selections of the rest of the acreage due it under the statehood—about 78 million more acres. Also at the same time, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized by H.R. 10367 to classify unreserved public lands—those lands not already owned by the State or withdrawn by the Federal Government for various purposes—for disposition under the public land laws, primarily for disposal or lease to private resource developers. Lands around villages cannot be selected by the State or classified by the Secretary pending Native village selections.

Thus, after the first stage of village selections, the State, and private developers in partnership with the Secretary of the Interior, will be selecting the best of the remaining public lands in Alaska.

State selections will end in 1983, but Interior Department classifications will continue indefinitely under H.R. 10367. Only when the State has completed its selections will the Native regional corporations be permitted to come back and select an additional 22 million acres from the remaining unreserved public lands.

Mr. Speaker, it is assumed by most knowledgeable observers of the Alaska scene that by the time the State and the private developers have made their selections, not much economically valuable land will remain from which Native regional corporations can select their 22 million acres. Representatives of the State testified that there are only about 70 to 90 million acres of economically valuable land in Alaska. The bill cynically asks the Natives to step aside while the best lands are selected.

An amendment was introduced in full committee that would have given the Natives first priority to their 40 million acres. This amendment failed, regrettably, by a vote of 26 to 10.

There is another important interest not even recognized by H.R. 10367. This is the national interest in new national parks, wildlife refuges, and wild and scenic rivers. While the Secretary of the Interior is authorized by the measure to classify the unreserved public lands for private use and disposal, the Secretary is not directed to identify those portions of Alaska public lands he may find suitable for inclusion in national park, national wildlife refuge, and national wild river systems. This oversight must be corrected, and that is why I have joined the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) in cosponsoring the national interest amendment.

The Udall-Saylor amendment would direct the Secretary of the Interior to study certain "national interest study areas." Five such areas are withdrawn by Congress at enactment, all of which have been previously withdrawn for other purposes. Other areas that have already been identified by the Interior Department would also be withdrawn by the Secretary within 5 years. These additional national interest study areas would be immune from appropriation under the public land laws until the Secretary completed his study and Congress acted on his recommendations in light of national interest in these areas. There is a limit of 50 million acres placed on national interest study areas that the Secretary may designate. Thus the Udall-Saylor amendment would formally include national interest along with interests of Natives, the State, and private developers.

It would work this way. Native village selections would proceed as called for under the bill whether located within national interest study areas or not. These 18 million acres of village selections would go to patent automatically. State land selections will also begin at enactment except within those areas set aside by the bill for the village selections. The State can indicate its intent to select lands within any of the national interest study areas that Congress sets up in the bill, and within any of the national interest study areas subsequently designated by the Secretary, who has 5 years in which to make these identifications. But State selections within those national interest areas could not go to patent until Congress weighed the national interest in these areas against the State's interest and proposed uses.

State selections under the Statehood Act proceed until the end of 1983; 78 million acres remain to be selected. There is no way of predicting how much of the State's selections will fall within national interest study areas. Probably the amount will be small. But whatever the total acreage of proposed state selections that may fall within the national interest study areas, the important principle is that the national interest is protected and not preempted by a State administration that has not hesitated in the past to use its power of selection to block national interest in a potential national park. My colleagues, Mr. UDALL and Mr. SAYLOR, will describe these areas of critical national importance that are withdrawn by this act and which the Secretary of Interior can be expected to designate as study areas within 5 years.

After State selections have been completed, in 1983, the 11 Native regional corporations are authorized by this bill to select an additional 22 million acres from unreserved public land. If by that late date any of the national interest study areas still exist—that is if Congress has not acted on the Secretary's recommendations—and a Native regional corporation selects lands within a study area, this selection would not go to patent until Congress resolves the overlapping claims of the Native, State, and national interests.

And here is the crux of the matter, Mr. Speaker. The Udall-Saylor amendment simply insures that national interest in preservation of certain of the public lands of Alaska is given equal consideration with Native, State, and private claims to our public lands.

This amendment would enter into the land selection process of the State only in those areas where State land selections coincided with a national interest study area. Similarly, it would only affect Native regional corporation selections if those proposed selections happened to fall within a national interest study area. Congress, in adjudicating competing claims, could very well decide in favor of Native and State interests; there is nothing in the Udall-Saylor amendment that automatically precludes Native or State selections. Or disposition to private developers or claimants, for that matter. Congress may decide that the area in question should be returned to unreserved public land status, or that Native and State selections should take precedence. If, on the other hand, Congress concludes that competing claims should give way to retention for the national purposes recommended by the Secretary, both Native and State selections of an equal amount of land can be made from unreserved public land outside of the area retained. There is no attempt made in the Udall-Saylor amendment to reduce the acreage totals of either the Native or the State.

But there is one matter that I would again like to emphasize—the question of priorities. This bill pretends to balance off State, native and private interests, at the same time as it deliberately ignores the national interest. As I pointed out earlier, the 22 million acres to be selected by Native regional corporations comes only after the State has completed its selections and after additional classifications by the Secretary of the Interior for private disposition, and the cumulative impact of both will be to remove most if not all of the truly valuable land from possible native regional selection. This is why the Native regional

corporation selections should be moved up and placed on a par with State selections, perhaps on an alternating basis. In terms of the Udall-Saylor amendment, these native regional corporation selections would still be subject to congressional review only if they fell within a national interest study area, but otherwise would proceed to patent, as do the village selections. As H.R. 10367 stands now, Alaska's natives have been put at the end of the line, and the national interest has not even been allowed to join the end of that line.

Again, I hope that the Senate counterpart to this bill will indeed correct this flagrant disregard of native interests by reordering the land selection priorities. It is regrettable that a similar amendment was defeated in committee in this body.

Meanwhile we can protect the interests of all of the people of this country by supporting the Udall-Saylor amendment. The Senate version also contains the framework for a national interest amendment along the lines suggested by the gentleman from Arizona and the gentleman from Pennsylvania and which I am cosponsoring. I hope the Members of this body will give their support to this vital provision.

UNITED NATIONS' CREDIBILITY GAP

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Ho Ying-chin, president of the United Nations Association of the Republic of China, was kind enough to provide me with a copy of his letter to the president and delegates of all member nations of the 26th session of the United Nations.

President Ho's eloquent statement expresses the sentiments of many of us who realize that the United Nations is going against its very purpose by even considering the admittance of Communist China. How can the United Nations purport to serve the cause of peace by expelling a peaceful and responsible country like Nationalist China and replacing it with Red China with a record of expansionist policies against other peaceful nations and oppression of its own citizens?

Any organization is judged by its actions more than on its promises and images. The United Nations Organization acts on half-truths and distortions. Daniel Patrick Moynihan, a member of the U.S. delegation to the UNO, has publicly accused that organization of "settling in a swamp of untruth and half-truth and half-truth and vagary," a news the admission of Red China is but another example of its "intellectual bankruptcy." Like "an old bitch gone in the teeth," the UNO has retrogressed to but a puppet organization of its Communist masters.

I include Mr. Moynihan's remarks evaluating the UNO for acting on "untruth and half-truth and vagary," a news article related to this attack, and a copy of President Ho's letter indicating UNO duplicity in the matter of the admission of Red China in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 9, 1971]

MOYNIHAN DENOUNCES U.N. REPORT ON U.S.

UNITED NATIONS, Oct. 8.—Former presidential adviser Daniel Patrick Moynihan, now a member of the U.S. delegation here, said today the United Nations "is settling in a swamp of untruth and half truth and vagary."

He angrily denounced "recurrently wrong" references to the United States in the U.N.'s 1970 Report on the World Social Situation and asserted that it provided evidence of the organization's "intellectual bankruptcy."

Moynihan, who returned to Harvard after resigning his White House post and refusing President Nixon's offer of the U.N. ambassadorship, said the report "reads like the work of a harassed undergraduate hoping against reason that his senior thesis, compiled in three horrendous nights of scissors, paste and black coffee, will be accepted on grounds that he will otherwise not graduate."

One section of the report that Moynihan said made the mind reel was its statement that the working poor in the United States would number 5 million by 1974, an increase of more than 2 million over 1967.

"Speaking only from memory, I would say our estimate of the working poor in 1967 was about 15 million and the number is expected to drop to about 10 million by 1974," Moynihan observed.

"Where did the U.N. data come from?" he asked.

A U.N. spokesman indicated that Secretary General U Thant might authorize a reply to Moynihan's strictures.

Veteran U.N. observers could not recall any similar outburst by a U.S. delegate against the Secretariat, which was responsible for the report. The spokesman said Curt Jansson, a Finnish national, was the head of the social affairs division which prepared it.

Moynihan, who made his remarks in the debate on the report in the General Assembly's social committee, said there was "scarcely a sentence concerning the United States in the . . . report which a reputable social scientist or reponsible gove.nment ofcial could approve."

