

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

**MRS. BERTIE SEXTON, 100 YEARS OF AGE TODAY, HONORED BY NEIGHBORS AND FRIENDS AT BIRTHDAY PARTY—PRESIDENT NIXON SENDS MESSAGE**

**HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH**

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 29, 1971*

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Mrs. Bertie Sexton, 100 years of age today, was honored yesterday by her neighbors and friends at a birthday party attended by more than 150 admirers.

The happy occasion was brought into being by Mr. and Mrs. James H. Pipkin, who have enjoyed a cherished affection for this truly remarkable woman who has lived her happy life in Virginia and West Virginia, in the area of Harpers Ferry.

Bertie was laughing and alert as she greeted the guests, walking about the dining room of the Blue Ridge Rod and Gun Club.

President Richard Nixon sent a personal message to Mrs. Sexton. It was read to the group by Deena Clark, well-known television personality. The President said:

Warmest congratulations to you on your one hundredth birthday. Mrs. Nixon and I join in the hope that your happiness on this occasion—and your contentment always—may reflect in full the joy you have brought to the lives of others throughout these years.

Congratulatory messages were received from Gov. Linwood Holton, Senators WILLIAM SPONG and HARRY BYRD of Virginia and Senator ROBERT BYRD and me. It was my joy to be present at the event.

Gifts were piled high on a large table. Among these presents were a fishing pole and a can of worms, given his rural route postal patron by the mail carrier from the Harpers Ferry Post Office. That gift was appropriate recognition of Bertie's many activities. She still gardens, makes pickles and preserves. A very religious woman, she has a genuine interest in her church and in community organizations. She currently is assisting in the solicitation of funds for the new Charles Town General Hospital project.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an article on the bright centenarian, appearing in the March 27 issue of the Martinsburg, W. Va., Journal, printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

**SHE'S READY TO CELEBRATE HER 100TH BIRTHDAY SUNDAY**  
(By Sarah Snyder)

HARPERS FERRY, March 27.—"I'd love to be back in the orchard business right now," declares Mrs. Chester (Bertie) Sexton on the eve of her 100th birthday.

For years, Mrs. Sexton and her husband operated the third largest orchard in Loudoun County, Va., just across the West Virginia border from here, and shipped thousands of bushels of apples to such places as England and other foreign countries.

While Monday, March 29, is the official century mark for Mrs. Sexton, the big celebration will be Sunday when more than 200 friends from the area will gather at the Blue Ridge Rod and Gun Club to honor her.

Mrs. Sexton said she has always lived within a mile of the place she was born, adding "there is no place like it." During her life, she has visited such places as Florida and California but always "drifts back here."

Her husband, whom she calls "one of the nicest men I've ever known," died in 1944, and she lost her son, Russell, two years ago. He was president of the Brunswick Bank.

Mrs. Sexton lives with her sister-in-law, Mrs. Margaret Russell, and is just waiting for Spring to come to get back with her flowers and garden. She said she would like to raise chickens, but Mrs. Russell won't let her have them.

A member of the Ebenezer Methodist Church, Mrs. Sexton used to be looked at as a "money raiser" for the church but admits she doesn't do too much lately. She remembers well baking an eight-pound cake and chancing it off for \$51.

Looking back over the last century, Mrs. Sexton recalls the many picnics on the island at Harpers Ferry when there were no automobiles, just horse and buggy.

She says things are so different now, and while she welcomes many of the changes, she does not like the new fashions for women particularly the short dresses. She told your reporter to put a ruffle on her skirt before she came to call again! Mrs. Sexton added that she hopes the time never comes when men start wearing dresses.

She declared that she is not pleased with taxes and expenses of today, adding that it cannot possibly last. A strike today, and up go costs.

One of her dearest friends is Lou Cohen, of Martinsburg. Mrs. Sexton said she used to visit his store just to see him, without wanting anything. Mr. Cohen said that was a sign of a true friend.

Even approaching the century mark, Mrs. Sexton concluded that she is still a scrapper, lively as ever.

**THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE**

**HON. HUGH SCOTT**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 29, 1971*

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, March 25, 1971, the 150th anniversary of Greek independence, should be a joyous time and a period of rededication to the quest for a more perfect freedom. Democracy began with the public meetings in Athens. The people would gather, debate, and vote on issues concerning their city. Truly, this exemplified a pure democracy, but the Athenians discovered democracy was hard to preserve in a hostile world.

Fortunately, the Greek people kept the democratic idea alive. They preserved it through art, poetry, drama, and literature. Today, the foundations of the Government of the United States owe their very basis to the Greek culture.

All the nations of the world should look back 150 years when the Greek struggle for liberty ended with independence from Turkish domination. The movement for independence started on

March 25, 1821, when rebellion swept across the Peloponnesos, Macedonia, and Thrace. Although setbacks were many, the relentless efforts of the Greek people, along with such patriotic allies as Lord Byron, kept hope alive. The struggle for freedom officially ended in July 1832, when Turkey recognized Greece as an independent nation.

And since this period, the courageous and artistic people of Greece have struggled to maintain their independence and freedom.

Thomas Jefferson, who left so much to this great Nation of ours, echoed his feelings that have much meaning today. In a letter to M. Coray in 1823, he wrote:

No people sympathize more feelingly than ours with the sufferings of your countrymen, none offer more sincere and ardent prayers to Heaven for their success. And nothing indeed but the fundamental principle of our government, never to entangle us with the brolls of Europe, could restrain our generous youth from taking some part in this holy cause. Possessing ourselves the combined blessing of liberty and order, we wish the same to other countries, and to none more than yours, which, the first of civilized nations, presented examples of what man should be.

**LET'S BRING OUR MEN HOME**

**HON. WILLIAM R. ROY**

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 23, 1971*

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting and proper that we observe a "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action." The plight of American families suffering the agony of uncertainty in regard to their sons, husbands, fathers, and brothers is one more tragic aspect of the dreadful conflict in Indochina.

Friday, March 26, marks the seventh anniversary of the capture of the first of our men still being held.

At the present time nearly 1,600 of our servicemen are either known to be prisoners of the Communists, or are listed as missing in action. We owe these men a tremendous debt.

Our Government sent them 12,000 miles to fight a war that was not of their making. It is our responsibility to secure their release and rapid return to their loved ones.

For although it is appropriate that we honor these men with special observances, it is not enough to make speeches and wring our hands over their fate. We must take positive action to secure their release.

There are heartfelt differences of opinion among those of us in and out of Congress as to the best means of achieving the end of the war in Indochina. Let us hope the policies decided upon are successful in rapidly securing this national goal.

Above all, however, our POW's must not be used as an excuse for prolonging our involvement. Their plight, in fact,

is a primary reason for speeding up our withdrawal, if this will result in their early release.

North Vietnam stands condemned for its violations of the Geneva Convention provisions in regard to prisoners of war. We should all join in writing letters and bringing pressure on the leaders of that country, so as to secure more humane treatment of our men.

Actually, our options are somewhat limited. We value our men highly and want them back, but it is not being realistic to expect Hanoi to separate the question of POW's from the larger political issues involved.

Our men have languished in captivity for 7 years. It is time we seriously considered negotiations linking our withdrawal and their release.

The POW situation is a part of the larger tragedy of this war, which has killed 50,000 and wounded 300,000 Americans. A quarter of a million Americans are still in Southeast Asia, risking their lives daily.

In a sense, all of our servicemen in Indochina are prisoners of war. Let us bring them all home as soon as possible.

#### ECONOMIC SANCTIONS AGAINST RHODESIA

**HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Monday, March 14, 1971, edition of the Charleston, S.C., News and Courier included an excellent editorial on the subject of economic sanctions against Rhodesia.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "U.S.A. and Rhodesia," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks. The editor of the News and Courier is Thomas R. Waring.

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

#### USA AND RHODESIA

The longer the United States participates in the United Nations' economic sanctions against Rhodesia, the more foolish that participation appears. The USA's position is not only foolish but dangerous and could be a hazard to national security.

In a forceful attack on the Nixon administration policy on Rhodesia, Sen. Harry F. Byrd Jr. of Virginia recently warned the Senate that the USA is permitting the Soviet Union to maintain a strangle-hold on supplies of chrome ore vital to national defense. Because the USA supports the U.N. sanctions against Rhodesia, which is the source of two-thirds of the world's supply of chrome ore, it has had to turn to Russia for the ore. Taking advantage of the USA's predicament, Russia has boosted its asking price.

The Nixon administration has asked Congress to release chrome ore from the national raw materials stockpile to ease the shortage caused by the embargo on Rhodesia. Sen. Byrd told the Senate such release "is not the appropriate remedy." The correct step, he said, "is for this nation . . . to end its foolish policy against Rhodesia and resume trade with that nation."

After Rhodesia in 1965 declared her independence from Britain, the U.N. Security Council adopted a resolution condemning Rhodesia as "a threat to international security." As absurd as this resolution was, since Rhodesia is no more a threat to world security than is Switzerland, the U.S. endorsed it.

Sen. Byrd has deftly demolished the arguments in favor of sanctions presented by Arthur Goldberg, then U.S. ambassador to the U.N. Mr. Goldberg said: "What is happening now in Rhodesia is an effort to perpetuate the control of 6 per cent of the population over the other 94 per cent . . ." Sen. Byrd observed that in the Soviet Union, members of the Communist Party comprising about 1 per cent of the population control the other 99 per cent of the population. A handful of men control the destinies of all the people in Albania.

"Fidel Castro," said Sen. Byrd, "almost singlehanded, operating through a small communist cadre, controls the lives of nearly 7 million Cubans," and a small communist dictatorship controls the lives of about 700 million Chinese.

Yet the United Nations, said Sen. Byrd, has imposed sanctions on none of those countries nor has the USA asked the U.N. to impose any such sanctions. "Besides that," said Sen. Byrd, "we are in the absurd position of demanding economic sanctions against a nation at peace with us and yet do nothing about seeking economic sanctions against North Vietnam . . ."

Economic sanctions against Rhodesia have failed. That country's export trade has increased. The USA has put itself in an exposed position. Russia could cut off its chrome ore shipments to the USA at any time. Rhodesia undoubtedly is finding other markets for the ore and soon will not need America's business even if sanctions were lifted.

With logic that cannot be evaded, Sen. Byrd has urged the Nixon administration to reverse its policy on Rhodesia because "morally, it is wrong. Legally, it is dubious. Economically, it is costly. And it would jeopardize the security of the United States." A policy riddled with so many faults should not be continued.

#### COMPARATIVE U.S./U.S.S.R. MANAGEMENT OF DEFENSE R. & D.

**HON. CRAIG HOSMER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the public, the press, and the Congress are interested in better management of our defense capability and in the development of new weapons to maintain an adequate capability for the future. We hear that the Soviets are investing a larger amount of resources in their weapons research and development; it would be interesting to compare how the two countries manage their programs to see what implications it may have on comparative technology posture.

All sectors of the Soviet national economy and all its resources are centrally regulated and allocated according to rigid state plans. In the long range—5-year and 7-year—plans and in the annual plans, resource allocation has been subject to stringent controls; unlike the capitalistic system which relies on the law of supply and demand, this method

of resource allocation is not always as efficient for supplying consumer goods.

However, the system has certain strengths. The Soviet state, in its sole ownership of resources, is able to concentrate resources on areas which support their stated goal of achieving technology superiority. It is apparent that planning in the U.S.S.R. is directed toward utilizing all of the resources allocated. This is reflected by the consistent rate of new weapons development, by full employment of their scientists, engineers, and technicians and by continuous and full use of their factories and test facilities.

On the other hand, the U.S. planning process can be called "needs" planning, that is, the United States identifies R. & D. needs and then seeks the resources from the Congress and indirectly from the public. While this process is more responsive to the will of the people, there is no assurance that R. & D. resources—people and facilities—will be fully and continuously used.

One way that we seek to overcome the Soviet advantage of greater R. & D. resources is by the use of new management technologies. One of these is called net technical assessment, which is a way of defining our margin of security by carefully measuring the assets of both sides and determining the most needed weapon system development.

In this assessment process, a very careful analysis is made of two distinct types of Soviet and U.S. data in the defense sector—input and output. In the categories of comparable inputs, we looked at the budgets, manpower, research and development facilities, transfer of manpower between nations, and the R. & D. management processes. On the output side, we have analyzed the technological progress of the United States and the Soviet Union in several key areas by examining the technical status of hundreds of particular kinds of research efforts—for example, research in fuels, engines, electronics, and materials—as they have related to improvements in weapon systems. We have compared a U.S. weapon system which does a certain kind of job with a similar Soviet system, over a period of years, to determine which was better and how many years it would take the nation with the second-rated system to produce one comparable to the other's.

Finally, we added up the total number of weapons systems produced by both sides over a number of years and analyzed this gross output in relation to the input of R. & D. resources; the numbers of new weapons are about the same and the U.S. inputs during the period were slightly larger, probably because of the higher complexity and technology of our product.

By the use of this input-output analysis, we have found that our identification of research and development requirements and our allocation of priorities is made easier. This method promises a way to get more military capability for the R. & D. dollar and, even more important, will permit a better assessment of national defense needs.



ACCOUNTING FOR SOCIAL  
PROGRESS**HON. FRANK E. MOSS**

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES  
*Monday, March 29, 1971*

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, David F. Linowes is a partner in a large accounting firm and has served as an adviser to the State Department and to the United Nations. In the New York Times of Sunday, March 14, 1971, Mr. Linowes published an article in the Point of View section entitled "Accounting for Social Progress." What he says in this article is most provocative and certainly is worthy of consideration.

At a time when the problem of social welfare is critical and much discussion is being had as to total Federal support of welfare, as contrasted with partial Federal support and partial local support, I believe that thought could be given to some of the ideas advanced by Mr. Linowes. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

ACCOUNTING FOR SOCIAL PROGRESS; YARDSTICKS  
MUST BE FOUND FOR PUBLIC PROGRAMS  
(By David Linowes)

The public sector has never been concerned with the bottom line of a profit-and-loss statement. It can no longer afford the luxury of this "benign neglect."

Many of our cities are facing the prospects of bankruptcy; our largest states are being squeezed beyond their financial ability to respond; the Federal Government is increasing the national debt dangerously—and far worse, the nation's problems are not being solved.

Yet, the social and governmental institutions that deal with these problems can be made effective if we devise new approaches to the way these agencies and their programs are set up, financed and run.

Fortunately, it is not too late—and the tools are at hand. The tools come wrapped up as several advanced business management principles to which must be added a number of social-science techniques.

To accomplish what must be done in the social sector—to produce the people-oriented individual-centered results urgently needed—we will have to create a totally new discipline; what I call Socio-Economic Management.

Before getting into the elements of this new concept, we should realize that when government applies standards in the public sector, they are usually the least relevant ones. The accent is on the quantitative. The old numbers game is being played. Consider, for example, welfare programs, where allocations are mostly based on the number of people fed, clothed and housed. Shouldn't the standards be concerned with making people self-sufficient, self-respecting, employable?

There are as yet no existing case studies of how standards for qualitative results can be related to the funding of social programs. But here is a simple and hypothetical example of how socio-economic management principles can be applied:

Public School No. 2 in Progress City received an appropriation of \$1,400 a student for fiscal 1971-72. Public School No. 3 was given \$1,200 a student and Public School No. 4 was granted \$1,600. All three schools were in equivalent social and economic environments.

Why the differences? A survey showed that the graduating students from Public School 2 last June had on the average achieved a competency in reading, writing and arithmetic of level B. Public School 3 students achieved only a level C, whereas Public School 4 graduates reached a level A competency.

Progress City in administering its funds for education made its appropriations not only based on numbers of students, but also based on the learning achievement of the students: Qualitative standards, as well as quantitative standards, were being applied.

Let's look at how value standards, based upon "people needs," can be implemented by funding geared to socio-economic management techniques in helping the poor to become self-sufficient:

Good City with a population of 90,000, received a grant from the Federal Government for its poverty programs in 1971-72 of \$9-million. Fair City, with the same population and the same economic status, received \$8-million; and Poor City, of equal size and status, received only \$7-million. Why the disparity?

In the last fiscal year, Good City, through its effective programs, imaginatively administered, succeeded in making 1,000 indigent residents employable and self-sufficient; Fair City returned only 500 people to the economic mainstream, and Poor City, none. The Federal Government was applying a value standard in making appropriations by relating the funds to the accomplishment of the true objectives of a poverty program. This, basically, is what socio-economic management is designed to do.

Social scientists have given considerable thought to qualitative standards, but no one has yet put the social scientists together with the quantitative and management experts. That is what would make socio-economic management a functioning entity.

There are five socio-economic management principles that I recommend be applied to social agencies and programs:

1. Clearly identify as standards for measurement, when making fund appropriations, those objectives for which the social program or agency exists.

2. Keep changing the mix of resource inputs—that is, the kind of things being bought with the budgeted funds—until satisfactory results are achieved. Don't become locked into hiring more of the same kind of policeman to do more of the same work. Put some of that money to use in analyzing the causes of crime or lighting more ghetto alleys, or creating more challenging playgrounds for potential teen-age offenders.

3. Many qualitative measurement standards already exist in the social, education, and welfare areas, but are being overlooked in assessing the results of operation of these nonbusiness organizations. They should be used.

4. For all social agencies and programs, identify the people who are supposed to be the recipients and develop procedures for choices by the clients.

5. Establish a regular program of socio-economic audits by independent outsiders.

To start the process by which we can hope to make our social institutions responsive to our national needs, I would urge that Socio-Economic Management Councils be created at every level of government. Composed of social scientists, accountants, and business management executives, they would examine the existing programs in education, environment, crime, poverty and drug control to establish to what extent their objectives are being met.

As a prototype, I propose that Socio-Economic Management Councils be set up on the local level to create programs to provide solutions for the major urban problems.

The council team would be assigned to one specific community problem area—preparing Harlem high school dropouts for college entrance, for example. It would first research

the problem and then design a system to obtain the desired solutions.

Socio-Economic Management is a logical extension of socio-economic accounting, which can be defined as the measurement and analysis of the social and economic consequences of governmental and business actions on the public sectors.

In the United States we need the determination to study and experiment with our resource inputs to arrive at the best combination to give us the most numbers of self-sufficient, self-respecting, happy people who happen to live in the ghetto areas.

Perhaps our poverty programs should apply some of their input resources to setting up trade training centers in conjunction with and joined to government-supported, ghetto-resident-owned small industry complexes—industries whose products have ready markets as components to be used by larger industries or as small consumer products. These products could be subsidized by a poverty program so that they can compete effectively in price with established, efficient plants. In time, these will also become efficient and be able to stand on their own, but of more importance, the people being aided will be working for what they get.

Our social problems have long outdistanced our ability to "buy" solutions. What's more, intense competition exists for what limited public dollars are available for social use.

The American accounting profession and business management—working in tandem for the first time with the social scientists—have all the know-how needed to begin a "turn-around" for the public sector. Together they can create social investments that can finally begin showing desperately needed profits: improving the quality of life in the United States.

SUPPORT OF INTERSTATE 75  
ROUTE IN GEORGIA**HON. JOHN W. DAVIS**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 29, 1971*

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for some 8 years I and other concerned citizens of the Seventh District of Georgia have been laboring on behalf of the construction of Interstate Highway 75 through the Seventh District. Five years ago, open hearings were conducted on the proposed route north of Marietta and the route was approved by the Department of Transportation after favorable recommendations were made by the State Highway Department of Georgia, the Georgia Game and Fish Commission, the Georgia Parks Department, and other interested agencies of the State and Federal Governments.

At that time, I maintained, as I have throughout, that the most important factor in the selection of a route must necessarily be swiftness of construction to avoid further loss of lives on the existing primary thoroughfare, U.S. 41, a highway which cannot begin to serve the great traffic flow running north and south from Atlanta to Chattanooga. Additionally, I supported the State highway department's proposed route because it offers the optimum resource utilization and cost effectiveness and is the most direct of all proposed routes.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the routing of Interstate Highway 75 became a

political issue in my last campaign. The opponents of this route, which traverses Lake Allatoona, cited environmental and ecological considerations which they contended would come to pass were the highway to follow this particular longitude.

As a long-time member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, no one is more aware than I of the grave dangers posed to our environment due to past excesses on the part of Government, industry, and all our citizenry. No one, Mr. Speaker, is more aware of our need to pursue a rational and careful course so that we may secure our environment from a disastrous end. But, I must contend that erring on one side of the issue can be nearly as calamitous as erring on the other side—to wit, the contention by opponents of the proposed routing of Interstate 75 over Lake Allatoona, that such a route will pose a serious hazard not only to the lake area, which, by the way, is an artificially created body, but also to the two State parks between which the route would run.

Two points must be made at this juncture. First of all, some of the finest engineering minds in Georgia have repeatedly and vigorously asserted that routing of the highway over the lake will pose no serious environmental threat to the lake community. Second, when it comes down to a question of human lives or the minor inconveniencing of a few recreational facilities, I look first to the security and welfare of those who must travel on an antiquated, overcrowded, and highly dangerous stretch of road.

Compounding the problem hitherto described has been what one Georgia State representative called the meddling of outsiders in the affairs of the seventh district. There are those in an adjacent district who have been extremely vocal on the side of prohibiting the lake route, as they contend this route would disturb recreational facilities presently enjoyed in large numbers by their own constituents. I might point out also that these facilities are themselves environmental pollutants. I would not dispute that this must be a consideration. However, I must reiterate my feelings that the safety of human lives can never be equated with the preservation of recreational facilities, particularly when such facilities would be only minutely disturbed and could, within time, be properly restored.

I am pleased that the majority opinion rests with my point of view, not only in my own district, not only with concerned State agencies—which have unanimously endorsed the lake route—but also in adjacent areas which have an interest in this project. All of my colleagues from Georgia in the House of Representatives—save one—have adopted my point of view, and I was delighted to learn this week that majority sentiment on the issue in that gentleman's district concurs with my feelings. Toward that end, I commend to my colleagues the following resolution adopted by the Fulton County Board of Commissioners:

**A RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF STATE HIGHWAY BOARD'S POSITIONS ON INTERSTATE 75**

Whereas, it has been reported that the Federal Department of Transportation has determined to reject the Georgia State High-

way Department's proposed route of Interstate 75 in the vicinity of Lake Allatoona; and

Whereas, the Georgia State Highway Department has invested between \$1,000,000.00 and \$2,000,000.00 of Highway funds in engineering studies and investigation of alternate routes for said highway, including serious consideration of environmental aspects, and the Highway Department has determined that the proposed route across Lake Allatoona is the route best in the public interest of the citizens of Georgia; and

Whereas, a rejection of this route will result in inevitable delays in constructing this vitally needed link in the Interstate system, such delays being estimated to be from two to three years in duration; and

Whereas, this traffic corridor to be served by Interstate 75 has by far the most heavily travelled corridor in the State of Georgia and the system as presently existing is totally inadequate to move said traffic with either facility or safety; and

Whereas, it has been reliably estimated that this additional delay will result in the loss of thirty additional lives because of the inadequacy of the existing highway;

Be it, therefore, resolved: That the Board of Commissioners of Fulton County, Georgia, strongly support the position of the Honorable Bert Lance, Director of the State Highway Department in his efforts to secure immediate acceptance of the presently proposed route for said Interstate 75 and, if he fails to secure this acceptance, his announced intention to seek the aid of the Courts in settling the route of said highway, so that construction can be begun at the earliest possible date; and

Be it further resolved: That the Clerk of this Commission send copies of this Resolution to: Honorable Bert Lance, Director, State Highway Department; Honorable John Volpe, U.S. Secretary of Transportation; U.S. Senators of Georgia, and U.S. Congressional Delegation.

#### BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE

#### HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, dating its economic, cultural, and political ties back to the 13th century, the people of Byelorussia established the Byelorussian Democratic Republic on March 25, 1918.

At the time the Republic was established, Byelorussians showed some very progressive measures. A provisional constitution was adopted which called for direct and secret ballot open to all freedom of press, speech, and assembly, national and cultural autonomy of all minorities, an 8-hour workday, the right to strike, and all guarantees of human rights.

These provisions came from a heritage that produced Litouski Statut, a carefully developed legal code that was a prelude to Byelorussia's period of cultural and artistic leadership of Eastern Europe.

The Soviet Union has been attempting to stamp out this heritage since Russian Bolsheviks created the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic in 1919. It is estimated that over 4 million Byelorussians have been removed from their homeland because of political terror, mass deportations, or forced resettlements of Byelorussians on the Asian parts of the Soviet Russian empire.

In governmental affairs, only Russians are permitted to occupy the key positions in the Socialist Republic. The Byelorussian language has nearly been eliminated from schools and government. The economic development of Byelorussia is guided by the needs of the Siberian and Central Asian regions of the Soviet empire.

Byelorussia is represented in the United Nations, but an analysis of the country's votes indicates that it does not deviate from the U.S.S.R. positions.

The Byelorussians have often indicated their desire for freedom from Soviet dominance. Uprisings from 1920 through 1926 and the Second All-Byelorussian Congress convened in 1944, reaffirm the Byelorussian people's desire for complete political independence.

Therefore, I join with Byelorussians throughout the free world in celebrating today as a symbol of their national aspirations.

#### AN ECONOMIC BASIS

#### HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ted Jefferson, the publisher of several trade magazines, has long been an outspoken defender of the free enterprise system.

In a recent editorial in one of his publications, *Welding Distributor*, he presents an interesting description of some of the benefits of the much-defiled "profit motive" in business. I insert this editorial in the *RECORD* as follows:

#### AN ECONOMIC BASIS

Profit seems to become a dirty word. If yours is an average firm, in all probability some of your employees are against the idea of the company making a profit—not because of any special reason other than that they have been listening to the wrong people.

We all know that the company's income is dependent on the sales of products and services. If the firm doesn't have sufficient profit to meet expenses, the business goes into the "red." These losses must come out of the reserves built-up in profitable years, or out of the owners' pockets. If the losses continue over a prolonged period, the business goes broke, and the employees then learn that a lack of profit has cost them their jobs. Profit then assumes a new importance.

Like most employers you probably have a communications problem. Have any of your employees ever been told that it takes the profits of sales equal to nearly two times their annual salary to pay the taxes on their social security and unemployment benefits? Do they know that those fifteen minute coffee breaks use up the profits on sales equal to two times their annual salary. These figures assume that your after tax profits are three percent—if they are greater these fringe benefits, of course, are not so costly, but if the profits are less, the sales required to meet the "fringes" may be many times greater.

Most employees enjoy many more fringes, such as paid vacations, health insurance, and the like, all of which have to be paid out of profits. When the cost of all these are totaled, they may add to the total profits obtained from sales equal to eight-to-ten times each employee's annual salary.



Profits also provide the owners of the firm with an incentive to invest. The returns must be sufficiently high to warrant the risk; otherwise, it might be better to place the money in a bank account or some other place offering an assured return at little or no risk.

It must also be remembered that profits are required to insure the continuation and expansion of the company. Only a few years ago, a distributor started business with an investment in inventory and equipment of only \$5,000 per employee. This sum is now grown to \$40,000-50,000, or more, per employee.

When profits are looked at in the correct perspective, it is seen that they are not a necessary evil, but rather a necessity. If your employees have not been told the story, now is the time to do it so that the entire team will work to make next year more profitable.

## TOBACCO INSTITUTE REPLIES

### HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, the tobacco industry is one of the oldest continuous enterprises in the New World, yet today we find that this industry is constantly having to defend itself on every hand.

In the Wednesday, March 17, edition of the Washington Evening Star there was a splendid article in the "Letters to the Editor" column written by Mr. William Kloeffer, Jr., vice president of the American Tobacco Institute, Inc. This article speaks for itself and I would like to include it herein with my remarks. I commend it to the reading of the Members of the House.

The article follows:

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR  
TOBACCO INSTITUTE REPLIES

SIR: Recently you published a lengthy letter from three officials, including the president, of the Medical Society of the District of Columbia, attacking a recent report by Columnist James J. Kilpatrick on the notorious "smoking dog" research of 1970.

Mr. Kilpatrick can handle his own affairs, of course, but we cannot permit your readers to be misguided by the assertions of the three doctors whose letter you published.

Certain of their assertions cannot be questioned, including their statement that until the "smoking dogs" report was published a year ago, "it had long been suspected that smoking did have a relationship to lung cancer," but "no proof had heretofore existed."

It appears, however, that in several respects the three doctors have been seriously misled by their sources of information.

The chronology of the "smoking dogs" episode is significant. For more than two years, using some three-quarters of a million dollars furnished by the American Cancer Society and the Veterans Administration, researchers had a group of beagle dogs "smoking" cigarettes through holes cut in their throats.

#### REPORTED THEIR FINDINGS

On February 5, 1970, the scientists in person reported their findings to an American Cancer Society meeting, and then to the public at a large news conference in the Waldorf-Astoria hotel in New York.

Then the "New England Journal of Medicine" refused to publish their finding because they had delivered them first to the news media.

Then, in June, the researchers delivered new versions of their report to the AMA convention in Chicago.

Then the "Journal of the American Medical Association" rejected their reports for publication.

Then the authors submitted new reports to "Archives of Environmental Health" on whose editorial board, as Mr. Kilpatrick pointed out, one of the authors serves. The editor of that journal convened a meeting in July with the authors and a veterinary pathologist employed by a Philadelphia drug company at the firm's headquarters, to work out enough changes in the manuscripts to make them suitable for publication.

The final versions of the papers appeared in print in December.

Contrary to the statement by the three doctors that "there was no change in the scientific content of the papers which would have differed in any way" from the initial version, there were, in fact, numerous and major changes.

One of these was deletion, in the December version, of a stated purpose of the experiment in the February version—"to ascertain whether smoking cigarettes for two years or longer will produce lung cancer in dogs."

Contrary to the statement by the three doctors, the pathologists who reviewed this research before last February did not all concur in the findings.

Contrary to the statement by the three doctors, the pathologist whom the beagle researchers invited from the Council for Tobacco Research (supported by the cigarette industry) to review their work, at a time when he was in New Zealand, did not ignore the opportunity. He wired this reply:

"Am informed of your invitation for me to review your . . . beagle experimental material. Believe desirable also to permit other independent experts to see the slides and protocol since as research director CTR the review by me alone might be considered biased. On return . . . would appreciate further opportunity for discussion."

#### NEVER RESPONDED

The researchers never responded to him. The three doctors say the authors "requested permission to retract the paper" from the Journal of the American Medical Association, so they could publish it elsewhere. This is certainly incorrect. The fact is that the authors went to another publication with their manuscripts; refusing to accept and deal with the fundamental criticism made by 17 of the 18 scientific experts to whom JAMA had submitted the papers for review.

The three doctors stated correctly that the Tobacco Institute does not accept this experiment, as reported, as any proof that cigarette smoking causes people to become ill. As most experts in the field are aware, scientists have been attempting to produce illness in animals for three decades or more with inhalation of cigarette smoke, and have failed. At this moment, the National Cancer Institute's Tobacco Working Group is focusing considerable funds and talents in the search for animal experimentation methods which can yield reliable answers to questions raised about smoking.

Finally, the three doctors have expressed their belief that smoking is associated "with other debilitating diseases," and they specify smoking as "probably the single greatest cause for emphysema."

With due respect to the gentleman's professional knowledge, we must point out that this expression puts them at variance with the National Institutes of Health, which states in a current news release about emphysema: "We don't know the cause."

Despite the years of effort to establish scientific facts about smoking and health, the controversy still founders in a quicksand of statistical mysteries. Oddly enough, those who oppose smoking have linked it

conveniently with the causes of three of the largest voluntary fund raising associations in the country, in the areas of cancer, heart trouble and respiratory diseases.

The tobacco industry itself remains the largest single contributor to independent scientific research in smoking and health—an expenditure by the industry which will exceed \$40 million by the end of this year. The industry will continue to set this example of investigation, not condemnation in this significant area where its "selfish" interest, and the public interest, wholly coincide.

WILLIAM KLOEFFER, JR.,  
Vice President, Public Relations, The  
American Tobacco Institute, Inc.

## A SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY

### HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1971

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 8th year of prison life for the first serviceman captured by the Vietcong. This week has been appropriately designated by Congress as the National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action. Accordingly, I have joined more than 200 other Congressmen in cosponsoring House Concurrent Resolution 114, calling for the humane treatment and release of American prisoners of war held by North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front.

The resolution calls on North Vietnam to abide by the Geneva Convention Accords on Prisoners of War, and endorses the efforts of the U.S. Government, the United Nations, the International Red Cross, and other groups in seeking better treatment for the POW's.

This resolution would put Congress on record as cognizant of the plight of more than 1,400 Americans held as prisoners of war or missing in action.

It would call upon the North Vietnamese and their allies in South Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos to: First, identify the prisoners they hold; second, permit impartial inspection of their POW camps; third, release prisoners who are seriously ill or injured; and fourth, permit the free flow of mail between prisoners and their families.

I believe that American pressure for better treatment for the POW's has brought some small improvements in their lot. Some increase in mail between the men and their families has been permitted, and more packages can now be sent to the POW's. Also, the weight limitations on Christmas parcels have been liberalized and families have been permitted to mail such previously forbidden items as small games, medicines, and vitamins.

Despite these improvements, conditions are still deplorable. Less than a dozen prisoners have been freed in the last 5 years.

We must continue our efforts to involve all Americans in showing their concern for the POW's. It is becoming apparent to the North Vietnamese that the world looks harshly upon their refusal to abide by the Geneva POW Accords, which they signed in 1957.

## POLICE STATE IN PANAMA?

## HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I have previously expressed my concern over conditions in the Canal Zone regarding relations between the Panamanian Government and Americans within the Canal Zone.

Recently, the current situation within the Panamanian Government itself has been brought to my attention. Mr. Speaker, I am alarmed at those reports.

Apparently the present Government of Panama has embarked upon a policy of suppression designed to remove civil liberties and basic freedoms of the citizens of that Nation.

Continued acts of suppression and other police state tactics will only serve to feed the frustrations and discontent of the people of Panama.

There is ample evidence that restoration of representative and democratic government in that troubled Republic is long overdue.

In order that this situation be given proper exposure before the Congress, Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD a recent letter sent me by Mr. Phillip Harman of Los Angeles and an article from the Los Angeles Times:

MARCH 22, 1971.

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE,  
Congress of the United States, House of  
Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WALDIE: Thank you so very much for your letter of March 16th, 1971, pertaining to my concern of the military dictator of Panama, General Omar Torrijos.

The Panamanian is not a person of violence and that is why General Torrijos has stayed in power although the force and fear of General Torrijos is well known to the people of Panama. However, there is a limit as to how long they will tolerate this suppression of their human rights and this tolerance is coming to an end.