Replying to a Soviet statement in the committee about "how bad things seemed to be in the United States, as portrayed, presumably," in the report, and about labor union protests against certain policies of the Nixon administration, he observed: "The distinguished delegates comes from a land where the last trade union protest occurred in 1917."

UNITED STATES DELEGATION TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

(Statement by Daniel P. Moynihan, United States Representative, in Committee III, on the 1970 Report on the World Social Situation, October 7, 1971)

The Secretary-General has stated the United Nations is on the verge of fiscal bankruptcy. I should like to talk about the prospect of intellectual bankruptcy as evidenced by the draft 1970 Report on the World Social Situation.

There is much that is admirable about this document, notably the introductory chapter which contrasts population growth with economic growth in appropriately global terms. There is so much to be learned from these few pages that it may seem ungenerous to dwell on the shortcomings of the main body of the text, but it is necessary to do so else the truth of these fundamental facts be obscured and their impact lost in the "mush" that follows.

There is first a question of quality. We are not new at the enterprise. The original World Social Situation Report appeared in 1967. We have had three years to prepare the present document.

It has not been done well. It reads like the work of a harassed undergraduate hoping against reason that his senior thesis, compiled in three horrendous nights of scissors, paste, and black coffee, will be accepted on grounds that he will otherwise not graduate.

I will speak only of references in the report to the United States. I am not competent to comment on references to other nations, and it may be that only the American passages have the quality of persistent and seeming invincible inaccuracy which is so distressing. The United States is but one among many equal nations, but we hope we are inferior to none in our concern for the United Nations and its reputation. A small part of that reputation is at stake here. The issue then is too important to admit of polite evasion.

There is scarcely a sentence concerning the United States in the World Social Situation Report which a reputable social scientist or a responsible government official could approve. Where the facts are knowable they are recurrently wrong. Where they are not knowable, they are confidently asserted.

No one should be required to hear the whole of it. I will cite but examples.

On page six we learn: "According to most recent estimates, even the working poor in the United States will number about 5 million by 1974, an increase of more than 2 million over 1967." Backward reels the mind. The United States has, I suspect, the best poverty statistics, as they are somewhat inelegantly referred to, of any country in the world. As with almost all our statistics, these are regularly published. Speaking only from memory, I would say our estimate of the working poor in 1967 was about 15 million, and the number is expected to drop to about 10 million by 1974. Where did the UN data come from?

On page 24 we learn that there is now under consideration in the United States the establishment of "a guaranteed minimum annual income of $1,600 for a family of four." This and accompanying proposals, the paragraph continues, "are being debated in the United States Congress in 1970." Really. The amount involved is $2,400, a considerable difference. The debate is going on in 1971. It is difficult to accept that a UN document should be so behind times, as this report is. By a rough count there are 195,000 words in our report: the result of three years work. The New York Times publishes 142,900 words daily, and would not tolerate the confusion of $1,600 with $2,400 with respect to a bill which the President of our country, doubtless for his own political reasons, but with grounds nonetheless, has called the most important item of domestic legislation in three decades.

Let me speak of the near unknowable. On page 17 we read, "A recent evaluation of Community Action Programs indicates that, as a catalyst for institutional cooperation and programme coordination, it does not show great success." I am not at all unsympathetic to this conclusion. Several years back I published a book which more or less predicted this outcome. But I know of no evidence that establishes it, and I am most skeptical that social science in its present stage of development is capable of making any general statement about such an activity. I know of a dozen case studies. Some are excellent, including a recently published work by a distinguished young scholar who

happens also to be the daughter of the present Secretary of State. But I know of no serious study that attempts a summary judgment. We work hard at such things in the United States, and I must state, speaking more as Vice-Chairman of the American Association for the Advancement of Science than as a member of the United States delegation to the 26th General Assembly, we don't think we know how to do them. Some think we do, but this at point most of us don't.

There are mistakes in details in the Report which delegations should not have to worry about. Thus footnote 76 cites a book, The Crisis of the Negro Intellect. The reference is to a work of Harold Cruse, a noted writer, entitled The Crisis of the Negro Intellectual, obviously a wholly different subject. Footnote 62 cites a work by myself and Nathan Glazer. The citation is not accurate. More importantly, the reference is to a proposition in the first edition that we revised considerably in a second edition published more than a year ago. It is not altogether true that professors revise their books only to increase their sales. I will note, finally, that American taxpayers will be surprised to learn that the Medicaid legislation was enacted in 1967.

My second point is far the more serious. Inaccuracies in the data of the World Social Situation Report have no ideological intention or consequence, and are easily corrected. This is not true of the methodology of the report. Here we encounter a profoundly serious problem, which can only cause alarm to persons committed to free enquiry in an open society. This methodology, let it be clear, is not the result of any plan, it is merely the end consequence of a succession of choices reflecting what was either convenient or possible under the circumstances. The outcome, nonetheless, is ominous. I use that term with care.

The nations of the world are shaded along a spectrum from those which allow no public criticism of government to those which allow and even facilitate and encourage such criticism. My nation is of the latter sort. We are protective of this tradition, even if we are not always comfortable with it. Like an old veteran—we are, after all, an old nation—we point with some pride to the scars of what in our care are typically self-inflicted wounds. Now in practical terms what this means is that our book stores are filled with volumes telling how terrible things are. Our "socially and politically disenfranchised" students, about which one reads on pg. 43 fly about the continent in jet planes to conferences at which they pass resolutions reflecting strong and genuine feelings about contemporary society. We do not fear such activities. We would fear their absence, knowing that the liberty lives in protest and democracy prospers under conditions of change. When we travel about the world and come to a country whose newspapers are filled with bad news, we feel that liberty lives in that land. When we come to a country whose newspapers are filled with good news, we feel differently.

It is possible for others to misunderstand us in these matters. The distinguished Soviet delegate commented at some length on how bad things seemed to be in the United States as portrayed, presumably, in the World Social Situation Report. She noted, also, the presence at this time of trade union protest against certain policies of the Administration now in office. It is not surprising that this should strike her. The distinguished delegate comes from a land where the last trade union protest occurred in 1917. Speaking as a former trade unionist, as a representative of my trade union local in the central body of our union, and as an Assistant Secretary of Labor under two American Presidents, I would like to make it clear that trade union protest—as with student protest, minority protest, majority protest, professorial protest—is characteristic of our democracy. We do not mind it. We should mind the absence of it. I believe Mr. George Meany, the head of our labor movement, a man of this nation and equally of world, would be willing to make this one thing perfectly clear to any who have doubts.

Hence my concern about the methodology of the World Social Situation Report. *Au fond* what we have here is a reflection of the differing levels of public criticism of government and society in the different nations and regions of the world. As the distinguished Soviet delegate told us, and here I paraphrase, "The Soviet people live in harmony—there is no conflict among social groups." Doubtless that is so. It is not so of the United States, where there is much discordance and considerable conflict. There has always been, and I should hope will always be. We make no demands on other peoples to live as we do, but we must insist that to interpret the processes of a society which encourages the clash of opinion—as for example between our various political parties—from the point of view of a society that does not is to utterly misrepresent our understanding of reality.

I repeat: we do not seek to convert anyone to our view of things. When we have tried, we have rarely succeeded. We are fully content that others live as they will. The world is a varied place, and the United Nations reflects that variation. There are commonalities, as we say. The United States, as so many members of the UN, has a colonial past which we overcame only with great difficulty and not a little sillyness. As with other underdeveloped nations we drew on great resources of foreign capital to develop our economy, and this too gave rise to awkward movements.

We share more than admiration for those nations now going through these experiences. We have shared their experiences as well. And yet there are differences among us, and these are equally matters of concern to us. It is all the more important, then, that official reports of the United Nations on social matters confine themselves to data about which approximately uniform international definitions can be agreed upon.

There is not the least hope, for example, that our many nations should agree on what constitutes social harmony, or what processes abet or impede social change. Nor is there any need. We all have writers. Let them write, and let those who read form what opinions they will. Our task should be to assist such independent analysis by publishing each four years a World Social Situation Report consisting primarily of standard social statistics relating to the basic census facts of birth and death and modes of life in between.

One or another country in the world has been doing this at least since the time of the birth of Jesus. We in the United States have been doing it every ten years since 1790. Other nations have equally long experience. Let us do, then, what we know how to do. Let us do it well. Let us do it so well that statistics provided by the United Nations set a standard for governments of the world, and a resource for scholars everywhere. But let us have no more efforts to explore one another's psyche on the basis of newspaper clippings. The British publication Social Trends, the first issue of which appeared in 1970, might well serve as a model. I do not doubt there are equally good examples as elsewhere.

The UN is not drowning in words. It is settling in a swamp of untruth and half truth and vagary, of which I would suppose "half truth" is as good example as any. We shall get out of this slough only as we learn to lower our analytic ambitions and raise our analytic standards.

THE UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATION
OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA,
Taiwan, China, Oct. 6, 1971.