I am firmly convinced and sincerely believe that the only solution to stop the spreading of communism in the Canal Zone area and a possible building of a new Panama Canal by another country (as per General Torrijos' statement of Feb. 23rd, 1971) would be the return of the Constitutional President, Dr. Arnulfo Arias, who is in exile in Miami, Florida. The whole country is waiting for his return to restore human rights and democracy to Panama.

I am enclosing an article by the Chicago Daily News exposing the police state tactics that exist in Panama today.

May I say how so very much I appreciate the interest you are taking in this matter which means so much to the people of Panama and to the free world.

Cordially,

PHILLIP HARMAN.

## POLICE STATE TACTICS TOLD IN PANAMA

(By Don Bohning)

PANAMA.—Repressive police state tactics reportedly have eliminated any trace of organized opposition to Panama's military dictatorship.

Methods employed have been as effective in silencing public criticism by disgruntled Panamanians as they have in quelling the hard-line extremists dedicated to terrorism.

Tactics used by the National Guard, Panama's only military force, include arbitrary

arrests, tapped telephones, widespread use of informants, subtle and not so subtle physical and economic threats and, in extreme instances, torture, say those citizens who will talk.

There is no evidence to indicate torture is practiced on any large scale. But neither is there any doubt that it has been used in such places as "the kennels" near Tocumen International Airport and in various "houses of interrogation" around the city.

As a result, the atmosphere in Panama City now is such that many politically aware Panamanians are afraid to be seen talking with a foreign newsmen.

When they do, they tell of telephone intimidations, changing their eating places because known informants frequented the ones where they had been eating and of being hauled off for questioning on the flimsiest of reasons.

## TWO-YEAR TERMS

Or they cite the case of five Panamanians—including a Canal Zone policeman and fireman—who were sentenced without public trial to two years in the Coliba Island prison for "developing subversive activities" against the government.

The system of informants and intimidation extends beyond Panama and to Miami as well, where a growing colony of Panamanian exiles lives.

Some of the Miami exiles are known to have received telephone calls from National Guard officials, threatening their families who still remain here and warning against any anti-government activity.

In fairness to the guard, the present government—administered by civilians under the tutelage of Gen. Omar Torrijos, the guard commander—is probably as popular with the peasants and the lower class working man as any Panama ever had.

Yet, as the guard's heavy-handedness increases, as many believe it is, a likely result is that a reaction born of frustration and resignation eventually will set in. The guard then could find itself in trouble.

The increased repression of recent weeks is partially attributed to a National Guard crackdown on an extremist group, apparently readying itself for a campaign of urban terrorism and partially to the appointment of Lt. Col. Manuel Antonio Noriega as the new head of G-2, or the guard intelligence section.

## GETS JOB DONE

Noriega has a reputation as a man who gets things done even if it means going beyond the generally accepted norms.

There seems little doubt that one thing he did was to effectively put out of business an extremist organization which posed a real problem for the guard.

The government announced recently that the group had been broken up with the arrest of 29 persons and the deaths of two others since late September.

Juan de Arco, the alleged leader and a respected Panama engineer, escaped into the Canal Zone where he requested political asylum.

Two other prominent members of the organization—Frederico Britton and Bolivar Crespo—were not mentioned in the guard announcement and apparently escaped.

The organization, however, has been completely smashed.

It was blamed for the \$29,000 casino robbery at the Hotel Panama in late September—which was not reported in the government-controlled press—as well as other recent robberies including one at a stationery store where a mimeograph machine was stolen.

The guard announcement said it had routed the Communist Party of Panama which was not entirely accurate.

In fact, the People's Democratic Party—Panama's pro-Moscow Communist group—

continues to exist with the apparent approval of the government as long as it remains inactive.

## MAOIST OUTGROWTH

The extremist group shattered by the guard action called itself the Central Command of the National Liberation Movement—29th of November.

Nov. 29, 1969, marked the day that Frederico Britton's brother Floyd died in the Coliba Island prison of what the government claimed was a heart attack, a story given little credence by most Panamanians.

Daniel Zuniga, a member of the so-called National Liberation Movement, was the key to the guard success in wiping out the organization.

A story Oct. 17 in Matutino, a government-controlled newspaper, reported that Zuniga had given himself up, apparently sometime earlier.

Zuniga's fate is uncertain but given the current repressive tactics in vogue, there is considerable skepticism that his "important information" came voluntarily.

## OFF THE FARM INCOME

## HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, parity today is at 70 percent. This means that our American farmers, if they are to maintain economic equality, must look other places than to their farm acres for a source of income.

Although this fact of substandard income seems to be universally known, we generally talk about it, but generate very little real action.

I always have been a strong supporter of 100 percent of parity for our food producers. Unless we can provide an adequate income for the products of their farms, they are forced to turn elsewhere for supplemental income, or move to the large centers.

Mr. Speaker, Editor Curtis Warnke of the Wood Lake News in our Minnesota Sixth Congressional District, touched on this problem recently in an editorial in his newspaper.

In order to bring this matter to the attention of my colleagues, with your permission, I hereby insert Mr. Warnke's editorial in the RECORD:

## OFF THE FARM INCOME!

A national publication recently pointed out that 92% or nearly 3 million American farm operators receive some of their income off-the-farm. The publication went on to extol the virtue of this arrangement, and spoke in glowing terms on how healthy this situation is for the American farmer—we beg to differ!

According to the most recent U.S. farm Census, off-the-farm jobs brought in income equal to 36 percent of the value of farm produce across the nation—this averaged nearly \$4800 per farm operation. In 1965, which is the most recent year that figures are available, the farm labor force (that is those working outside actual farming in addition to their normal pursuit) received a whopping \$8.3 billion in wages and salaries. Now that's nothing to sneeze at! During the same year, on two out of every five farms in the country the off-farm income was greater than the farm income.

We don't have figures available for later years, but in 1970 the net income of Amer-



ica's farmers declined from \$16.2 billions to \$15.8 billions. Thus in order to live and subsist, the farmer must look elsewhere for his livelihood—he must join the labor force of the nation.

Contrary to the line followed by the national publication referred to above, we here—at our vantage point in Wood Lake, should be concerned about this trend. Do we want only giant corporation type farms? Do we want only "hobby farmers"? Well, pure and simple, that's exactly what we are going to find if the present trend is not reversed.

The first order of business is to raise farm income! It can be done (if they really want to) in a number of ways—however, the method is not important—what is important is the necessity of it being done. We don't care if it's a direct government subsidy or what it is—it's absolutely imperative that it be done now before it's too late.

If you disagree with the above paragraph we only wish you could have been in Minneapolis last Friday morning to see the people lined up at the Hennepin County employment office attempting to secure a limited number of jobs that were going to be offered. They spent all night in sleeping bags, lying out in the cold air—literally by the thousands, and—mind you, only to apply for a job! They had no assurance they would get one. Many of them were Vietnam Veterans who are coming home and can't find work—of any kind.

Yet, we have forced our farm friends to go to work in off-the-farm pursuits to survive—now this newspaper asks you—how crazy can we get?

The \$8.3 billion farmers earned working in the labor force in 1965 is a powerful amount of money—but actually it is a small amount compared to what we are spending on space exploration for example; and how much more practical it would be to subsidize the American farmer that much to keep him on the farm (where he'd much rather be); and in turn open up the jobs he's working at for others.

We agree with our American Indian friend when he said: "White man heap crazy".

#### FUTURE HOMEMAKERS' WEEK

### HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, this week has been set aside to pay special tribute to the more than 600,000 American teenagers who, as members of Future Homemakers of America, have devoted themselves to constructive work in helping solve many of the problems which confront today's society. In my own State of Maine alone there are 2,482 members who belong to 78 chapters from Madawaska, south to the Maine-New Hampshire border.

The motto of the Future Homemakers—"Toward New Horizons"—is evidence of the challenging role this impressive organization can provide to those who join its ranks. FHA activities center on individual growth, the family, education, development of occupational competencies, preparation for marriage and careers, and youth's role in society and the world.

The future of this Nation and our world rests on the shoulders of today's youth, and we should be grateful that we have such organizations as the Future Homemakers of America to train the leaders of tomorrow.

#### THE SELLING OF CBS NEWS

### HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, so much has been said recently about the CBS program, "The Selling of the Pentagon," with regard to the distortions and half-truths it contained, that Jack Kestner, military writer for the Norfolk, Va., Ledger-Star, did some background research.

The resulting article, "The Selling of CBS News," appeared in the Ledger-Star on the afternoon of March 24, 1971. I would call particular attention to the fact that in attempting to stage a shot of Adm. Ephraim Holmes greeting a group of Boy Scouts, CBS implied to his public affairs officer that they were planning to do a "Navy community relations program." Mr. Kestner's conjecture concerning the use that would have been made of such a shot is also worthy of note.

I submit to you that the lack of good faith on the part of CBS did not begin with the actual showing of the program, but indeed was part of the "documentary" from its very conception.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Mr. Kestner's article to the attention of my colleagues:

#### THE SELLING OF CBS NEWS

(By Jack Kestner)

NORFOLK.—News commentator Roger Mudd opened CBS's broadcast "The Selling of the Pentagon" with the following statement:

"Nothing is more essential to a democracy than the free flow of information. Misinformation, distortion, propaganda, all interrupt that flow. They make it impossible for people to know what their government is doing—which, in a democracy, is crucial."

These words have a noble ring to them.

One segment of the hour-long "documentary" that followed Mudd's introduction was the revelation that the U.S. Department of Defense staged an action in Vietnam to brighten the image of the South Vietnamese soldier.

It appears that what is staging for the Defense Department is not necessarily staging for CBS.

Last year, while CBS News was putting together its special broadcast, Cmdr. David M. Cooney received a telephone call.

Cooney at that time was serving as Public Affairs Officer for Adm. Ephraim P. Holmes, who as commander in chief U.S. Atlantic Fleet was the Navy's top admiral in the Atlantic.

"The man identified himself as an assistant producer for CBS," Cooney recalls. "He said CBS was working on a Navy community relations program and wondered if a camera crew could film Admiral Holmes greeting a troupe of Boy Scouts at the Naval Station gate."

"I told him CBS would be welcome to film civilians visiting the Naval Station as part of the 'Normal Tour'—which they do every day," Cooney continued.

"He asked me if I didn't think the admiral would cooperate in this Boy Scout idea in view of the fact he would receive national exposure on TV."

"I told him if he could arrange for Dr. Frank Stanton (president of CBS) to start greeting tourists in the CBS building to call me back and I'd see what I could do with the admiral," says Cooney, who is now a captain working in the Pentagon. "I never heard from him again."

It can only be conjectured to what use CBS would have put the staged Boy Scout shot, but certainly it would have tied in with two other segments of the broadcast—segments in which CBS raised the specter of the military influencing children in the techniques and hardware of combat.

When the program was first aired a month ago it resulted in a mixed bag of criticism—praise from newspapers like The New York Times, vehement protest from official Defense Department spokesmen, Vice President Spiro Agnew, and Rep. Edward Hebert.

Last night, CBS re-aired the program and followed it with the critics' protests and CBS response to the protests.

Responding was the president of CBS News, Richard Salant.

"None of our critics have said these things didn't happen or weren't done, so the validity of the broadcast stands unscathed," Salant said.

Of course, no one argues that events in the program didn't happen. Optically, it would be rather difficult to film something that didn't take place.

It is the use of the events and the interpretation thereof that has so enraged the military.

The program, they say, is sprinkled with half-truths and innuendoes.

Arguments can be made both for and against the military "selling" itself. Certainly, the Civil Service has its powerful Washington lobby to get its share of the taxpayer's dollars—and so does every major private enterprise that does big business with the government.

Certainly cases can be cited of the military either misleading or misinforming the public.

But in "The Selling of the Pentagon" CBS has strained at a gnat and swallowed an elephant.

#### GONZALEZ BACKS BILLS TO BENEFIT THE CIVIL SERVANTS

### HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing today two bills that would ease tax burdens on retired Federal employees and allow early retirement for employees who have completed 30 years of Federal service.

My first bill calls for an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code to exclude the first \$5,000 received in civil service annuities from gross income. This provision would make any Federal retirement benefits up to \$5,000 tax exempt.

Presently, retired civil service employees are taxed on all benefits exceeding the amount they personally contributed to retirement while working. My bill changes this situation by extending the nontaxable status of social security and railroad retirement annuities to most civil service annuities. Passage of this measure is essential to equal treatment of all retired persons.

Fair treatment of Federal employees is also my motivation for reintroducing another amendment to the Civil Service Retirement Act to permit civil servants with 30 years of service to retire with full annuities regardless of age.

Many Federal employees complete 30 years of service well before the presently stipulated 55-year-old minimum retirement age. There is no reason that

30-year employees should not be able to opt for early retirement.

The advantages of this proposal are twofold: It would reward a faithful civil servant and would place more employment opportunities in today's ever-tightening job market.

Retirement law has been amended to provide retirement with full annuities at 55 with 30 years service, 60 with 20 years service, or 62 with 5 years service, but this amendment has not really responded to the desires of Federal employees and to the need for Government leadership in diminishing the ranks of the unemployed. My proposal recognizes both of these needs and I urge prompt and favorable action by Congress.

#### THE PROBLEMS OF GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION

### HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon is to be commended for focusing so much attention on the problems of government organization. He has presented us with a dynamic set of proposals for four new Departments centered around the major purposes of Government to substitute for the seven departments we now have—each of which marches to the time of a different drummer. Some Departments—Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor—were established as voices for specific constituencies. Interior was designed to preserve our resources, while HUD and Transportation were supposed to develop our resources. At the same time, HEW has been trying to administer to the Nations very real human needs.

With all of these officers running similar programs for different constituencies, it becomes enormously difficult to know exactly what the Federal Government is doing in any one area.

Not only is the public confused when it tries to get answers from Government, tries to apply for Federal assistance, or tries to find where responsibilities lie for a particular action, but the Congress and the President are likewise confused as to who is ultimately accountable for program performance in education, health, water treatment, community development, highway construction, and so on. We can all locate points of responsibility, but the buck is constantly passed from one agency to another and seldom comes to rest short of the President's Office.

The President's reorganization plan will do away with all this confusion. I am hopeful that we can so restructure the Federal Departments that one Administrator, in one agency will exercise ultimate authority over related programs. If one man has authority he can then be held accountable for knowing exactly how individual programs under his responsibility are performing their assigned functions.

Less confusion will result during congressional hearings and on the administration side, the President will be able to direct programs far more efficiently.

I heartily endorse the President's proposals for reassigning Government programs to four new areas—Human Resources, Community Development, Economic Affairs, and Natural Resources. At last we will have accountability for dollars spent and performance achieved.

#### CVP WATER CHALLENGED

### HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, an interesting and enlightening expression of opinion on a subject of great interest in California which has national implications is contained in the March 18, 1971, editorial of the Stockton, Calif., Record.

Entitled "CVP Water Challenged," the Record editorial comments upon issues raised by a recent suit to halt delivery of water to a key pumping station of the Central Valley project.

The article follows:

#### CVP WATER CHALLENGED

With a scrupulous disregard for any other region's welfare, the San Francisco Chronicle again has assumed its strident pose as defender of San Francisco Bay.

From its base in a city that historically has plundered bay waters, filling them and fouling them with garbage, and even now dumping sewage raw through storm drains, the journal self-righteously exults in the suit of the Sierra Club and others that could stop the delivery of Central Valley Project waters at the Tracy pumping plant.

The plea for injunctive action in federal court takes in other aspects of river water diversion, including the Delta Peripheral Canal, the San Luis Drain and the East Side Canal. With this challenge of works as yet unconstructed we have little quarrel. If they cannot survive legal tests they should either be revised or shelved.

We do, however, regard as a piece of querulous hind-sighting the attempt to dry up thousands of West Side farming acres that grow food and fiber for people who live in cities. We do not believe for a moment that this irresponsible effort will be upheld. We wonder, however, why the plaintiffs did not go farther up-stream to the Friant-Kern Canal that taps the San Joaquin River in their assault on diversions that might be harmful. Why such exclusive attention to the Tracy pumps and the Delta-Mendota Canal?

Meanwhile, we direct the Sierra Club's attention to another fruitful opportunity to apply hindsight in stopping an operating, ecological monstrosity. There is nothing in this part of California to match the violation inflicted by the Hetch Hetchy project of the Chronicle's own city.

Thanks to San Francisco's political muscularity, its citizens tap water from a reservoir built uniquely in a national park, Yosemite, that destroyed a scenic chasm rivaled only by Yosemite Valley, itself. That project, too, like Central Valley, exists through the authority of Congress. Moreover, it diverts water that otherwise might run freshly into San Francisco Bay rather than as a conveyor of San Francisco's sewage.

Apply a federal stopper to Hetch Hetchy would mean, of course, that San Franciscans would go thirsty, and the Chronicle might object San Franciscans are, after all city people, and farms—well, they're just dirt.

#### ASSISTANCE FOR AEROSPACE UNEMPLOYED

### HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Labor recently estimated that there are now somewhere between 50,000 and 75,000 unemployed aerospace engineers and scientists. Most of these people have lost their jobs, and cannot find reemployment, because of specific Federal policies.

The plight of the aerospace unemployed presents us with not only a tragic problem, but, frankly, an unfortunately ironic dilemma. It is quite difficult to rationalize a state of affairs where a nation, very technologically advanced and oriented, has at the same time a substantial portion of some of its best trained and most experienced scientists and engineers unable to find work.

This is precisely our situation today. Government policy has seriously reduced available jobs in aerospace and related industries. And, while there is considerable discussion about alternative long-range policies that can be initiated to provide new sources of jobs for the technically trained, little has been done to solve the immediate circumstances faced by these people.

Quite frankly, many of the men being laid off are in their late forties and fifties. Age discrimination, former high salaries, and even overtraining in a very specific area are reemployment handicaps almost impossible for many to overcome.

Although some grants have been made available for retraining, there are some problems with this. First, very few dollars are available for retraining and therefore the great majority of unemployed aerospace engineers and scientists cannot benefit.

For example, in my own district only two retraining programs are underway. Less than 100 people were able to enroll. This is out of an estimated 3,000 unemployed highly trained engineers.

The second problem is that, although the retraining is provided and a small income made available, there is no assurance that a job will be waiting at the end of the course. Really very little provision has been made to insure jobs.

While I strongly endorse retraining, I cannot help but feel that not enough Federal support is being given. It seems quite clear that more funds must be made available now and careful attention and support must be given to insure that these men and women are being trained for jobs that will be available.

There is another policy we can pursue which can offer some immediate relief to many of the unemployed. With the training and experience which they have accumulated over the years, unemployed scientists and engineers can move into new businesses, perhaps technically oriented and geared to solving many of our domestic problems.

I am introducing two measures today which will assist and encourage many



unemployed aerospace personnel to take advantage of new business opportunities.

The first bill would encourage small business investment corporations to make loans to unemployed aerospace personnel interested in going into a new business. SBIC were created by the Small Business Act of 1958 and have provided \$1.8 billion in loans to many small companies which would have been unable to start under ordinary circumstances.

The measure provides authority to the SBA Administrator to extend the 90-percent Federal guarantee to loans made by SBIC's. The guarantee would only be extended to SBIC loans in areas where the Administrator determined that national policy goals are being advanced. The bill lists three goals: Aiding the unemployed, assisting rapid transit development, and solving pollution problems. The language is open ended so that the Administrator may extend the guarantee to other areas of national concern.

As a companion to this measure, I am also introducing legislation which will increase SBA guarantee authority from \$2.2 to \$3.1 billion. This increase would provide the Administrator with enough additional flexibility so that a portion of the guarantee authority could be extended to cover SBIC loans to unemployed aerospace engineers and scientists.

These measures will not solve all the problems faced by many of those who are unable to find a job. However, this program will help quite a few gain a new opportunity. I urge the House to take quick action on these two proposals. We must demonstrate that we are offering every reasonable avenue of relief to the many aerospace personnel who have lost their position because of Federal policies.

#### THE RURAL TELEPHONE BANK BILL

#### HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1971

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the rural telephone bank bill which recently was passed by this body represents a major step toward the redevelopment of rural America. This legislation will make possible the expansion of rural telephone service of a quality comparable to that which has long been available to our urban people.

Presently, over 60 percent of the REA residence telephone subscribers have four-party service or worse. Almost a third have eight-party service. This is hardly a condition which would encourage rural people to remain in rural areas or to encourage urban people to move back to the country.

Today, there are approximately 200 million telephones in the United States. Of these, the Bell System owns about 85 percent. The independents own roughly 14 percent, and REA borrowers own the remaining 1 percent. The rural telephone bank bill will benefit primarily that 1 percent.

The telephone bank which will be es-

tablished under this bill will not make grants. It will use no Federal tax revenues. Government funds, which will make up the class A stock of the bank, will come from moneys which REA telephone borrowers are presently repaying to REA on outstanding loans.

This bank is necessary because the revenue which is generated by providing rural telephone service is so small compared to urban service. The rural telephone cooperatives average about \$300 in revenue per mile of line, while the Bell System grosses about \$11,000 per mile.

If the House version of this bill survives the conference committee reasonably intact and is signed by the President, we will have performed a great service not only to rural America, but to the whole Nation.

As one of the founders of the Yorkville, Tenn., Telephone Cooperative, I am aware of the tremendous value of good rural telephone service. I am eager to see that all of America has such service available.

ADM. U. S. GRANT SHARP

#### HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the following article which deals with a recent speech made by retired Admiral U. S. Grant Sharp should be of great interest to all my colleagues. Admiral Sharp was commander in chief Pacific from 1964 to 1968 and speaks with a great deal of experience in matters pertaining to the military.

Particular attention should be paid to Admiral Sharp's assessment:

It seems clear that the Soviet Union is striving to achieve a first-strike capability which could be used to blackmail the United States.

It is our duty as Representatives to see that the Soviets do not achieve this capability which will give them the material requisite for achieving their stated goal of global conquest.

The article, which appeared in the Register, Santa Ana, Calif., of March 18, 1971, follows:

"INADEQUATE" DEFENSE BUDGET INVITES WAR—EX-PACIFIC CHIEF

(By Len Davis)

NEWPORT BEACH—Retired Adm. U. S. Grant Sharp, former Commander-in-Chief Pacific (1964-1968), said here Wednesday that the 1972 defense budget submitted by President Nixon to Congress is inadequate for the security of the country "and multiplies the chances not of peace, but of nuclear war."

The former five-star admiral, who commanded nearly one million Army, Navy, Marine Corps and Air Force personnel in an 85 million square mile area, said Russian overconfidence or miscalculation "may trigger such a war inadvertently, or place the United States in a posture from which there can be no retreat."

"There are perilous times ahead," the 64-year-old Sharp told an Operations Alert planning session at the Stuff Shirt Restaurant.

"The fiscal 1971 defense program is only \$5 billion more than the fiscal 1964 level," said Sharp. "Yet, the cost of the war in fiscal 1971 will be more than double the \$5 billion budget increase."

"This means that the war in Vietnam is being funded by deferring weapons modernization and reducing operational readiness."

"We could have won this war back in 1966," he said, "if we had deployed our bombers effectively."

"In spite of operational restrictions," he continued, "we had them licked in 1967."

"And in 1968, we could have won with ease."

"But we licked ourselves. Now look where we are," he added.

Sharp warned against pulling out of Vietnam too fast.

"If we do, we will surely lose the war," he said.

"In terms of Gross National Product," Sharp explained "our defense budget has gone from 9.7 percent of the GNP in 1968 to 7 percent in 1971, the smallest allocation for defense purposes in 20 years."

Sharp said the 1972 budget presented to Congress by the Nixon administration represents only 6.8 per cent of the GNP.

"It seems clear," said Sharp, "that the Soviet Union is striving to achieve a first-strike capability which could be used to blackmail the United States."

He pointed out that since 1965 "the Soviet Union has engaged in a major effort to change the balance of power in the development of strategic nuclear weapons."

"During that period it has more than tripled its inventory of these weapon carriers from about 500 to 1,700, including some 200 nuclear heavy bombers."

"In the same time, the United States has not increased its level of 1,710 strategic nuclear missile launchers, and has reduced its heavy bomber strength from 780 to less than 600," said Sharp.

"In 1965," he continued, "the Soviets had none of the monster SS-9 missiles now operational. Today, they have more than 200 SS-9s, with an ultimate total of about 300 when current construction effort is completed."

"The SS-9s alone," said Sharp, "will be capable of delivering a megatonnage in nuclear weaponry that exceeds the combined total nuclear weapon megatonnage capability of all our existing strategic delivery systems."

"We have no counterpart for this huge Soviet nuclear weapon," he added.

Sharp said the Soviet SS-9s "are capable of carrying a 25 megaton payload and can be produced with the accuracy necessary to destroy the entire United States missile force and every major city in the nation."

He told the audience that the Soviet Union is now deploying huge new intercontinental ballistic missiles "as big or bigger than the SS-9s and superior to them in quality—and accuracy."

Noting that most major U.S. cities "are close to our coasts and within short range of their (the Soviet Union's) potential submarine launching stations," Sharp said "they can launch their attacks with little time for us to react before being hit."

Sharp pointed out that, since 1954, "the Soviets have designed and produced 18 new types of fighter planes, 15 of which we have actually photographed in flight."

"During that period," he said, "the United States has not produced a single new and superior fighter, and we have not had one on order until last year."

"After long delays, due to lack of appropriations, we now have two fighters under way—the F-14 for the Navy and the F-15 for the Air Force—but they will not be a part of our inventory for several years," said Sharp.

"The Soviet Union now has the largest submarine fleet in the world, the strongest

force of missile-launching ships and is even closing-in on the United States in the numbers of cruisers and destroyers," he said.

"The great majority of our fleet," he added, "consists of ships more than 20 years old, and equipment."

Sharp said Red China "will not be a threat during the next 20 years."

"Even more of a threat than Red China," said Sharp, "is our own U.S. Congress with its left-wing members and those who play politics with the security of our country."

#### HEAPING WRONG UPON WRONG

### HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have pointed out on previous occasions some of the shocking facts surrounding the construction of the so-called Hirshhorn Museum on the Mall, not the least of which is that it should be named for an individual of dubious character.

I would like today to call the attention of Members of the House to a newspaper article by Mr. Clark Mollenhoff which details how the Federal Government is permitting a construction firm owned by a criminal to build this monument and turn a fat profit on the deal.

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

#### WATCH ON WASHINGTON

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The government's dealing with the Piracci Construction Company is a classic case of how far the General Service Administration (GSA) can bend the rules if it wants to do business with a firm involved in violation of the law.

Ordinarily, a firm can be suspended from doing business with the government for up to 18 months if fraud is suspected. If found guilty, the firm can be "debarred" from dealing with the government for up to three years.

The basic thesis is that firms and individuals who cheat the government through frauds and payoffs shouldn't be regarded as "responsible bidders."

However, Robert Kunzig, the administrator of GSA, has made it possible for the Piracci Company, of Baltimore, Md., to continue to do business with the government despite repeated law violations. The GSA has minimized the fact that Dominic A. Piracci, Sr., the sole owner of the construction firm, has a record of fraud convictions and involvements in fraud.

Piracci has simply stepped out of his role as president and director, and has turned the management over to some other business men "for a period of time which will extend six months beyond the completion of The Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Gardens."

Piracci's firm holds the \$15,000,000 general contract for the controversial Hirshhorn project in Washington, D.C. and is to receive more than \$1 million in profit.

Looking at the law and the background of Piracci, there would have been ample reason to debar the Piracci firm from ever bidding on the Hirshhorn project. In fact, the counsel for the GSA Region Three office had recommended debarment of the Piracci firm. The law authorizes suspension of "all known affiliates of a concern or individual" who has been convicted.

The law further states:

"The criminal, fraudulent or seriously improper conduct of one individual may be

imputed to the business firm with which he is connected when the impropriety involved was performed within the course of his official duty, or with the knowledge or approval of the business firm."

Not only has Piracci been permitted to do business with the government, but in the face of a record of proven bribery, perjury, and falsification of records, Piracci has been permitted to increase his bid on the Hirshhorn project by \$754,375. The GSA accepted Piracci's explanation that a "clerical error" had resulted in a lower bid than he intended. Piracci was still the low bidder, but by a narrow margin.

The GSA informed Representative Joel Broyhill (Rep., Va.) that it has "insufficient justification" for debarring Piracci's firm.

Here is the Piracci record.

In 1954, Piracci was convicted of fraud and obstructing justice in connection with an off-street parking scandal in Baltimore. Piracci paid a \$4,000 fine on that conviction and was later pardoned by former Governor Theodore R. McKeldin.

In 1969, Piracci was convicted in the United States District Court in Baltimore on charges of having made a payoff to Guido Iozzi, Jr., president of the Baltimore Building Trades Council, AFL-CIO. Piracci was sentenced to pay a \$5,000 fine and to serve 183 days in federal prison.

Another indictment has been returned against Joseph P. Doherty, executive assistant to the assistant postmaster general in charge of post office bureau facilities. Piracci was not a defendant in this case, but the indictment charged that Doherty took large sums of cash from Piracci to provide influence for Piracci Construction Company in dealing with the Post Office Department.

Doherty entered a "no contest" plea to the ninth count of the indictment on "conflicts of interest" that charged he "did knowingly act as agent" of Piracci and the firm "in connection with applications, contracts, and other particular matters involving the leasing of various post office facilities." Action on the other counts in the indictment against Doherty is still pending.

In dealing with Piracci's record, the GSA, in its letter to Broyhill, dismissed the 1954 conviction as being far enough back that "it cannot ordinarily be used to support a current debarment."

The GSA also noted the federal judge did not impose the maximum prison term and fine on the 1969 conviction and that "the six months' sentence presumably recognized the fact that Piracci had cooperated with the government."

But, the GSA overlooked the comments of United States District Judge Alexander Harvey II, who said as he sentenced Piracci:

"You lied to the FBI, the United States attorney and the federal grand jury: A man who has a prior criminal involvement and who has lied . . . can hardly expect leniency from the court."

The GSA also told Broyhill, "Finally, to the best of our knowledge, it has not been legally established whether Mr. Piracci or the firm made any illegal payments to a former employee of the Post Office Department."

Apparently GSA did not ask the prosecutor who could have told them Piracci admitted making payments of at least \$3,000 to Doherty and a total payoff of \$20,000 was discussed.

A final argument on behalf of doing business with Piracci Construction Company was that Piracci had "resigned both as president and a member of the firm's board of directors, the fact that he is divorced from all control over the firm; and the fact that the firm itself has satisfactorily performed several construction contracts for GSA."

The GSA and other government agencies aren't often so tolerant of fraud, or so understanding of the lines between control of a firm and the actual ownership of the

firm. Apparently, Piracci is receiving some unusual understanding at a high level in Washington.

Piracci's penalty for his problems with the previous convictions will be that he won't be permitted to pick up the profits on the Hirshhorn project until at least six months after it is completed.

#### STATEMENT AND RESOLUTION OF THE NEW ENGLAND LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE

### HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I attach herewith a statement and a resolution of the New England Leadership Conference held on March 21, 1971, in Newton, Mass.

This resolution was drawn up by 500 leaders of all New England Jewish organizations assembled in an emergency conference.

I commend this thoughtful presentation of issues in the Middle East at this particular time:

#### STATEMENT AND RESOLUTION OF THE NEW ENGLAND LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE, MARCH 21, 1971

##### STATEMENT

We, of the Jewish community of New England, gathered in emergency session, unequivocally reject current attempts to impose on the Middle East the futile and discredited policies reminiscent of Munich. In October, 1938, Czechoslovakia, like Israel today, was pressured to exchange defensible frontiers for "peace in our time" and "Big Power guarantees."

"Those who do not learn from history are condemned to relive it."

Twice in the last 22 years, Israel was compelled to surrender vital strategic areas in the Sinai to a defeated, but unrelenting Egyptian aggressor. Each forced withdrawal was followed inevitably by another round of Mid-East warfare, 1949 led to 1956. 1957 led to 1967. Today, the basic thrust of Big Power pressure is to embark once more on this fatal path. It should be recalled that President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles later recognized and regretted the error of interposing the great powers between the parties in the Middle East, thus shielding Egypt from the need to face Israel in direct negotiations.

President Nixon correctly underscored this lesson when he stated in his televised news conference of March 4, 1971:

"The question here is whether or not the U.S. will impose a settlement in the Middle East, and the answer is no. We will do everything that we can to urge the parties to talk . . . but we are going to have to depend upon the parties concerned to reach an agreement . . ." (emphasis supplied).

The regrettable fact, however, is that the Great Powers and the UN Secretariat are obstructing any Israeli-Egyptian negotiations, direct or indirect. Not only are the representatives of Israel carefully kept from meeting their Egyptian counterparts—an unprecedented way of "negotiating"—but Israel may not even address written memoranda directly to the Egyptian government. Regarding substance, Israel has been told simply to sign documents under which all the relevant details, including borders, are already spelled out. When Israel questions this attempt to dictate to it on matters of its own vital security, over which the blood of its own youth was spilled, the UN Secretary-General intervenes to criticize Israel for insufficient docility. It is abundantly clear, therefore, that the so-called "talks under Dr. Jarring's auspices"



are not negotiations at all, but a mere cover for a Big Power dictate.

This posture is fundamentally inimical to the chances of a genuine peace in the region. Egypt and the Arab countries, which have three times attempted to destroy Israel, are in effect guaranteed perpetual immunity from the consequences of their own acts. The Great Powers, the UN Secretary-General—whose own precipitate action helped to bring about the 1967 war—apparently stand ready at all times to bail out the Arab aggressors. It is significant that this lesson has already been duly noted in Cairo, where the semi-official *Al-Ahram* and its influential editor, Mr. Heykal, have openly stated on February 26, 1971, the correct meaning of Egypt's present willingness to accept a political settlement.

"There are only two specific Arab goals at this stage: 1) elimination of the consequences of the 1967 aggression through Israel's withdrawal from all the lands it occupied that year; and 2) elimination of the consequences of the 1948 aggression through the total eradication of Israel . . . If the whole land is returned . . . it will not become possible to . . . isolate Egypt from the rest of the Arab nation, and expel the USSR from the Arab area."

This statement underlines the illusory nature of dreams that appeasing Egypt at the expense of Israel's vital security will somehow weaken Russia's grip on the Arab world. The Egyptians themselves, obviously have no such intentions. Moreover, it is utterly unrealistic to think that Washington can ever outbid Moscow in being anti-Israeli and pro-Arab. Any appeasement, as in 1957, would give Moscow a gratuitous victory. Russian influence would be strengthened and not weakened.