H. E. DR. ADAM MALIK,
President of the 26th Session of The UN General Assembly, and The Delegates of All Member Nations, United Nations, New York, N.Y., U.S.A.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT MALIK AND THE DELEGATE OF ALL MEMBER NATIONS: The purpose of the United Nations is to find effective means to establish an ever-lasting peace in the wake of two disastrous world wars. The objectives of the U.N. Charter are the prevention of international aggression, maintenance of world peace, respect for human rights and freedom, and improvement of the living conditions of the people everywhere. To insure the attainment of these goals, member nations are required to abide by international justice and the principles of international law and are particularly forbidden to encroach upon the territorial integrity or sovereignty of another nation by the use of coercion or force of arms. This is the fundamental spirit of the U.N. Charter. The violation or abnegation of this spirit in any way would inevitably shake the United Nations at its very foundation and bring about the threat of an unprecedented disaster to the human race.

The Republic of China had fought aggression single-handed for five long years when the Second World War began. With the victory over aggression finally won, the Republic of China joined its wartime Allies to give birth to this world organization for peace and, in recognition of its contributions, was justly awarded a permanent seat in the Security Council alongside the four other principal Allies which is clearly stipulated in Article 23 of the Charter. The full name of this country "The Republic of China" stipulated in the aforementioned Article which cannot be usurped by any illegal means. As China made the biggest sacrifice prior to the birth of the United Nations and considering the difficulties pertaining to the organization of the world body, we consider it our inalienable duty to safeguard the integrity of the principles on which the U.N. Charter was drawn up.

The Government of the Republic of China was legally constituted through popular elections as provided in the Chinese constitution. In this same Constitution it is specified that respect for the U.N. Charter shall be the cornerstone of the nation's foreign policy. Practising consitutional democracy internally and faithfully carrying out the obligations of the U.N. Charter externally, this government has enjoyed the unanimous support of the Chinese people at home and abroad and is internationally recognized as a government of responsibility.

On the other hand, the Chinese Communists are a rebel group. Since its usurpation of power on the mainland of China, the regime has been tramping on human rights in its domestic administration while pursuing a policy of aggression in international affairs. The atrocities committed by the regime have been getting worse over the past years. Here are some of the notorious crimes committed by this group of gangsters.

1. Twenty years ago the Peiping regime attacked the Republic of Korea by force, for which the Security Council meted out the penalty of collective sanction and the regime was formally condemned by the General Assembly as an aggressor—Resolution adopted by the 327th general meeting of the General Assembly, February 1st, 1951. The condemnation still stands. Instead of curbing its aggressive acts, the regime has stepped up its international brigandage. Besides playing the role of an instigator in the Viet Nam con-

flict, it has engaged in infiltration and subversion in other parts of the world. Today the hands of the Chinese Communists are clearly discernible in every local insurgence in Southeast Asia, the Middle East, Latin America and Africa. Furthermore, the regime has repeatedly proclaimed its attempt at a "world revolution" by means of violence. Despite its recent smiling offensive, the peiping regime still regards the United States as its arch enemy and has openly reaffirmed its determination to support the Communist forces in Viet Nam, Khmer and Laos to perpetuate the war against the United States.

2. Essentially a gang of terrorists, the Chinese Communist regime has earned the deep hatred of the Chinese people for imposing upon them a system that is diametrically opposed to the Chinese cultural traditions. This accounts for the endless uprisings against the regime since its inception over twenty years ago. In order to suppress the resistance movement and to uproot the Chinese traditions, the regime has resorted to a reign of terror and wholesale massacre. The program in Tibet in 1963 has been unsurpassed both in scale and brutality. According to reliable statistics, as many as 63,000,000 Chinese people have been butchered by the Chinese Communists, and more than 2,500,000 Chinese people have fled from the mainland to escape Communist persecution. The internal power struggle within the Peiping regime is far from over. These developments have given lie to the assertion that the Peiping regime is in effective control of the mainland.

3. Dedicated to an expansionalist policy, the Peiping regime has been squeezing the captive people of their last trace of material possession in its frantic preparation for war. During the turmoil created by the devilish Red Guards, production ground to a halt and rural areas were plunged into a state of bankruptcy. The upshot has been an economic crisis that is getting steadily worse. In an attempt to wriggle itself out of the difficulties resulting from international isolation, the regime has of late adopted a smiling offensive and is using trade as a bait to lure the Western countries into its political trap. It is a known fact that free trade is impossible under the economic system of the Chinese Communists. They are merely using trade as a cover for their political plots. The only "foreign trade" the Peiping regime has been pushing with earnest in the past twenty years is the export of nacrotics to undermine the physical and mental health of the people in the free world. According to data collected by the *Weekly Review* of London, the peasants on the Chinese mainland have been ordered to plant poppies on a massive scale with the total acreage reaching 5,830,000 hectares. There are thirty "special products processing factories" engaged in the processing of narcotics for dumping overseas. In 1970 alone the Peiping regime exported $800 million worth of narcotics, including opium, morphine and heroin. Peiping's trade with "friendly" Japanese business firms has further facilitated its narcotics shipments to Japan. According to the statistics of the Japanese National Narcotics Control Commission, Peiping's annual narcotics export to Japan has reached 60 billion yen. If left unchecked, the regime's evil policy of exporting narcotics would completely wreck the cultural foundation of the great democracies and corrupt the moral fibers of their people in ten years. Those who are enthusiastic about doing trade with the Chinese Communists would do well to consider the consequences thereof.

All these point up to our conviction that the Peiping regime is at the root of all troubles in Asia and the whole world. Each and every act of the regime has violated the principles of the U.N. Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Furthermore, the Chinese Communist leadership has time and again poured venom against the United Nations and vowed to form a "Revolutionary United Nations." These and other pronouncements have unmistakably shown the regime's determination to destroy the existing United Nations. The irony of all this has been that Albania, Peiping's European satellite, and several other countries, in complete disregard of the sanctity of the United Nations Charter, have regularly submitted to the General Assembly the preposterous proposal that the Chinese Communist regime be admitted to the family of nations at the expense of the Republic of China. The fact that the Albanian proposal was invariably voted down by the General Assembly during the past years indicated eloquently that we, China and our friendly powers, fought against the admittance of the Peiping Communist regime to the United Nations not only for the purpose of safeguarding our own legal rights and privileges in the United Nations but also for the purpose of upholding the sanctity of the Charter as well as the security of the United Nations Organization. However, we cannot help observing again with apprehension that the clamor for admitting the Peiping regime has again gained currency lately amidst a rising tide of international appeasement. It has even been suggested that China's permanent seat in the United Nations Security Council should be given to the Peiping Regime. If such an absurd idea, so obviously at variance with the principles of the U.N. Charter were to be translated into reality, it would be tantamount to rewarding aggression in total disregard of international justice. Such a development would be like the United Nations signing its own death sentence.

In view of the fact that the present session of the United Nations General Assembly will debate and decide on the so-called "China Representation" issue and that the decisions of such debate would have serious consequences on the future security of the United Nations, this Association has reached an unanimous resolution to appeal to Your Excellency and the Delegates of all member nations to the present United Nations General Assembly Session to effectively respect the sanctity of the U.N. Charter and to resolutely prevent the Peiping Communist regime from entering the United Nations for the purpose of upholding international justice and the preservation of world peace.

Yours sincerely,

HO YING-CHIN,
President.

NATIONAL STUDENT LOBBY DIRECTOR COMMENTS ON HIGHER EDUCATION BILL

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, my mail today contained the following letter from Peter L. Coye, the acting executive director of the National Student Lobby.

Peter Coye is a constituent of mine from Berkeley, and he has worked over the past months to develop the nascent National Student Lobby into an effective voice of students relating to major issues before this body.

This week, we shall be called upon to consider significant alternative proposals concerning the direction of Federal aid to higher education. Mr. Coye has studied both the committee proposal and the Quie substitute and he has talked with other student leaders around the country before writing to me.

I believe his letter provides information on the student perspective on this crucial legislation, and I now insert it into the RECORD:

OCTOBER, 18, 1971.

CONGRESSMAN RONALD V. DELLUMS,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DELLUMS: I am writing you in regard to a vital matter concerning Federal aid to higher education.

Sometime this week you will have a chance to either advance equal education for all classes and races of people in America, or set back those opportunities for young people in this country.

H.R. 7248, as amended by Mr. Quie from Minn. will, in my opinion, provide a more equitable system for distributing Federal money to needy students. Specifically, the E.O.G. grants will be guaranteed to students, rather than institutions under Mr. Quie's proposal. I feel this is a move to combat institutional racism in this country and will provide educational opportunities for minority groups which have been locked out of the colleges and universities in America in the past.

I urge that you give full support to Mr. Quie and the amendments which he is considering.

Though the National Student Lobby is taking no official stand on this issue due to the fact that we have not had adequate time to poll our constituency, I have had a chance to talk with several students in Texas, California and Wisconsin by phone. These students have urged me to support Mr. Quie in all possible ways.

Sincerely,

PETER L. COYE,
Acting Executive Director.

TRIBUTE TO BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, for more than 2 decades, Bourke Hickenlooper was a symbol, to most Americans, of the great State of Iowa. His unswerving dedication to the American people and his steadfast defense of American principles were admired by millions. Iowans were particularly proud of the example of leadership which he furnished the rest of the country. Iowans' admiration for Senator Hickenlooper was demonstrated time and time again at the ballot box. He became known as the "winningest" Republican the State had ever known.

In the 19 times Bourke Hickenlooper went before the voters of Iowa, he only lost on two occasions. He was defeated in his first bid for public office, losing his party's nomination for Linn County attorney in 1932. This defeat, however, did more to strengthen his resolve to enter public service than anything else. Two years later, he successfully ran for the office of State representative. He served 4 years as a State representative before entering the Republican primary for the office of lieutenant governor.

During this primary, Bourke Hickenlooper learned, first-hand, the political disadvantage of having a hard-to-pro-

nounce last name. Although he lost the primary, his opponent declined to continue the campaign as the Republican nominee, and Bourke Hickenlooper was asked to take his place.

For the next 30 years, Bourke Hickenlooper was an unbeatable force in Iowa politics. He served 4 years as lieutenant governor and 2 as Governor before his election to the U.S. Senate in 1944. For the next 24 years, Bourke Hickenlooper served his State and his Nation in the Senate.

During the course of his years of service, Senator Hickenlooper gained a reputation as a conservative who served easily with the most liberal of his colleagues. Senator Hickenlooper's rare insight, keen sense of humor, and acknowledged ability made him admired and respected by his colleagues of every political persuasion. His deeply held faith in the American way of life made him a staunch defender of the free enterprise system and an advocate of a farm economy unfettered by Government controls. True to his strict upbringing, Senator Hickenlooper was always an opponent of excessive spending both at home and abroad. His opposition, however, was not necessarily against the principles behind the spending as it was against inefficiency and fraud.

As Senator Hickenlooper explained his position, he was firmly in favor of helping the poor as well as extending aid to countries overseas. He was, however, unalterably opposed to open-ended programs that lacked any sort of controls. Furthermore, he felt that such programs seldom did much good for the people that they were designed to help. Although Senator Hickenlooper, in true frontier tradition, was always the first to lend a helping hand to someone in need, he was opposed to setting up welfare programs that would turn the recipients into weak dependents of the dole. In recent years, we have all come to realize the price, in both human and economic terms, of the dole system.

It was this sense of fair play which, perhaps, prompted the Senator's proposal of the Hickenlooper amendment. This amendment was attached to the 1962 foreign aid bill, and after much controversy it was passed. Essentially, the amendment cuts off all aid to any country which expropriates property or equity of an American citizen, holding a valid contract, without offering compensation within 6 months. The amendment was invoked against Ceylon in 1963, and in recent months it has again been discussed in connection with Peru.

Although Senator Hickenlooper was best known for this amendment, he performed other invaluable services for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Along with Committee Chairman FULBRIGHT, he was instrumental in concluding the consular treaty of 1967, the first treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Senator Hickenlooper also made outstanding contributions in the field of atomic energy. He served as the first active chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy. In 1947 at the dawn of the atomic age, it was Senator Hickenlooper who shouldered a great deal of responsibility for steering the United States through those troubled times. He early pushed for more research in the area, and it was partly through his efforts that the career of Admiral Rickover was salvaged and promoted. In fact, it is unlikely that our modern nuclear submarine force would be in existence if it were not for the efforts of Senator Hickenlooper.

The clear-sightedness and dedication which Senator Hickenlooper displayed during his years of service were appreciated by his colleagues. His departure from the Senate in 1969 was indeed a day of sadness for all who had known him. His recent passing in September was even a sadder day.

Yet, we who had known him for many years can be comforted by the thought that his achievements will continue as a living memorial to a man who made his Nation's welfare his utmost concern for 24 years. It is my hope that his son, his daughter, and his grandchildren have been consoled by the admiration and respect which have been expressed for their father and grandfather. In the years ahead, I am sure that Bourke Hickenlooper's grandchildren will have even more reason for feeling pride in their grandfather's contributions.

I would also like to share with my colleagues the prayer and sermon given at the funeral services for Senator Hickenlooper. The prayer was given by the Reverend Larry R. Johnson, and the sermon by the Reverend John S. Shew.

The prayer and sermon follows:

PRAYER BY THE REVEREND LARRY R. JOHNSON FOR THE FUNERAL SERVICES OF SENATOR BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER

O Lord our God, in these quiet moments we have caught a glimpse of your goodness and your glory. We have seen once again the quality and the quantity of your love for us, in that, despite what we are, and regardless of what we do, your love is unconditional, with no strings attached.

We are reminded, however, of your ancient and time-honored promise:

"If my people shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land."

Help us, O God, as a people and as a nation to meet the conditions you have set down, which will allow you to heal and help.

We confess that we have sought to hide behind stockades of selfishness. We have attempted to isolate ourselves from the bleeding wounds of the world. In our self-sufficiency we have not asked for your help. We have held conferences and ignored you completely. We have disguised selfishness as patriotism; our arrogance has masqueraded as pride.

Lord forgive us. By your guidance and your power may we once again become your people—keenly sensitive to all the unresolved injustice in our midst—contrite in heart—yet confidently expecting to see your promises fulfilled in our time.

Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

REVEREND JOHN S. SHEW—THE GIFT OF HONESTY—A MEDITATION AT THE MEMORIAL SERVICE OF SENATOR BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER

"let your yes be yes and your no be no, . . ."
James 5:12

The late Reinhold Niehbuhr, in an article on Justice and Order, said that the reason a democratic society holds together lies in the fact that 95% of the people accept and keep the laws of the land. What he was saying in a word, is that our society's foundation is built on trust. But there is something which is basic to trust. Trust does not simply appear. No one trusts another by merely hearing words. No one gives consent to every plea. Trust is born from basic honesty.

That's why the book of James places this word at the very last part of his several bits of advice:

"But above all—yes—above all!—let your yes be yes, and your no be no . . ."

This is the basic Christian position. A Christian should need no dotted lines to sign, no notary publics to witness his contracts.

This is not original with James. No, it is a direct quote from Jesus himself, who spoke in the Sermon on the Mount: "Don't make oaths and seal them by reference to heaven, or earth, or by your head—let what you say be simply 'Yes' or 'No'—anything more than this comes from the Devil." By definition. Christ's man or woman is honest. His word is clear. He means to keep his promise no matter what extremity overtakes him.

Now what does all of this have to do with our gathering here to worship God and to remember our friend Senater Bourke Hickenlooper. First of all, let me remind you that the greatest casualty of the last 20 years has not been the environment, neither has it been the cumulative suffering of war wounded and dead. I would not minimize these. But the greatest casualty of the last 20 years in my opinion has been the erosion of trust in our country. And trust goes, when honesty is no longer a virtue. When our success is measured by the deals we can make, we inevitably stretch the fact, and garnish the truth.

I need not remind this congregation, that we have been living in a time when the citizen has grown cynical with his government, and when the government has had to take measures to arm itself from the dishonest citizen. We need not labor this point. It is the supreme task of our time to restore honesty to all levels; to do away with the glamour of the big deal, to realize that there is no diplomacy which dictates that we as a nation must not deal with others except in the most candid fashion.

Long-range, honesty is the best policy, both domestic and foreign. But we have said that we will not labor the point. I mention it here because we are remembering a man who has distinguished himself in this country's service for over half his life. I have not known Senator Hickenlooper personally, except to visit him in his recent sorrow at the occasion of his beloved Verna's death. I have known his name, however, since I was a boy. I can remember the way he conquered himself as leader of vital committees in the Senate; I have read all of the wonderful tributes in our news during the past week. I have talked with his friends. And one thing comes through, with much emphasis. Bourke Hickenlooper meant what he said, and said what he meant. He was an honest man. That's why this nation will miss him. He gave the gift of honesty to it. He let his yes be yes, and his no be no.

It is written therefore, in another part of the New Testament, that such honesty has the undergirding of God himself. Paul writes:

"As surely as God is faithful, our word to you has not been Yes and No—at once. For the Son of God, Jesus Christ, was not Yes and No; but in him it is always *Yes*. For all promises of God find their Yes in him."

In keeping faith with us, in his honesty, Senator Hickenlooper has been Christ's man, both consciously, and unconsciously. And the promise to all who exercise this gift of honesty is that for them God grants the Yes of Eternal Life.

WHAT IS WRONG WITH PROFIT?

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I read an interesting statement on profits in one of my hometown newspapers, and I would like to have it reprinted in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal, Oct. 9, 1971]

WHAT IS WRONG WITH PROFIT?