It is important to note the contents of current Big Power discussions and the spirit of the so-called "Rogers Plan", as reported in the press. They wish to substitute for defensible borders, freely negotiated between the parties themselves, an international force under the auspices of the same UN which showed its moral bankruptcy in 1967. This force would contain a Soviet contingent; in other words, Soviet soldiers and missiles, which Israel has successfully contained on the west bank of the Suez Canal, are to be shipped across the canal under U.S. and UN auspices, into the Sinai Peninsula, the vital Straits of Tiran and the frontiers of Israel's Negev. The U.S. in 1967, when faced only with Egyptian opposition, was unable to implement its guarantee to protect Israel's freedom of shipping in the Tiran Straits. Would the U.S. be able to carry out such a commitment when confronted by Soviet troops? Only six months ago the violation of the cease-fire standstill agreement through the illegal introduction of Soviet-Egyptian missiles into the canal zone, demonstrated U.S. helplessness in the face of a Soviet breach of an international undertaking.

However, it is not only the utter impracticability of these "guarantees" that is objectionable. The fact is that the whole concept runs completely counter to the basic thrust of the current U.S. global policy. In two State of the World messages to the Congress, President Nixon emphasized that the U.S. intends to strengthen her friends and allies in all parts of the world, to the point where they will be capable of defending themselves, assisted only by U.S. arms shipments and U.S. deterrence against attack by a nuclear power. In fact, the President's positive leadership, in providing vital U.S. economic and military aid to Israel, forced Russia and Egypt to abandon military action, at least for the moment, and turn to the diplomatic front. In his televised news conference, the President reemphasized this aspect, saying:

"We, of course, will be there to see that the balance of power is maintained in the Middle East. We will continue to do so be-

cause if that balance changes, that could bring a war . . ."

Nevertheless, seduced once more by the siren-song of appeasement and acquiescing to Soviet and Egyptian blandishments, some State Department officials are turning the President's policy upside down. In Israel, the U.S. has one of the very few allies that is capable of defending itself, not only because of the democratic, progressive nature of its society and the magnificent spirit of its people, but because, for the first time in its history, it is not imperiled by indefensible lines. To force Israel back to the pre-1967 lines is bound, once again, to invite aggression. It would leave Israel defenseless, especially since now she would be facing Russian troops in addition to Arab armies. What these officials are proposing is to make it virtually impossible for the Israelis to defend themselves and then to substitute U.S. soldiers, under UN auspices, to fight for Israel instead!

For a most dubious short-lived "diplomatic" advantage for the U.S., it is proposed that, in effect, every bullet fired in a Middle Eastern skirmish could become the opening shot in a Big Power confrontation. This will neither give security to Israel nor comfort to the U.S.

Particularly disingenuous is the argument that, in view of the development of modern weapons, it does not matter where Israel's frontiers are located. It still makes a fundamental difference whether the frontier leaves Tel Aviv and Jerusalem easy targets of conventional weapons and leaves Israel's maritime life-line to Asia and Africa within open range of Egyptian light artillery, or whether Israel's enemies have to launch a protracted, full-scale campaign before reaching any of her vital centers and communication lines.

Finally, the character of any agreement or treaty is, in large measure, determined by the history of the negotiations leading to the final document. There is, therefore, a difference in kind between a document which results from a careful and detailed process of free negotiation and one which is signed primarily as a result of outside pressure. The long-term questions of war and peace hinge on the lack of ambiguity in interpretation of any peace agreement.

#### RESOLUTION

A true and lasting peace is the only sensible goal for U.S. policy in the Middle East. Such a peace which will assure the security of Israel is in the vital national interest of the U.S. Because we, of the American Jewish community of New England, are committed to real peace, and because we see clearly the danger, futility and immorality of appeasement, we declare our firm and unyielding solidarity with the people of Israel in their demand for a settlement of Middle East problems through free and untrammelled negotiations between the parties concerned in the conflict.

We therefore:

1. vigorously endorse and support the Middle East policy enunciated by President Nixon of maintaining the balance of power and not imposing a settlement. We urge that U.S. diplomacy conform to that policy and abandon all pressures, however well-motivated, to impose pre-determined and futile plans on Israel and the Arab states.

2. strongly urge that the Big Powers desist from those activities that cripple the process of free negotiations, which alone can bring the Middle East to the threshold of genuine peace.

3. strongly urge that the Big Powers and the U.N. Secretariat desist from activities and statements which undermine the delicate balance of U.N. Resolution 242 of November, 1967, which called specifically for "agreement" between and among the parties so that every state in the area will have the right "to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force."

#### A LOW, SLOW ALTERNATIVE TO THE SST

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, Jim Bowman, a friend and constituent of mine from Walnut Creek, has recently brought to my attention a perceptive and provocative article from the *Wall Street Journal* of March 10. It is the story of the short take-off and landing aircraft and its promise for the airline industry. I would like my colleagues who have not seen its compelling case for the development of suburb to suburb STOL's to have the opportunity to see this article:

#### A LOW, SLOW ALTERNATIVE TO THE SST

(By Harvey E. Foster)

The year 1970 was not a good one for airline profits. New equipment increased seat-miles and labor settlements increased costs, while a slowed economy reduced growth. The results were heavy losses for most of the nation's carriers, in spite of an actual growth in both passengers and freight last year. As Secor Browne, chairman of the CAB, so aptly put it, "The airlines had more seats than bottoms to cover them."

Many people are gravely concerned. The industry itself, the stockholders and responsible citizens who know the need for economic health in our prime people-transportation system. But what kind of rhetoric fills our news? Do we see solutions offered to the airline dilemma?

No, it's the SST that seems to have captured all our attention.

Not that the SST shouldn't be discussed. It should, and a decision must be made. But the more pressing problem is to get more people to travel by air, not to move a few of them twice as fast.

Less than 1% of the freight moved in this country goes by air. The automobile still far exceeds the airplane as both the long- and short-haul passenger choice.

Early railroad history gives a clue to where we should look for a solution—improve the short-haul transportation system. Early railroads encouraged the building of roads as a means of bolstering the short-haul system, which routed payload to the railroads for the more profitable long-haul.

Short-haul travel today is by rails and highways. Each system unfortunately is expensive to build and difficult to relocate and consumes huge quantities of expensive real estate. An uncrowded expressway connecting centers of commerce would perform the short-haul task well if it remained uncrowded. The truth is, however, that if the road is located where it can serve a short-haul need, it is invariably so crowded as to restrict traffic to a crawl. The railroads have practically lost their short-haul ability. Connecting city center to city center, they offer little more than slum to slum connections.

#### THE STOL

The airplane, on the other hand, is not encumbered by such impediments. It is the most flexible vehicle existing today; it uses a small amount of real estate, and this only at the terminals. With short take off and landing, or STOL, it becomes still more flexible and needs even less land. STOL planes make possible a new transportation system, a third-level airline network connecting new sources of airline payload with existing terminals.

Where are these new sources of payload? They won't be found in the city center, where with few exceptions, the decay continues its irreversible pattern. The greatest potential for new airline payload is in the suburbs.

Most major cities today are bypassed by a beltway, a natural consequence of the interstate highway system. Along these prime transportation arteries, centers of industry and commerce are springing up. Shopping centers and industrial parks, including much new office space, are taking over the functions formerly performed by the city center. Thus they represent the source and destination of most of the future airline payload. Stolports close to or in these centers would linke them to existing air routes.

This is by no means the first recognition of the need for STOL to complete the transportation complex, but is a plea that we consider carefully where these stolports are located. Much press has been given to recent attempts to locate stolports near the city center. Even better coverage has been given to the vigorous and emotional protests of citizens living near these proposed new facilities. Attempts to extoll the virtues of STOL to these citizens are severely hampered by the fact that these protesters are not likely customers for STOL service, nor is there presently an operating system that can exemplify its advantages. It therefore follows that if a downtown stolport is ever to exist (and it could be a valuable factor in reversing city decay), it must first be proved in some other location.

The suburbs, adjacent to the beltways, or at intersections of interstate highways, are the ideal place to start STOL. Not only is it the source of much potential airline payload it is also a place not likely to arouse the citizen objection. This later point is particularly true if the stolport is in a new shopping center built over an abandoned general aviation airport. This would not only avoid citizen protest, but would salvage the facility for continued aviation use.

Stolports could be added to most shopping centers with little difficulty. For example, locating the STOL strip on the roof of the shopping mall would make it handy to the traveler, and would also elevate the approach and departure paths, thus reducing the neighborhood noise problem. The parking lot surrounding the shopping mall would serve as an additional buffer. Noise could be further reduced by routing the flights over the highways. People don't mind working near an airport, but object vigorously to sleeping in the landing pattern.

What about the other end of this new airline system, the airport terminal? With many airports already at or near saturation, won't STOL traffic just add to the problem? Not if we utilize the unique capability of the STOL plane. Steep angles of climb and descent, combined with a short runway—1,500 to 2,000 feet—would permit separation of STOL and conventional flight patterns at most terminals, allowing completely independent operations.

What does this do for the average traveler? Improved load factors mean improved airline profits, which might reduce fares, or at least delay rises. But more important, the service offered the public would be greatly improved. The missing link in our transportation system would be finally fitted into place, offering fast, efficient public transportation to the 50-300 mile traveler.

Unfortunately this missing link in transportation will not just happen. The equation is far too complicated; too many different and only slightly related factors are involved for the system to develop naturally in time to address the need. The federal government, with help from state and local authorities, must act to bring the system into being. To succeed, the federal government must accept the lead. Fortunately, both the FAA and the CAB have written into their charters a requirement for stimulating growth in civil aviation. Never before was that stimulation more sorely needed.

History shows that the federal government did not shrink from shaping the fu-

ture of railroads. By huge federal land grants, the roadbeds were sent across unprofitable routes and supported the railroads until the routes profited.

#### SOME SUGGESTIONS

This does not mean that subsidies in any form are proposed for building the STOL system. Instead, the federal assist would include:

Define and publicize the advantages of STOL and the consequences of no STOL.

Halt, or at least slow, destruction of general aviation airports; many have already been turned into shopping centers without provision for STOL.

Bring airframe manufacturers and airlines together to develop the new equipment required.

Stimulate architects and city planners to develop ways to include STOL in their plans.

Develop the economics of the short-haul STOL operation for the potential operators.

Inform land developer of the urban dispersion possible with the aid of a STOL network.

Last year vividly illustrated what a slight economic recession does to airline profits: a loss currently estimated at \$123 million. Growth that heretofore was considered normal by the airline industry has created an environment responsive to innovative ideas and courage to make huge investments. Setbacks as were felt by the industry last year, and as are forecast for 1971, could destroy this spirit of optimism and seriously stifle the industry's future growth. We would all suffer if this spirit of confidence were destroyed.

A STOL airline network performing the short-haul task could do much to restore economic health to the airline industry, and complete the public transportation complex.

Just possibly, if we lowered our SST voices, we could hear a small STOL voice saying, "The way to solvency is low and slow, not high and fast."

#### GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

#### HON. GEORGE W. COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1971

Mr. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, 150 years ago a band of Greeks staged a revolt against their foreign overlords, and after constant warfare for more than 6 years, that revolt culminated in the birth of modern Greece as we know it today. March 25 of that year, 1821, is memorable in the annals of Greek history because it marks the regeneration of Greece after its subjection to alien rule for many centuries.

In the course of those centuries the Greek people suffered and sacrificed much, but they did not lose the fine traits of their forefathers. As a nation the Greeks were submerged, but fortunately they were not subdued. Diligently they nursed their hopes of winning their national independence and, when the chance presented itself they cast off the foreigner's yoke and proclaimed their independence. In this they had the wholehearted sympathy of all lovers of freedom everywhere. Partly through such sympathy and effective support from abroad Greece's independence was assured.

We Americans have always been friendly to Greece and have helped the Greeks in their hours of need. We have aided them in defending their freedom against external foes both in the struggle for independence in the early 19th century and in the fight against first fascism and then communism in the 20th. We helped them from the very serious threat of a Communist takeover in the late 1940's. It was to enable Greece and Turkey, first of all, to defend themselves that the Truman doctrine was proclaimed and military and financial assistance given. We have felt that such aid would serve a double purpose: Help the Greek people, and also enlist their alliance in our struggle against East European Communist tyrannies.

On the observance of the 150th anniversary of Greek Independence Day I gladly join my Greek-American friends in wishing happiness to the Greeks in their homeland.

#### U.S. NAVY SPEEDS VIETNAMIZATION IN UNIQUE WAYS

#### HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, turning the war in Southeast Asia over to those whose prime interests are there, the people who live there, involves a wide spectrum of unique effort. The men of the U.S. Navy have shown exceptional enterprise in this effort as witnessed by the following account written by PO 1/c Bob Lincoln, USN, which appeared in the February issue of the Naval Reservist:

#### SELF-HELP SMOOTHS THE WAY TO VIETNAMIZATION

American Navymen in the Republic of Vietnam—both Regular and Reserve—are doing their best to work themselves out of a job.

Through such programs as ACTOV, "Helping Hand," "Buddy Base" and the colorfully named "Pigs and Chickens," they are helping to achieve Vietnamization and reduce the need for American forces in that country.

Perhaps their most successful venture to date is ACTOV, through which the turnover of the U.S. Navy's river patrol boats has been completed.

Unscrambled, ACTOV means Accelerated Turnover to the Vietnamese. It was started just 2 years ago, with the assignment of Vietnamese sailors—one at a time—to the crews of American boats. But the program really began to roll on a large scale when both navies launched intensive operational management and maintenance programs in the U.S. and Vietnam to train complete crews for each vessel before delivery.

Operation Helping Hand, a relatively new venture, is designed to upgrade the standard of living for the Vietnamese sailor and his dependents through low-cost family housing and food supplement plans.

The housing project is being carried on throughout the South Vietnamese countryside by American Seabees. They are building the concrete units of materials produced in-country, at a modest cost of \$600 each. Some 21,000 are planned.

The results of this self-help project can be seen in many villages where Vietnamese Navy



families, following the Seabees' lead, are building their own homes.

Pigs and Chickens is the U.S. Navy's broadside attack on the food problems of the Vietnamese Navy family. The aim is to establish a self-sustaining source of meat, poultry and produce for sale at each local naval base in the Vietnamese equivalent of an American military commissary.

This food-on-the-table project began with an initial free stock of 40,000 day-old chicks. Later, enough hogs and feed were added to allow each base at least two sows, one boar, 200 chicks and the necessary feed.

From this beginning, Vietnamese Navy men assisted by American Navy men with farm experience—who conduct intensive farm management and market education programs—are now better able to feed their families at prices they can afford.

The Pigs and Chickens project has so inspired the local Navy community that the Americans and Vietnamese are also trying experimental truck farms and fully stocked duck ponds. Thriving pig pens and chicken coops are already becoming familiar sights behind most sailors' homes.

One U.S. Navy advisor has taken on the task of teaching the Vietnamese new ways to fish.

Going a step further than the experienced local fishermen, he has introduced the long-line fishing technique—a long, floated line with 3000 baited hooks hanging near the ocean bottom. Now, during a night's fishing, a 3-man crew averages 1 to 2½ tons of fish—re-baiting the hooks only about 4 times.

Perhaps the most comprehensive Vietnamization project is the new Buddy Base plan—designed to link a U.S. base with a South Vietnamese Navy base through a "sister city" approach.

Among the plan's multiple objectives is a close working relationship between paired-off bases, with the U.S. side providing management and technical advice to its Vietnamese counterpart.

Each of these self-help programs is almost entirely voluntary, funded primarily through contributions. An Operation Helping Hand fund has been organized by American businessmen in Saigon and the U.S. to raise funds to support the projects. The collective aim is to make the expanding Vietnamese Navy community self-supporting.

In the process, by relieving the individual Vietnamese Navyman of many of his worries about his family, the programs are helping to make the Vietnamese Navy a more effective organization.

#### CLERGYMEN GIVE THEIR VIEWS ON THE SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT

##### HON. DAN KUYKENDALL

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

#### STATEMENT ON SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT

In man's long and sometimes tortuous ascent toward a civilized state, he has readily and generally accepted certain norms almost unanimously. One of those norms has been the recognition of the clergy's commitment to a higher allegiance than the temporal, and this recognition, too, was accorded those students for the divine ministry.

We, who are undersigned, bring this concept to your attention in the matter now pending before the U.S. House of Representa-

tives and ultimately in the U.S. Senate, which would deny exemption from the military service to students of divinity preparing for their various and respective ministries.

It is our considered religious obligation to bring to your attention our moral conviction that the passage of this specific portion of the Selective Service Act constitutes a regression in our country's civil striving.

We have resolved that this be no political statement of general opposition to the Selective Service program, since such an opinion is not unanimously shared by those who signed this statement. Let it, therefore, be a statement of religious conscience. This country cannot afford the many dangers inherent and the interruption of the preparations of its future clergy. Let us be warned that few strongholds of religious instruction and moral retention remain. Should these be weakened, the complexion of our beloved United States may be changed in the manner which will be unacceptable to all.

The position which the United States must maintain as a leader in the gentler aspects of civilization demands the resolute encouragement of the various strengths of many religions and their teachings. We dare do no less.

With the blessings of God we commend into your able hands this matter and the sincere conviction that you will treat with sympathy this cause for the blessed betterment of our great land.

Most Rev. CARROLL T. DOZIER,  
Catholic Bishop of Memphis, on Behalf  
of Catholic Community,  
Rabbi CHAIM D. SEIGER,  
Senior Rabbi, Baron Hirsch Synagogue,  
Memphis Orthodox-Jewish Community.

#### BIPARTISAN SUPPORT NEEDED ON REVENUE SHARING

##### HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in order for progressive legislation to wind its way through the congressional maze and become law, bipartisan support is needed. Programs that do not receive the support of elements of both parties are doomed to failure.

Revenue sharing, a means of aiding the financially depressed State and local governments, cannot become a reality unless it receives support from Democrats and Republicans alike; it cannot become law unless the parties join hands in a common effort.

In the past, we have seen instances where programs were endorsed by the President only to see his party desert him—the SST, according to the Evans-Novak report, is a case in point. I would hope that Republicans, as well as Democrats, listen to the local officials and heed their warning on the financial plight of the localities. This program must not be abandoned like the SST.

At this point, I include an article by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak that appeared in the Washington Post on March 26, 1971:

#### WHY SST LOST IN THE HOUSE

Shortly after the House voted down any more money for President Nixon's supersonic transport plane (SST), a Democratic SST supporter needed a high administration of-

ficial about Republican congressional opposition to the project.

"I thought we had enough Democrats to save you," said the Democratic congressman, "and we did. But why did so many of your Republicans vote against SST?"

"They weren't voting against SST," the official replied evenly. "They were voting against John Ehrlichman and the German Mafia in the White House."

That blunt assessment is partially true. The remarkable fact that 85 House Republicans opposed the SST on March 18 (compared with 89 for it) transcended environment and economics. Unquestionably, some were seeking vengeance against what they consider arrogant presidential aides, typified by policy chief Ehrlichman. But the broader meaning escaped the administration official.

The fact is that all the ecological, economic and Ehrlichman factors combined would not have impelled so many Republicans to defect if Richard M. Nixon's star were not in decline. Far more than the Senate (which now has also rejected the SST), the House is a barometer of national opinion. On the SST that barometer registered stormy weather for Mr. Nixon.

Moreover, the SST vote was one of those rare Washington events that both reflects the current political climate and simultaneously influences the future. Spawmed by the feeling of Republican congressmen that the President is not strong enough to influence their vote, the defeat reinforces that mood and makes him still weaker. Caused partly by divisions among the party's House leadership, the loss further divides that leadership.

All this is perceived but dimly by the White House senior staff, whose lack of rapport with Capitol Hill has become a truism. Indeed, a careful staff re-examination of the SST in January barely brushed against vital political questions. The certainty of a very close vote in the new, more liberal House was regraded by senior staffers as not relevant.

Just how relevant it would become was obvious when the new Congress convened. Scores of "undecided" Republicans, the balance between victory and defeat, were impervious to lobbying—from labor, industry, even the White House. Unlike suburban ladies' clubs and college campuses, the House Republican cloakroom was not transfixed by ecological outrages over the SST.

Rather, the true source of this opposition became clear the week before the House voting. With the President dropping in the polls and folks back home talking about him as a loser in 1972, Republican congressmen wanted to embellish their record with some anti-Nixon votes. What better issue than the SST, where grass roots supporters are hard to find?

The defections permeated even the nine-man House GOP leadership team, whose loyalty is normally beyond question. In a bitter closed-door session before the vote, Minority Leader Gerald Ford of Michigan angrily told his lieutenants that SST was a matter of personal loyalty, both to him and the President. It didn't work. Five of the nine voted against the President.

That split showed unprecedented hostilities among the House Republican leaders. More important will be the memory of those five party leaders walking down the center aisle with green cards (against SST) to place in the teller's ballot box. The impact of that astonishing spectacle on previously disciplined House Republican ranks could be epidemic, eroding Mr. Nixon's ability to sustain unpopular vetoes of spending bills.

In fact, it strikes to the heart of White House legislative strategy: a loyal House Republican minority becoming a floating majority with the addition of different combinations of relatively few Democrats. Nor can a revised coalition be built now with more Democrats. Rep. Hale Boggs of Louisi-

ana; the new House Democratic leader, supported the SST, but for two weeks dodged a meeting with Ford to coordinate strategy. Ford can expect more of the same from Boggs on other domestic legislation.

To optimists at the White House, these hard days are only the vestige of the long hard winter, soon to be replaced by a more favorable cherry blossom climate. But to Republican realists the defeat of the SST casts a shadow far darker and longer than the death of an airplane.

IS ANYBODY THERE? DOES  
ANYBODY CARE?

HON. ROGER H. ZION

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, this poem, written by a young lady in my district, shows how deeply she feels about the inhumane treatment being given our POW's. I want to share her moving thoughts with my colleagues:

Is ANYBODY THERE? DOES ANYBODY CARE?  
I lay in my lonely cell in the dark of night  
Longing for my mama's bosom to rest my head  
My restless dream of smiling faces  
Faraway voices calling out  
Their reassurance of their love  
I feel clinging arms swallowing my body  
Smothering me until I can't breathe  
I . . . can't . . . breathe . . .  
I wake up with sweat on my face  
I find my fingers grasping my own arms  
The dawn's glare becoming a reality  
And I am here in this stinking hell  
I fall on my knees  
My eyes lifted towards heaven  
"Dear God  
Does anybody hear?  
Does anybody care?"  
In the shadows  
My enemy's voice mocking back my words  
Scorn on his face as he throws  
The damned food  
On the floor  
I put the bitter morsel to my lips  
And pretend it's mama's good food  
I endure this rot to nourish my body  
Always praying—  
"God, I want to live!"  
In the distant still  
I heard my comrades fighting a battle to  
their deaths  
I felt the moans and the suffering  
Whispering to their last breath—  
"Mama and daddy—  
Don't cry for me  
For in your hearts I'll always live!"  
And I laughed—  
At the enemy!  
Now the time has come when  
The blood of my comrades is  
Mixed in the soil.  
Their bodies you cannot hold as your own!  
And I pound my fists against  
The cold steel  
My bitter tears  
To gain my sanity!  
A small ray of light appeared momentary  
I reached out to touch it  
As if an answer to my plea  
I feel God's gentle touch in the peace of my  
cell  
His deliverance unto my soul  
"My son, you will one day be free"  
But again I whisper a silent reassurance—  
Is anybody there?  
Does anybody care?

DAVID WEBBER OF WARREN  
COUNTY, N.C.

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to inform my colleagues of an editorial broadcast by WRAL-TV in Raleigh, N.C., on February 22, 1971.

On most occasions, editorials for this station are voiced by Mr. Jesse Helms, executive vice president of the Raleigh station.

But this particular broadcast was mainly the work of a young man named David Webber, of Warren County, N.C. David is 17 years old, he is a student at San Diego State College, and he is black.

His words show wisdom beyond his years and an objective viewpoint that few men, black or white, are able to express so precisely and effectively.

David's letter was written to the black students at John Graham High School, in North Carolina, which has recently been troubled by violence and disruption.

I am inserting Mr. Helms' editorial, including David Webber's letter, in the RECORD of today, and I urge my colleagues to read it carefully:

AN EDITORIAL EXPRESSION OF THE VOICE OF  
FREE ENTERPRISE IN RALEIGH-DURHAM  
(By Jesse Helms)

One of the more melancholy lamentations of our time is most frequently stated in the form of a rhetorical question: What has happened to reason? The answer, of course, is that there are still plenty of voices of reason; they just don't make the headlines or the newscasts. So we seldom hear them.

Last week we received a copy of a letter written by a 17-year-old Negro boy, a native of Warren County, now a freshman at San Diego State College. David Webber has been reading in California newspapers about the violence and disruption taking place in the high school at Warrenton—the high school from which he himself was graduated just last year.

So David Webber wrote a letter which he asked to be placed in the hands of black students at Warrenton. David Webber's is a voice of reason. We invite your attention to excerpts from his letter:

Dear Future Citizens: We as young people want the world to be better for ourselves, but we are selfish and narrow-minded toward creating a better world for others. We want things changed in an instant that have taken years to formulate . . . the combined efforts (of black and white, and shades in between) who have worked together for a better world. I do not say "perfect" world, but a better one.

I must mention selfishness and narrow-mindedness again, for no greater example do I know than disruption of school, disruption of a fellow human being's right to learn and to make something of himself. What we need is personal responsibility—not students acting like five-year-olds who throw tantrums when things don't go to suit them, and who destroy a toy to keep another child from playing with it.

This is what is happening in Warrenton this year. The disruption and violence has been caused by children, certainly not students and certainly not responsible adults, who don't know how to use the educational process.

We all cry about "civil rights." We say that

we have a right to stay out of school. I agree . . . some also say that we have a "right" to disrupt classes. I disagree! Our rights, no matter what color we are, stop at the ends of our noses.

When certain young people start saying that they shouldn't go to school, I am inclined to agree. I am of the opinion that there should be a place to send people who crave to be illiterate. If they don't want to learn, if they don't want to better themselves, they should not take up space needed for people who do want to learn and who do want to better themselves. The schools should not be burdened with those who do not wish to make the effort to be responsible citizens.

Too many of us cry and gripe that "the man" is "holding us back." We need to understand that we are holding ourselves back by not making full use of what is available. Thousands upon thousands of opportunities are open to all of us. We need to ask ourselves—what qualities are these opportunities looking for, in us? Punctuality—being where we are supposed to be when we are supposed to be there. Neatness—keeping ourselves clean and well-kempt, even if it be in patched overalls. Responsibility—to fulfill one's obligations to himself and to others. Maturity—the ability to keep one's cool in an emergency. And finally, a record of willingness to work—and that includes working with others.

The opportunity is there at Warrenton for you to use, not abuse. It is not our school that will bear the stigma of disruption. It is the disruptors who will forever bear the stigma who, through their actions, have shown that they don't want to learn, but just to mess up a good thing for everyone else. Students, don't let a handful of trouble-makers rob you of your rights to learn and make something of yourselves.

(Signed: David G. Webber, San Diego State College.)

The preceding was a letter written by a 1970 graduate of John Graham High School at Warrenton. David Webber is 17; he is black. And, as we said at the outset, his is a voice of reason too seldom heard amidst the clash and clamor of turmoil and unrest. We thought you'd be interested in David's attitude—and his courage in offering advice to his friends back home.

STOL TECHNOLOGY AND AIRPORT  
PLANNING

HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, I have noted the new emphasis which NASA places on its first "A," aeronautics, and particularly NASA's determination to assist in the development of technology to create a short takeoff-and-landing plane for commercial use by 1978. The FAA has also announced new STOL studies.

We should welcome this new emphasis because of the growing problems of air traffic control and heavy congestion of existing airports. As former FAA Administrator General Elwood "Pete" Quesada stated recently, flights of up to 500 miles constitute approximately 40 percent of all commercial air traffic. The perfection of STOL, therefore, within 7 years' time would effectively reduce the traffic prob-



lems of major airports. Nevertheless, we find plans for future airports which will not come into being in less than a decade being made oblivious of and without reference to either the current state of the art or its near future prospects. In order to justify carrying out airport plans initiated before STOL possibilities were considered, recent developments in the field are simply being ignored. For example, Mr. Arven H. Saunders, director of planning for a proposed new \$500 million airport in Illinois to complement and ultimately supplant Lambert Field, has been quoted by a St. Louis Post-Dispatch editorial of March 10, 1971, as saying that it would be a "tragedy" to risk the economic future of the bistate area on a theoretical airplane "that is not even off the drawing boards."

Mr. Speaker, the tragedy would be rather to go forward with such a huge investment without at least examining the possibilities inherent in a number of STOL aircraft which have been off the drawing boards and up and away for some time. These would include McDonnell Douglas' 50-passenger experimental STOL, and De Havilland's "Buffalo" which claims to be a very quiet STOL plane.

There is no particular reason to believe that airport planners in other parts of the country have a greater awareness of the prospects of STOL. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I would recommend a STOL symposium to catch the national attention and incorporate such practical demonstrations as can feasibly be made at this time. I would very much hope, since the question of airport needs is a very lively one in St. Louis at present, that appropriate authorities there together with interested manufacturers might welcome such a symposium to St. Louis. Moreover Missouri's recent emergency fund bill includes an appropriation of \$125,000 to study the airport needs of the greater St. Louis area. An on-site STOL symposium would provide valuable guidance for such a study.

#### REPORT TO NINTH DISTRICT CONSTITUENTS

#### HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

#### COMMENTARY ON THE SST

Each Session of the Congress produces a few dramatic votes. The 92nd Congress had its first such moment last week when the House rejected funding for the Supersonic Transport (SST) by a 217-to-204 vote. The Senate followed with a 51-to-46 vote against the project.

The debate on the SST has centered on the President's request for \$290 million to continue the development of the aircraft in Fiscal Year 1971. In the final days of the 91st Congress, the House approved the request, but the Senate rejected it. A House-Senate conference committee agreed to fund the program at \$210 million until March 30, 1971, and the compromise was accepted by both Houses.

The President then asked the 92nd Congress for \$134 million for the final quarter of FY 1971 (April-July) to bring the development program up to its full funding level. It was this request that was rejected by the House and Senate. The President has requested \$281 million for the SST in the budget for Fiscal Year 1972, but the future of the project is uncertain.

My vote against continued funding of the SST was based on several factors:

#### NATIONAL PRIORITIES

The funding of the SST—an appropriation of public money for a private purpose—demands tax dollars at a time when we face enormous Federal budget deficits, for Fiscal Years 1971 and 1972. The project is absorbing millions of dollars of public money and thousands of years of skilled labor at a time when there are urgent needs for these resources in health, education, housing, crime, pollution, rural and urban development, to name a few.

I have serious reservations, too, about spending the tax resources of many Americans to provide a few Americans (about 3 percent) with prestige transportation over a few transoceanic routes which will shave only a small amount of travel time on a door-to-door basis.

#### THE ECONOMICS

Continued development of the SST poses great uncertainties in the area of economics. My major concern is that the government is investing heavily in an aircraft which apparently does not have commercial attractiveness. A survey of the Nation's best-known economists—from Milton Friedman on the right to John Kenneth Galbraith on the left—rejected the marketability of the SST. If the market was really there, the economists argued, forced-feeding by the government would not be necessary. The cost of prototypes of the SST will cost the taxpayer \$1½ billion, but that may only be the beginning. With the present financial plight of the airline industries, it appears to me that they can only come to the government to finance the major developmental costs.

Put simply, why shouldn't the SST stand or fall in the competitive market?

Proponents argue that the SST will provide many jobs. Undeniably, it is an important source of employment. However, we should not be persuaded by a philosophy of make-work, in which employees are hired to do less important tasks. The argument of job creation assumes that nothing else will happen if the SST program is stymied. Surely, money not spent on the SST will flow into other job-creating investments.

#### THE ENVIRONMENT

Much of the opposition to the SST has centered around its engine noise, the sonic boom it will create, air pollution and possible climatic effects. This argument has not carried decisive weight with me, but the environment problems are serious, largely unanswered, and must be taken into consideration. If the SST production does proceed, all of us, proponents and opponents, must make every effort to reduce the harmful environmental aspects of the aircraft.

#### PRESTIGE

Probably the strongest argument for the SST was that its development was essential to keep the U.S. in the forefront of aviation technology. The British-French SST (the Concorde) is obviously in trouble, with operating costs twice those of the 747, and a decision pending on whether or not to proceed with production. Moreover, I wonder if it is proper to base a decision to go ahead with the project on any generalized concept of the enhancement of American prestige. I question that international prestige is a valid argument since the U.S. already has more than one type of operational aircraft capable of Mach 3 flight.

Finally, I should say that all of us—opponents and proponents—believe that the SST should be built. The debate is on the rate of development and the extent of government financing.

MRS. B. J. BANDY: A \$22,000 DEBT PAID FOR IN BEDSPREADS AND EVENTUALLY BUILT A CITY

#### HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the Chattanooga, Tenn., News Free Press there appeared an article about Mrs. B. J. Bandy of Dalton, Ga. The article was written by Mrs. Helen McDonald Exum and tells the story of how Mrs. Bandy and her late husband literally began what is now a major industry in the United States.

From a very modest beginning, which is described in this article, there developed the tufted chenille bedspread industry which in turn became the carpet industry and Dalton, Ga., became the carpet capital of the world.

In a very interestingly written article Mrs. Exum tells the story of how Mr. and Mrs. Bandy got into the bedspread business and later the carpet industry more or less by accident. When someone once described her as a pioneer in the industry, she replied:

Oh, I never think of myself as a pioneer. All I could think of back in the depression was how on earth my husband and I were going to get out of debt.

Mrs. Bandy is now nearing 80 and can look back on a life of service and many contributions of her time, her talents and her material goods to her home and community. Her son, B. J. Bandy, Jr., put it this way:

The story portrays a lovely lady. Her interests have been many over her eighty years but devotion to her family always has been first. She has been a wonderful mother.

Mr. Speaker, it is with much pleasure that I include Mrs. Exum's article on Mrs. Bandy as a part of my remarks:

[From the Chattanooga News-Free Press, Chattanooga, Tenn.]

MRS. B. J. BANDY: A \$22,000 DEBT PAID FOR IN BEDSPREADS AND EVENTUALLY BUILT A CITY

(By Helen McDonald Exum)

Dalton, Ga., that pleasant town about 30 miles south of Chattanooga on the way to Atlanta, is now the carpet capital of the world. It is a boom town where fortunes are made and sometimes lost, and the carpets that come out of 75 or so mills there are shipped all over the world.

One of the pioneers in the industry is a woman, Mrs. B. J. Bandy, and she is undoubtedly the first lady of Dalton. Many credit her with starting the whole thing.