"When shallow critics denounce the profit motive inherent in our system of private enterprise, they ignore the fact that it is an economic support of every human right we possess, and without it all rights would soon disappear."—Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The crescendo of demands for curbs on profits has produced disturbing evidence as to how far out of kilter economic reasoning has gotten in this country.

President Nixon acknowledged during his "Phase 2" speech Thursday evening that he had been advised that the politically popular thing to do would be to seek controls of profits. He did not, and wisely so. That such moves would even be considered in a free economic system is alarming.

Oddly enough, those who are shouting the loudest for profit curbs are those who stand to gain the most when businesses are profitable—namely, labor union leaders and their members. Their claim is that by freezing wages and not profits (Congress did not include profits in its enabling legislation) President Nixon was favoring business over labor. And they made no bones about wanting ceilings on profits to be part of any long-term system of economic controls.

Undoubtedly the immediate emotions of the times and an understandable amount of political rhetoric have contributed to producing a distored picture of the whole affair. But from this vantage point it appears that far too many Americans have come to look upon profits in business as a great evil.

As suggested by the quotation above from a speech made some years ago by the late President Eisenhower, profits form the lifeblood of the American economic system. Without at least the promise of profits—even generous profits—there would be no incentive for investment of money or managerial ability in new or expanded firms.

Indeed, poor profit performance is one of the prime causes of the country's current economic lag. Firms that are not making money cannot expand their work forces or create additional employment indirectly by increasing their purchases of equipment and materials.

A recent article in the Wall Street Journal illustrated this situation in a graphic manner. It noted that from 1965 to mid 1971 the gross national product had expanded by 52 per cent, that wages and salaries had gone up 60 per cent but that corporate profits had increased only 4 per cent.

Thus it appears that profits are not only being "controlled" by existing market forces; they are being downright stifled! To add additional restrictions could prove disastrous to the already beleaguered American economy.

Another former president many years ago summed up the situation with words that apply even today. Theodore Roosevelt said this:

"I hold it to be our duty to see that the wage-worker, the small producer, the ordinary consumer, shall get their fair share of business prosperity. But it either is or ought to be evident to everyone that business has to prosper before anybody can get any benefit from it."

SECOND IN DEFENSE?—AN UNIMPRESSIVE STATISTIC

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, throughout the waning days of our involvement in Southeast Asia, the cry has rung out from varying quarters that we must now turn our heads on the institution that has largely become the scapegoat of our involvement in Vietnam, the military. The reasoning has been that the lesser a role we relegate to our armed services, the more secondary we make them—the fewer the prospects of other American involvement in unfortunate wars become.

The target of this argument became the annual defense budget, and even the prudent trimming of the fat that President Nixon has carried out has not satisfied some. They say that should only be the beginning.

To be sure, there were wasted dollars in the Defense Department's budgets of the last decade, but those excess moneys have largely been pruned in the past 3 years.

To continue to further voguely hack away at the defense budget "because without enough money we can't have any more wars" is elementary philosophy at best, and I believe it is very mistaken logic.

Two recent articles of particular note in this discussion came to my attention this week, and I would like to enter them here so my constitutents in the Fifth Congressional District of New York and my colleagues of the Congress have the benefit of both sides of this argument:

[From the New York Times, Thursday, Oct. 14, 1971]

LAIRD WARNS OF A SOVIET MISSILE BUILDUP FAR EXCEEDING HIS EARLIER ESTIMATES

(By William Beecher)

WASHINGTON, Oct. 13.—Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird expressed concern today over what he said was a continuing Soviet buildup of land-based and sea-based missiles. This buildup, which he said is already "far outdistancing" the estimates he offered Congress seven months ago.

While the United States still enjoys a lead in the quality of its strategic weapons, he said, there is no assurance that the Russians may not overtake this advantage.

He stressed the potential political problem if the Russians were in position one day to ring the United States with a larger force of missile submarines than the United States.

In a 40-minute news conference at the Pentagon, Mr. Laird disclosed plans for a visit to South Vietnam in early November to provide President Nixon with an appraisal of the military situation before the next troop withdrawal announcement. Accompanying the secretary will be Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. Laird confirmed a report that the Soviet Union is expected to match the United States strength by deploying 41 Polaris-type missile submarines by 1973.

Other sources have recently said that the Russians now have 23 Y-class missile submarines in operation, 5 or 6 afloat and being fitted out, and 13 to 15 under construction. Thus by late 1972 or 1973, barring a halt or slowdown in the construction effort, the Russians would match the size of the American Polaris fleet of operational submarines.

Mr. Laird said he was chary of citing numbers of new Soviet weapons at this point lest critics accuse the Administration of trying to influence Congress in voting funds for the Defense Department. He promised to go into greater detail in his defense report next year.

The Laird visit to South Vietnam, as in the case of some earlier ones, is to provide the President with a last-minute report on how many American troops may be safely withdrawn, defense sources said.

The Secretary noted there are now about 210,000 troops in South Vietnam, down from a high of 543,400 in 1969. The number is scheduled to go down to 184,000 by Dec. 1.

Administration sources have been suggesting for several months that the President would like to reduce this to 30,000 to 50,000 advisers and support forces by next summer.

Whether such a force should include fighter-bomber squadrons, helicopter companies and artillery battalions is one of the major questions still to be decided, the sources say.

EXPANSION OF YARD REPORTER

While Mr. Laird dealt only with concerns about the Soviet Union's drawing abreast of the American Polaris submarine force, he is known to share with other officials an even greater worry. This is that a reported doubling of the production facilities at the principal Soviet missile submarine yard at Severodvinsk, on the White Sea, suggests a Soviet intention of outstripping the American missile submarine fleet over the next few years, unless an arms control agreement can be worked out to prevent such a development

The Russians are known to have balked at a United States proposal that an interim arms limitation agreement halt the production of missile submarines, in addition to land-based missiles.

The Soviet Union is reported to have more than 1,600 land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles in operation and under construction, against 1,054 for the United States. The Russians are said to have indicated some willingness to halt new construction of such missiles under a first-step agreement that would also attempt to limit the missiles on both sides.

Mr. Laird said the United States was still ahead in missile technology, but there was no reason the Soviet could not catch up. Apparently he was talking about American multiple warheads and missile-guidance systems, which are believed to be far superior to those of the Soviet Union.

On another subject, Mr. Laird said there was a "mistake in the field" on the handling of a letter written by S. Sgt. John Sexton Jr. after he was captured by the Viet Cong. The letter was reproduced by the Vietcong and distributed as a propaganda leaflet. The Pentagon was not told that the letter was in the sergeant's handwriting, Mr. Laird said, and as a result Sergeant Sexton's parents were merely told it was possible their son was a prisoner, but that he was still being carried as missing in action.

Mr. Laird said he had ordered all propaganda-leaflet files to be reviewed to see if there were other such cases. He said such mistakes should not be repeated.

[From Time magazine, Oct. 18, 1971]

THE SOVIET THREAT TO NATO'S NORTHERN FLANK

On the bleak coast of the Barents Sea, where the Soviet Union shares a common border with Norway near the roof of the world, the Norwegian defense force of 400 men is frequently witness to a disturbing scene. They watch on radar as the Soviets practice assaults on the coast of their Kola Peninsula, some 300 miles away. In the Soviet war games, the attacking force is always victorious and the defenders are always defeated.

That spectacle points up a growing Soviet threat to the northern flank of NATO, which extends from Norway's North Cape to West Germany's Baltic coast (*see map*). NATO's northern command is outnumbered by the Soviets four-to-one on the ground, seven-to-one in aircraft and six-to-one in ships in the north. "The Russians are very busy displaying raw military power on the northern flank," reports Time Correspondent John Mulliken, who recently toured the region. "It is a significant example of how the Soviets intend to use the pressure of their operational armed forces to achieve their political policies in the 1970s and 1980s."

The Russians' overwhelming military predominance in the northern flank is most evident in the icy waters of the area. Since the Soviet navy launched a massive buildup after the 1962 Cuban crisis, it has become, as *Jane's Fighting Ships* notes, "the supernavy of a superpower." Moscow's growing strength at sea has long since been noted in the Mediterranean and in the Indian Ocean. But the fact is that the northern fleet, the smallest in the Soviet navy at the end of World War II, is now the biggest—the superfleet of a supernavy.

Operating out of ice-free Murmansk, the nothern fleet has an estimated 560 ships, including 160 submarines, more than 65 of them nuclear-powered (but not counting sizable forces in the Baltic, plus the East German and Polish navies). By contrast, the entire U.S. Atlantic Fleet has 358 ships, of which 40 to 50 are assigned to the Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean. Since 1968, the U.S. command has been cut back 25% in ships and 19% in men, and it is scheduled to lose another ten ships by next summer. Says Norway's Rear Admiral Magne Braadland: "The threat to the U.S. is not coming from Viet Nam and not from Central Europe either. It is sailing from Murmansk."

At a time of tentative *detente* in Europe, the Soviet threat is posed not in the stark terms of war but in the gray area of geopolitics. As Defense Secretary Melvin Laird put it: "If the Russians have a superior military force, they can gain their political objectives throughout the world without the use of weapons. There is no military advantage to overkill, but the political gains are tremendous." British Prime Minister Edward Heath outlined this gloomy scenario in a recent speech to the House of Commons: "The Soviets may calculate that eventually the sheer disparity of military strength would leave Western Europe with no convincing strategy. Political pressure, shrewdly applied and backed by the threat of greatly superior military force, could compel one of the more exposed members of the alliance to lapse into neutrality. Then a process of disintegration could begin which would lead to the ultimate price, an extension of the Soviet sphere of influence gradually into countries at present members of [NATO], and if possible, to the Atlantic."

That pressure is already being applied to Norway, the most exposed country on NATO's northern flank. For the past decade, the Soviet navy has staged big exercises in the Norwegian Sea, making the point that Norway, with no land connection to the rest of NATO, is at the mercy of whichever country rules the waves. Johan Jorgen Holst, research director of the Norwegian Foreign Policy Institute, warns that the Soviets intend "to push their naval defense line outwards to Iceland and the Faeroes," which could turn the Norwegian Sea into what he calls "a Soviet lake."

To a lesser degree, the Soviets have made a similar point with Denmark, whose NATO task in any conflict would be to mine the exit from the Baltic—a move that would require approval from the Danish Parliament. The Soviets now regard the Baltic as virtually a Communist sea. On a "good-will" call in Copenhagen last August, Soviet Vice Admiral L. V. Mizhin, deputy commander of the Soviet Baltic fleet, pointedly complained that an American cruiser had shown up in the Baltic Sea, and that West Germany had intensified its naval exercises there. The Soviets are on the verge of achieving their most concrete gain to date in Iceland, which is known as "the cork in the bottle" for the entire northern tier of NATO's defenses. From Iceland, U.S. Navy aircraft keep track of Russian craft moving through the Faeroe Channel and the Denmark Strait—including subs, carrying Polaris type missiles targeted on U.S. cities. Last July the new coalition government of Iceland, which includes two Communist Ministers, asked the Americans to depart from their strategically important Keflavik base. Negotiations on the request have yet to begin, however, and they could take up to four years before resulting in any move.

To remain, a plausible deterrent, NATO depends on a strategy of rapid reinforcement in time of crisis. Yet if Norway or Iceland were threatened, it would take an estimated ten days to two weeks for U.S. reinforcements to reach the northern flank, ten to 20 days for Britain's troops, and 30 days for Canada's. That assumes, of course, that they could even reach their destination through waters controlled by the Soviet northern fleet. Thus the real threat posed by Russia's dominance in the northern seas is to NATO's credibility and perhaps, in the end, to the alliance's unity.

AMCHITKA NUCLEAR TEST—A MISTAKE

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, these last 2 weeks have been a time of new development in the search for peace. President Nixon has ordered a start to his preparations for a visit to Peking, and has announced his intentions to conduct high-level talks with the Soviet leadership in Moscow. We have heard continuing talk about 1972 being a great year—about the possibility of these discussions being the steps necessary for peace for a full generation of Americans.

Yet, in the midst of all this diplomatic activity, the United States continues with plans to detonate a 5-megaton nuclear device off Amchitka Island. Perhaps we who oppose such actions are naive. Perhaps we do not understand the subtleties of applying one face to seek peace, then quickly changing face to continue experimentation into how to kill more people, with greater speed and less pain. Perhaps we do not understand that this scheduled detonation is this country's way of telling the Russians they better start talking seriously in the SALT negotiations.

There is another possibility: Perhaps we, who are naive and unable to comprehend, are right in our belief that this venture is the product of a bunch of little bureaucrats, deep within the bowels of this Government, who are intent on having another nuclear explosion. Perhaps we are correct in saying they do not really care what American citizens think about this test and are not really concerned with the worry being expressed by environmentalists and scientists.

Whatever the reason or the excuse, Mr. Speaker, we can at least say we did our part in putting a stop to all this foolishness. We have thrown the ball into Mr. Nixon's court. He is the one who has the final decision concerning this test. Will his final determination follow the whims of little men within the bureaucracy, or will he seek a position in line with his efforts to achieve world peace? In light of the diplomatic overtures made in the last 2 weeks, it is hard to understand how he can justify this blast.

Mr. Speaker, I have no idea how the mail on this subject is running over at the White House, but I want this body to know how one member of my constituency expressed her views to the President concerning the Amchitka test.

I am happy to include this letter from Mrs. Patrick E. Brunelle of Moraga, Calif., in the RECORD.

The letter follows:

OCTOBER 5, 1971.

President RICHARD M. NIXON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing to you today to urge you to cancel the proposed 5 megaton nuclear test at Amchitka, Alaska. I cannot begin to express the personal anguish I feel over the implications of such an act. The unleashing of this awesome weapon into the earth may, for who has the wisdom to really know, result in untold environmental repercussions and can only serve to perpetuate the climate of frustration and fear which prevails throughout the world.

In the past quarter of a century we have assembled a war machine so sinister in nature that it is sheer madness to store it. Yet, with full knowledge of this fact we continue to develop and stockpile weapons designed for death and destruction, for killing and over-killing, each phase more deadly than the last. If it is true that the national budget tells what a nation cares about and what it does not care about, we may conclude that our budget poses a serious question of immorality. The military machine which has grown as a result of governmental policies has become so awesome in size and complexity that it is almost impossible for the human mind to encompass it. Indeed we have become so curiously obsessed with fear of "the enemy" that we have betrayed our real purposes, and that is to provide quality of life for all of mankind on this plant to the limit of our intellectual and economic capacity. Certainly the testing and storage of these despicable weapons indicates our fear of a need for them, when in fact the fear of need is need itself. And, we could begin to fulfill this need by opening our minds to the futility of war and our hearts to the human race. Until we do this there can be neither peace nor freedom for any of us.

Perhaps men in power should bow their heads each day and shed a few tears for the human suffering in the world, and in doing so remember the words of the great American patriot, "The world is my country, all mankind are my brethren, and to do good is my religion." (Thomas Paine, "Rights of Man.") You may talk loosely, Mr. President, of losing our ugly face in Viet Nam, of prestige and of being a world power second to none, but in this meaningless pursuit have you ever stopped and looked into the sorrowful eyes of a mother and father who have just viewed the battered body of their son through the protective wrapping of a plastic bag? And for what? We vow this will never happen to our son . . . certainly not for the shameful reasons it has cost the lives of so many thousands of our boys and the equally valuable lives of Asian men, women and children by the hundreds of thousands. Body counts have been recorded, but the story of human suffering can never be told

until one suffers himself. Human beings are what the world is all about, Mr. President, and the case against human beings as brought to light in the Pentagon Papers will never appear in the memoirs of the policy makers where it so rightfully belongs. But the truth can never be erased from the hearts and minds of men where it shall remain forever as a testimony of man's inhumanity to man.

The truth, not the explosion of a 5 megaton nuclear bomb at Amchitka, nor bombs at the rate of one hundred tons per hour on our Asian neighbors will set us free. I am not a patriot, Mr. President, or I would perhaps be in prison with the Ellsbergs of this country. My calling is of another nature. I am a mother and a housewife and I am angry. I want to see my two children and all the other children of the world grow in a world free from the fear of war, and in a country which does not base its economy on the slaughter of human beings in other lands. Is this asking too much, Mr. President?

Sincerely,

Mrs. Patrick E. Brunelle.

THE MUSE OF TRAGEDY IS STILL WAITING

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the main arguments against American policy toward the Greek dictatorship have become familiar and well worn, though no less valid. Yet, fresh and incisive commentaries continue to appear. An outstanding example is the Helen Vlachos article which appeared in the October 15 New York Times. In its excellence it goes beyond good journalism and enters the realms of literature.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, the article follows:

THE MUSE OF TRAGEDY IS STILL WAITING

(By Helen Vlachos)

WASHINGTON.—I looked for her again this year, and there she was, still waiting. A life-size bronze statue, a lonely figure in the lofty expanse of the State Department's entrance hall in Washington. An inscription, on a small board propped against the hem of her metal skirts, informs the curious that she is Melpomene, the muse of tragedy, and that she was presented to the United States, on behalf of the Greek Government, in 1865, by Greek Ambassador Alexander Matsas. Also that she was placed there temporarily, until a better location could be found.

There is no scarcity in parks, gardens or friendly green nooks in the capital city where the muse could lead a better life. But evidently she is sharing the fate of many Greeks; she has developed into an embarrassment. Her removal and new installation would require some sort of a ceremony, friendly exchanges between officials would be photographed, and inevitably, Greece, America and tragedy would be symbolically linked.