"Oh I never think of myself as a pioneer, honey. All I could think of back in the depression was how on earth my husband and I were going to get out of debt. B. J. and I had a country store when the depression hit. We did a large credit business and many of our customers had to take bankruptcy, and didn't pay us a dime. We owed our suppliers \$22,000 and we were determined to pay them in full, but how?

"We thought and thought. B. J. was a telegrapher with the Southern Railway when we married, and he kept his job along with the store and taught me how to be a telegrapher, too. He made \$57.50 a month, but that wouldn't pay all we owed."

This was about the time that tufted bedspreads were coming in. Most of us can remember the roadside stands that dotted Highway 41 between here and Dalton with every variety of spreads on the lines. But no one had thought of taking them to other parts of the country.

Mrs. Bandy went to Mrs. Catherine Evans Whitener, who started the tufted bedspreads and got her permission to copy five designs. She got these tufted, bought one new dress, and since her husband was an employee of the Southern Railroad, got a free railroad pass to New York.

"I had never been farther away from home than Atlanta. I took the bundle of sample spreads, my suitcase, and took a seat on the day coach, sitting up all night until the train got to Washington. I'll never forget it," she says.

"I didn't even know that you could check your suitcase in the terminal, so I got off the train with my bag and my spreads and made my way to Woodward and Lothrop. When I got to the buyer's office I must have looked a sight, but I showed him what I had to sell. I told him I'd never sold anything before, and he smiled and said he knew!"

"But do you know, he was wonderful. He ordered 400 spreads at \$4 a spread. I figured I could get them made for \$2 each, so maybe we would get out of debt after all!"

"I was so excited I got the train to Baltimore and sold 200 more at Hochschild and Kohns. This was so much more than we had hoped that I didn't even go on to New York, but turned around and came home. We had to hire people to tuft the spreads, had to figure out how to get so many stamped with the stamping irons, the shipping problems. But we filled the orders."

From this start she used her pass to go to New York and to Macy's. Her first order there was for 1,000 if she would sell them for \$3. She did. She also began using those free railroad passes and spent many nights on day coaches as she made regular trips to Boston, New York, Chicago, Washington, wherever she could talk a buyer into buying tufted bedspreads from Georgia.

This was a cottage industry and the Bandys had people all around tufting the spreads that they would stamp. Whole families worked on the spreads. When the wage and hour law came in with the New Deal, many thought the bedspread business was all over.

"I was just praying the bedspread business would last long enough for us to pay the \$22,000 we owed," she remembers.

But technology took over. The old-fashioned goose neck Singer sewing machine was adapted so that the spread could be machine tufted. The Bandys opened their first factory in a tin building down on Thornton Avenue. I asked if I could get a picture of the first factory. "Oh, honey, it was nothing. We wouldn't have wanted a picture of that!" she said.

The new machine age was born. Mr. Bandy later bought a large plant in North Carolina; he established the Southern Craft Co. in Rome, Georgia, and built Bartow Textile Co. in Cartersville. He is credited with being the first man to ever make a million dollars in the bedspread business.

From tufting bedspreads it was a natural step to use much the same principle to tuft carpets. The Bandy family were among the first to get into the carpet business, taking advantage of every innovation. Her son, B. J. Bandy is currently vice president of Coronet Carpets which recently merged with R. C. A. in a stock exchange. "Why, Coronet

was started just 10 years ago in this very living room," she told me.

Her daughter, Mrs. Joseph K. McCutchen, is the wife of the chairman of the boards of both J. and C. Carpet Co. and Universal Carpet of Ellijay, Georgia. McCutchen is the holder of more than 30 major patents in tufting technology.

You cannot drive through the streets of Dalton with Mrs. B. J. Bandy without detecting her wide interests, her enthusiasm, her drive. "There's our new bank. Isn't it beautiful? Over there is a carpet business that has expanded and expanded so that it includes a whole block. That landscaping is nice, isn't it? I like the water fountain."

We drove out by Dalton Junior College, a beautifully planned college. She is a member of the board of trustees. All the classrooms are carpeted.

Dickie Bradley Bandy is not only a super saleswoman with lots of dynamic ideas for a family business, but she is both civic and history minded. In memory of Mr. Bandy, who died in 1948, and a granddaughter, Christie McCutchen, who was killed in an automobile accident at the University of Georgia, her family established an intensive care unit at the Dalton Hospital.

"I think people should be interested in everything, and help wherever they can. Life is more than just business. Once my husband went to see a man about possibly selling a plant, and they had lunch together. The man talked nothing but business all through lunch, and my husband decided not to get involved."

Mrs. Bandy says that as she was growing up as Dickie Bradley with all her brothers and sisters, as the daughter of a country doctor, she always felt sorry for the Indians and thought they had been treated badly. She had watched the once magnificent old Vann house, built by Cherokee James Clement Vann, fall into disrepair. She interested the Whitfield Murray County Historical Society in restoring it and they bought the big house at Spring Place outside Dalton for \$5,000. Of course, it took another \$75,000 to restore it, but it is the only mansion type home in America built by an Indian.

When she needed help in decorating it, she just called Mr. Scalomandre in New York, who came down to get the feel of it and ended up donating \$8,000 worth of material for the draperies. When it was dedicated, Will Rogers, Jr., a descendant of the Vanns, came, as well as governors, dignitaries and representatives from the Cherokees in Oklahoma. Dickie Bradley Bandy was made an Ambassador of the Cherokee Nation by W. W. Keeler, president of Phillips Petroleum in Bartlesville, Oklahoma.

Today Mrs. Bandy can look about her at the changes that have come to her part of the country in her lifetime. The country doctor's daughter has made the big time without losing for a minute her compassion for people who have been treated unjustly, as well as for the sick, her patriotism that feels we must save the best of the past for the future, and her love of people and of life. Mrs. Bandy is the first lady of Dalton, and a gracious, down-to-earth Southern lady in the best sense of the word.

#### PROGRESS OR AN EXPENSIVE FUNERAL?

### HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, much has been said here, in the other body, and in the press on the fate of the supersonic transport project.

Some of what has been said and written made sense and was accurate; some of it, unfortunately, bordered on the absurd and hysterical. In the cold light of day following the votes on the SST, the Washington Daily News printed an editorial which I believe makes a great deal of sense and I commend it to my colleagues for their reading. Under the permission heretofore unanimously granted me, I include this editorial which was published in the Washington Daily News of March 25, 1971:

#### NO OBIT FOR THE SST

Backers of the supersonic transport plans are confronted with two choices now that both houses of Congress have cut off future federal aid.

The can quietly bury the SST project, leaving the supersonic field to the British, the French and the Russians.

Or they can try to revive the SST—either thru private financing, government-guaranteed loans or a combination of both.

The only responsible choice is to keep trying.

This wouldn't be pigheaded stubbornness. It simply would reflect the conviction of many knowledgeable Americans (including nearly half the members of Congress as well as this newspaper) that supersonic travel is bound to come—and the United States should go after its share of the market.

The 51-46 vote yesterday in the Senate and last week's 215-204 vote in the House are not convincing enough to drop abruptly a project which so far has cost the taxpayers \$864 million and could cost a billion dollars once contract cancellation penalties are computed.

As Sen. Henry M. Jackson, D-Wash., said, this is too stiff a price to pay for unproven scare stories about sonic booms, skin cancer and air pollution.

"The SST program is a program to build two prototypes," he points out. "No one ever claimed this would have any adverse effect on the environment."

There is always the chance—however remote—that Congress will change its mind about the SST. Perhaps some kind of partial funding can be arranged for the fiscal year starting in July.

In the meantime, the Nixon administration should continue exploring every possible way to keep this project alive—even if it means backing private loans with federal credit.

This is the wrong time to write an obituary for the SST. The stakes are too high. And the funeral would be far too expensive.

#### AMERICAN POW'S—WE DO CARE

### HON. ROBERT H. STEELE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1971

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, it has been 7 years since the first U.S. serviceman, Capt. Floyd J. Thompson, was imprisoned in Southeast Asia. Today he is among the almost 1,600 young men of our Armed Forces listed as missing in action or prisoners of war.

The North Vietnamese and Vietcong have claimed that they are treating American prisoners of war humanely, but there is clear evidence that this is not true. They have, in fact, consistently ignored the requirements of the Geneva Convention. They have never released



the names of all the U.S. prisoners they hold. They have not released sick and wounded prisoners. They have not allowed impartial inspections of prisoners-of-war facilities. And they have not permitted a regular flow of mail between the prisoners and their families.

The North Vietnamese Government has often indicated that it does not really believe that the American people care about their captured servicemen. As a cosponsor of legislation in the House which designates this week as "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action," I am hopeful that this congressional action will help to dispel this grave misconception in Hanoi.

I am also hopeful that this national expression of concern for our missing and captured servicemen will focus new attention on the callous disregard the North Vietnamese Government has shown for its own military personnel captured and missing in South Vietnam. Hanoi continues to deny that its army has invaded South Vietnam and consequently treats its own 8,000 prisoners of war in South Vietnam as nonpersons. It denies that these 8,000 men exist and has rejected all proposals for prisoner exchanges.

Hanoi's stand on the prisoner-of-war issue thus contravenes not only the most basic interest of the American people, but of the Vietnamese people themselves, north and south. It is a policy which cannot stand exposure to the light of world opinion and one which we therefore must continue to expose with all the resources at our command.

#### IN DEFENSE OF RIVERS

### HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter to the editor which appeared in the Charleston, S.C., News and Courier on March 23, 1971.

The letter, which speaks for itself, was written by members of the L. Mendel Rivers Monument Committee:

#### DEFENSE OF RIVERS

TO THE NEWS AND COURIER:

Congratulations to Sen. Strom Thurmond for springing to the defense of our beloved friend, the late L. Mendel Rivers, who has, in a Senate hearing, been accused by Sen. Abraham Ribicoff in what, under the circumstances, we consider to be an unfair and cowardly manner.

As we understand from newspaper accounts, the accusation is based solely on two alleged conversations between Sen. Ribicoff and the late Congressman Rivers in the fall of 1969. If any such conversations did indeed take place, obviously the living may report anything he chooses, while the dead is forever silent.

One wonders, if his accusations were true, if by withholding the said vital evidence for more than two years Mr. Ribicoff does not to some extent indict himself. If such should be the case, would he not by his silence dur-

ing this time become somewhat of an accessory to whatever wrongdoing he now claims was going on?

Any citizen knows that no court will accept "hearsay evidence," and it only takes a grain of common sense to tell one that what a living person, with no witnesses, states that a dead one said is just that.

Sen. Fritz Hollings, like Sen. Thurmond, is also to be commended for making a similar admirable defense on the floor of the Senate when the New York Post printed an inexcusably tasteless and indeed abhorrent article on the day of the late Congressman's funeral.

It is expected that all great men will have enemies, but let it be known that the true friends (Republican, Democrat, Independent, or whatever) of L. Mendel Rivers, who admired him in life and revere him in death, will not forget that he literally gave his life for our interests and those of our country. We shall never stand by and fail to speak out when any attempt shall be made, either directly or by inference, to besmirch a name which he made great by sacrificial service to his God, his country and to us, his fellowmen.

J. A. HAMRICK,  
JOSEPH P. RILEY,  
HAROLD SIMMONS  
F. JULIAN LEAMOND,  
W. HAROLD BUTT,

13 Broad St.

#### AN AMENDMENT TO IMPROVE THE POSTAL REFORM ACT

### HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I have been pleased with the progress we have made in providing the citizens of the United States with the best possible mail service. With the implementation of the Postal Reform Act this July, we will have produced a mail service that is convenient to the public as well as reliable.

However, I feel that the Postal Reform Act would be greatly improved with the adoption of the amendment which I have just introduced. The amendment will prohibit the unsolicited mailing of cigarettes and the unsolicited mailing of merchandise for which payment is required or expected. The amendment would also restrict the mailing of drugs.

The banning of unsolicited mailing of cigarettes and merchandise is necessary, because, unfortunately, there are some who would abuse the privilege of the mail by using the mail service for their own convenience. I include in this group those tobacco companies who send sample cigarettes to a random selection of the population. I also include those companies who send unsolicited merchandise through the mail, and then bill the recipient for receiving the parcel. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced this amendment to stop this harassment of the public.

Restrictions on the handling of drugs and other controlled substances covered by the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 are

necessary to insure that these items reach only those who have requested them and who are authorized to receive them. Dangerous and readily abused drugs must be handled with special and meticulous caution.

The amendment follows:

A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, as enacted by the Postal Reorganization Act, to prohibit the mailing of unsolicited merchandise for which a remittance is required and of unsolicited samples of cigarettes, to regulate the mailing of drugs covered by title II of the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3001 of title 39, United States Code, as enacted by the Postal Reorganization Act (84 Stat. 745 and 746; Public Law 91-375) and amended by the Act of January 8, 1971 (84 Stat. 1974; Public Law 91-662), is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g); and

(2) by inserting immediately below subsection (e) the following new subsection:

"(f) (1) Any sample of any cigarette mailed without the prior express written consent or request of the addressee is non-mailable matter, shall not be carried or delivered by mail, and shall be disposed of as the Postal Service directs. The Postal Service may permit the transmission in the mails, under regulations prescribed by the Postal Service, of any such unsolicited sample addressed to a physician, chemist, or medical technician engaged in medical research or to a hospital, clinic, laboratory, medical school, or other agency, institution, or organization, whether government or private, engaged in medical research or having medical research facilities. Such regulations shall provide that the envelope, package, or other cover under which such unsolicited sample is mailed shall bear on its face in conspicuous type a notice, in words prescribed by the Postal Service, to the effect that such envelope, package, or other cover contains a sample of one or more cigarettes unsolicited by the addressee but which may be of interest or assistance to the addressee for purposes of medical research.

"(2) As used in this subsection, 'cigarette' has the meaning provided by section 1332(1) (A) and (B) of title 15."

Sec. 2. (a) Chapter 30 of title 39, United States Code, as enacted by the Postal Reorganization Act (84 Stat. 745-761; Public Law 91-375) and amended by the Act of January 8, 1971 (84 Stat. 1974; Public Law 91-662), is amended by inserting immediately following section 3001 thereof the following new section:

"§ 3001A. Mailing of certain drugs and other controlled substances covered by Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970

"(a) Any controlled substance otherwise legally acceptable in the mails is nonmailable matter, shall not be carried or delivered by mail, and shall be disposed of as the Postal Service directs, unless such controlled substance is mailed—

"(1) in response to the prior express written order or request of the addressee and

"(2) under such conditions as the Postal Service shall prescribe in order to provide—

"(A) security in the handling of such controlled substance in the mails, and

"(B) certainty of personal delivery of such controlled substance to the addressee, and

"(C) proof of when, where, and the person to whom such controlled substance was delivered; and

"(3) upon agreement by the manufacturer, distributor, or other sender of such controlled substance to pay, if such con-

trolled substance is not delivered after such period of time as the Postal Service shall prescribe, an additional postal fee to be fixed by the Postal Service to cover its cost of return of such controlled substance to the manufacturer, distributor, or other sender; and

"(4) under a cover which bears the name and address of the manufacturer, distributor, or other sender of such controlled substance and indicates on its face, by such notice as the Postal Service shall prescribe, that such cover contains a controlled substance which has been ordered or requested by the addressee.

"(b) For the purposes of this section, 'controlled substance' has the meaning provided by section 102(6) of title II (the Controlled Substances Act) of the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1243; Public Law 91-513).

"(c) The Postal Service shall prescribe and issue special regulations for the administration of this section."

(b) The table of sections of chapter 30 of title 39, United States Code, as enacted by the Postal Reorganization Act (84 Stat. 745; Public Law 91-375), is amended by inserting—

"3001A. Mailing of certain drugs and other controlled substances covered by Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970."

Immediately below—

"3001. Nonmailable matter."

Sec. 3. (a) Chapter 83 of title 18, United States Code, relating to offenses against the Postal Service, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 1738. Unlawful mailing of certain drugs and other controlled substances covered by Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970

"(a) Whoever willfully uses the mails for the mailing, carriage in the mails, or delivery of any controlled substance in violation of section 3001A of title 39, or willfully violates any regulation of the Postal Service prescribed and issued under such section 3001A, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 for each offense.

"(b) As used in this section, 'controlled substance' has the meaning provided by section 102(6) of title II (the Controlled Substances Act) of the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970."

(b) The table of sections of chapter 83 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"1738. Unlawful mailing of certain drugs and other controlled substances covered by Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970."

Sec. 4. (a) Chapter 30 of title 39, United States Code, as enacted by the Postal Reorganization Act (84 Stat. 745-751; Public Law 91-375), and amended by the Act of January 8, 1971 (84 Stat. 1974; Public Law 91-862), is amended by inserting immediately following section 3009 thereof the following new section:

"§ 3009A. Mailing of unsolicited merchandise for which payment is required or expected

"Any item of merchandise mailed without the prior express written consent or request of the addressee and payment for which by the addressee is required or expected by the sender is nonmailable matter, shall not be carried or delivered by mail, and shall be disposed of as the Postal Service directs."

(b) The table of sections of chapter 30 of title 39, United States Code, as enacted by the Postal Reorganization Act (84 Stat. 745; Public Law 91-375), is amended by inserting—

"3009A. Mailing of unsolicited merchandise for which payment is required or expected."

Immediately below—

"3009. Mailing of unordered merchandise."

Sec. 5. Section 3009 of title 39, United States Code, as enacted by the Postal Reorganization Act (84 Stat. 749; Public Law 91-375), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) The foregoing provisions of this section shall not impair, change, or otherwise affect the application and operation of any other section of this chapter."

Sec. 6. The amendments made by this Act shall become effective at the beginning of the third calendar month following the date of enactment of this Act or on such earlier date or dates, published in the Federal Register by the Board of Governors of the Postal Service, as the Board may prescribe.

## MUSEUM OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK—NARCOTICS EXHIBIT

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, each day three New Yorkers die, victims of the horror of drug abuse. Each day, drug abusers commit nearly one-half of all crimes reported to the New York City Police Department. Each day, the drug crisis, leaving no segment of this Nation untouched, becomes increasingly severe.

We in the Congress must do all possible to put an end to this spreading addiction and fatal abuse. A comprehensive, coordinated effort to direct all of the resources at our command toward this goal must be developed. The Congress, the Executive, and the citizens of this Nation must be made to realize that as long as hard drugs permeate our land, as long as they infect our youth, if it everyone's dilemma, we must all live with it, and together we must all solve it.

Congressional and Executive action might well begin to bring us to a solution. But that is not enough. Our media, our educational and cultural institutions, and our people themselves, must act so as to influence and increase our commitment to the eradication of this growing crisis.

The Museum of the City of New York, through a \$65,000 grant from the New York State Narcotic Addiction Control Commission, is now staging a timely exhibit entitled "Drug Scene." It is the first exhibit about drug abuse staged by a museum in this country and it has been a complete success. By taking this problem directly to the people of New York, the museum and the city have discovered a neutral ground for family and school groups to examine the facts and the problems of drug abuse in a dramatic and effective manner.

The success of this kind of endeavor demands that there be more of the same, in museums, schools, and cities, all across the Nation.

A series of reviews which appeared

upon the opening of this exhibit, unanimous in their praise and approval, follows:

[From the New York Post, Mar. 3, 1971]

A GRIM TRIP: "DRUG SCENE"

(By Jerry Tallmer)

They passed in through the coffins at the entrance to the show, 10 kids, mostly black, and their teacher, a young white woman, and now stood contemplating some free-standing photo-figures each labeled: "I'm on drugs."

A little boy about 7 stood himself next to one of the photo-figures. "She 'bout the same size as me," he remarked.

A little girl pointed to another of the figures. "What's that," she said, "a girl or boy?" The teacher looked and said: "A girl. Do you think she'll live to be a grownup?" "Nope," said her student, and the group moved on into the rest of the exhibit.

It is called "Drug Scene," and it opened last week for three months at the Museum of the City of New York, Fifth Av. and 103rd-104th Sts., where it is already smashing attendance records.

All day long on weekdays the school buses pull up and the kids pour out. Sunday was even heavier, some 5500 in a continually moving line, bringing the total by the end of that fifth day of the show to 17,500.

Normal Sunday attendance, says Joseph V. Noble, director of the museum, would be "2000 to 2500, tops." He recommends weekday lunch hours, 12-2, as the best time to avoid the crush.

The kids were looking at the blownup face of a man taking LSD, and the LSD he was taking, cut into the photo at the appropriate spot, was the real stuff.

"He takin' a drug pill, and he gives me the creeps at night," said one of the little girls of the fourth grade, PS 6, the Bronx.

"Don't worry about it, Annie," said her teacher. "Better he gives you the creeps now."

A new group came walking through.

"If you have a question," said their teacher, "go up to the 'Ask Me' man and ask."

The "Ask Me" men wear big buttons saying: "Ask Me," and they are reformed—or reforming—addicts. There were two of them on hand right then.

One of them made himself available to a little girl who was studying a bunch of marijuana cigarettes.

"What do they put in there?" she asked, pointing to the reefer.

"This," said the "Ask Me" man, pointing to powdered marijuana and then to a marijuana leaf. "You see, you dry it out, then crush it up."

He pointed high up to a window sill. "We have the plants growing up there," he said—and sure enough, they do. The little girl reached out to try and touch a marijuana leaf, but it and all the rest are securely bolted behind thick plastic shields.

A little boy walked up and jabbed the "Ask Me" man in the elbow.

"How do you feel when you take it?" he asked.

"How do you feel when you take marijuana?" said the "Ask Me" man. "Well, kind of light. Music sounds great. You feel kind of happy. It all depends on the setting you're in when you smoke it."

And then he informed the boy, and others listening what else might happen to people who start smoking marijuana.

The group moved along the "Ask Me" man moving with them.

"That there—that's methadone," he said. "See, you use that to help you stop taking dope. This here—this here's an encounter session in group therapy. You see," he said to a Puerto Rican girl, "I run encounters." And he explained them.



Toward the end of the exhibit at a red "hot line" telephone stood another "Ask Me" man, a brown man of about 30 with a neat mustache and intense eyes. A bunch of kids were clustered around him, enthralled.

"How did you feel when you were taking dope?" one of them asked.

"Very aching," said the "Ask Me" man, recruited here from the Bushwick methadone program. "You get aches and pains all over. Plus you break out in cold and hot sweats. And on top of all this you might take too much."

"An overdose," said a kid.

"Right, and it will kill you instantly."

A girl asked: "When you're on speed, do you feel funny?"

"Like you're on the roof, and want to jump right off it."

He was asked which drug he thought was worst.

"All bad. All. But," he said, slowly and emphatically, "I would say the worst one is heroin. And LSD is very bad because it puts you through hallucinations."

#### REALLY TRUE

"I might be with my wife, and I might take a knife and stab her in the heart."

The kids were wide-eyed, silent, listening, as the "Ask Me" man told of other horrors. Finally one boy asked: "Is this really true?"

"Yeah," said the "Ask Me" man bluntly, "it's the truth. Any time you go on drugs there's no future for your life whatsoever. You lose your self-respect, and you definitely don't love anyone else. So please don't ever take no kind of drugs. I've experienced it and I know."

"There were 10 of us on drugs, and only two of us are alive now. Two were killed by police. The others were O.D.s."

The kids nodded and a tall girl said: "If you start doing it once . . ."

"If you do it once you can't stop," said the "Ask Me" man. "If you do it one time, you're going to do it two, if you do it two times, you're going to do it three."

Says museum director Noble: "One thing has astounded me. I hadn't been prepared for it. We get kids down to 10-year-olds confiding to the 'Ask Me' men that they're shooting it up."

"The 'Ask Me' man can get them help through the 'hot line' telephone but he usually says first: 'Have you told your parents?' The kids say: 'My parents would throw me out.' He says: 'Bring your parents back to the show and maybe we can talk to them too.'"

According to Noble there have been about 10 such confessions—or cries for help—a day, or 40 to 50 in all so far.

At the end of the show there's a family portrait, Dad, Mom, the kids, the dog—and a medicine cabinet full of "legal" pills in Mom's tummy, a cabinet of liquor and another of cigarettes in Dad's.

"We are all part of the drug scene" is written over their heads—in English and Spanish, like everything else in the show.

"Hey, Red, look," said a little white girl to her chum while pointing to all the TV-blatted remedies in Mom's tummy, "they tell us this stuff is safe."

"I gave my sister an aspirin the other day," said her friend.

"You stupid, you really are," said the first girl, giggling.

"Anything taken in excess is dangerous," said their teacher as they started out of the exhibit.

Another group came up and stared at all the familiar brand names and then at a strange man standing there, writing things down in a reporter's notebook.

"My mother takes that," said one of the children to the writing man, pointing to a headache remedy. "Why do they have this here?" And a bunch of other kids echoed his question.

"Anything taken in excess is dangerous," said the writing man, doing the best he could to explain why.

You could see the light dawn.

"Ohhh," said a girl pointing to each item in turn, with the others shaking their heads in agreement, "sleepies are bad for you, headache pills are bad for you, diet pills are bad for you . . ."

Out by the coffins at the entrance a little white boy of about 6 grasped: "Coffins! Is it real?"

By the coffins there is a sign that reads: "Three New Yorkers will die today from overdoses and diseases caused by drugs."

[From the New York Sunday News, Feb. 14, 1971]

#### CITY MUSEUM SETS EXHIBIT ON NARCOTICS

(By Edward Benes)

A trip through the world of narcotics, dramatically portrayed by life-size three-dimensional, free-standing murals, awaits visitors to the Museum of the City of New York when a special exhibition opens Feb. 24. Entitled "Drug Scene," it will be the first major exhibition concerned with drug abuse ever presented by a museum in this country, Director Joseph Veach Noble said.

"This provocative exhibition was proposed as an attempt to show that not only is a museum a mirror to the past, but also can serve as a powerful visual educational medium to today's problem, which will be tomorrow's past," he said.

Noble called drug addiction today's No. 1 problem in the city and said although the exhibition will not cure someone who is an addict, it might help prevent someone from either experimenting with drugs or stop an experimenter from going deeper into habit.

COST IS \$65,000

Noble was confident that the exhibit, funded at a cost of \$65,000 by the State Narcotic Addiction Control Commission, would be watched carefully by other cultural organizations and museums throughout the country. "If we seem to meet with any measure of success in attracting people, on what I consider to be neutral grounds, in a museum, to become more educated in all aspects of this terrible drug epidemic sweeping our country, I know it will be repeated in every big city nationwide," he said.

The exhibit will show a brief history of narcotics in this country since the Civil War, the consequences of drug abuse, the treatment of addicts and a "first step" toward help.

Three guides, all former addicts, and identified by buttons reading "Ask Me," will be on duty to answer questions. The exhibition will be bilingual and is expected to run for three months, from Tuesday to Saturday from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. Admission is free.

Greeting visitors in the main rotunda of the museum will be a 15-foot three-dimensional mural of an addict about to mainline a shot of heroin. It will be captioned in both English and Spanish: "Welcome to New York City, Drug Capital of the World."

Past this grotesque figure, Noble said, other figures will all be life-size to give the illusion that the viewer is actually part of the scene. "At one point, in the treatment area, the viewer will be surrounded by about 12 figures engaged in an encounter session rapping about drugs," he said. Two of the figures will emit voices from tape recordings, both in English and Spanish, of actual dialogue in a rehabilitation center.

At the end of the exhibition, the phase called "First Step," an eight-page booklet in both languages, will be handed out. On a desk will be a "hot line" phone.

It will be connected directly with State Narcotic Addiction Control Commission centers for anyone who might need help.

Noble, who became director of the museum

on Sept. 1, said the museum's board of trustees, including President Louis Auchincloss an author; Mrs. Bennett Cerf, Mrs. Charlotte Ford, Bruce A. Gimbel and Julian K. Roosevelt, completely supported his idea of a drug exhibit.

[From the New York Catholic News, Feb. 25, 1971]

#### CITY OF NEW YORK MUSEUM PRESENTING "DRUG SCENE EXHIBIT"

Drug Scene, the first major exhibition dealing with the problems of drug addiction and abuse to be presented in the United States, opened at the Museum of the City of New York yesterday. This educational exhibition, which is primarily concerned with the drug problem as it relates to New York City, will be bilingual in English and Spanish. Admission is free.

Joseph Veach Noble, Director of the Museum, conceived the idea for the exhibition and its presentation at the Museum of the City of New York. In commenting on it he said, "Drug Scene is an exhibition which fills an urgent need here in New York City. A wave of drug abuse is our major urban problem, and it affects all of us every day—directly or indirectly. The dread of its consequences lies in the heart of every parent. And yet, until now, where could people take their children in a neutral environment to have a look at the hardware of drugs, to question the root causes behind drug abuse, and to see an objective presentation of the methods of treatment and rehabilitation? The Museum of the City of New York has undertaken the responsibility of presenting Drug Scene as an educational and constructive exhibition which will create an insight into this perilous problem."

The exhibition is divided into five major areas. The first area is entitled "How and Why." Here the viewer is shown the root causes of drug abuse in juxtaposition to the actual "hardware" of the drugs themselves, with details on the legal and illegal uses of the drugs and their effects on the human body. The second major area entitled "Consequences" is a multi-media visual and sound presentation to tell of the horrors and consequences of drug abuse. "Treatment" is the third part of Drug Scene and here chemotherapy and psychotherapy as means of overcoming drug addiction are explained and illustrated.

"Law Enforcement" is the fourth section, which illustrates the routes by which drugs reach New York City, and the attempts locally, federally, and internationally at controlling the flow of drugs to this city. The "Ask Me" desk is in the fifth major area. This is attended by a former drug addict with a red "Hot Line" telephone for instant referral to any of the drug addiction agencies for anyone wishing help for further information. A free 8-page booklet covering the drug problem, in English or Spanish, will be given to every visitor.

The aim of the Drug Scene exhibition is involvement, and to achieve this an entirely new exhibition technique has been created whereby the visitor is confronted with life size, free-standing figures and settings which serve as the medium for displaying the artifacts of drug abuse. A sound track of the street vocabulary used in connection with drugs orients the uninitiated visitor. To further help in an understanding of Drug Scene (the guides for exhibition are former drug addicts who will be stationed throughout the area to answer questions. They will be wearing the large "Ask Me" buttons).

The Museum, located at Fifth Avenue and 103rd Street in Manhattan, is open Tuesday through Saturday, 10 A.M. to 5 P.M., and Sundays and Holidays from 1 to 5 P.M. Drug Scene has been made possible by a grant from the New York State Narcotic Addiction Control Commission. It will be shown for three months.

[From the Long Island Newsday,  
Feb. 23, 1971]

#### THE ADDICT WHO CAME IN FROM THE RAIN

In the walkways of the housing project at 104th Street and Madison Avenue yesterday the rain was running gray rivulets around crushed beer cans and empty wine bottles. Women coming back from shopping clutched brown paper bags in one hand and umbrellas in the other. Kids coming home from school pulled their raincoats up over their heads. There wasn't a dope pusher in sight, but Virgil Black, chatting in a building a block away, knew they were out there, or would be there later, in the hallway or in the playground or just standing on the street corner. Virgil spent 10 years shooting up heroin in that neighborhood and hustling it to others.

"I was on skag for \$200 a day," he said. (Skag is his word for heroin.) "I had a girl who was supportin' me. She'd bring me two bags in the morning. Then I would be okay. I wasn't sick, as long as I had the stuff. But when she left, that's when it got bad. When you got to support yourself, you've got to be out hustlin' all the time, hustlin' all day long. You don't got no time to rest. And you could never hustle enough. Some days I'd hustle up \$300, I'd go to an after-hours shoot-up joint with my friends and blow the whole \$300. Next morning you got to start all over again."

"I got into skag when I was 27," he said. "That's pretty late. I came to New York from North Carolina when I was 26. Didn't know anything about skag back then. There wasn't all this publicity back home. I hung out with some fellas from North Carolina. They're snortin' this white stuff and they say, 'Here try it, it'll make you feel good. It can't hurt you, see, we're takin' it.' So you snort the stuff a few times and before you know it you're hooked. You've got a habit."

"Ten years I was on skag. I guess I'm lucky. A lot of those guys I started out with are dead, O.D. There was never any trouble gettin' the stuff, it's all over the place. They can't stamp it out, it's too big. Cops are hustling stuff. Straight guys, guys you'd never guess, are shootin' up. You take a girl out, drinkin' and partyin', and you pull out some skag and snort it and say, 'Here, try it, it won't hurt you.' So she tries it and gets hooked. Then you dump her and move on to the next. That's the way these guys operate. I wouldn't do that, though. I wouldn't turn on anybody who wasn't hooked already."

"But a guy on skag likes to get his friends skag too. That way they can shoot up together. It's companionship. And you can hustle each other. When you start out, there's no trouble gettin' money for stuff. Friends will give you money, and relatives. For about six months, till they find out what you're doing. Then they stop. Then you've got to start hustling."

"Sometimes I'd go visting back home in North Carolina or stay with friends in Connecticut," he said. "There would be junk around, but I wouldn't need any. The minute I'd get back to New York my stomach would start tightening. I'd start getting sick and have to get some skag."

It was still raining as we talked, but Virgil was dry and warm, in a building at 104th Street and Fifth Avenue, one block from the housing project where he used to hang out. The building is the Museum of the City of New York. An exhibition on the drug scene opens to the public there tomorrow, for a three-month run, and Virgil began work there yesterday as a guide. He is no longer an addict, but it had taken him 10 years to travel that one block, 10 years to come in out of the rain.

The exhibition is informative and frightening in a low-key way. There are three coffins beneath a sign that says: "Three New Yorkers Will Die Today from Drug Abuse." There are displays of heroin, LSD, amphet-

amines, barbiturates, marijuana, even alcohol and tobacco. There are pictures portraying some of the reasons for drug use: loneliness, alienation, poverty, discrimination, materialism. One display depicts the pressures that can lead to middle-class addiction. "Step right up for the easy life and instant happiness," it says. "Buy, buy, buy . . . promise her anything . . . automatic status . . . the hair nature should have given you . . . life is too short and winter too long to go without mink . . ."

The hope of museum officials is that parents will bring their children to the exhibition and learn about drugs together; communicate with one another before it is too late. Maybe that will help, maybe it won't. As one display says: "The problem will keep growing until some of the things people are trying to escape from change . . . until people themselves change."

It must be noted that Virgil Black was not cured of his 10 years of addiction by any museum display. He was cured at the Narcotics Treatment Center at Lexington, Ky., and it was no wall poster or psychedelic display that motivated him to go there. "I finally got busted for hustlin'," he said. "They was goin' to give me five years. I told them I'd take the cure."

One other detail, just for the record. Virgil is not his real name, it's just a made-up name for a guide through hell. He didn't want his real name to be used. "I've got a new girl," he said. "I haven't told her about this drug stuff yet."