Between saying hello and goodbye to Melpomene, I met and talked with a number of people inside the building. They were, as always, courteous and cautious, soft-speaking and little-telling, leading the conversation on a path of familiar clichés, well polished by constant usage: "The United States wishes to see Greece return to democracy." "The United States cannot interfere in the internal affairs of a foreign country." "There are matters of strategic importance to consider, NATO, the defense of the Western world. . . ."

Well-blended official hypocrisy is offered for you to swallow, and there is little else you can do. Except if you decide, for your own satisfaction only to proceed to an exercise which you know is doomed to failure. That is to tell the truth to someone who already knows it, but does not want to hear it. Because in Washington they know that truth. They know that the military junta has failed to fulfill any expectations, keep any promises, succeed in any venture, and that after four and a half years in power, has yet to win any friends or influence any investors. The well trumpeted financial deals with Litton and Onassis have dissolved into thin air, and the frightening gap in the balance of payments can only be appeased by short-term loans that spell future disaster.

At a time when Europe is gaining in importance, Greece finds herself increasingly isolated, shunned by international organizations, pitified as a victim of a loathsome political disease which was thought to have been wiped out—at least from the Western world—after the last war. Inside Greece, education has taken a backward leap, there are more informers than professors in the universities, and the young are regimented into "Alkimi" groups, copied after the "Hitlerjugend" pattern, corruption gallops uncontrolled, and Greece is fast developing into the liveliest gambling den in the Mediterranean.

And the army has been destroyed, in spirit if not in body. The best officers, the war heroes, the men who fought against the three enemies of freedom, Nazis, Fascists, Communists, have been cashiered when they have not been exiled, jailed or tortured. Devotion to the junta is now the only recognized military virtue in an army which is disintegrating into an undisciplined corps of near mercenaries.

Washington knows all this, and is—I quote official words—disappointed. It is difficult to guess if this disappointment will lead the Nixon Administration into putting any real pressure on the Greek regime for a return to democracy. What is certain, is that up to now, there has not been any. It is difficult to believe that the United States could be for democracy, and against every democrat, against every antiregime Greek, even if he happened to be a declared anti-Communist. And as to the: "We cannot interfere . . ." this is a jumbo-size lie. What the United States is doing is interfering at all levels, in all directions, in every way, helping, supporting, advising, shielding, giving the junta the right to gloat and speak of present-day Greece as the only "real" ally of America.

And one last truth, the ugliest of all. The present Greek regime has been given military aid, not because of high-level strategic reasons, nor for the security of the United States, but for the servicing of the Sixth Fleet, for low-level port conveniences, more touristic than military. Which, one would like to reassure the Pentagon, will always be available. The point when Americans will be chased away from every free country is not here yet. It may come, if the trend of loving dictatorship better than democracy is not reversed.

And then the question: "Why did we fight the Nazis and the Fascists, Daddy" will be a very difficult one to answer.

DR. HARRY M. KLENDA

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Harry M. Klenda, a distinguished citizen of Wichita, Kans., who rose to national prominence in dentistry, was taken by death on October 2, 1971. Dr. Klenda was immediate past president of the American Dental Association and was to be installed as president of the American Prosthodontic Society earlier this month.

He was a past president of the Kansas Dental Association, the Seventh District Dental Society, the Wichita Dental Society, and was past president and a founder of the American Academy of Dental Practice Administration. He also had served as a member of the American Dental Association Task Force on National Health Programs.

Dr. Klenda's service was not limited to his profession alone. He contributed significantly to the development of his community, State, and Nation as a citizen dedicated to civic service. He will be greatly missed, but his work and service to mankind will long be remembered.

Mrs. Shriver and I join in extending our heartfelt sympathy to Dr. Klenda's family upon the great loss they have suffered.

MINNEAPOLIS HEALTH HEARINGS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, for many of the aged, the most serious problems facing them are poverty, disenfranchisement from the society, and political impotence.

Mr. John Grill, from the Metropolitan Citizens Communications Co., stated that many of the elderly do not feel part of the society. They are, in large measure, unorganized and they speak with various voices. Mr. Grill pointed out that many older citizens are afraid to become politically involved in attempting to change things. He believes, in short, that the aged have become the quiet minority in our society.

Mrs. Lavinia Howell, testifying on behalf of the U-Meet-Us senior citizens, supported Mr. Grill's statement. Mrs. Howell discussed in very real terms the problems of trying to subsist on very low income. The recent cut in food stamps forces many to go without meat. Mrs. Howell also argues persuasively for reducing the emphasis on trying to get senior citizens to move into rest homes. In short, Mrs. Howell points out that the way this society treats its senior citizens is, in the long run, destructive and, in the short run, callous. Her statement follows:

STATEMENT BY MRS. LAVINIA HOWELL

I am speaking for the U-Meet-Us senior citizens—Mrs. Brown could not be here. And so I was sent as a representative. But I am also speaking for the handicapped. The health bill as it is now is a farce. Things have gone up, but patient care has not gone up. The elderly people—their diet is not what it should be. They will live on spaghetti, potatoes—which will help you have a full belly. But it's not nutritious and so many are afraid of buying meat because their budget is so low. The Social Security has raised their standards and the way they raised it, Medicare went up also so the older person was in the same bag as he was in the beginning.

The handicapped are accused of being drunk and thrown in jail—it is ridiculous and then when you ask for more rehabilitation training, you are faced with statements like "well you don't want more training—you want to cause trouble." I speak slowly but I am not on dope. Our people exist in a different culture but we are American. We go out through the snow in order to keep going. We eat corn bread that has kept us going all these years, and when I see that senior citizens, because my husband is one where they talk to him and tell him, "Well, you ought to go in to a rest home," and I am supposed to go into a nursing home. Now the money—the most that federal and state, county and city will pay is not enough to live on—and we have our home. Our home is paid for. And so that is why I would like to say to you, oh yes, everyone can say, "Well, you can get food stamps," for when you buy food stamps, where is your toilet paper coming from? Where is your soap coming from? You see, when everything is so low and when we know that there is inflation, then they have the nerve to cut, and my husband's food stamp allotment was cut by $13, and I told him I would have told them to shove it, because that does not even buy his food stamps. And I go down and I talked to someone—"Well, you are fortunate, Mrs. Howell, that you have someone in the house during the day." I'm not fortunate—I think it's a crime while we Americans can take care of everyone all over the world and our citizens, we refuse to do right by them. And I don't care what I say, I'm not going by color, I know that it happens to poor whites, and the Indians are in the same bag as we are and we have worked—he's 80 years old and he should be allowed to spend the rest of his time in his own home.

So as members of the U-Meet-Us Senior Citizens, we help ourselves—we cook, we sew, and do everything that we can to help ourselves. We don't want anyone carrying us—we'll carry ourselves if you'll let me get on that first ladder. I don't want to stay there—I want to climb higher to the next ladder and that is the way the senior citizens do. And you build all of these high rises which is an unnatural situation. Mother, grandmother, grandchildren, years ago, used to be able to stay in the home.

And now, if they stay in the home, then you're cut off and the bill, the health bill that's going through is just like the Green bill. It is not going to help the poor. When everything goes out, in salary, what's coming down to the poor to get them training? That is why when Mrs. Brown said to me, "I will not be able to make it, but you will represent the U-Meet-Us citizens." I said, "All right I will." And that is why I am here.

Thank you Congressman Fraser for taking your time. I didn't know that you had a gathering last night. You know me very well. Of course I didn't know you were a Congressman when I told you to take my hand to help me over the ice.

So I am saying that to you. Give us older people a chance. We have old bodies but young hearts. And every one of us, if you live long enough will get as old as we are. So thank you very much.

LAKE SUCCESS RESOLUTION

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that my colleagues in the House are well aware of my long-standing opposition to our involvement in the tragic conflict in Indochina. Almost 6 years have passed since I proposed a stand-still cease-fire which would be followed by a peace conference and a prisoner exchange. Today, despite the prolonged withdrawal and disengagement process, we still have not achieved the goal of ending the sacrifice of life in Southeast Asia.

For these reasons, I was gratified to receive the following resolution adopted on October 11 during a special meeting of the board of trustees of the village of Lake Success:

EXTRACT FROM MINUTES OF A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE LAKE SUCCESS BOARD OF TRUSTEES, HELD AT THE VILLAGE OFFICE, 318 LAKEVILLE ROAD, ON OCTOBER 11, 1971

Whereas, military spending for the Viet Nam War represents a substantial portion of the Federal Budget and diverts public funds from more urgent needs of this nation, including purposes which benefit municipalities, both large and small, and their residents; and

Whereas, the President of the United States has already taken initial steps to terminate American involvement in the Viet Nam War; and

Whereas, doubt exists throughout all segments of the Nation and our Government as to the propriety and morality of now prolonging the said War,

Now therefore, at a Special Meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Village of Lake Success, held at the Village Office on October 11, 1971, the Board of Trustees of the Village of Lake Success has unanimously passed the following Resolution:

Be it resolved that the Board of Trustees of the Village of Lake Success, County of Nassau, State of New York, hereby urges the President and the Congress of the United States to do all in their power to effect an immediate cease fire and prompt withdrawal of all United States Military Forces from Viet Nam, Laos, and Cambodia.