[From the Newark Sunday News, Mar. 7,  
1971]

#### DRUG FORUM: A MUSEUM THAT TELLS IT LIKE IT IS

(By Dr. Stanley Einstein)

Most people remember museums in odd ways. Teachers took them there as part of school. Parents did the same to broaden horizons, to fill up a rainy day or for family togetherness. Tourists go there. And they are a reasonable kind of place for a cheap date or to pick up a date. In a sense, they are status, static places for many of us.

But the scene has changed at the Museum of the City of New York. Situated at 103rd Street and Fifth Avenue, with beautiful gardens to the west, Black Harlem to the north, Spanish Harlem to the east, and the jetset to the south, the museum and its director, Joseph Veach Noble, are bringing the dynamic reality of today's drug problem to thousands of daily visitors.

As you walk in there's a huge photo of a youngster injecting himself. To the side are three coffins. The bronze one is to remind us that the rich are affected; the pine one is for the young and if that doesn't get to you, as you raise your eyes there are some devastating facts staring at you:

One out of every 80 New Yorkers is hooked on addictive drugs.

Two addicted babies will be born today in New York City.

Three New Yorkers will die today from overdoses and diseases caused by drug abuse.

That's just the beginning of the exhibit called "Drug Scene in New York City." The exhibit was conceived by Noble. What's included in it, and what's excluded is his sole responsibility as well. He knew that if all the drug experts get together to decide what to do and how to do it, the exhibit would never be.

One may wonder what motivates an old prestigious museum and its scholarly director to get involved in the nitty gritty of daily urban problems. The answer, according to Noble is quite simple.

"Museums should step out of conservative roles into contemporary life," he said. "History starts today—it's not yesterday's newspaper."

While the exhibit gets this message across quite succinctly, none of the foundations that the museum turned to would take a chance on funding the project. It was too avant garde, which is a fancy way of saying that tax exempt funds should only be used for safe issues. And indeed, drug abuse is far from safe. The tab was picked up with a grant by the New York State Narcotic Addiction Control Commission, which spent less than 24 hours to make its decision. Funny thing is that they used taxpayers money.

The exhibit is a three dimensional, multimedia one, which is divided into five areas of concern. After walking through a short historical hallway which reminds us that America had an opiate problem after the Civil War, we are hit with the hows and whys of the drug problem.

Various drugs and how they are misused are shown. Since the intent of the exhibit is honesty, the drugs are all real ones. The museum has five different governmental licenses which permit it to show these drugs. Otherwise, the scholarly Noble might be doing time on a drug bust.

The reasons for drug use—the educated hunches—are dramatically spelled out; alienation, materialism, discrimination, social pressures and poverty. This is a long way of saying contemporary life.

Just about when you have adjusted to the "causes," you enter the "consequences." A multimedia scene reminds you not only of Janis Joplin but of Judy Garland as well. "Over the Rainbow" went over the hill. And there are lots more voices to hear, scenes to see, and feelings to experience.

The two kinds of treatment, verbal and chemical are explained, as are the various facets of law enforcement. Most times an exhibit would end at this point. Not this groovy one. As you almost walk out there is an "Ask Me" desk, attended to by a "tell it like it is" ex-addict who not only distributes a free booklet, in English or Spanish, but mans a red "Hot Line" telephone. He answers questions and is able to make an immediate referral to many New York City centers, all of which are listed in the booklet.

The day that I was there two things happened that got to me. A class of 10-year-olds had finished walking through the exhibit and began talking to their teacher about their own drug experimentation. When the initial shock wore off, the teacher understood that exhibits aren't just for intellectual understanding; they can open up areas that indeed need opening up. Now the teacher is being faced with a real educational challenge—getting students to take a chance on living life with people and not playing at it with drugs.

The second event was a 13-year-old girl who told the "Ask Me" ex-addict that she smoked marijuana and wanted to tell her folks but was afraid to. He offered to help her, but she was too anxious at the time to take him up on his offer. His comment was most appropriate. "When you're scared to talk to your folks, you have a problem—and it's not marijuana."

All of this is going on in a museum with old furniture, old fire trucks and old models of ships. Youngsters were asking questions about the consequences of drug use and oldsters were more often than not asking about why people begin to use drugs. Most often each group knew their answers before they entered the exhibit. By the time they left it, they were just beginning to ask themselves the questions that must be asked.

And with all of this going on, museums from Milwaukee, Washington and San Antonio, were calling. And the National Association of Museums was closely observing what was going on. If this relatively small staid New York museum could generate public interest and take museums out of the mothballs of safety, to the excitement of today, others would follow suit. Press, TV and



radio coverage was quite adequate. Funny thing though—the black and Spanish speaking press were not covering the exhibit. It's hard to figure that one out.

The final statement in the exhibit was the real zinger. Because after experiencing the sound and sight of the drug scene, the visitor must ask of himself what can I do? Obviously the first step is to attain knowledge, that is sound and reasonable. Going to this exhibit is one excellent way of doing this. The exhibit is free and school buses have been bringing kids from all over to see it.

The next step is to figure out what your role in your community could be. Remember, if our educational efforts don't work out, the real drug scene will be in our streets, parks, living room, bathroom and schools, not in a museum.

Obviously the choice is ours to make. While you are choosing, take a chance and find out if there aren't others like you in your community to whom you can turn to for mutual aid. And while you are checking this out, take the time to consider whether your community needs a drug exhibit, and if so, what kind?

[From the Village Voice, Mar. 18, 1971]

MUSEUM'S "DRUG SCENE" COCAINE, COPS, COFFINS: A PROGRAM OF DETERRENCE  
(By Roslyn Lacks)

"I thought it was going to be different," says Marilyn, seven, standing perplexed before the cardboard image of a teenager four times her size, shooting heroin on the elegant marble stairway of the Museum of the City of New York.

Three coffins punctuate the entrance to "Drug Scene," the new multi-media exhibit that has already broken all attendance records. The display, financed by a \$65,000 grant from the New York State Narcotics Addiction Control Commission, is scheduled to run at least three months. The coffins—bronze, pine, and white—signify the utter democracy of death among all classes and ages. "ONE out of every 80 New Yorkers is hooked on addictive drugs," a bi-lingual legend reads. "TWO addicted babies will be born today in New York City. THREE New Yorkers will die today from overdoses and diseases caused by drug abuse."

These dismal truths steer Marilyn and her classmates into a somber labyrinth introduced by a history of drug use from colonial nostrums and Civil War opiates through Lydia Pinkham tablets to window boxes growing gentle leaves of grass.

Genevieve, a six-year-old, brightly examines the spoons, eye droppers, and needles near a blassine envelope of heroin sealed into a plastic case. "Do you know any drug addicts?" I ask her. "Yes," she murmurs, mimicking the drawl and shuffle of an old junkie in her neighborhood. "I just say no, thank you," she adds, somewhat obliquely.

The splashiest display occurs in the area labeled "Consequences." Corpses flash on the screen, alternating with images of Janis Joplin, Jimi Hendrix, Judy Garland, and Marilyn Monroe, while a sound track erupts into amalgams of sound. Fragments of encounter sessions, street noises, and melodies run concurrently and contrapuntally, pausing briefly for the clear and eerie sound of Judy Garland singing "Somewhere Over the Rainbow."

I am told that this is "a media overload thought process which provides more information than one can assimilate." Well, Linear throwbacks like me, who hack along trying to hear what's being said in this barrage of sound, are left feeling as though connections between hearing and perception have been permanently severed.

"What's he eating?" Genevieve asks, as a corpse floats on the screen, his mouth filled with the white froth of death from an overdose of heroin.

A young man with clear, friendly eyes, recently graduated from City College, stands midway between "Consequences" and "Treatment." "Scare tactics," he observes, shaking his head. The written texts beside each drug, he agrees, are scrupulously correct; but the exhibit as a whole, he feels, is one-sided, leaving out any positive attributes of drug use. His own experience? Head drugs mostly—never heroin. He drifted away from them of his own accord, except for occasionally smoking marijuana.

Standing beside a bottle of methadone, Genevieve calls to me from the "Treatment" display. She has just remembered something. "Last Halloween, there was this boy in the house we used to live in and he went trick-or-treating and this old lady she gave him some candy with drugs in it and he got dead. . . ."

The labyrinth is populated by lifelike figures wearing badges of addiction and real life figures (ex-addicts and ex-addicts in training who serve as guides) wearing big red "Ask Me" buttons. The guides report that they receive more questions from children than from adults. The most frequently asked questions are "How did you get started? How did it make you feel? How did you stop?" Will this turn kids on or off?

"The kids already know about drugs," a graduate from Phoenix House answers. "This is mainly an educational program for their parents."

"If I had seen this before I started," a guide from the methadone maintenance program at Greenwich House adds, "I never would have gotten hooked."

The "Ask Me" desk in the final area of the exhibit provides a "Hot Line" telephone for instant referral to any drug addiction agency for anyone wishing help or more information.

The six- and seven-year-olds walk soberly through the "Law Enforcement" area past free-standing tombstones beyond the "Ask Me" desk, back to the 15-foot photograph that looms over the exhibit.

"I thought it would be different," says Marilyn, hesitating between tombstones and coffins. "I thought we would see pictures and stuff and learn how to make things."

For Joseph Veach Noble, the museum's director, "Drug Scene" sets an existing precedent. "The museum has been too much a mirror of the past," he explains. "We felt it should reflect the problems of the city today."

"Museum directors have been calling Mr. Noble from all over the country about mounting similar exhibits," Mrs. Jacqueline Adams, the museum's public relations director, adds enthusiastically.

"Passivity is passe," Noble quips in the large airy conference room. Newly framed licenses permitting the display of heroin, morphine, and cocaine rest on a ledge nearby.

"Has anyone tried to get at the samples in your display?" I ask.

"The samples are tightly sealed behind plastic," Noble smiles. "And of course, we have guards and police about."

To be sure, you'll see more police around the Museum of the City of New York on Fifth Avenue and 103d Street than you'll ever find just four block east where multiples of glassine envelopes change hands every day.

Noble hopes the exhibit will deter youngsters from experimenting with drugs or from escalating what they have already started. "And the parents take a second look when they pass the display. The pharmaceutical companies are as guilty as the Mafia," he continues, "when you consider that eight billion ups and downs are manufactured in a single year. Curiously, the most affluent use the least expensive drugs (amphetamines and barbiturates) and the poor the most expensive (heroin)."

Before his appointment to the Museum of the City of New York, Noble, who is also an authority on Attic vases, served as vice-director for the Metropolitan Museum of Art. I ask him if this current show is in any way an extension of the "Harlem on My Mind" exhibit.

"No," he says emphatically, "neither in thought nor technique. This exhibit has been carefully programmed. It's no random accident, but follows an outline like a paper for college."

"You see," Mrs. Adams interjects, "although you were not aware of it, you were programmed as you passed through the exhibit."

Noble nods in agreement. "True art," he concludes, "conceals itself."

[From the New Yorker, Mar. 13, 1971]

#### DRUGS

An extraordinary and regrettably pertinent exhibition has just opened at the Museum of the City of New York, and on the first day we went up to see it and find out how it was being received. The show, an audio-visual, multimedia one, is entitled "Drug Scene," and it is believed to be the first of its kind. It pulls few punches. As we entered the Museum, we saw a fifteen-foot-high photomural of a youth probing one forearm for a vein still able to accommodate a hypodermic needle. Below it, three coffins stood, illustrating the fact that every day three New Yorkers die from drug abuse. We entered the exhibition in the company of a few adults and several classes of schoolchildren, who had just arrived in a convoy of bright-yellow school buses.

"I thought I'd try drugs just once," a recorded voice was saying as we and the children made our way into the south wing of the Museum, past a series of strikingly lifelike three-dimensional photomurals of narcotic addicts of all races and ages.

"Yeah," one of the boys near us said in reply to the voice. "Wasn't it good?"

The recording went on, "And then, before I knew it, I was hooked."

Turning a corner, we and the children came into a section in which the hardware of narcotics use was displayed, some of it in transparent recesses in additional photomurals. A boy began to cry, and was taken in tow by a woman teacher. Beside one of the exhibits, other children were gathering around a long-haired young male teacher.

"Who knows what this is?" he was asking.

"A needle," the children chorused.

"Can it be used for good?" he asked.

"Yes," the children said together.

Another voice said, "By a doctor."

"Right," the teacher said. "By a doctor or a nurse. They may use needles, because they know how to use them."

The class rounded another corner and moved toward a screen on which were projected dozens of images, including headlines and a picture of Judy Garland singing.

We paused for a minute to talk to the teacher, who told us that his name was Robert Eisner, and that he was escorting fourth graders from P.S. 17, in Brooklyn.

We asked Mr. Eisner if he thought his students were profiting from the realism of the exhibits.

"I've been asking myself the same question," he said, "But look at these kids. Every one of them seems to know what it's all about."

The teacher who had taken care of the crying child joined us. Two or three more children were clinging to her arms and hands now, and we asked if she thought it was a good idea to subject children of their age to so dramatic a presentation.

"I'm afraid I have to think it is a good idea," she said. She identified herself as Mrs. Janet Levy, a teacher at P.S. 182, also in Brooklyn, and went on, "These kids have al-

ready been exposed, you know. We've had highschool kids around our schoolyard trying to get them to sniff glue. I think it's better that they find out here what it can lead to."

Patrolling the exhibit area were several men and women—rehabilitated narcotic addicts, we learned—wearing red-and-white buttons that read "Ask Me." We asked one of them—a sweater-wearing, crew-cut youngster, who told us he was twenty-five years old and in Bellevue Hospital's methadone program—what the children's questions tended to be.

"They ask the same questions everybody else asks," he said. "They want to know how long I was on drugs and what I took."

"And what do you tell them?" we asked. The young man looked us in the eye. "I tell them I was on narcotics for seven years, and I took everything, all the way to heroin."

Nearby there was a considerably older man wearing one of the buttons, and we asked him about the children's questions.

"They ask me which of the drugs is the most dangerous and which is the safest," he said. "I tell them not to mess with any of them. They're all dangerous, and the use of one adds to the use of the others."

We took the elevator up to the Museum's administration office, on the third floor, where we found Joseph V. Noble, a gray-haired scholar, who is the director of the Museum and the man who conceived "Drug Scene" and commissioned the striking photographs, by Michael Hanulak, from which the murals were executed. "It would have been a lot easier for me to go on scheduling shows of antique furniture and historic objects," he said. "But when I came here from the Metropolitan, last September, I realized that this museum, if it were really to be a museum of the City of New York, had to stop treating history as something that occurred in ancient times and begin treating it as something starting now and running backward in time. We have a diorama of the blizzard of 1888. I told the board of trustees I didn't want to wait twenty years and then do a diorama on the city's great problem of today—narcotics. They told me to go ahead."

We asked if he had encountered any particular problems in setting up the exhibition.

"There have been nothing but particular problems," he said. "Not just in setting up the show—that was the easiest part—but in getting funds and legal clearances. First, I went to the foundations; they were interested, but they all said this was a little too avant-garde to try out right now. Finally, I thought of the state Narcotic Addiction Control Commission, and I got an hour's hearing before its board. I told them what I wanted to do, and said I needed sixty-five thousand dollars to do it. They called me the next morning and told me I had the money. Then my problems really began."

Mr. Noble went to a table, and showed us a framed mat on which were displayed New York State certificates licensing the Museum as a "laboratory entrusted with the custody" of narcotics, stimulants, and barbiturates. "This museum has lots of hard-to-get items," he said. "But I don't know that many of them were harder to come by than these pieces of paper. I had to get federal, state, and city permission to put this show on right, with the true drugs, but I'd be damned if I was going to stop at anything less than the real thing. All the way along, people kept asking me why I couldn't use powdered sugar for heroin and use simulated capsules."

"Why couldn't you?" we asked.

"Because we're a museum," he said. "For generations, we've told people that when they come to museums they are seeing the real thing—not just a copy of a painting but the real painting. If we were going to do a show on drugs, then I had to have the real drugs—not just imitations or drawings of marijuana plants. We needed the real plant."

Even the methadone bottle down there in the treatment section is authentic. One of our 'Ask Me' guides took his dose from it this morning before we integrated the bottle into the show."

We asked how the guides were working out.

"Very well," he said. "They were referred to us by the Phoenix and Greenwich House rehabilitation programs and state addiction-control centers, and we made sure we had black, white, and Puerto Rican guides, so that everybody would have somebody he could identify with. We pay them regular museum-guide wages, which aren't much but are enough to take them off welfare. We couldn't really have put on an effective show without them. I believe that the combination of the photomurals, the audio tapes, real drugs, and the testimony of these people as to what drugs have done to them makes this an exhibition that truly fulfills our role as the city's museum."

We told Mr. Noble that we had seen one child crying and several children who appeared frightened by the display.

"People have said we're using scare tactics," he said. "But maybe it's good that people become a little frightened. The tragedy would be if we made this stuff attractive to anyone. I don't think we have. Look at the kids going in. They're laughing and joking. But watch them when they come out. They're quieter. Of course, this isn't just a children's show. About fifty per cent of it is geared to allow adults to catch up with what many of their children seem to have found out about already. And it's no accident that we've included cigarettes and whiskey in our display of products that contribute to the drug scene. As kids who worked on the show pointed out, these are the 'drugs' most often abused by adults."

We asked about the volume of response, and Mr. Noble waved a hand toward the window of his office, from which we could see parked school buses from the city, White Plains, and Long Island. "We haven't counted the adults yet, but normally we get about two hundred schoolchildren a day in classes touring the Museum," he said. "So far today we've had four hundred, and the day's only half over. Originally, we thought we'd restrict the show to fifth-graders and up, but we've had calls from third-grade teachers and from as far away as Philadelphia, so we've relaxed our age limit, and also our policy of scheduling all classes through the Museum. Now we're telling teachers that if they can handle their class, they can bring it in—no appointment necessary."

After thanking Mr. Noble, we rode down in the elevator with several boys of high-school age, who told us, with just a little hesitancy, that they had skipped school that day in order to see "Drug Scene," and were now taking in the remainder of the Museum for the first time. "This guy here," one said, pointing to another. "We couldn't get him out of some of those Colonial rooms."

"I took a whole trip looking at some of that antique furniture," the second boy said. "I really dig the way it was made."

On the first floor, we paused on our way out to watch a tall man with an Afro haircut and wearing a badge that identified him as a teacher at a Bronx junior high school taking pictures of students grouped in front of the entrance display. A minute later, we were joined by Mrs. Robert Neilson, the supervisor of the museum's school tours. "I can't get over it," she said. "Some of these kids—fourth- and fifth-graders, for heaven's sake—are asking us for the addresses of the treatment centers. I don't know whether it's for themselves or for older brothers or sisters, but it's for someone, and I handle about fifty-four thousand kids each year, but I have never seen anything like this. This is what a museum should do. We're teaching people."

[From the New York Times, Feb. 19, 1971]

#### MUSEUM TO OPEN DRUG-ABUSE EXHIBIT

(By Richard Severo)

The Museum of the City of New York—which must be more than "just a mirror to the past," according to its director—will soon enter an area normally avoided by museums: drug-abuse education.

The museum will open an exhibit on drug abuse next Wednesday. The display has been financed by a \$65,000 grant from the New York State Narcotic Addiction Control Commission and is scheduled to run at least three months—more if attendance warrants it.

But a look at some of the elements in the show and a talk with the museum's director Joseph Veach Noble, suggests the uncertainties in trying to put together any visual approach to drug education. For among psychiatrists and others who work with addicts, there are grave doubts that any visual approach is effective, and many are extremely skeptical of the "scare" techniques in visually trying to present the perils of drug abuse.

There is a lack of fully evaluated information as to what educational approach—visual or otherwise—is effective, what is not effective, and even worse, what might serve to spark interest in experimentation where none existed before.

#### MAY BE A 'FIRST'

A few days ago, as workmen were bringing huge, photo-mural displays into the museum at Fifth Avenue and 103d Street, Mr. Noble talked about his plans, noting that this would mark the first time, to the best of his knowledge, that any museum in the nation had created such an exhibit on drug abuse.

"No exhibit will cure a drug addict," he said, "but perhaps this will dissuade some from experimenting or stop them from escalating what they've already started."

But Mr. Noble concedes "there is probably no way we can measure the deterrent." He is also sure there is nothing in the exhibit that would "turn on" a youngster.

He pointed out that the exhibit would not attempt to simulate the visual distortions associated with the use of marijuana or LSD, would offer no strobe effects or perfume, or do anything else to alter the perception of the beholder. "We are trying to tell it as cold turkey as we can," Mr. Noble said.

#### A PHOTO AT THE DOOR

Those who attend Mr. Noble's production will be greeted inside the door by a 15-foot-high photograph of a kneeling boy who is sticking a hypodermic needle into his arm. Mr. Noble is sure the photo won't turn anyone on and may, in fact, turn a few off.

Workers in the field of drug abuse remain undecided about the merits or demerits of portrayals of this type.

Following the kneeling boy, the visitor will see three coffins, placed at the entrance to a room filled with photo-murals. One coffin is bronze, one is white, the other pine.

"It symbolizes that drug abuse affects every facet of society," Mr. Noble explained, "bronze for the wealthy, white for children and the pine box for potter's field."

#### THE CAUSES EXPLORED

In an effort to describe the root causes of addiction, Mr. Noble contends—using photographs of addicts, pushers, bored students and the grimmer aspects of life in New York—that the reasons lie in the nation's materialism, its poverty, its school system, in the decay of family life and in discrimination, among other things.

In one caption for a bigger-than-life photomural, Mr. Noble writes that the addict "trades loneliness, anxiety, despair for an illusion . . . a fleeting warmth, safety, euphoria . . . a permanent hell of a body craving more and more . . . of a mind going crazy . . . of sudden death."

The theory that the addict is largely the result of an ugly society has been widely



discussed. But the approach was probably relied on more heavily a decade or two ago, when drug researchers felt that addicts tended to be brighter and more sensitive than their peers, and less able to cope with harsh reality.

But more recently, other factors have come under scrutiny that suggest addiction is far more complex and capable of reaching more types of people than was originally imagined.

The factors include not only hypersensitivity and emotional problems, but self-indulgence in an affluent society and the willingness on the part of some people—of high, low and average intelligence—to try any drug once, no matter what they've been told about it and no matter how happy and content they may be.

The spread of drug use in black slums has surprised even some of the blacks who were worried about it years ago. For now, youngsters in some neighborhoods are under considerable peer group pressure to experiment drug abuse is virtually normative.

In this type of situation, blacks who are well adjusted and have no desire, latent or otherwise, to "cop out" are literally deluged with a wide selection of drugs, of which heroin is but one.

#### LIMITATIONS ACKNOWLEDGED

Mr. Noble said he was aware of the variety of causes of drug addiction. But he explained that a visual presentation such as his could not deal with all the nuances in the same way that the footnoted chapter of a well-researched book could.

Anyone who starts a drug education program has the problem of measuring its effectiveness. Teachers, doctors, students and former addicts have reported on the wide range of reactions within a single group to their message.

Thus former addicts, warning of the perils of heroin are sometimes listened to, sometimes laughed at and sometimes glamorized in the minds of those who regard them as a kind of folk hero. Semidocumentary motion pictures describing the life-style of the addict have provoked laughter where they meant to evoke pity.

Mr. Noble does not see that kind of problem with his exhibit. He is sure that nothing he has created will turn on children, whom he feels are already quite sophisticated about drugs.

#### EDUCATION FOR PARENTS

"Fifty per cent of the value of such an exhibit is to educate the parents," he said.

The display will offer its message in both English and Spanish. A few ex-addicts will be on hand to answer questions, and Mr. Noble has provided a "hot line" telephone that people can use if they need help with an addiction problem.

Mr. Noble is a former vice-director of the Metropolitan Museum, which he served from 1956 until last September, when he took his present job.

During his tenure at the Metropolitan, he did the technical analyses from which he concluded that the famous Etruscan terracotta warriors and a Greek bronze horse were forgeries. Mr. Noble owns a large collection of Athenian vases that are authentically ancient.

#### AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR

##### HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1971

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I join with our colleagues in observing the National Week of Concern for our service-

men who are being held captive by the North Vietnamese or the National Liberation Front or are listed as missing in action.

It was exactly 7 years ago today that the first American was taken prisoner in Vietnam. Since that time this number has grown to almost 1,600 soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen.

As most of our colleagues know, Mr. Speaker, I am unalterably opposed to the continuation of our involvement in Indochina and to the senseless death and destruction being wrought by both sides in this tragic, war-torn land. I am equally opposed, however, to the violations of the Geneva Convention being perpetrated by the North Vietnamese and the NLF. The basic comforts and human dignities of the Geneva Convention must be afforded to our servicemen being held captive and the names of those in captivity must be released.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that continued bombing missions, secret raids and similar activities dreamed-up by Pentagon bureaucrats are fruitless and that they will not contribute to securing the release of American POW's. The only clear answer is our complete withdrawal from Vietnam with a simultaneous release of the prisoners. I am pleased to have joined in sponsoring a concurrent resolution calling for a proportional repatriation program. The wives, parents and children of our POW's are certainly tired of years of meaningless rhetoric and inaction and simply want to be reunited with their husbands, sons and fathers. I believe the proportional repatriation program could conceivably bring this about by Christmas and I urge that our resolution proposing such a plan be promptly approved and effected.

#### COURT DELAYS

##### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, an editorial carried in the Wednesday, March 24, Tri-City Advertiser, serving Dolton, Riverdale, and South Holland, Ill., discussed some specific cases in Cook County involving delays in court decisions, which is a nationwide problem in our courts.

We recognize, Mr. Speaker, that "justice delayed is justice denied." Unnecessary delay, whether deliberate or otherwise, is a major problem the public faces when individually involved in any situation under the jurisdiction of the judicial branch of our Government.

#### COURT DELAYS ARE COSTLY

All of us are becoming increasingly alerted to the problem of Court procedure in our country, not only nationally but locally.

Clearing the dockets of the pile-up of unheard cases seems to be a major problem.

Any criticism of those in judicial authority, or those in the legal profession, is not presently within our province.

We always tried to understand that when a person is charged with a law violation, whether it be murder, robbery, arson or minor

violations, the duty of the courts and attorneys was to proceed on the premise that the accused was entitled to a fair and impartial trial with his full legal rights to be protected.

We agree that the attitude to seek a mitigation of a just sentence is a serious deterrent to the suppression of crime as it is today known. The problem goes out of focus when we assume personal inclinations to influence decisions.

By violation of the principle of mathematics the offender punishes himself. That, we believe, should be the basis of fair, legal procedure.

Perhaps we should also be concerned with the problem of rehabilitation of the law offender in endeavoring to reform him instead of the present status of condemning him to a life in prison.

A visit to the Circuit Court held in the Riverdale Municipal Building would astound those who have never been there. Here are gathered hordes of people of all sorts and one could find it hard to believe that so many violators exist.

As an example of delays imposing strain on the public purse, by attorneys, who must surmise that a delay in imposing a sentence may result in a milder sentence, we quote a case typical of many others.

On July 5, 1970, police apprehended and charged a youth with disorderly conduct and possession of marijuana. Court records indicate that the defendant appeared in court on seven subsequent occasions and succeeded in obtaining delays from the judge. Finally, the defendant requested a jury trial and appeared in Harvey Police court March 22, 1971, where such trials are held.

The expense of such delay procedure should be of interest to taxpayers as well as the expense of a jury trial.

When the date of the trial arrived, the defendant suddenly pleaded guilty to the charges and was sentenced.

If his final judgment was that he was guilty, as accused, we wonder why he didn't know that at the beginning.

We surmise that is how attorneys make money off their clients.

#### THE PRISONER OF WAR

##### HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1971

Ms. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues in Congress in voting to observe a National Week of Concern to again draw the world's attention to the callous refusal of North Vietnam to abide by the Geneva Convention on the Treatment of Prisoners, which that nation signed in 1957. We must be relentless, I believe, in insisting that Hanoi's leaders comply with these most basic humanitarian principles. I believe that all nations must join us in demanding the humane treatment of American prisoners of war in accordance with the Geneva Convention. In fact, I find it incredible that other nations would continue to tolerate and condone the example set by North Vietnam, the outlaw nation flaunting its contempt for decency and the rights established by international law.

We must rapidly end the war in Southeast Asia to free the American POW's. But I think our Nation's leaders should intensify their efforts to persuade other

world leaders of their obligation, and it is no less than an obligation to condemn the criminal behavior of North Vietnam. Would they not ask the same of us in similar circumstances?

Mr. Speaker, we should gratefully acknowledge the work of the National League of Families, as well as millions of other concerned citizens, to publicize the POW/MIA issues. We are united in this great cause.

Let us rededicate ourselves to the effort to find a way to bring these men home.

#### ECONOMY OF TOTAL FORCE CONCEPT

### HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I am highly pleased by the portion of Secretary Laird's statement to the Congress on the defense program in which he explains his new policy regarding greater reliance on the National Guard and Reserve. Recurring comments in his statement refer to the role of specific units of the Guard and Reserve in various contingencies. He went into great detail on current actions to improve and modernize the equipment of the units of these components so that they will be able to attain adequate levels of combat readiness.

This new policy and the efforts of Defense and the Military Departments to make it a reality are commendable. Bringing the Guard and Reserve to a state of preparedness at which they can perform the mission assigned them by law is something we can all applaud. The determination to use these forces as part of the in-being military force of the Nation and, by insuring their capability, to make possible reductions in the size of the active duty military forces is even more deserving of our support.

Secretary Laird has pointed out that the lower sustaining costs of nonactive duty units will allow greater flexibility in U.S. force structure planning—that attainment of the proper balance between active duty and Reserve elements can produce "more bang for the buck" or the same amount of "bang" for a smaller investment in dollars. I am familiar with a cost study which shows that, deleting the costs of current operations and talking strictly about the maintenance of capability, an air defense fighter unit can be maintained at full readiness in the Air National Guard for about half what it would cost in the active Air Force. I am sure that savings in other mission areas and other components are equally impressive.

In this age of great emphasis on economy—I might say of great necessity for economy—this cost differential is a vital consideration. But the economic attractiveness goes further than mere base cost.

In the process of their training—and in many cases at no cost beyond that involved in training—the units of the Guard and Reserve perform useful tasks

for the military and for the entire society. As one example, Army Guard and Reserve engineer units have helped to improve living conditions on certain Indian reservations at the same time they were learning and practicing their military skills. Another case is the airlift provided by Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve units as a byproduct of training which had to be performed. Some of this effort provided needed supplies and equipment for our forces in Southeast Asia; some of it resulted in humanitarian missions to relieve disaster victims in the United States and elsewhere.

And throughout the Reserve components of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, countless units and individuals have been able to provide essential assistance in alleviating natural disasters as a result of their Reserve training.

Preparing the Guard and Reserve for their statutory role in national security is good insurance against potential enemies in the future. Using these forces, thus prepared, as an integral part of our total military posture is good business.

#### COUNTRY GREEN FOR CITY LIVING

### HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, on March 18, 1971 the Research Center of the Department of Agriculture sponsored a program on the national Garden and Lawn Week with the theme "Country Green for City Living." Mr. Ray Shirley, director of the Georgia Forestry Commission, delivered a most informative talk on the metro forestry program in the Metropolitan Atlanta area. In 1967 the Georgia Forestry Commission, recognizing that people living in urban areas had become vitally interested in the environment, organized the metro forestry program to provide assistance and advice to homeowners who have problems relating to forestry and conservation. A very thorough educational program including TV shows, news articles, and neighborhood displays, has been created to educate the public in the proper cultivation of trees.

As more and more citizens today are concerned with the preservation of our natural resources, Mr. Shirley's description of the principles of metro forestry will be informative to us all. I include this interesting speech at this point in the Record:

#### METRO FORESTRY

(By Ray Shirley)

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen: I am highly honored to have a part on the garden and lawn program today. The theme "Country Green for City Living" is most appropriate and meaningful.

In July 1967, the Georgia Forestry Commission began a Metro Forestry program for the Metro Atlanta area. This area consists of one and one-half million acres on which one and one-half million people live or about one-third of the State's population. Trees and forest occupy about 64% of the area.

What is Metro Forestry? Metro Forestry is the adaptation of sound forestry principles to urban areas. Basically, it involves professional advice and assistance on problems relating to trees, and education of the urban populace on the role of trees in their environment.

How important are trees in the life of your community, area, town, city and State? There is more concern and interest in trees and things around us than ever before. The average citizen is becoming increasingly interested in the things that are around him and have an effect on his well-being.

People living in the city and urban areas have become vitally concerned with the words environment and ecology as well as the total environment. I think we should look at this word environment. Webster defines it as "surrounding conditions, influences, or forces, which influence or modify". It relates broadly to climate and soil; wild plants and animals; human behavior, customs, laws, and languages. Environment means many things.

The word is used by every group that you can conjure, and for each a different meaning is exploited.

Trees mean many different things to people and as the population increases these differences become more pronounced and take on a new importance.

Trees, to the home owner, are aesthetics, beauty, lome for birds, noise abatement, nature's air conditioner, water purifier, the play area, and the landscape of the community.

Trees, to the hunter, are the habitat for game, providing cover and food.

Trees, to the fisherman, provide a basis for food in the streams and lakes, filter the water reduces water temperature in summer and helps maintain stream flow.

Trees, to the recreationist, are a place to hike on a scenic trails; to study plant life, bird life and animal life; a restful place to relax; shelter from the elements of wind and temperature; and a place to camp.

Trees, to the city, a watershed insuring a continuous supply of good water and the basic requirement for a park or playground area.

Trees, to landowners and the public, are vital in preventing soil erosion, providing flood control and an income from an investment.

Trees, to the forest landowner, a raw material to grow and sell to industry, hopefully for a profit.

Trees, to industry, a raw material for processing into items for trade.

Trees, to the wage earner, affording a job to support himself and or family

Trees, to the local and state governments, basis of tax revenue for government.

The trees and the forests are big enough in Georgia to meet all of these needs if we use the knowledge we possess toward meeting these needs.

Georgia is indeed rich in natural resources. Trees and forests are important to Georgia's economic well-being, providing raw materials and jobs in great abundance for the benefit of all. However, with almost seventy percent of the state's land area in forests, trees have a profound effect on the total environment.

In looking at three great resources given to us by nature—the air, water, and trees—we sometimes forget the incredible part that trees play in contributing to the ecological balance over the other two.

It is no accident that air pollution hangs heaviest over the cities, and that once in the country, not too distant away, the air smells sweeter. The forgettable fact about our woodlands is that their blessings are not just in their wood product and their aesthetic beauty, but in the many ways they aid the atmosphere and help maintain the pure water supply.