The Village Clerk will be instructed to send copies of this Resolution to the President of the United States, Senators James L. Buckley and Jacob K. Javits, and Congressman Lester L. Wolff.

On a poll vote, the following elected officials voted in favor:

Mayor Richard F. Antonoff; Trustee Jack G. Sahn; Trustee Reuben L. Kershaw; Trustee Dr. Sumner Cohen; Trustee Mrs. Susan Firestein; Trustee J. Lawrence Hauser; Trustee Dr. Morton Leff.

And further, the village Justice, Godfrey Schutzer, endorsed the Resolution.

This resolution precisely emphasizes the crucial issues which have, for so long, been a part of the American dilemma in Vietnam; namely, that the winding-down of the war already implies a decision to terminate our involvement, that the resources—both of men and materiel—diverted to the war could better be utilized here at home, and that the American people clearly want an end to the continued loss of lives in Indochina.

This document calls upon me to do all that I can "to effect an immediate cease-fire and prompt withdrawal" of all American forces from Indochina. I plan to answer this call by again voting in favor of the Mansfield amendment which, through the setting of a definite withdrawal date, would allow us to negotiate seriously both for the release of our POW's and for an end to this terrible war.

PITTSBURGH PITCHER STEVE BLASS

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, the poised and triumphant champion of the 1971 world series—who was born in northwest Connecticut, threw his first pitch in Falls Village, and still maintains his home in this beloved area of Connecticut—has stirred the hearts and imaginations of the people throughout the Nation.

All of us in the Sixth Congressional District, along with millions of Americans across the land, were awed and delighted by the brilliant athletic achievement of Pittsburgh pitcher Steve Blass. After talking with newsmen about his country life in western Connecticut and his pitching days at Housatonic Valley Regional High School, Steve proceeded to confound the "experts" by hurling his second masterful series game against the mighty Baltimore Orioles. Family, parents, relatives, friends, and fans witnessed in person or on television the exhilarating spectacle of near athletic perfection. The attention of rooters throughout the district was riveted on every pitch, and they cheered their hero to victory.

After two series games, it appeared the Pittsburgh Pirates' drive for victory was hopelessly stymied. Then the young man from the land of Canaan—with great courage and confidence—led his teammates out of the doldrums to renewed vigor in the battle with the Baltimore Orioles.

The Pirates went on to post a 3–2 lead in the series games after leaving Pittsburgh, only to have the defending champs—the Orioles—fight back to a series tie at 3 games apiece, following their return to familiar grounds in Baltimore.

What a difficult situation for a young pitcher. The tension, emotion, and anxiety must be tremendous when one faces the intimidating power of the Baltimore Orioles in their own stadium on the seventh and concluding game of the world series. Yet, Steve Blass' immense ease and composure on the mound enabled the hero of Falls Village to maintain the slim 1-run lead his teammates provided him and secure the finest victory in his young life.

All Americans can appreciate the personal strength embodied in Steve's world series performance. However, the people of the Sixth District in Connecticut share with Steve's family—his parents, Mr. and Mrs. William S. Blass, his wife and two sons, David and Chris—a special pride.

Each of us in the sixth heartily commends his great spirit and ability. We

look forward, excitedly, as the future of Steve Blass—star pitcher—unfolds.

THE END OF CONTAINMENT

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, a recent press conference held by conservative Members of the Senate revealed how strongly the administration's notion of the feasibility of a "two-China policy" has taken hold. Although the focus of the conference was supposed to be on keeping the Republic of China in the United Nations, it soon became apparent that many of those who opposed the expulsion of free China were in favor of the admission of Red China to the U.N.

I was forced to strongly dissent from the turn the press conference had taken. If the press could present all anti-Communists in Congress as being willing to settle for a "two-China policy" in effect recognizing the legitimacy of the Communist conquest of the mainland, the Communist victory there would finally be complete, and there would be no rallying ground for the many Americans who still cannot see why we should accept their conquest and bloody rule. For the fundamental effect of the administration's changed policy toward China, of which the seating of Red China in the U.N. and the expulsion of free China from that body is only one element, is the sacrifice of Nationalist China and the end of the global holding action against communism—containment—which has been the general goal of our foreign policy since 1947.

Why do so many otherwise intelligent and patriotic individuals who realize the true nature of communism in general and the Peking regime in particular, fail to understand this essential point? One reason seems to be a set of false assumptions regarding the nature of power politics.

Some start from indications of Sino-Soviet rivalry and proceed to advocate strengthening Red China by bringing it out of international isolation. But since the split on which these individuals base their thinking occurred during a period when Red China was more or less isolated, there is no reason to believe that removing the isolation will deepen the split. There is at least as much reason to believe that our change in policy may help to bring the two enemy powers back together.

A recent historical example of the folly of attempting to split totalitarians through concessions, took place in 1935 when Britain and France accepted Mussolini's conquest of Ethiopia in the hopes that he would side with them against the Nazis. He took their support at the time, and then stabbed them in the back later.

Another rationale for the administration's policy, put forth by those who recognize that Red China has not become any less aggressive in the last 20 years, is the balance-of-power theory. This theory generally holds that an equilibrium of forces between two nations or a combination of nations maintains peace. A war between equal or nearly equal forces is unlikely, its advocates say, since neither side can count on victory. European history from 1815 to 1914 is generally used as historical confirmation of this theory.

Besides assuming—without evidence—that our policy of appeasement toward Red China will drive Moscow and Peking further apart and thus bring into play some type of undefined balance, this theory does not stand up for other good reasons. In Europe during the period when a balance of power was supposedly responsible for some degree of national restraint and generally prevailing world peace, there was a basic intellectual unity and moral consensus among all advanced nations. But since then the rise of universalistic totalitarian ideologies, such as communism, has removed this stabilizing factor. The Communist extension of empire is limited only by the raw power which opposes it. For the Leninists, Soviet and Chinese, everything which furthers world revolution is moral; everything which hinders it is immoral.

Furthermore, both the Soviet Union and Red China are vigorously seeking an imbalance of power in their favor, as is shown by the increasing margin of Soviet military superiority over the United States. A general balance of power, even if possible, would mean that the United States could not pursue the positive foreign policy which superior force alone permits. It would seal forever the fate of all the peoples now under Communist control, while also making containment impossible to sustain since, being defensive, it necessarily requires superior force.

Those interested in the security of the United States must recognize that decreasing free world strength by strengthening a vicious tyranny and abandoning a free world ally is the surest road to war.

SENATE—*Tuesday, October 19, 1971*

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

PRAYER

The Reverend Charles Lewis Yates, pastor, the Marshall Circuit, Wheeling, W. Va., offered the following prayer:

Our heavenly and loving Father, another day, and we come to Thee, for guidance and direction, in this worldwide known Senate Chamber, and so humble ourselves, under Thy mighty hand, that we may exalt You.

We desire to be sober, vigilant, because the Devil as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour.

Bless our President, Richard Nixon, and those in leadership and trust, of our Nation, and in all nations that they may seek the same in constant prayer with You, not relying on themselves but following Thy divine leadership as Thou has promised to give when we come to Thee.

In this great America, may we always be reminded by Thy loving words, found in the Gospel of Matthew, the seventh chapter the seventh and eighth verses:

Ask, and it shall be given you;
Seek, and ye shall find;
Knock, and it shall be opened unto you.
For everyone that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened.

And so, may Thy blessings and help be always with this chosen group of men and women, for the safety, honor, and welfare of Thy church, that all things may be so ordered and settled by their endeavors, upon the best and surest foundations that peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety may be established among us for all generations.

These and all other necessities, for them and for us, and Thy whole church, we humbly pray in the name and meditation of Jesus Christ, our blessed Lord and Saviour, in whom we put our trust and faith, from this time forth and forever more. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On October 13, 1971:

S. 2613. An act to extend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended for 1 month.

On October 14, 1971:

S. 47. An act for the relief of Flore Lekanof;

S. 617. An act for the relief of Siu-Kei-Fong;

S 1489. An act for the relief of Park Jung Ok; and

S. 1759. An act for the relief of Leonarda Buenaventura Ocariza and her daughter, Lucila B. Ocariza.

On October 15, 1971:

S. 646. An act to amend title 17 of the United States Code to provide for the creation of a limited copyright in sound recordings for the purpose of protecting against unauthorized duplication and piracy of sound recording, and for other purposes; and

S. 932. An act to amend title 13, United States Code, to provide for a revision in the cotton ginning report dates.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the President pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of Senate proceedings.)