What would you think if I told you that a great discovery had been made, a machine had been invented that would take carbon dioxide gas and convert it into pure oxygen, and at the same time, would filter out of the atmosphere dust, dirt, pollen, smoke, odors, and other air-borne particles, and in addition, act as an air conditioner. But that's not all this machine will do, it also takes in polluted water and purifies it and then recirculates it back into the atmosphere. You would immediately say that's just what is needed today. If such a machine could be invented, everybody would want one or more. The inventor would certainly receive every award that mankind could bestow upon him. Well, we do have such a machine, the perfect ecological system, a tree. God is the inventor or creator of it. I believe all of our people should know about this and metro forestry program about it and what it means to all people.

In reverse to man, the tree breathes in man's pollutants of carbon dioxide and mono-oxide and breathes out pure oxygen into the atmosphere. Along with the green vegetation, trees produce one-third of the planet's oxygen.

Research indicates that just one acre of young, growing, well managed trees release four tons of oxygen into the air each year, enough to supply the needs of 12 humans. Thus, lumber and pulp and paper companies, that are harvesting nature timber and growing new, young forests could be contributing more to the control of air pollution than we may be giving them credit.

The forest is equally adapted at aiding man's water supply in purifying, maintaining, and recirculating much of the moisture in our environment. A large oak tree takes several barrels of water out of the earth each day, runs it through its incredible complex filter system, then places it back into the atmosphere.

Without trees to recirculate the moisture—the humidity level drops, creating conditions unfavorable to plant and tree growth. As countries such as Israel know, the reforestation of arid areas is a stimulant to increased humidity and rainfall.

The forest is one of man's best allies. The control of floods, acting as a blotter for excessive rainfall and as a giant snow fence in the winter, in the vast paved-over areas of the cities and suburbs, the water runs over asphalt and concrete instead of through the purifying forest land, bringing pollutants of the streets into our water supply.

Too many of our subdivision, residential, and business developments are destroying with bulldozers and other equipment many trees, shrubs, and other plants that make for a healthy environment. These barren areas contribute greatly to soil erosion and water pollution.

City and county officials, with proper zoning and enforcement, can maintain small wooded areas to be used for parks, historic sites and shrines, playgrounds, nature trails, and other similar areas that will add to a more liveable environment.

Atlanta and the metropolitan area is actually in a big forest. Trees occupy sixty-four percent of the lands that total 1.5 million acres. About 1.5 million people live in this area of about one-third of the State's population. Some of the finest hardwood stands in the State are located in this area.

Trees in urban areas have needs just as they do in rural areas. The metropolitan forestry program is based on giving advice and assistance to home owners who have tree problems. The city of Atlanta and the Georgia forestry commission have entered into an agreement providing for the joint use of an entomologist. We work very closely with the Atlanta director of parks and recreation in providing advice and assistance for their parks, streets, and other areas where

trees are located. Requests are received from home owners for information and advice related to shade trees on subjects of insects and disease, pruning, fertilization, damages caused by mechanical equipment, earth fills and others. Often times one tree or only a few trees may be as valuable to urban or city home owners as a farm or fifty to one hundred acres in rural areas.

A forest education program is provided for tree owners; school, church and youth groups; civil organizations; garden and women's clubs; and other groups of all phases of forest conservation.

A weekly five-minute TV program, complete with color and sound, or with appropriate slides, is conducted. This program primarily deals with one subject such as how to plant a tree, how to prune a tree, how to fertilize a tree, flowering trees, tree insect and disease problems, and other appropriate subjects.

Floats are prepared for parades. Last year the national geographic carried the Georgia forestry commission float used in the Dogwood festival.

Exhibits are placed in various shopping centers and other suitable areas on various forest and conservation subjects.

News articles and other means of communication are given to informing the public on the multiple use forest concept and the value of trees to all people. The economic benefits of forests are made known.

Youth in urban areas know only what is told them about our forests. The metro program is trying to tell the true story to all the youth, that the forests are big enough for all of our needs. Boy Scout, Girl Scout, school, church and other youth groups are learning of the trees about them. However, it was only three years ago that the metro forestry program was begun for the Atlanta area. Today, we have a technical forester on this program for Athens, Augusta, Albany, Columbus, Gainesville, Macon, Rome and Savannah.

Today, the overwhelming majority of Georgia citizens live in an urban environment. Why shouldn't they receive assistance with their tree needs? Numerous conservation organizations, civic groups, city and county officials and State legislature members have expressed support of this program.

Georgia has been blessed to have Governors, over the past years, and members of the general assembly who supported and encouraged the development and conservation of our State's natural resources.

The metro forestry program is focused on trees and the part trees play in our daily lives, and what a progressive forestry program means to Georgia.

We have a social system that puts a premium upon a high degree of physical comfort and decent surroundings for every person. Forests and trees can be the most useful of all raw materials toward this continued system. They can be used to make products for people while they also enhance their environment, recreation, and at the same time embody their own natural recycling system.

Citizens who glorify "environmental values" alone must recognize that wood fiber from vigorous public and private forests is absolutely essential for the production of more than five thousand different products. Without wood there would be no lumber and plywood for housing; no pulp and paper for packaging, wrapping, writing, or reading; no cellulose for rayon to make clothing. The standard of living of all the people of the United States would deteriorate rapidly without the miracles provided by trees. The remarkable forest resources, in their natural state and in their material contributions, benefit all of the people all of the time.

The products of the forests and the resource itself contribute much to the quality

of the environment and the least to ecological pollution.

The basic wood products the forests provide such as lumber, plywood, particleboard, hardboard, shingles, and other products of wood are made from a raw material that is created from the earth with only the heat and the light of the sun.

The green leaves of the trees use sunlight, air, and moisture to make wood. And this forest process of wood manufacture is a perpetual process that adds to and does not deplete our stock of natural resources.

Many of us know, but many of our fellow citizens do not know, that a managed forest produces not only wood fiber but water, wildlife, or a pleasant place to camp or walk or sit by a brook. While the steel mills . . . and the public's automobiles, furnaces, and electric power plants . . . inhale vast quantities of oxygen and produce equal quantities of carbon dioxide and other pollutants, growing forests utilize that carbon dioxide to make new wood, and return oxygen to the air.

We have to tell this to the people.

We want the people to know that industry is aware of current environmental problems in water and air pollution.

For the \$130 million current annual expenditure, the industry-wide figure may rise to as much as \$250 million annually by 1975.

We want the people to know that skilled management can protect the forests against fire, pestilence, disease, and the infirmities of old age.

We want the people to know that one of the Nation's major social ills—inadequate housing—requires the lumber and plywood that comes from scientific management of our forests for timber production.

Forests are a place for people to play and think. A source of food and shelter for wildlife. And best of all—forests are renewable! They can be harvested, renewed, and re-harvested indefinitely, all the while providing their many priceless benefits.

There are many things that must be told. And those of us in public and private life who are knowledgeable and concerned about trees and forests are trying to assist and inform all Georgia citizens, urban and rural, of the facts about forestry and their environmental and materialistic value.

Forests are the greatest achievement of ecological evolution, the largest, most complex of all ecosystems. It is in forests that natural regulatory processes excel, producing the most stable of ecosystems. It is in forests that man has his best opportunity to work with nature. Development of this opportunity is the major challenge to foresters in an increasingly crowded and demanding world.

#### ERRONEOUS REFERENCE TO THE ACTIVITIES OF THE FBI

**HON. JEROME R. WALDIE**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. WALDIE, on March 16, 1971 I inserted into the RECORD a term paper authored by a constituent of mine attending St. Mary's College on the subject of civil disobedience. In that paper there was a reference to an incident that allegedly occurred in Seattle, Wash. involving a raid on the local headquarters of the Black Panther Party.

The intimation was to the effect that the Federal Bureau of Investigation had requested the chief of police of Seattle, Wash., to conduct that particular raid.

The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation advises me that that reference is not correct, and I am inserting into the RECORD a letter from Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, dated March 19, 1971, setting forth a correction on what is apparently an erroneous reference to the activities of the FBI:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION  
Washington, D.C., March 19, 1971.

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE,  
House of Representatives  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The Congressional Record of March 16, 1971, on page 6797 contains a statement which was included in a paper you had inserted into the Congressional Record to the effect that the Federal Bureau of Investigation had requested the Chief of Police of Seattle, Washington, to conduct a raid on the local headquarters of the Black Panther Party.

You may be interested in knowing that I had previously checked the facts regarding this matter and I can say without qualification that the Federal Bureau of Investigation was in no way involved in the situation.

Sincerely yours,

J. EDGAR HOOVER.

#### THE SST—A MATTER OF PRIORITIES

#### HON. WILLIAM R. ROY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, as a freshman Member of Congress, I was swept into the debate surrounding the future of the U.S. supersonic transport program.

I attempted to obtain a balanced presentation from supporters and opponents of the project, and cast my vote against further funding only after serious consideration.

As I finally saw it, I could not, in good conscience, support further use of our taxpayers' dollars for the SST. The needs are too great in other areas. Our resources are limited and must be applied to the solution of human problems. We cannot afford to squander our National Treasury on luxuries which would benefit only the privileged few.

The Federal Government has already put up \$864 million for the SST. That is enough, as far as I am concerned. If private industry cannot even take it from here, then I can only conclude that the SST does not meet the test of the marketplace—a long-established principle of our free enterprise system.

In this Congress I will support redirection of the public funds proposed for the SST and similar projects to higher priority uses. These should include constructive programs to help Wichita, Seattle, and other aerospace centers redirect their technological and managerial genius and skilled work force.

Their expertise could be used for the revitalization of our rural areas and cities, control of air and water pollution, provision of adequate housing and health care, and development of improved mass transportation.

Two editorials which appeared the day after the climatic vote in this Chamber summarizes well, in my opinion, the argu-

ments of those of us who voted against continued Federal funding of the SST. I insert them in the RECORD.

[From the Evening Star, Mar. 19, 1971]

#### DOWNING THE SST

It would be premature to write an obituary for the Supersonic Transport on the basis of yesterday's House vote. True, the decision to cut off funds—a reversal of last year's House vote—has put the project on the critical list. But now it's up to the Senate, and no one should underestimate the pressure that the SST lobby will apply to rescue their crippled billion-dollar baby.

The economic argument, to the effect that America faces bankruptcy and disgrace unless it produces an SST, has been pulled out from under the proponents by the testimony of domestic economists and some chilling reports from Europe on the economic prognosis for the Concorde.

As a result, the rose-tinted balance sheet has been put away. Now we are told that what we don't know can't hurt us; that since no one can prove environmental damage by a fleet of SSTs, therefore there is nothing to worry about. The tone of the argument has shifted from one of logical persuasion to one of abuse and ridicule. Anyone who opposes the project is either an irrational alarmist, an irrational environmentalist, an irrational fuddy-duddy—or an irrational combination of all three.

The political-industrial complex has aimed some of its most barbed wit at William Proxmire, the leader of the anti-SST forces in the Senate. The senator, they said, had been suckered in by the outlandish claim that the SST might cause cancer—an obvious crackpot charge. Then some two dozen scientists, including several recognized experts on cancer and radiation, expressed serious concern that the introduction of water vapor into the upper atmosphere might reduce the protective layer of ozone, increasing exposure to cancer-producing ultra-violet rays. So the tactic shifted. From the President's press secretary came the charge that Proxmire, in bringing up the cancer issue, had indulged in an "inexcusable and shocking attempt to create fear about something that is simply not a fact." The spokesman added that, of course, if the skin cancer theory should turn out to be correct, the SST project would be dropped.

Very reassuring.

The rest of us who have opposed the SST have come in for our lumps, too. The trade paper Aviation Daily last month referred to the opposition as "braless tennis-shoe environmentalist crusaders," a charge to which we cheerfully plead guilty—except for the tennis shoes. This month, the Air Transport Association of America let us have it. In their newsletter, Airlines, the lobbyists for the airline industry opened with a letter from Governor Martin Van Buren of New York to President Andrew Jackson, protesting plans for railroads which would travel "at the enormous speed of 15 miles per hour." The trains, the governor argued, would be noisy, dangerous and unnecessary. The newsletter traced a brief history of obstructionism down to the present opposition to the SST, implying that some obdurate people never get the word.

Right again. Some people have failed to learn, despite the mounting evidence, that change is not necessarily progress; that the wonders of civilization already constitute a threat to the health of the inhabitants of the planet; that the time has come to stop bowing down blindly before the golden idol of technology and to start considering the consequences.

Some people haven't learned. But happily the House has. And we expect that the Senate is about to demonstrate once again that it can stand up to pressure by voting to nail the lid shut on this environmentally and economically dubious project.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 19, 1971]

#### THE SST: A BLITZ THAT FAILS

We do not kid ourselves that there was only one lobby at work in the fight over the SST in the House; the environmentalists were in it as ferociously as the coalition of labor and business interests which has been adorning bumpers with stickers and plastering the newspapers with full-page ads. What was destructive about the argument of the environmentalists, and the other SST opponents, however, was that in the main they were animated not by narrow self-interests or false national pride but by larger human concerns. So we congratulate the House majority in yesterday's vote for listening to the right arguments. It was a narrow margin—215 to 204—but it is no less comforting on that account, for the blitz mounted by the well heeled outfit which called itself "American Industry and Labor for the SST" was no mean effort. We will feel its heat again, no doubt, as the showdown approaches in the Senate, where again the margin will probably be a narrow one, and the pressure will be intense. But the argument, for the SST as it shifts to the Senate, is not likely to become any more persuasive, even if last-ditch desperation increases its intensity.

For what we are dealing with here is less a matter of hard facts than one of genuine anxieties, questions which are by their nature unresolved; that is what largely worries the environmentalists, together with the question of priorities, of where this country at this moment should place its emphasis. And yet the proponents of the SST persist in pretending to deal in facts. That is what makes their lobbying efforts so patently spurious—the inflated claims of jobs at stake, the certainty with which they speak of Soviet or other foreign supremacy in the commercial airways, the absolute terms in which they dismiss the threat of ecological or environmental damage. If they could conceivably be as sure about these matters as they sound, there would be an easy answer to their argument: private financing for a project so soundly founded technologically and so certain of commercial success. If the SST is as good as they make it out to be, why are they clamoring for federal funds? If the supremacy of the American system is what is at stake, why don't the SST advocates first put private, free enterprise to the test? The answer, one would have to presume, is they are not that sure at all—about noise levels, about the future demands for commercial air travel, about the impact of the boom and the possible threat to the earth's atmosphere. So they would have the government do the gambling at the taxpayers' expense.

Well, we can think of better ways to spend federal funds right now. As we have said on several occasions, we do not see the need to hurry—either across the oceans or into the building of an aircraft which will convenience only a tiny fraction of the population at a time when great numbers of our people have more urgent needs. Some would say that we can have the SST and everything else at the same time, and perhaps we can. But we aren't doing the other things, which is precisely why the SST has become a very meaningful symbol of misplaced values and disordered priorities.

#### BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE

#### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday was the 53d anniversary of the independence of Byelorussia. Unfor-



unately, it will not be a day of rejoicing for its people, but rather a time of sadness, as their nation is one of the many colonies of the Soviet empire.

In December 1917, not long after the provisional government of Alexander Kerensky had been overthrown by a Communist coup d'etat led by Nikolai Lenin, the All-Byelorussian Congress met in Miensk. On March 25, 1918, it proclaimed the independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. The provisional constitution of the new nation provided for universal suffrage and freedom of speech, press, and assembly.

Free Byelorussia was soon erased from the map of Europe, as the Soviet Army invaded it, and the infant republic became a unit of the Soviet Empire in 1919. Except for the period during World War II when it was occupied by the forces of National Socialist Germany, Byelorussia has been under the domination of Moscow.

Its territory of 80,154 square miles contains 9,003,000 people, but these are only half the total, as an additional 9,000,000 Byelorussians live in other parts of the Soviet Union. Another million of Byelorussian stock reside in the United States, Great Britain, Canada, and Australia.

Mr. Speaker, let us hope and pray that the day is not too far distant when March 25 will be an occasion for rejoicing rather than a day of mourning for the people of Byelorussia. These people are as deserving of freedom as the inhabitants of the dozens of new nations that have been emancipated from the bonds of colonialism since World War II.

#### KILPATRICK DEBUNKS THE TIMES AND A KNIGHT RIDES ON

### HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, Columnist James J. Kilpatrick has the engaging habit of getting to the facts of a case in a hurry and then getting them to the reader in no uncertain way.

In a recent column he recounted the story of how the pompous New York Times has tried to deceive its readers into believing that Miss Frances Knight, Director of the U.S. Passport Office, is embarked on a massive witchhunt by maintaining a snooper's file on passport applicants.

Columnist Kilpatrick deflates this ridiculous story in short order. My hat is off to both Mr. Kilpatrick and Miss Knight.

I include the article for insertion in the RECORD at this point.

[From the Washington Star, Mar. 21, 1971]  
THE FLAP OVER MISS KNIGHT'S "LOOKOUTS"  
FILE

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

The best-known Knight in Washington, unlike the paragon of Chaucer's tale, may be "verray parfit" but she is not the least bit "gentil." Miss Frances Knight, director of the U.S. Passport Office for the past 16 years, is a hardboiled egg, well seasoned with salt and pepper, and she is an absolute delight.

This weekend finds Miss Knight down in Florida with her millionaire husband, publisher Wayne Parrish, puttering around the retirement home they have in mind at Hobe Sound. The prospect that the lady may even be contemplating retirement will gladden a few hearts in the State Department and on the Hill, but it will depress the legions of Miss Knight's admirers. One is inclined to encourage an outpouring of letters to Frances: "Say it isn't so."

She was in a low when I lunched with her a few days ago, and this was sadly out of character. Ordinarily she flies as high as a flag on a windy day. An attack in The New York Times had her spirits drooping, but her foes should not be too encouraged. By the time she got back to her office, she was in full fighting form.

The Times was giving her a hard time for its belated discovery last month that "Passport Office Has Secret File." The gist of the story was that Miss Knight's office maintains what is known as a "lookout file," now comprising some 243,000 names. To the Times, this was "Raw Material for Snoopers."

In point of fact, the lookout file is not new. It has been maintained, in one form or another, for many years. Its existence never has been a secret; and until the Times began heaving and howling, about the only public criticism had come from the Warren Commission on the assassination of John Kennedy. In the matter of Lee Oswald, said the commission, the system was "obviously deficient."

In the maintenance of this common-sense lookout, the Passport Office functions in an administrative capacity only: It places a flag on names sent to it by the courts, the FBI, the CIA, and the Secret Service, and when one of the names turns up on a passport application, that fact is reported to the agency concerned. The Passport Office maintains no dossiers, undertakes no surveillance, and routinely issues passports unless it finds compelling reason not to.

Many of the names in the lookout file have been inserted by the FBI as "known or suspected Communists or subversives." This troubles the New York Times, which cherishes the breathless illusion that all men must be considered innocent until proved guilty in court, but it will not trouble persons who live in the real world. Of course law enforcement agencies must keep an eye on suspects; they would be derelict if they didn't.

The lookout file also contains names of persons whose U.S. citizenship is doubtful. The list embraces fugitives from justice, draft dodgers, and those sought by courts for desertion or failure to maintain child custody. Still another category takes in persons who have threatened the life of the President. Miss Knight sees nothing wrong in the service her office renders to law enforcement. I am as apprehensive as any man at computerized invasions of privacy, but I see nothing wrong in this either.

The Times and the lookout file are the least of Miss Knight's troubles. Her office is struggling to maintain its outstanding performance record against a formidable increase in foreign travel. Last year saw 2 million passports issued; the number will be much larger this year. Instead of increasing efficiency, a new system under which certain postoffices handle passport applications has produced additional paperwork.

But it is the sheer obsidian nature of bureaucracy that is beginning to get to her. Miss Knight finds herself arrayed, much of the time, against her superiors in the State Department. She is pelted with memoranda from her boss. She has proposed some bold innovations in the whole business of issuing passports, but she is getting nowhere with them. A deserved raise in grade and pay, long overdue, still is denied her. But quit? Not yet. Over her desk is a familiar Latin motto. Loosely translated, it reads: "Don't

let the bastards grind you down." It's great advice for a doughty Knight whose armor gets more battered all the time.

#### THE PENTAGON SOLD SHORT

### HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, the reaction of the news media to the CBS "documentary" "The Selling of the Pentagon" seems to have consisted largely of knee-jerk tributes to the doctrine of TV network infallibility. In view of this, it is both refreshing and heartening to find that there are local television stations and newspapers that have maintained their objectivity and honesty.

The Norfolk, Va., Ledger-Star is one of these. It does not hesitate to criticize when criticism is due, but its staff does not leap blindly to the conclusion that because a great network has said something it must be true. The fine article by Jack Kestner was evidence of this; the editorial from the March 25 issue which I now submit is further proof.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent a district which is served by a newspaper to whose staff truth, accuracy, and fairness are so important.

The article follows:

#### THE PENTAGON SOLD SHORT

Because a great deal of criticism followed the original showing of the CBS documentary, *The Selling of the Pentagon*, it is very probable that the audience for the second presentation the other night gave the show more attention than it deserved if it was meant to be, as we suppose CBS meant it to be, an exposé of military public relations shenanigans.

As a spectacle, it was good viewing; guns firing, ships sailing, men training, the Green Berets in a tumbling act, our old friends Chet Huntley and Walter Cronkite busily selling the Pentagon's image in old clips; the show even had John Wayne. As we say, as a kind of war picture, it was interesting; as a documentary it was one-sided and as an exposé it was ho-hum.

Ho-hum, because not many people could have been convinced that the Pentagon ought not to try to tell the American people what the armed forces are supposed to do. Roger Mudd may find it wrong to see an Army or Navy display in a shopping center, but we certainly think the majority of Americans don't. Nor do we see anything wrong in having civilians attend war games. One remark of Mr. Mudd's typified an attitude we thought unresponsive to the facts; he commented on these war games and attendance by civilians and said: war, however, is not fought in front of a grandstand. Of course not; but then neither were all these exercises carried out merely to sell the Pentagon; most of them, we think, were part of the training men undergo to prepare them to defend themselves in conditions of war.

The program even included in its broadside criticism the armed forces "home town" report system, whereby items of interest such as awards and promotions are sent to a serviceman's local paper and broadcast station so his friends can learn about him. This is wrong? One wonders how the armed services are expected to keep up their enlistment quotas, and the parents and wives of servicemen to be informed unless such things are done? Is the Pentagon next to be asked to

close down the recruitment desks in the post offices?

The chief criticism of the documentary, we think, lies not so much in the errors and emphases that brought on charges of irresponsibility, but in the fact that the program's thrust was aimed not at some areas of public information but at all areas of armed services public information. So it seemed to us.

Propaganda? Of course such activity is propaganda in the eyes of some beholders. But what is one man's propaganda is another man's information.

We see nothing wrong with the armed services polishing their images and putting their best foot forward so long as it is done sensibly and we don't think the public objects to this at all. The trouble here was that *The Selling of the Pentagon* seemed to be an all-and-nothing approach: What the Pentagon does in information is all wrong and nothing is worthwhile or good. It was foolish for CBS to create such an image for itself.

## INCREASE IN PAY FOR ARMED SERVICES

### HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following amendment which I may offer for consideration during the debate on the draft. Please see pages 30 to 33 of House Report 92-82 for comparison of H.R. 4450 to other proposals.

The amendment follows:

H.R. 6531 is hereby amended by striking lines 11 through 15 on page 12, along with the following tables on pages 12, 13, and 14,

and by striking lines 10 through 23 on page 16 and lines 1 through 15 on page 17, and substituting in their place the following:

"Section 203(a) of title 37, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"INCREASE IN PAY RATES FOR MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES

"The Secretary of Defense shall formulate not later than the first day of the first calendar month after which this Act is enacted a revised basic pay schedule for members of the uniformed services incorporating the increases in the basic pay of enlisted personnel and officers listed in the table below and such adjustments in the basic pay of other personnel of the Secretary deems necessary and appropriate to insure equitable pay differences between grades. The revised basic pay schedule formulated by the Secretary pursuant to this section shall become effective on the first day of the first calendar month after which this Act is enacted.

#### COMMISSIONED OFFICERS

Pay grade	Years of service						
	Under 2	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10
O-10 <sup>1</sup>	\$2,111.40	\$2,185.80	\$2,185.80	\$2,185.80	\$2,185.80	\$2,269.50	\$2,269.50
O-9	1,817.40	1,920.80	1,961.70	1,961.70	1,961.70	2,011.20	2,011.20
O-8	1,695.00	1,745.70	1,787.40	1,787.40	1,787.40	1,920.60	1,920.60
O-7	1,408.20	1,504.20	1,504.20	1,504.20	1,571.10	1,571.10	1,662.60
O-6	1,043.70	1,147.20	1,221.90	1,221.90	1,221.90	1,221.90	1,221.90
O-5	941.40	980.70	1,047.90	1,047.90	1,047.90	1,047.90	1,080.30
O-4	844.20	886.80	914.40	914.40	930.60	972.30	1,038.30
O-3	758.10	791.70	809.10	864.90	906.30	938.70	989.10
O-2	693.30	725.00	748.20	773.10	789.30	789.30	789.30
O-1	612.30	648.90	672.60	672.60	672.60	672.60	672.60

Pay grade	Years of service						
	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26
O-10 <sup>1</sup>	\$2,443.50	\$2,443.50	\$2,618.40	\$2,618.40	\$2,793.30	\$2,793.30	\$2,967.60
O-9	2,094.60	2,094.60	2,269.50	2,269.50	2,443.50	2,443.50	2,618.40
O-8	2,011.20	2,011.20	2,094.60	2,185.80	2,269.50	2,361.00	2,361.10
O-7	1,662.60	1,745.70	1,920.60	2,052.60	2,052.60	2,052.60	2,052.60
O-6	1,221.90	1,263.30	1,463.10	1,537.80	1,571.10	1,662.60	1,803.30
O-5	1,137.90	1,213.80	1,304.70	1,379.70	1,421.10	1,471.20	1,471.20
O-4	1,097.10	1,147.20	1,197.00	1,230.30	1,230.30	1,230.30	1,230.30
O-3	1,038.30	1,063.80	1,063.80	1,063.80	1,063.80	1,063.80	1,063.80
O-2	789.30	789.30	789.30	789.30	789.30	789.30	789.30
O-1	672.60	672.60	672.60	672.60	672.60	672.60	672.60

<sup>1</sup> Chief/staff, \$3,000.

#### COMMISSIONED OFFICERS WITH OVER 4 YEARS' ACTIVE SERVICE AS AN ENLISTED MEMBER

Pay grade	Years of service						
	Under 2	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10
O-3	0	0	0	\$864.90	\$906.00	\$938.70	\$989.10
O-2	0	0	0	773.10	789.30	814.20	856.50
O-1	0	0	0	672.60	698.40	722.10	743.70

Pay grade	Years of service						
	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26
O-3	\$1,038.30	\$1,080.30	\$1,080.30	\$1,080.30	\$1,080.30	\$1,080.30	\$1,080.30
O-2	889.80	914.40	914.40	914.40	914.40	914.40	914.40
O-1	766.50	790.50	790.50	790.50	790.50	790.50	790.50

#### WARRANT OFFICERS

Pay grade	Years of service						
	Under 2	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10
W-4	\$666.30	\$714.60	\$714.60	\$731.10	\$764.40	\$798.00	\$831.00
W-3	605.70	657.00	657.00	665.10	673.20	722.40	764.40
W-2	544.20	576.60	576.60	590.40	622.80	657.00	681.90
W-1	484.80	517.20	517.20	549.00	573.60	598.50	622.80

Pay grade	Years of service						
	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26
W-4	\$889.80	\$930.60	\$963.90	\$989.10	\$1,022.10	\$1,056.60	\$1,137.90
W-3	789.30	814.20	838.80	864.90	897.90	930.60	963.90
W-2	706.50	731.10	756.60	781.20	806.10	838.80	838.80
W-1	648.30	673.20	698.10	722.40	748.20	748.20	748.20



## ENLISTED MEMBERS

Pay grade	Years of service						
	Under 2	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10
E-9	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$756.90
E-8	0	0	0	0	0	\$635.10	652.80
E-7	\$445.80	\$478.50	\$496.20	\$513.60	\$531.30	\$548.10	\$565.50
E-6	411.30	431.70	448.80	463.20	480.30	497.40	514.20
E-5	378.90	397.80	413.10	429.00	446.10	462.90	479.70
E-4	352.80	370.50	387.90	405.30	421.20	430.20	430.20
E-3	336.90	353.40	367.80	384.00	392.40	392.40	392.40
E-2	320.70	336.60	353.70	353.70	353.70	353.70	353.70
E-1	310.80	326.40	326.40	326.40	326.40	326.40	326.40
E-1 (under 4 months)	310.50	0	0	0	0	0	0

  

Pay grade	Years of service						
	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26
E-9	\$774.30	\$792.00	\$809.70	\$827.70	\$843.90	\$888.60	\$975.00
E-8	670.20	687.90	705.30	722.10	740.10	783.60	870.90
E-7	583.50	609.60	626.70	644.10	652.80	696.60	783.60
E-6	531.30	548.10	565.50	574.50	574.50	574.50	574.50
E-5	496.80	505.50	505.50	505.50	505.50	505.50	505.50
E-4	430.20	430.20	433.20	430.20	430.20	430.20	430.20
E-3	392.40	392.40	392.40	392.40	392.40	392.40	392.40
E-2	353.70	353.70	353.70	353.70	353.70	353.70	353.70
E-1	326.40	326.40	326.40	326.40	326.40	326.40	326.40
E-1 (under 4 months)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

REMARKS ON ANNIVERSARY OF  
GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

## HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1971

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to join my colleagues in the observance of Greek Independence Day, the 150th anniversary of the Greek struggle for freedom from Turkish domination. The spark of freedom ignited on this day in 1821 characterizes the history of this nation and its people. It is the Greeks who gave the West both the definition of freedom and the earliest demonstration of its practice. So great and so encompassing has been their heritage that we in the United States are—at least in a sense—all Greeks; for the freedom that we now exercise and the ideal of human dignity upon which we have built our political system are the heritages of the Greek nation.

When Homer sang of the anger of Achilles in the Iliad, man still fought the caprice of the gods; yet as Odysseus made the tortuous journey back to his homeland, the gods became an equal foe, and the Greeks yelled at them in jest and derision. It was in Solon's code that the West found its own destiny to order and rule through law. It was through the thought of men like Plato and Aristotle that the Greek nation provided the concepts and vocabulary of freedom. This was not only the freedom of a people to govern itself, but the freedom to create beauty for its own enjoyment and the freedom of man to laugh and cry at himself in the comedies of Aristophanes and the tragedies of Aeschylus.

The hunger for this freedom has lived in Greece throughout its history, so that to be free, a small nation would fight an Empire in 1821. The same nation would remind us again of its love for freedom as it withstood the devastation of fascism and communism only to arise again as an independent state. This is the spirit that has made us all Greeks

and that must continue to remind us of the paramount value of human dignity.

I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to celebrate this heritage of the Greek nation on the occasion of Greek Independence Day.

THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF  
GREEK INDEPENDENCE

## HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1971

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of Greek independence, the celebration of which commenced on March 25 and will continue throughout the year. I rise to add my remarks because I am firmly convinced that what we are commemorating here in Congress under special orders granted last Thursday is not something which is or should be limited to the Greek-American community; I agree with the gentlemen who observed many years ago that in a real sense we are all Greeks—not just today, this week or this year, but always have been and always will be. For at the very root of our civilization—and I would go further and argue that providing the impetus and logical framework for all of the advances in knowledge and science by Western man—lies ancient Greece. I believe it was Alfred North Whitehead, the eminent philosopher, who once observed that all philosophy is but a footnote to Plato. To a degree, I think the same could be said with accuracy of the ancient Greek accomplishments in other fields of human endeavor. While it is true that this country is usually referred to as part of the Judeo-Christian tradition, insofar as we are members in good standing in what is known as Western civilization and the Western world, our identity is, in fact, traceable to the singular achievements of those philosopher-kings, scientists, writers, and immortals who lived and dwelled in the scattering of islands and rocky peninsula washed by the waters of the Ionian and Aegean. If any people

can be credited with realizing man's full potential, with discovering his faculties for reason and logical discipline, with disciplining the arts and exalting the intellect over his emotions, then it was the ancient Greeks that discovered in man qualities which set him apart from the rest of the animal kingdom and set man, for good or for bad, on the road to progress which changed the very horizons of the then known world.

Nor was the Greek contribution to succeeding generations limited to solitary intellectual advancement, book learning and ivory tower concerns. Those same Greeks, in their ceaseless quest for knowledge and unquenchable curiosity, were bound to turn their attention to the world around them—not just in scientific observations of the natural world around them, but to observe, study and reorder the social world around them. It is the ancient Greeks who, after studying man's relation to his fellow man were led by the logic of their own observations to conclude that the ideal form of government was democracy. The Greek city-state was to be the earliest example of a democratic experiment. In a real sense, not much new has been done or thought of since politics was first practiced in the Greek polis—city-state, of old. It can also be doubted whether any group of people developed a finer sense of loyalty and devotion to their community than the ancient Greeks. Greek patriotism in its purest and most uplifting form was practiced in a way which has inspired generations of citizens ever since. A devotion to liberty and freedom from foreign oppression has received few more exalting approximations in history than the field of Marathons, the mere mention of which today never fails to conjure up the most noble sentiments around the world. Is it any wonder then that James Monroe summed it up on December 2, 1822, in his annual message to Congress in this manner:

The mention of Greece fills the mind with the most exalted sentiments, and arouses in our bosoms the best feelings, of which our nation is susceptible. Superior skill and refinement in the arts, heroic gallantry in action, disinterested patriotism, enthusiastic zeal and devotion in favor of public liberty

are associated with our recollection of ancient Greece.

But the unfortunate thing is that for most of the modern history of the world, Greece did not know independence. The modern Greeks knew only one form or another of foreign oppression and domination ever since the Romans. The sad fact is that Greece has been more a state of mind for much of its history than a state, in fact, in the political sense. It really has only been for the relatively short period of 150 years that Greece has been more than a name on the map, a period in ancient history, an inspiration to succeeding generations of students. For hundreds of years the survival of the Greek culture and tradition depended very much on the efforts of men outside of Greece to keep it alive. The world had to look outside of Greece to find examples of democracy in action, of liberty and freedom from foreign domination. As President Monroe observed:

That such a country should have been overwhelmed and so long hidden, as it were, from the world under a gloomy despotism, has been a cause of unceasing and deep regret to generous minds for ages past.

When the Greeks finally could stand it no longer and made their glorious final push for freedom from the ruthless Ottoman empire, the word spread throughout the civilized world like wildfire. Greece which in a real sense had given birth to the very idea of liberty and home rule was at last to enjoy the fruits of its own creation. It is hardly surprising that the Greek war of independence captured the imagination of the most sensitive souls in the capitals of Europe and in our own young country. Jefferson, Adams, Monroe, Webster all cheered and gave moral support to the Greeks in their efforts. Some joined the battle not content to cheer from the sidelines. Samuel Gridley Howe of Boston and George Jarvis of New York fought in Greece, the latter losing his life, as did Lord Byron, probably the single most heroic and romantic figure in the Western world of his time. These men were fighting for their birthright in a very real sense. They were fighting for an idea, for an ideal of which they felt as much a part of as any Greek living in Thessalonica at the time.

In their victory, the Greeks became at one and the same time the newest nation with the longest tradition. In achieving their independence and uniting as a nation, the Greeks were destined to play another epoch-making role in history. For the rest of the century, other peoples throughout Europe struggled to achieve the same thing. Other old civilizations were to take courage from the Greek example. Other places which had existed over the centuries more in name than as political realities were to unite with a sense of national identity—that is, Germany and Italy. Throughout Central Europe and the Balkans, men of good will found in the culture of their ethnic past strength for concerted political action to throw off the yoke of imperialism and foreign domination. In a very real sense, the events in Greece in 1821 set off a chain of events which finally culminated in World War I and the breakup of the old order.

Many times since the Greeks have had to struggle for their national identity. Their success in the 1820's was not to go unchallenged. Practically every succeeding generation of Greek people have had to reassert their freedom from foreign domination, most recently in the war of 1947. Through all of this, I am happy to say, the United States has found it in its best interests to be on the side of the Greeks and hopefully that is the way it always will be. This alliance, proven tried and true as it has been over the years, has more going for it today than it did in 1821. Then, as I have said, Greece was more a state of mind than anything else. Yet men of good will the world over found Greek independence a common cause. Today, however, the United States is the adopted homeland of thousands of Greek Americans, who have brought to this country their great heritage and character, the infusion of which into our national bloodstream has made this country so much the better for it.

There is also another reason for commemorating Greek independence which has nothing directly to do with Greece itself, and that is the lesson contained in Greek history for other small downtrodden peoples who find themselves under foreign domination this very day. Captive nations the world over in the Baltic, Central Europe, and the Balkans can take comfort in the knowledge that a strong idea is hard to keep down. National identity and a desire to throw off foreign domination whether it be Ottoman or Russian has survived and will continue to survive years of oppression. If the Greeks could nourish and nurture the idea of freedom and nationhood, after centuries of foreign domination, then there is hope, indeed, that the idea will live and grow stronger in those nations which have lost their freedom this century. Just as Greece inspired nations yet unborn in the 19th century, I firmly believe it will continue to inspire nations temporarily submerged in the 20th century. This message of hope should emerge from this year of commemoration of the Greek struggle against hope.

I cannot conclude without admitting that recent events in Greece have been a cause of deep concern and distress to men of good will the world over, but nowhere more than in these United States. The Greek American community finds itself mirroring the profound disquiet in Greece itself. For me, or any other American, to pretend to be in a position to judge on the basis of fact, rather than emotion, the relative merits or demerits of the present government in Greece would be the height of arrogance and interference in the internal affairs of our allies. As in all cases of civil disagreement in a nation with friends and supporters on both sides, the best thing that the friends of Greece around the world can do today is to hope and pray that Greece will soon be at peace with itself, that its traditions once again be resumed, and that justice will prevail and its national soul made whole again. Only then will the air of sadness be lifted from this 150th anniversary of the Greek independence of 1821.

## THE MAYORS VIEW THE BUDGET

### HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1971

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced into the RECORD the first of two parts of the Conference of Mayor's report, "The Mayors View the Budget." I am today submitting the second part of that report:

#### THE MAYORS VIEW THE BUDGET—PART II MANPOWER

The manpower programs on the accompanying table are designated for conversion into the special revenue sharing package. Before analyzing them, let us review briefly the Administration's budget request for overall Manpower Administration activities to get a clear picture of the extent of its commitment to solving urban employment problems by placing increased authority and resources in the hands of local government.

The FY 72 overall Manpower Administration budget increases by \$212 million from FY 71. One major increase is found in the Work Incentive Program (\$136.9 million), which if incorporated under the Administration's Family Assistance Program would be administered by state employment services, not city government prime sponsors. The second major increase appears in funds also earmarked for state administration, Unemployment Compensation and Employment Service programs (\$62.6 million). Hence, the major increases in the overall Manpower Administration budget are in the programs that would circumvent a city manpower delivery system.

FY 72 funds available for locally administered manpower programs reflect the trend established in the overall Manpower Administration budget. Here, the Administration's commitment also appears to be on the downturn. For example, budget requests for those manpower programs slated for conversion into special revenue sharing funds (see table) show an absolute decrease of \$21.5 million from the level of obligations for this fiscal year. From Administration wants to reduce the number of programs.

Furthermore, the Administration views the special revenue sharing manpower funds, and not a new PSE program, as the more appropriate way to finance a local government's PSE program. In short, the Administration considers PSE a local and not a national program option. But, as we have already seen, special revenue sharing manpower funds are derived from converting existing manpower programs listed on the accompanying table. Hence, if a local government chooses to institute a PSE program under the Administration scheme, it must deprive other training and work support programs already operating within the community. This clearly is not a workable option.

Before leaving the Administration's plans for special revenue sharing, special consideration should be given to "reverse" revenue sharing plan. An example of this can be seen in the FY 72 budget for summer youth programs. In it, the Administration plans to raise the local share of the program costs for this urgent urban program from 10 percent to 20 percent. By doing so, it hopes to extend program coverage. Yet, at the same time, it has sharply cut the funds available for this program by \$32.2 million. In effect, through this form of "reverse" revenue sharing, the Administration is looking to the scarce resources of local government to help salvage the program and thereby lessen the Federal government's commitment to this priority national program.



MANPOWER  
[Dollars in millions]

Department of Labor	Obligations (thousands)		Budget estimate		Department of Labor	Obligations (thousands)		Budget estimate	
	1970	1971	1972	Change		1970	1971	1972	Change
Private sector, OJT.....	\$221,500	\$260,700	\$260,500	\$-200	NYC, post school.....	148,900	165,800	165,800	-----
Public sector, OJT.....	87,100	135,600	125,800	-9,800	Special targeting (CEP).....	\$186,800	\$177,900	\$172,900	-\$5,100
MDTA, institutional.....	321,800	335,400	324,900	-10,500	Computer job placement.....	9,700	22,300	22,300	-----
Job Corps.....	158,200	156,200	196,100	+39,900	Program support.....	48,500	70,900	61,600	-9,300
NYC, in school.....	59,200	64,100	69,800	+5,700	Total.....	1,399,600	1,586,600	1,565,300	-21,500
Summer youth program.....	157,900	197,900	165,700	-32,200					

<sup>1</sup> Includes funds appropriated to OEO.

## ENVIRONMENT

The Administration is seeking some increases in environmental programs impacting on the cities.

Most noticeable is a substantial increase in requested budget authority for waste water treatment facilities. The new Environmental Protection Agency is requesting \$2 billion—\$1 billion more than this year's appropriation. It plans to obligate \$1,905 million—\$720 million more than this year.

For other water quality programs, \$137.5 million requested budget authority represents an increase of \$20.2 million over this year's appropriation of \$117.3 million. These funds will be used for accelerating river basin planning, research and development, and manpower training to improve the efficiency of local waste treatment plant operators.

Requested budget authority for solid waste programs is \$18.4 million—up only about \$1.3 million over this year's level. This is a major disappointment because Congress authorized more than eight times as much—\$152 million—for FY 72 in the Resource Recovery Act of 1970. The Administration plans to use these monies for continued research and development of resource recovery and solid waste disposal rather than undertaking a large construction and demonstration program.

Budget authority requested for air pollution control programs is up \$14.9 million from \$101.9 million in FY 71 to \$116.8 in FY

72. Much of this increase will be used to strengthen state air pollution control agencies. In addition, it is expected that a large portion of an \$85 million supplementary request for FY 72 will be used for clean air programs.

The Interior Department's budget includes a major increase of \$95 million in requested budget authority for state and local Outdoor Recreation programs: from the \$185.4 million appropriated in FY 71 to \$280 million in FY 72. However, the gap between appropriations and obligations is increasing. The budget indicates that FY 72 obligations will total only about \$125 million. While higher than this year's obligations, it is less than half the FY 72 appropriation request. This year's obligations are also less than half the FY 71 appropriations.

## SELECTED ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS

[Dollars in millions]

	Fiscal year 1970, appropriation	Fiscal year 1971, appropriation	Fiscal year 1972, budget request
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY			
Water quality:			
Operations, facilities, research.....	83.7	117.3	137.5
Construction grants.....	800.0	1,000.0	2,000.0

## LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION

[Dollars in thousands]

	Fiscal year—		Proposed 1971 supplemental	Proposed 1972	Change
	1969	1970	1971		
Grants for development and implementation of comprehensive plans.....	\$19,000	\$21,000	\$26,000	\$35,000	+\$9,000
Matching grants to improve and strengthen law enforcement:					
Allocations to States according to population (block grants).....	24,650	182,750	340,000	413,695	+73,695
Allocations to States or localities as determined administratively.....	4,350	32,000	70,000	73,005	+3,005
Aid to correctional institutions and programs.....			\$50,000	97,500	+47,500
Academic assistance:					
Law enforcement education program (LEEP).....	6,500	18,000	21,000	1,000	+7,000
Curriculum development and program evaluation.....				250	+750
National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice.....	3,000	7,500	7,500	21,000	+13,500
National Criminal Justice Information and Statistics Service.....		1,000	4,000	9,700	+5,000
Technical assistance and training:					
Assistance.....		1,200	4,000	6,000	+2,000
Training.....				500	+500
Administration and advisory committees.....	2,500	4,487	7,454	11,500	+3,596
Total, obligation authority.....	60,000	267,937	479,954	52,900	+165,546
Transferred to other agencies.....	3,000	182	46		-46
Total authorized.....	63,000	268,119	480,000	52,900	165,500

## LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

## 1972 Budget

The levels of authorization and appropriation have risen rapidly since 1968 when the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration began to administer its new programs to improve the criminal justice systems through grants to states and cities.

Appropriations have jumped from \$63 million in FY 69 to a proposed level of \$698 million for FY 72 reflecting the growing capacities of the states and cities to gear into the new program.

The 1972 budget proposes a \$218 million increase over FY 71 and a supplemental FY

71 request of \$52 million for grants for corrections programs. The 1972 program will include \$584 million for various grants in aid to state and local law enforcement improvement programs and for correctional institutions, and \$35 million for comprehensive planning.

It is expected that two of these grant in aid programs, discretionary grants and block grants, totaling \$486 million in obligational authority, will be included in the special revenue sharing program.

## TRANSPORTATION

The 1970 Amendments to the Mass Transportation Act provided five-year authority

of \$3.1 billion for capital facilities, relocation and technical studies, research, demonstration, and university training.

In assessing the program from the jumble of budget figures, there are four stages to keep in mind: authorization of a portion of the \$3.1 billion for use during a single year; "reservations" set aside for new project approvals; "obligations" made as projects get under way; and "outlays" of cash during construction. The activity in the Mass Transportation program can be judged by how much is reserved for new projects and by the level of obligations as projects reach construction, but outlays are not a good

	Fiscal year 1970, appropriation	Fiscal year 1971, appropriation	Fiscal year 1972, budget request
--	---------------------------------	---------------------------------	----------------------------------

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Solid waste: Operations, facilities, research.....	14.6	17.1	18.4
Air pollution: Operations, facilities, research.....	104.7	101.9	116.8
Separate transmittal <sup>2</sup> .....		13.0	85.0

## DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

Land and water conservation fund: Aid to State and local governments <sup>3</sup> .....	62.0	185.4	280.0
---	------	-------	-------

<sup>1</sup> Obligations for construction grants were: \$425,000,000 fiscal year 1970; \$1,185,000,000 fiscal year 1971; \$1,905,000,000 fiscal year 1972 (estimated).

<sup>2</sup> Funds for implementing the 1970 Clean Air Act, 1970 Resources Recovery Act and overall organization and management of EPA programs and new proposals, with most to go for air pollution.

<sup>3</sup> Obligations for Land and Water Conservation—Aid to States were \$49.4 fiscal year 1970 (estimated); \$85 fiscal year (estimated); \$125.0 fiscal year 1972 (estimated).

Note: Operations, Facilities, Research Includes: Abatement and Control; Manpower Development; Research Development and Demonstration; Facilities.

measure of progress for this program. The additional obligational authority proposed for FY 72 is \$600 million. This is the same as granted by Congress for FY 71. New approval reservations for FY 72 will be \$227 million higher than FY 71. There will be a substantial increase (\$35 million) in Research and Demonstration grants. By the end of FY 72 it is estimated that \$2,462 million will remain unobligated from the original \$3.1 billion. Thus it appears that most new authority requested for FY 72 will not be used. This rate of utilization of funds, \$640 million by June 30, 1972, must be doubled if

we are to reach the level authorized by Congress for the five year period.

The mass transit capital facilities program will be included in the transportation special revenue sharing group starting January 1, 1972. Research, development and demonstrations will remain to be administered at the Federal level.

The Interstate Highway System program has been operating at a level of \$3 billion in obligations against authorizations of \$4 billion for several years.

The Federal aid program for urban extension of state highways will increase from

\$266 million in FY 71 to \$275 million in FY 72. A new urban high program will be funded at \$50 million, half its authorized level for FY 72.

The Traffic Operations in Urban Areas (TOPICS) program obligated only \$97 million during FY 1970 and FY 1971 leaving a balance of authority of \$303 million. The FY 1972 authorization is \$100 million while obligations are expected to reach \$200 million because of carryovers from the current fiscal year.

By the end of FY 72 there will be an unobligated balance available in the trust fund of \$6,965 million.

## AIRPORT GRANTS

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1971	Fiscal year 1972	Change
Grants for planning.....	\$10	\$15	+\$5
Grants for construction.....	170	205	+\$35
	\$180	\$220	+\$40

## TRANSPORTATION

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1971 <sup>1</sup>		Fiscal year 1972 <sup>2</sup>		Change <sup>3</sup>	
	Reserve	Obligation	Reserve	Obligation	Reserve	Obligation
Mass transit						
Total.....	4328	179	600	464	+272	+285
Capital facilities.....	270	129	497	381	+227	+252
Technical studies.....	15	15	25	20	+10	+10
Reserve and demonstrations.....	40	33	75	60	+35	+27
University research and training.....	3	2	3	3	0	+1

<sup>1</sup> \$600 authorization, increased from \$214.

<sup>2</sup> \$600 authorization.

<sup>3</sup> None.

<sup>4</sup> Does not include a \$57,000,000 loan to the District of Columbia.

## HIGHWAYS

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal 1970		Fiscal year 1971		Fiscal year 1972	
	Authorization	Obligation	Authorization	Obligation	Authorization	Obligation
Interstate System.....	4,000	3,080	4,000	3,045	4,000	3,000
Urban extensions of primary and secondary.....	275	251	275	266	275	275
Topics program.....	200	1	200	96	100	200
Urban highways.....					100	50

Grants to public agencies under the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970 are for planning, development and improvement of public airports. Planning grants support the development of construction plans for regional systems of airports and for individual airports. Financing of this program was shifted to a trust fund partially supported by airline user charges. As the trust fund was established in 1970, comparisons are only clear between FY 71 and FY 72. They reveal a moderate increase in grants for planning and construction, however these commitments are well below the legislative authorization of \$280 million per year.

## EDUCATION

While the FY '72 Budget proposes an overall increase of \$300 million (from \$4.4 to \$4.7 billion), most of the increases go to higher education for proposed reform of college grants and loans which expire this June.

Only \$1.85 billion is requested for elementary and secondary education—a drop of \$50 million from FY 1971 appropriations. There were sharp budget cuts for individual programs such as libraries and educational communications, down \$35 million; vocational education, down \$25 million; and impact-aid to federally affected schools, down \$110 million. No money is requested for school equipment and minor remodeling, nor for construction of public libraries. Decreases in vocational education reflect the Administration's intent to consolidate existing programs into four broad categories:

Basic grants to states, research and special projects, adult education and planning and evaluation. The low request for impact-aid also reflects a renewed Administration effort to pass the Impact-Aid Reform Act reducing assistance to several thousand districts.

The Administration plans to ask Congress for \$1 billion in fiscal 1972 for emergency school desegregation funds not shown in the budget. The President also requested money to fund the new Environmental Education Act and Drug Abuse Education Act at their fiscal 1971 levels, \$2.5 million and \$6 million respectively.

The Office of Management and Budget estimates that education would receive \$3 billion in special revenue sharing during the first full year. All titles of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act would go into the proposed revenue sharing funds for education. Even if revenue sharing were enacted quickly—an unlikely possibility—elementary and secondary education would receive only \$92 million more than it did in fiscal 1971.

## EDUCATION

[Dollars in thousands]

Program	1970 actual	1971 estimated	1972 request
Elementary and Secondary:			
Educationally deprived (ESEA I).....	1,339,014	1,500,000	1,500,000
Library resources (ESEA IV).....	42,500	80,000	80,000
Supplementary Services (ESEA III).....	130,810	143,393	143,393

Program	1970 actual	1971 estimated	1972 request
Equipment and re-modeling (NDEA II).....	36,854	50,000	-----
Bilingual education (ESEA VII).....	21,250	25,000	25,000
Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII).....	4,981	10,000	10,000
Federally affected areas.....	520,498	550,657	440,000
Planning and evaluation.....	8,825	8,825	3,825
Handicapped.....	84,865	105,000	110,000
Vocational and adult.....	371,345	505,696	476,073
Libraries and Ed. communications.....	126,713	85,280	29,400
Research and development.....	82,325	98,077	105,000

<sup>1</sup> Consolidated with NDEA V-A in the 1970 ESEA Amendments.  
<sup>2</sup> Formerly community education, including university community services (now under higher education) and adult education (now under vocational education).

## WELFARE

Public assistance grants to states are for maintenance and medical assistance, social services, State and local training, and child welfare services. The Department of HEW has taken the estimates of requirements prepared by the states and adjusted them downward for the following actions to be taken in administering its programs: (1) A reduction in the number of hours a person can work and still meet the definition of an unemployed parent under title IVA of the Social Security Act. (2) Installation of improved utilization



review procedures and other management improvements in the Medicaid programs.

The estimates of Federal payments for maintenance assistance administration, social services, and State and local training have been limited to 110 percent of each State's estimates for FY 1971. The administration believes that appropriations for needs unrelated to subsistence should be limited by the Executive and the Congress through deliberate advance choices as to their size, character and the amount of Federal financial commitment for any given year.

A number of amendments to the Social Security Act including social security benefit increases, Welfare Reform and proposed reforms of the Medicaid and social services program are proposed for separate transmittal to the Congress. Estimates of the effects of these amendments are not included in the budget figures.

Amendments in 1969 increased the funding for the Food Stamp Program. Purchase requirements were reduced and, as a result, June 1970 participation climbed to 6.5 million persons, and by October it reached 8.8 million. The appropriation for 1972 is \$580 million higher than that for FY 1971.

The existing legislation for juvenile delinquency programs expires on June 30, 1971 and will be followed by a basic revision in the legislation and substantial changes in the focus of the program. The FY 1972 Budget shows an increase in technical assistance and a decrease in program development resulting in a net reduction of \$5 million in program funding.

The social security payments shown above are those not funded by payroll taxes from workers and employers. The decrease of \$134.6 million reflects adjustments for prior years for which the amounts appropriated were higher than presently estimated costs.

#### WELFARE (In millions of dollars)

	Appropriations		Budget request 1972	1971-72 change
	1970	1971		
Public assistance grants to States.....	\$7,498.9	\$8,651.9	\$11,411.6	+\$2,759.7
Social Security Administration.....	2,014.6	2,599.9	2,465.3	-134.6
Food stamp.....	596.9	1,416.2	1,996.4	+\$580.2
Juvenile delinquency.....	10.0	15.0	10.0	-5.0

<sup>1</sup> A supplemental request will be submitted for \$1,047.6 million to meet increases requested by States as both numbers of recipients and average monthly payments rose sharply.

#### HEALTH

Federal appropriations for construction of health facilities will decline to \$108.7 million in 1972, \$76.6 million less than in 1971, reflecting changes in the Hill-Burton program. Emphasis will be on encouraging construction of facilities which offer lower cost alternatives to hospitalization such as ambulatory care, rehabilitation, and mental health facilities. In addition, \$20 million in interest subsidies will be made available to support the new program of guaranteed and direct loans for construction and modernization of hospitals and other health facilities.

There will be a substantial increase in the appropriation for maternal and child health programs. A major portion of these programs assists States and localities in providing comprehensive health services for low-income mothers and children. Emphasis will be placed on broadening the range of services available, increasing the number of Budget provides a substantial increase, both in appropriation and in outlay for these services.

Legislation is being proposed again in early beneficiaries receiving comprehensive medical care, and expanding training for pediatric

nurses and physician assistants serving mothers and children.

The President's message to Congress in July, 1969, set a goal of providing family planning services by 1975 to all women who face barriers to receiving them. The 1972 1971 to modify Medicare to stem sharply rising costs.

#### OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

The 1972 budget for OEO reflects the Administration's intent to limit OEO activity to poverty research. The agency will administer a research, development, and evaluation program, of between \$70 and \$80 million, and even this amount is \$40.4 million less than Congress appropriated last year.

#### HEALTH (In millions of dollars)

Program	Appropriations		Budget fiscal year 1972	1971-72 change
	Fiscal year 1970	Fiscal year 1971		
Medical facilities construction.....	\$179.7	\$185.3	\$108.7	-\$76.6
Comprehensive health planning.....	205.9	247.2	251.7	4.5
Maternal-child health.....	277.9	255.7	326.4	70.7
Rehabilitation services/facilities.....	497.3	570.4	605.0	34.6
Family planning services.....	22.8	33.6	90.9	57.3

#### OEO PROGRAMS

(Dollars in millions)

	1970 obligations	1971 appropriation	1971 obligations	budget request
<b>PROGRAMS TO REMAIN IN OEO</b>				
Research development and evaluation.....	65.0	114.6	79.5	74.2
Community development:				
Community action.....	371.2	388.6	368.4	346.0
Health and nutrition.....	157.3	195.3	189.1	159.5
Special impact.....	36.2	37.1	36.1	25.8
Special migrant and Indian.....	52.5	35.5	60.1	60.6
Legal services.....	54.7	61.4	61.0	61.0
VISTA.....	34.2	36.5	36.2	33.0
Rural economic opportunity loans.....	3.5	9.4	6.0	
Subtotal.....	709.6	763.8	756.9	685.9
General Support.....	16.0	16.0	18.0	17.9
Subtotal.....	790.6	894.4	854.4	778.0
<b>SPIN-OFF PROGRAMS</b>				
Child Development:				
Headstart.....	325.3	360.0	360.0	376.5
Follow through.....	70.3	69.0	69.0	60.0
Subtotal.....	395.6	429.0	429.0	436.5
Work and training:				
Private sector OJT.....	47.0			
Public sector OJT.....	46.8			
Job Corps.....	170.0			
In-school work support.....	183.3			
Post-school work support.....	149.0			
Special targeting.....	139.0			
Program support.....	17.5			
Subtotal.....	752.6			
Unobligated balance lapsing.....	3.3		40.0	
Transferred to other accounts.....	6.0			
Total.....	1,948.1	1,323.4	1,323.4	778.0

<sup>1</sup> Includes funds for Indian CAA's which were transferred out of community action to special migrant and Indians during fiscal year 1971.

<sup>2</sup> Decreases resulting from phasing out of emergency food and medical program and alcoholism program were only partially offset by increases in comprehensive health, family planning and drug rehabilitation.

<sup>3</sup> Appears in HEW's budget request for fiscal year 1972.

<sup>4</sup> Balance of funds appropriated for rural loan fund.

<sup>5</sup> Total appropriation for fiscal year 1970

**DESIGNATION OF MONTANA'S LINCOLN BACK COUNTRY AS A WILDERNESS AREA**

**HON. RICHARD G. SHOUP**

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation to bring wilderness designation to 240,500 acres of western Montana known as the Lincoln Back Country. This is mountain recreation land at its best. Its lakes and streams are home to the native cutthroat trout and its forests are home to elk and grizzlies.

This is a textbook example of a "best use" for land. Many individuals and agencies have studied this area for years. The consensus says that this fragile alpine country, without minerals or timber of commercial significance, would best serve man in its natural wilderness state.

I would enter into the RECORD a joint resolution of the Montana Senate and the Montana House of Representatives as an example of the general and bipartisan support for this wilderness proposal:

**RESOLUTION NO. 23**

A joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of Montana to the Honorable Mike Mansfield and the Honorable Lee Metcalf, Senators from the State of Montana; to the Honorable Richard Shoup and the Honorable John Melcher, Representatives from the State of Montana, urging that parts of the Lincoln Back Country and Scapegoat Mountain area be enjoined with the National Wilderness Preservation System

Whereas, parts of the Lincoln back country and Scapegoat Mountain area lie within the national forest system and are in a natural wilderness condition at the present time; and

Whereas, the area is presently being heavily utilized as a natural recreation area for horseback riding, hiking, fishing, hunting, camping, photography, and observation of wildlife; and

Whereas, there is a growing population of Americans seeking high quality outdoor recreational opportunities; and

Whereas, the Lincoln back country and Scapegoat Mountain area contain some of the most spectacular scenic and recreational opportunities to be found in the United States; and

Whereas, these outstanding recreational areas, and the wildlife and scenic opportunities therein are of the highest value in attracting people to Montana for the enjoyment of these areas; and

Whereas, Montana is one of the few states where this type of outdoor recreation containing a complete wildlife community in its natural environment can still be enjoyed; and

Whereas, the grizzly bear, the majestic elk, the native cutthroat trout, the Rocky Mountain goat and various other species, some of them endangered, abound in this area; and

Whereas, these areas should be preserved and protected for the enlightenment, education, and enjoyment of future generations.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana:

That the forty-second legislative assembly of the state of Montana urges the congress of the United States to take the appropriate action necessary to identify those parts of the Lincoln back country/Scapegoat areas

**EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS**

8439

best suited to optimum recreational purposes and include them in the National Wilderness System.

Be it further resolved, that the secretary of state is instructed to send copies of this resolution to each member of the Montana congressional delegation.

**H.R. 6825, LEGISLATION TO LIMIT THE PRODUCTION OF AMPHETAMINES**

**HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in the past, Congress has admirably noted the serious and critical abuse and effects of narcotics and dangerous drugs. Research and experience have made the effects of such dangerous substances as amphetamines common knowledge among my colleagues, the public, and the medical profession.

Direct observations have shown amphetamines to be physically addicting. Dr. Sidney Cohen of the Division of Narcotic Addiction and Drug Abuse, National Institute of Mental Health, affirms the possibility of a panic and paranoid state, malnutrition, prolonged nervous breakdowns, and infections as the result of such addiction. Also, a newly developed possibility is that the use of a very high dose of amphetamines over a long period of time may lead to brain cell changes. In addition to the dangers of physical addiction, "speed" can also cause a potent psychological addiction. Many doctors have made connection between the amphetamine usage and paranoid psychosis.

The dangerous and harmful effects of amphetamine usage extends further than to just the individual user. Just recently, the Select Committee on Crime—January 2, 1971—attested to the relationship between the abuse of amphetamine-type drugs and violence and crime. Dr. Joel Fort, professor at the School of Social Welfare, University of California at Berkeley, testified before the committee that on:

A typical run of speed, there develops severe paranoia, a marked tendency to violence and sometimes tragically leading to murder, and serious physical deterioration.

From all the evidence, amphetamines do tend to set up conditions in which violent behavior is more likely to occur than would be the case had the individual not used it.

Congressional response to this evidence of the dangerous nature of amphetamines has been limited basically to the amendments to the Drug Abuse Control Act in 1965 and the enactment of the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970. Such bills were designed to increase controls over the distribution of amphetamines, barbiturates and other drugs affecting the central nervous system. The 1970 Act placed amphetamines under Schedule III substances which inadequately limits the drug through annual registration, periodic reports, and registrant inventories.

The effect of these laws on the amphetamine problem has been like applying a bandaid where a tourniquet is needed. Our laws have not been adequate to deal with this fantastic problem, nor have they kept pace with it.

The results of this near void has been prodigious. First of all, there has been an incredible overproduction of "speed" (amphetamine) by legitimate manufacturers. Eight billion "speed" pills are being spewed out every year. According to the National Institute of Mental Health, the total legitimate medical need of amphetamines in this country can be measured "in the thousands of pills rather than the billions." Physicians by and large agree, that if amphetamines were to disappear from the market tomorrow, almost all patients would benefit except children with narcolepsy and hyperkinetic behavior. Secondly, there has been no meaningful or adequate controls on the exportation of such dangerous drugs. Also, there has been no adequate Federal or State control over the purchase of the immediate chemical ingredients needed to manufacture such drugs. And, finally, there has been no adequate Federal or State control on the overprescription and the mail order purchase of "speed."

Mr. Speaker, the importance of controlling these dangerous substances cannot be overemphasized. The overproduction of "speed," far in excess of any legitimate need, no longer can be tolerated. Consequently, I am introducing a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to move amphetamines and certain other stimulant substances from Schedule III of such Act to Schedule II. By movement from Schedule III to Schedule II, the Attorney General will be required to fix a manufacturing quota for each of the basic classes of amphetamines and amphetamine-like substances based upon the estimated medical, scientific, research and industrial needs of the United States, plus lawful export requirements and a sufficient quantity for reserve stocks.

Under current law, only liquid injectable methamphetamines are included in Schedule II. This constitutes 0.12 of 1 percent of the "speed" being marketed in the United States. In order to achieve any rational control, it is necessary for the Federal Government to control the quantity of all speed-type drugs, no matter in what form they are manufactured.

I introduce this bill today as the necessary tourniquet for the overproduction of the danger drug—amphetamines.

**MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?**

**HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 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 sadisti-



cally practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,600 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

# CONGRESSMAN WENDELL WYATT REPORTS

## HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, for the 7th year in a row I am mailing out a questionnaire polling the residents of my First Congressional District on some of the major issues we as a Nation face today.

Because of the diversity of my district, which takes in the northwest corner of the State of Oregon, the opinions represent the thinking of a wide social and economic spectrum. The questionnaire goes to urban residents in Portland, suburbanites in Washington, Clackamas, and other counties, to rural residents, university communities, mill towns, fishing ports—just to cite a few.

In the past I have received a good response, and many who return the questionnaire add additional remarks. I read these very carefully and when respondents include a name and address I try to answer them individually. Because of space limitations, and the time element in getting a questionnaire drafted and printed some vital areas are omitted. But I believe the basic areas of national concern are included in the questionnaire, which I would like to share with my colleagues:

### CONGRESSMAN WENDELL WYATT REPORTS

DEAR FRIEND: Once again I am seeking your opinions on the many issues facing the nation, the State of Oregon and the 1st Congressional District which I am privileged to represent in the U.S. Congress. In the past your views have been of great value to me in guiding my voting in the House of Representatives.

A simple yes or no answer may not fully express your views on some of the issues. If such is the case, any additional comments you may wish to make will be most welcome.

This is the seventh consecutive year that I have sent out a questionnaire. I hope you will take the few minutes required to fill it out and return it to my Washington office. Simply fold the questionnaire over and affix a six cent stamp. Please do not seal it with staples or tape. Thank you.

Sincerely,

WENDELL WYATT,

Member of Congress, First District,  
Oregon.

1. To get families off welfare, President Nixon has proposed a work incentive and job training program while guaranteeing a basic level of financial assistance. Do you favor this alternative to the present welfare system?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ ☐  
No \_\_\_\_\_ ☐  
No opinion \_\_\_\_\_ ☐

2. Do you approve of the way the Nixon Administration is handling the conduct of the Vietnam war?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ ☐  
No \_\_\_\_\_ ☐  
No opinion \_\_\_\_\_ ☐

3. Would you favor a federal program which would actively provide information on ways to control the size of families?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ ☐  
No \_\_\_\_\_ ☐  
No opinion \_\_\_\_\_ ☐

4. Do you favor federal legislation to legalize abortions nationwide?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ ☐  
No \_\_\_\_\_ ☐  
No opinion \_\_\_\_\_ ☐

5. Would you favor stringent federal controls on air, water and land pollution by industry even though this may result in higher taxes for you?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ ☐  
No \_\_\_\_\_ ☐  
No opinion \_\_\_\_\_ ☐

6. Should the federal government impose wage controls in order to slow inflation?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ ☐  
No \_\_\_\_\_ ☐  
No opinion \_\_\_\_\_ ☐

7. Should the federal government impose price controls in order to slow inflation?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ ☐  
No \_\_\_\_\_ ☐  
No opinion \_\_\_\_\_ ☐

8. President Nixon has proposed a program of revenue sharing with state and local governments. Would you favor returning a share of federal taxes to the states and local governments, with no restrictions on how the funds are to be spent?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ ☐  
No \_\_\_\_\_ ☐  
No opinion \_\_\_\_\_ ☐

9. Do you think the federal government should provide a medical insurance program to everyone, even if it meant higher taxes to you?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ ☐  
No \_\_\_\_\_ ☐  
No opinion \_\_\_\_\_ ☐

10. The construction of the Supersonic Transport (SST) passenger plane has created controversy because of the noise problem and the possibility of increased air pollution. On the other hand, it will provide new jobs and advocates argue that it will help the balance of trade problems of the United States. Do you favor using federal money to support the construction of the SST?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ ☐  
No \_\_\_\_\_ ☐  
No opinion \_\_\_\_\_ ☐

11. In general,

(a) How would you rate the performance of President Nixon:

Excellent \_\_\_\_\_ ☐  
Good \_\_\_\_\_ ☐  
Fair \_\_\_\_\_ ☐  
Poor \_\_\_\_\_ ☐

(b) How would you rate the performance of Vice-President Agnew:

Excellent \_\_\_\_\_ ☐  
Good \_\_\_\_\_ ☐  
Fair \_\_\_\_\_ ☐  
Poor \_\_\_\_\_ ☐

12. What, in your opinion, are the top domestic issues confronting the United States today? Please rate first, second, third.

(a) Inflation — \_\_\_\_\_ ☐  
(b) Law and Order — \_\_\_\_\_ ☐  
(c) Environment — \_\_\_\_\_ ☐  
(d) Campus Disorders — \_\_\_\_\_ ☐  
(e) Drug Abuse — \_\_\_\_\_ ☐  
(f) Civil Rights — \_\_\_\_\_ ☐  
(g) Housing — \_\_\_\_\_ ☐  
(h) Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_ ☐

The following questions are completely optional. However, you would assist me in knowing about the people answering the above questions if you felt you could respond to them.

13. Your sex

Male \_\_\_\_\_ ☐  
Female \_\_\_\_\_ ☐

14. Your age

Under 21 \_\_\_\_\_ ☐  
21-30 \_\_\_\_\_ ☐  
31-40 \_\_\_\_\_ ☐  
41-60 \_\_\_\_\_ ☐  
61 and Over \_\_\_\_\_ ☐

15. Is the head of your house now

Employed \_\_\_\_\_ ☐  
Unemployed \_\_\_\_\_ ☐

16. How many family members in your home, counting yourself?

One \_\_\_\_\_ ☐  
Two \_\_\_\_\_ ☐  
Three \_\_\_\_\_ ☐  
Four \_\_\_\_\_ ☐  
Five \_\_\_\_\_ ☐  
Six or more \_\_\_\_\_ ☐

My sincere thanks for taking this time to answer my questionnaire.

WENDELL WYATT,  
Member of Congress.

## UNDERGRADUATE DRAFT DEFERMENTS

### HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, when H.R. 6531, to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967, reaches the floor for amendments, I plan to offer an amendment to section 1 to insure that, if the President exercises the authority given him in the bill to abolish college deferments, anyone now having a deferment will be permitted to retain that deferment until he completes college, drops out, or reaches age 24.

This amendment is necessary because the President has indicated that if given the authority, he will do away with undergraduate deferments retroactive to April 23, 1970. To change the law now for undergraduates who entered college last fall under a law which provided them with a 4-year deferment does not seem just.

Mr. Speaker, for the convenience of Members, I include herewith the text of the amendment:

#### AMENDMENT TO H.R. 6531

Page 4, line 9, strike out the period and insert the following: "except that any deferment which was granted to an individual under such section 6(h)(1) (as in effect before the effective date of this paragraph (12)) before such effective date and not terminated as of the day before such effective date shall continue until such individual completes the requirements for his baccalaureate degree, fails to pursue satisfactorily a full-time course of instruction, or attains the 24th anniversary of the date of his birth, whichever first occurs."

J. EDGAR HOOVER

**HON. FLOYD SPENCE**

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, one of America's greatest leaders is being attacked by various sources. Some of these individuals are motivated by political ambition while others seem intent on further eroding respect for law and order in this country.

For more than 45 years J. Edgar Hoover has stood as a beacon, guiding law enforcement on its upward climb toward greater professionalism. While there are today a few in this country who would douse this light of professionalism, there are far, far more friends and admirers of Mr. Hoover than there ever will be enemies and detractors.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is imperative that we all examine the motives behind the attacks against Mr. Hoover and the possible consequences should these attackers succeed in their efforts to drive him out of active law enforcement.

The well-known editor in chief of the Hearst newspaper, Mr. William Randolph Hearst, Jr., in a recent column entitled "Mud For A Monument" contributed greatly toward putting some of the charges against Mr. Hoover in proper perspective. Ray Cromley in a column appearing in the March 17, 1971, issue of the Washington Daily News pointed out another important aspect in this campaign against Mr. Hoover.

Mr. Speaker, I think it would benefit all Members of this body to be aware of the contents of these two columns, and, I therefore, include them at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) News American, Mar. 14, 1971]

**MUD FOR A MONUMENT**

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

NEW YORK.—Although the 1972 presidential election is a long 20 months ahead, hot political winds already are gusting across the land as Democratic White House hopefuls step up their search for vote-getting issues and campaign cash.

To date, and for compelling reasons of strategy, the hottest and most extreme blasts have emanated from Sen. George S. McGovern. Because he must overcome the Muskie steamroller to have a chance, he became the first to declare his candidacy—in January—and has been running desperately since.

In attempting to outdistance his still-undeclared potential rivals, South Dakota's champion dove on Vietnam already has established himself as number-one war critic of the pack. None could possibly surpass his election promise of a total and immediate American withdrawal.

My disgust over this position—which amounts to nothing less than abject surrender to Communism in Southeast Asia—has been voiced here before and there is no point in repeating it. The point to be noted is that the war is inevitably going to be a primary campaign issue in the months ahead.

This is as it should be. Vietnam is a legitimate campaign issue if there ever was one. And Sen. McGovern has a perfectly legitimate right to take any position he wants, no matter how reckless and harmful it might be.

The same cannot be said for another issue he has injected into the 1972 race. Thanks to Sen. McGovern, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover—if he stays in the post he has held since 1924—again is assured of becoming the political football he was in 1968.

Mr. Hoover, now 76, became a target because of his age and because of his eminence as a symbol of law, order and old-fashioned Americanism. The latter was anathema for the liberals. A critical pronouncement about the FBI and its head thus became a required act of faith for them in the 1968 campaign.

It was a phony and illegitimate issue then and it remains so now that McGovern has resurrected it.

What is tragic about the situation in that the world-famous FBI—zealously built by Mr. Hoover during the terms of eight Presidents—faces a new barrage of the scurrilous partisan attacks which have done so much serious and possibly irreparable damage.

It is doubly tragic that this damage to its prestige has been especially noteworthy among the young people of our nation—the generation which will be influencing Congress and paying the nation's bills before long.

For the benefit of those coming in late—or who may not have been paying close attention—here is how Sen. McGovern has succeeded in re-establishing Mr. Hoover and the FBI as prime targets for forthcoming Democratic campaign criticism.

He started out by demanding a Senate inquiry into the resignation under pressure of John F. Shaw, an FBI agent who wrote a letter that included some criticism of Mr. Hoover. Subsequently, on March 1, the Senator made headlines by inserting in The Congressional Record an anonymous letter he said came from 10 unhappy agents of the bureau.

Like the Shaw letter, the anonymous communication charged that the FBI director is a sternly demanding boss who tolerates no disobedience or criticism from his agents—a charge that certainly is true enough.

Throughout his long and distinguished career, J. Edgar Hoover always has imposed rigid discipline on his men. The total lack of any scandal in the ranks—ever—is a measure of his success in keeping unsullied the FBI motto: "Fidelity, Bravery, Integrity."

Over the years—as today—there, of course, always have been some agents unable to adjust to the necessity for such high standards. Yet the level of morale generally remains as high as the standards. Some 62 per cent of the special agents on the rolls as of April 1, 1969, had been with the FBI for 10 years or longer.

This fact speaks loudly and clearly to any impartial observer. Yet it obviously was no concern of Sen. McGovern when he inserted the anonymous letter of criticism into the Congressional Record—along with his own comment that Mr. Hoover has "an overbearing concern for the FBI's public image."

As might be expected, responsible FBI officials were outraged by the publicity the Senator got through his act and comment. A total of 21 senior FBI officers subsequently wrote to him, denouncing him as an irresponsible, reprehensible opportunist.

The strongest came from Clyde Tolson, the bureau's veteran associate director. It said, in part:

"I term you an opportunist because it is no small coincidence that you have singled out a man of Mr. Hoover's national stature for attack at a time when waves of publicity are urgently needed to buoy your political career."

"You are not the first person I have en-

countered during 30 years in Washington whose ambition has far exceeded his ability, and I cannot help wonder how many other esteemed career public servants will be maligned and abused before your political balloon runs out of hot air."

The Tolson letter, as Sen. McGovern declared later, may well have "exceeded the bounds of proper comment by a high government official."

Considering the provocation, however—and particularly the irresponsibility of Sen. McGovern in publicizing an unsigned communication throwing mud on a monument of integrity—I think I would have used even stronger language had I been Mr. Tolson.

It is impossible in this space even to summarize adequately the tremendous, 47-year record of Mr. Hoover and the FBI. It covers too varied a field of successful investigations of gangsters and kidnappings in the 30s through Nazi espionage in World War II, and up to the present through Communist subversion, civil rights strife, city rioting and the plots of anarchy.

Headlines aside, the best proof of FBI effectiveness is the extremely high percentage of convictions it marks up in cases based on its investigations.

According to the Congressional Quarterly, in fiscal 1968 such convictions were obtained against 97.3 per cent of persons brought to trial during that year. And of the 13,059 convictions that year, 11,190 (or 85.7 per cent) were on guilty pleas; the rest following trials before judge or jury.

"These percentages," notes the eminently reliable Congressional Quarterly, "were typical of other years."

It is not the FBI and its director who need any justification. What cries out for any kind of justification are the shockingly unfair attacks of such short-sighted, self-serving politicians as George McGovern.

The only possibly valid criticism that could be directed at J. Edgar Hoover would have to be based on his advanced age. And so far as anyone knows he is remarkably sound in both mind and body.

In a word, there is no justification whatever for the mud slinging—either in or out of a political campaign.

J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI have done nothing to deserve castigation. The exact opposite is true.

Politicians who go around seeking votes by knocking honorable men and their accomplishments make me literally sick at heart.

It is small wonder that so many of our youngsters are growing up with the idea that the whole establishment of our society is no good.

[From the Washington Daily News, Mar. 17, 1971]

**THE FBI FILES**

(By Ray Cromley)

The other day a prominent presidential candidate spoke in muted horror of the warnings his senatorial colleagues voiced about the dangers of his speaking critically of FBI Chief J. Edgar Hoover.

The thrust of their warnings, as described by this candidate, was that Mr. Hoover as chief of the Federal Bureau of Investigation has data on so many people that it is not safe for anyone, including high members of Congress, to say anything Mr. Hoover might consider critical.

Rubbish.

Whatever else a man may say of Mr. Hoover, he has a consistent record thru the past decades of never having used secret information from the FBI files for political attacks on any member of the government.

I know, in fact, that from time to time in other years pressure from very high places indeed has been put on Mr. Hoover to allow



the FBI's secret files to be used for other purposes than checking on crime or in tracking down criminals. I know that Mr. Hoover has consistently refused to open the files to these highly placed men.

I have contacted the office of the candidate who made this statement. I was answered in evasions and hints. When an attempt was made to explore these hints, they evaporated in further evasions.

Every one of us, senator or citizen, has the right to criticize Mr. Hoover or any other government official, and to differ with the way the FBI or any other government agency operates. But let us hold to the truth.

Consider the awful situation in this nation if the FBI files were ever used by the government in power to ruin the members of the political opposition.

I sometime stay awake at night worrying who Mr. Hoover's successor will be, and whether that man, whatever his virtues and his faults, will have the guts Mr. Hoover has shown—to resist all pressures aimed at opening his files for political use.

If we did have as head of the FBI a man who would let those files be used for political massacre, we could indeed very quickly have a police state.

#### DADE COUNTY SCHOOLCHILDREN BELIEVE IN POSITIVE ACTION

#### HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, there is something exciting happening in my district, and I am proud to call our colleagues' attention to it. Hundreds of young people from Kinloch Park Junior High School in Miami have been spending their free time turning the school grounds into a showplace.

This beautification project has brought students, faculty, administrators, and the community together in a common effort to "put the park back into Kinloch Park." Especially significant is the fact that most of the students are of Latin American heritage—many are Cuban refugees.

I want to particularly commend the leadership roles played by Principal Harold Rash and faculty member Harry Hewitt. They have been the moving force behind the students' enthusiasm and work. That work includes planting trees, shrubs, and flower beds, and surrounding them with ponds, waterfalls, covered walkways, and benches for resting and studying.

The Kinloch Park story is certainly worthy of emulation in other schools and communities in our Nation. It not only improves and upgrades our environment, but also brings school communities together and bridges generational and cultural differences.

Miami has been called the Magic City. Once again its residents have shown the spirit which makes the city a thriving crossroad of the Americas. The Kinloch Park experience is one of the most dramatic demonstrations of that spirit.

I know our colleagues join in wishing continued success to the boys and girls of Kinloch Park Junior High School. Their positive action to beautify their school is an example from which we can all benefit.

#### PRISONERS OF WAR AND MISSING IN ACTION GRAVE CONCERN TO AMERICANS

#### HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, the fate of our soldiers who are prisoners of war and missing in action is of grave concern to all Americans. I have expressed my views on this subject just last week when I said I supported any action that would bring our soldiers home quickly and safely.

The Alaska State Legislature has always been concerned with the vital issues that shape our future and well-being. I know that every member of the State legislature in Alaska shares the concern of the family, and friends of these men who are serving so valiantly in Indochina. At this time, I wish to insert into the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Alaska State Senate in which they express their deep concern for our men who are prisoners of war or missing in action.

#### SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 14

Be it Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska

Whereas the Alaska Legislature in 1970 passed a Resolution urging the Congress of the United States to enact legislation for the protection of American personnel captured in military operations in Southeast Asia; and

Whereas, despite continued and repeated appeals by both government and private individuals, the names of American prisoners of war largely remain unknown; and

Whereas the United States government has information that prisoners are not being accorded the right of humane treatment; and

Whereas impartial inspections of prisoner-of-war facilities have not been permitted nor even the regular flow of mail facilitated;

Be it resolved by the Alaska State Legislature that it renews its concern regarding prisoners of war in Southeast Asia and urgently requests the Congress of the United States and other government officials to do everything possible to obtain a complete listing of all American and other prisoners, effect the release and freedom from captivity of those men now, and at the very least, assure the humane treatment of all prisoners taken captive in these hostilities.

Copies of this Resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States; the Honorable William P. Rogers, Secretary of the Department of State; the Honorable J. W. Fulbright, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; the Honorable Thomas E. Morgan, Chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee; and to the Honorable Ted Stevens and the Honorable Mike Gravel, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Nick Begich, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

#### ANTI-SEMITISM IN ARGENTINA

#### HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the ancient problem of anti-Semitism persists in modern dress despite the lessons of history and the efforts of concerned humanity.

Last November, I visited South America at the request of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. The committee's concern was principally focused on the impact that political change in Chile would have on the U.S. immigration policies.

Argentina was among the countries I visited. It was obvious to me, despite attempts by some members of the community to convince me otherwise, that anti-Semitism continues, sometimes in a most virulent form.

Events of the last week have seen the rise of another military junta to power in Argentina and its designation of Army Commander Alejandro A. Lanusse as President. One would hope that General Lanusse will quickly bring to a halt open terrorism against the Jewish community in Argentina by extreme nationalist groups.

However, a careful reading of Rabbi Morton M. Rosenthal's assessment of the Argentine situation does not encourage optimism along these lines. It is the contention of Rabbi Rosenthal, director of the department of Latin American affairs for the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, that much of the anti-Semitic terrorist activity goes on with the unspoken consent of Argentina's establishment, including, of course, the army.

With the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I enter in the RECORD Rabbi Rosenthal's article "The Threatened Jews of Argentina," from the March edition of the ADL Bulletin, the national publication of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith:

#### THE THREATENED JEWS OF ARGENTINA

EXTREMIST NATIONALIST GROUPS AND ARAB PROPAGANDISTS ARE NATURAL ALLIES IN AN ORGANIZED ANTI-SEMITIC CAMPAIGN

(By Rabbi Morton M. Rosenthal, director, ADL's Department of Latin American Affairs)

"The legacy of Hitler is alive in the forces and virulence of Nazi organizations and in the action of Arab terrorism . . . We testify with anguish to the incredible anti-Semitic hatred of a neo-fascist left that fought with us against Nazism, but that today raises anti-Jewish banners under the pretext of anti-Zionism."

The speaker was Dr. Nehemias Resnizky, an officer of the Delegation of Argentine Jewish Associations (DAIA), which represents the Jewish community before the Argentine government. He addressed an emotional overflow crowd in the auditorium of the La Plata Jewish Community Center at a meeting called to protest the devastating explosion which destroyed a portion of the

Community Center building. La Plata is the capital of Buenos Aires province.

"Nobody should forget the lesson of history," Dr. Resnizky said. "Attacks on the Jews are the first step to liquidating democracy and the dignity of man. Public authorities and the pressure of public opinion must check the armed attacks in order that Jewish youth not be obliged to decide that it is the sole defense of the physical existence and the dignity of our people . . ."

The La Plata bombing, in the predawn hours of May 16, 1970, was the most destructive in a long series of attacks on Jewish institutions in Buenos Aires and provincial cities. Jewish schools, synagogues, fraternal organizations, newspapers and community centers have been the target of more than twenty bombings since November, 1969.

In most incidents, aside from some shots fired through school room windows, the explosive devices used made a loud noise and splattered tar, but seldom caused injury or extensive damage. The explosives used at La Plata, however, were a plastic type available only to military personnel. They caused more than \$20,000 in damages to the Community Center and shattered windows in the neighborhood. Had the bombing occurred while the building was occupied, many lives might have been lost.

What happened at La Plata brought into focus various factors which pose a serious threat to the Jews of Argentina.

Of paramount concern is the government's policy of passively tolerating repeated attacks on Jewish institutions. Jewish leaders have insisted that those responsible for the attacks can be identified through "their organizations . . . their swastikas . . . their hymns of hate . . . with the new swastika of the half moon."

The failure of Argentine government officials to apprehend and punish those responsible for the bombings contributes to the proliferation of anti-Semitic incidents. The Buenos Aires daily *La Prensa* editorially criticized the government's attitude. Discussing a rash of anti-Semitic bombings in January and February, 1970, the paper noted that the attacks were not spontaneous acts of isolated individuals, but were well-planned efforts of anti-Semitic groups which "were able to commit these attacks with absolute impunity, despite the fact that the identification of those responsible does not appear to be an extremely difficult task."

The DAIA, in messages to the Minister of Interior, has asked that government action be taken to halt the attacks and bring those responsible to justice. When a DAIA delegation met with an official of the Interior Ministry after the La Plata incident, he said the government regretted the attacks but reportedly suggested that Jewish leaders protect the institutions themselves because the government could not grant special attention.

It was not until three months after the bombing, when a soldier at the army base near La Plata voluntarily disclosed the complicity of military personnel who were members of a right-wing extremist organization, that the army began to probe links between the military personnel and well known civilian nationalist personalities. Although the commander of the garrison was relieved of his duties, and four officers and eight non-commissioned officers and soldiers were arrested, military authorities have not yet announced any date for trial.

The relative immunity enjoyed by ultra-nationalist hooligans is not a new phenomenon in Argentina. The Jewish community over the years has frequently protested a police failure to apprehend those responsible for hundreds of attacks upon Jewish buildings and individuals. The situation became so desperate in 1962, in the wake of Eichmann's capture in Argentina, that the DAIA

called a general strike to back up its demands for "immediate action against Nazi-Fascist bands."

The Argentine press has also frequently commented on the special protection the terrorists enjoy. At the time of the general strike, *La Nacion* editorialized: "No one explains how bands organized to bring off such villainies can continue acting with impunity. It is well-known that the acknowledged sagacity and diligence of the police are capable of putting an immediate end to such excesses which reduce our community to the level of a primitive people."

When the neo-Nazi terrorist group *Tacuara* was in its heyday, the journal *Primera Plana* addressed itself to this problem, too: "The general public feels that *Tacuara's* deeds go unpunished thanks to some special military immunity. Those who hold that opinion cannot easily prove their claim, but certain leaders of the Armed Forces are convinced that the terrorist bands are an effective barrier against the spread of Communism."

Another explanation for the freedom granted nationalist groups such as *Guardia Restauradora Nacionalista*, which claimed responsibility for most of the recent attacks by scrawling its initials on walls and leaving leaflets at the scene, is that members of the group are young men from some of the country's "best" families. They are the sons and grandsons of Argentine aristocracy, supported and protected by influential personalities in the government, church and armed forces.

A second major cause for concern is the coalescence of the extreme left and the extreme right. In an analysis of the situation of Jews in Latin America written several years ago, Prof. Leon Perez of Argentina said that a convergence of the anti-imperialist left and the frequently anti-Semitic nationalist right was "sinister." He warned that if the two extremes merged their efforts to overthrow the existing government and nationalize the country, open anti-Jewish aggression could result. It seems to be happening in Argentina.

According to a New York Times story (February 19, 1971) on the dramatic increase in guerrilla activity in Argentina, the groups support both the Castroite radical left and the radical right. "The radical left and radical right have largely fused," the Times correspondent declared.

Arab propagandists have played a significant role in fostering and fusing extremism in Argentina. Intent upon discrediting Israel in order to weaken support from Argentina and other Latin American countries at the United Nations, Arab League agents have worked for two decades fomenting anti-Semitism under the guise of anti-Zionism.

Early in the game they found that anti-Semitic Argentine nationalist groups were natural allies and cultivated their relationship with large amounts of cash. As early as 1964, an Argentine weekly said that police authorities had proof that the Arab League representative was covering most of the expenses of *Tacuara*. The close relationship was most apparent at a mass rally organized by the Arab League that year.

Posters announcing the event and denouncing "Zionist lies" appeared on Buenos Aires buildings prior to the rally. At the rally itself, contingents of uniformed *Guardia Restauradora Nacionalista* and *Tacuara* members greeted the mostly Arab crowd with the Nazi salute. They also encouraged various Arab speakers with shouts as "Jews to the gas-chambers" and "Long live the Fuehrer." When Hussein Triki, head of the Arab League office, compared the Arab population of 200 million with Israel's much smaller Jewish population, the nationalists shouted, "Thanks to Hitler, thanks to Hitler."

In recent years, the Arabs have penetrated leftist political circles, trading on the fact that both the Arab and Latin American countries are part of the "Third World."

Arab propagandists have used every means and spared no expense in their efforts to win over workers, students and intellectuals. Arab agents are responsible for vast quantities of anti-Semitic literature sold at newsstands. During a speaking tour, the Syrian Ambassador in Argentina, Col. Jawdat Attasi, charged Argentine Jews with "financing Israeli armaments with monies stolen from the country in which they live." Arab delegations from abroad frequently go to Argentina and other Latin American countries to spread the Arab message.

Arab propagandists have had their impact. They have stimulated the growth of what a DAIA spokesman called "a new anti-Semitism, implanted in the working class."

Is Argentine Jewry really in danger? The views of Jorge Garcia Venturini, professor at the Catholic University of Buenos Aires, are as pertinent today as they were six years ago when he first voiced them. Arguing against those who insist that no one in Argentina can successfully advance an anti-Jewish policy, he referred to the attacks launched by Juan Peron against the Catholic Church. Noting "ample support from the masses when tyranny wanted to unleash an anti-Catholic persecution," Dr. Venturini warned that "any other despotism might receive greater support if Jews were involved."

#### LINDA DEATON, ALABAMA'S MAID OF COTTON

#### HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, when people think of Mobile County, Ala., they usually conjure up thoughts of beautiful, blooming azaleas growing in profusion across the landscape. They also think of Mobile County as the home of the annual Senior Bowl football classic, the nationally recognized America's Junior Miss Pageant, and as a landmark for some of the most succulent seafood to be found anywhere in the United States.

For many years now, Mobile County has also received recognition for turning out some of the South's, and the Nation's most beautiful and intelligent young women.

The most recent testimonial to this claim occurred when Miss Linda Deaton, a 20-year-old green-eyed beauty from Chickasaw in Mobile County, was named Alabama's Maid of Cotton for 1971.

A graduate honor student in mathematics at the University of Southern Mississippi, Linda was described by a number of beauty pageant officials as possessing more poise and character than most people develop in a lifetime.

No newcomer to the world of winning beauty contests, Linda has also been chosen Posture Queen of Mobile County, Miss County Fair, Miss Vigor High School, and last year, was first runner-up as Freshwater Fishing Rodeo Queen.

In the First District of Alabama, we are all proud of Linda Deaton.



# BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

## HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, March 25, 1971, marks the 53d anniversary of Byelorussian Independence Day.

Emerging initially as a cultural manifestation, the unique cultural conception of the Byelorussian nationality in time acquired a distinct political relevance.

Based at first on the ironies of war, German occupation of Byelorussia during World War I set the stage for throwing off the yoke of oppression and slavery under Russian czarism. Despite the occupation, accompanied by certain restrictions, German permissiveness in the treatment of the Byelorussians enabled their leaders to carry on their political activities.

Those activities found their opportunity for open expression in the growing disorganization of the Russian Army subsequent to the Russian March Revolution of 1917. Over Bolshevik resistance, the Great Byelorussian Rada declared itself the national representative of the Byelorussian people and in December 1917, the first All-Byelorussian Congress, comprised of democratically chosen delegates from all Byelorussian organizations and political parties, met to determine the political future and form of the new Byelorussian state. Although temporarily interrupted in this move by the Bolsheviks, the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk of February 19, 1918, between the Germans and Bolsheviks gave the Byelorussians sufficient relief that on March 19, 1918, the executive committee of the Rada, representing the first All-Byelorussian Congress, declared:

During the World War (I) which has overthrown some governments and weakened others, Byelorussia has awakened to state life. After 3½ centuries of slavery the Byelorussian people proclaim to the entire world that they are living and will live . . .

Shortly thereafter, on March 25th, the Rada of the new Byelorussian National Republic rendered the official declaration of independence, proclaiming in part:

From now on, the Byelorussian National Republic is to be a free and independent power. The peoples of Byelorussia themselves, through their own Constituent Assembly, will decide upon the future relations of Byelorussia with other states . . .

Byelorussian independence, ironically owing itself to the permissiveness under German occupation, began to wane as the German armed forces dissolved following the Armistice in November 1918. On their heels came the Red army and the beginning of the end for the fledgling Byelorussian state. Officially, by the Treaty of Riga in 1921 between Poland and Bolshevik Russia, Byelorussia was divided.

Mr. Speaker, Byelorussians throughout the free world celebrate this day as a symbol of their national aspirations. They, I am sure, look to the United

States for the hope that those aspirations will again one day be realized. I am equally certain that they are painfully aware that precious freedom must not be taken for granted. It can be lost, whether by defeat or default.

As I take the occasion from time to time to recognize the anniversaries of the Independence Days of this and other former independent nations that have succumbed to the tyranny of communism, I would hope to impart that while the peoples of those nations may find hope and inspiration in the free world leadership of the United States, we have not earned that position of confidence without great sacrifice. In practical terms, that position today is contingent, in my estimation, upon our willingness and our ability to fulfill our commitments wherever they have been made.

## THE DEATH OF WHITNEY YOUNG, JR. IS A LOSS TO THE NATION

### HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply shocked over the untimely death of Mr. Whitney Young, Jr., executive director of the National Urban League.

On March 17, 1971, I expressed my sentiments in a column written for weekly newspapers in my District. I thought it would be appropriate to include those remarks at this point in the RECORD:

## THE DEATH OF WHITNEY YOUNG, JR., IS A LOSS TO THE NATION

America was deprived of one of its ablest civil rights leaders with the death of Whitney Young, Jr., on March 11.

Not quite as well known to the general public as such men as the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Mr. Young was perhaps one of the most effective black men in this era.

His essential characteristic was pragmatism. He knew what he was about and frequently reflected candidly on his way of doing things.

An observation he made one day to a reporter is illustrative. He and the journalist were on a commuter train from Mr. Young's home in the New York City suburb of New Rochelle. As the train passed through Harlem before going underground to Grand Central Station, Mr. Young commented:

"I think to myself, should I get off this train and stand on 125th Street cussing out Whitey to show I am tough? Or should I go downtown and talk to an executive of General Motors about 2,000 jobs for unemployed Negroes?"

The reporter noted that he did indeed go "downtown" and to a lot of other places, pleading the case for a better America for every citizen. But he strongly resented being called a moderate.

"There is no such thing as a moderate in the civil rights movement," Mr. Young once declared. "Everyone is a radical. The difference is whether or not one is all rhetoric or relevant."

To Whitney Young, relevancy meant results—concrete improvements. He was a black man who fully comprehended the white society within which we all live. And he applied the very basic American tech-

nique of persuasion and salesmanship in dealing with that society. He knew that underlying the layer of racial prejudice that does, in fact, exist in this country is another layer of basic Christian morality. That root was tapped and bore fruit in the racial renaissance that began to blossom in the early 1960s only to wither and lose momentum in the late sixties.

Mr. Young's posture of non-violence made his task all the more difficult in many quarters of black America. Not only was he engaged in an unpopular cause so far as the white view was concerned, he was not militant enough for some whose lives he was trying to improve.

But he persevered. And his courage and determination would inspire anyone, even the most ardent segregationist.

He did not have to stick his neck out. Coming from a family of educators, Mr. Young originally intended to become a physician. But he changed his mind during military service in World War II when he witnessed directly the problems of the black man in the Army and foresaw what it portended for the future. He then went into social work and later was named dean of the School of Social Work at Atlanta University. In 1961, he became the executive director of the National Urban League.

Having served as a delegate to the White House Conference on Children and Youth under the Eisenhower Administration, Mr. Young subsequently served on a number of commissions and advisory committees under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson. He also authored two books, gave talks and wrote a syndicated newspaper column in a jammed seven-day-a-week schedule.

As one newspaper commented editorially: "... Whitney M. Young, Jr. was 49 years old, chronologically between the older leaders of the civil rights revolution and some young men and women who have preached a new separatism. They have not always communicated well with each other; they rarely had trouble talking with Whitney Young."

I first met him at a meeting in New York City in 1968 although I already knew of him. I did not see him again until I had the privilege of introducing him at the annual Urban League dinner in Dayton in 1969.

Mr. Young was one of the most capable men to lead the fight for racial equality in the United States.

His untimely death at the age of 49 is as tragic as Dr. King's assassination. It removes from our midst a gifted, perceptive American who was devoted to his country and to its hopes of becoming an even greater Nation. His passing weakens the strength of the undertaking which dominated his life.

## BERNADETTE DEVLIN

### HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1971

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, on March 9, 1971, I addressed the House in regard to the so-called cultural speaking tour of Bernadette Devlin in the United States.

I am happy to tell you now that Miss Devlin departed the shores of the United States from the J. F. Kennedy Airport in New York City on March 10, 1971, at 8 p.m., on flight No. 700, TWA, traveling with a Mr. Hawkins to the destination of London, England.

Mr. Speaker, further investigation of this matter indicates that Miss Devlin arranged this so-called speaking tour

where she advocated the overthrow of the governments by revolution through the American Program Bureau, a U.S. corporation, located in Boston, Mass.

I have inquired as to what has been done with the money she has collected and whether or not it is subject to the scrutiny of the Internal Revenue Service.

I am now advised by the Internal Revenue that they have instructed the American Program Bureau to withhold 30 percent of Miss Devlin's fees to be paid to this country the same as any American citizen would be required to do who receives honorariums for speaking.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to follow this up, and it will be quite revealing to ascertain just exactly how much money Miss Devlin will collect for the purpose of advocating the overthrow of governments in the entire world.

## INEQUITIES OF OUR TAX LAWS

### HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine, Mr. Cyril Bell, has recently written me concerning retirement income credit features of our tax laws. Mr. Bell points out that inequities of this law result in tax breaks for many who are well able to pay, while offering those who truly need tax credits far too little relief. I share Mr. Bell's comments with my colleagues:

WALNUT CREEK, CALIF.,  
March 17, 1971.

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE,  
Member of Congress,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WALDIE: I read in the March 15, 1971, San Francisco Chronicle that 301 Americans with incomes of more than \$200,000—paid no income tax during 1969.

As you are aware over \$40 billions—about 20% of the U.S. Federal Government annual income—is lost every year to the Treasury in tax loopholes!

I will write more on these matters later but I wish to use them as a contrast for support of this request for legislation for the elderly.

I have two widow clients whose income tax I complete. One is financially independent and does not work. The other has to work to maintain her very modest way of life. They are both over sixty-five and under seventy-two. I am struck at how the wealthy one has a relief of \$229 in actual taxes for Retirement Income Credit, while the one who has to work does not get this credit. This would appear to be a clear case where a tax break is available for the non-productive wealthy American without the same tax break being available for the productive one. The only difference in their tax situations is that one can sit at home and "clip her coupons" (not even that work is necessary nowadays!) and the other works for her income!

Recent figures indicate that of all Americans reaching the age of sixty-five only 2% can retire on their own savings. This 1040-R Schedule should therefore be called Sch-R "Retirement Income Credit for the Wealthy".

I realize as time passes—and we live in what I call the age of "Accelerating Change"—the supposed rationales for legislation evaporate entirely. I would suggest this case is a perfect example.

I am enclosing sample Federal Income Tax returns (Forms 1040 and Sch. R) for imaginary taxpayers who do not represent any of my clients. The figures on the forms are collected from imaginary sets of figures but could conceivably be the exact figures of two of the hundred million taxpayers filing returns.

As you will see the only difference in the income tax returns is the source of the income and yet—

Mrs. Part-Time Poor Worker pays (in income tax) .....	\$295
Mrs. Able-Bodied Retired pays only (in income tax) .....	66
Difference in actual income tax paid .....	229

With so many vast tax breaks allowed for the wealthy I do think the above situation should not be allowed to last another year.

I would respectfully suggest that a Bill should be presented to both houses of Congress eliminating Schedule R (1040) entirely with all its nonsensical and petty restrictions. A new law should allow a straight \$400.—to be deducted for each individual over sixty-two, from his income tax due on his taxable income, whatever its source.

This reduction of actual tax should be called "Retirement Age Income Credit" and could be shown on Form 1040, line 52 without attaching any Schedule. In fact, line 52 should read: 52 Retirement Age Income Credit, 62 years & over enter \$400. Joint Returns—see instructions.

This "Retirement Age Income Credit" would be available to all Americans over sixty-two and not merely to the wealthy 2% of Americans over sixty-five, to which the current "Retirement Income Credit" primarily applies.

With a "Retirement Age Income Credit" of \$400.—available to those over sixty-two, the exemptions for sixty-five and over need not be touched.

The main point is to make a simple change from the current "Retirement Income Credit for the Wealthy" available to 2% of Americans over sixty-five to "Retirement Age Income Credit" available to a 100% of Americans over sixty-two.

To return to my first paragraph. It is time the wealthy started paying their fair share of the country's bills. With the poor needing help and the wealthy evading their responsibilities, it is the "Middle Income Group" that has paid this great country's bills. When the members of the "Middle Income Group" reach the age of sixty-two they thoroughly deserve a "Retirement Age Income Credit" of at least \$400.—reduction in taxes due, whatever the source of their income.

Congressman Waldie, I do hope that you can see your way to help in this matter. I am convinced that if you can get a bill passed in the U.S. House of Representatives and one started by a Democrat in the U.S. Senate to help the aged of the "Middle Income Group", only good can come to the country.

I do wish to thank you for the attention which you have given to my other letters.

Yours respectfully,

CYRIL BELL.

## SALVATION ARMY LOSES A PIONEER

### HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago, one of America's greatest military lead-

ers, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, passed away and was laid to rest amid the solemn pageantry of a state funeral, a tribute from 200 million people to a great patriot and soldier of freedom.

Many of us still remember the revered strains of the song, "Onward Christian Soldiers," as it was sung by kings and Presidents gathered to honor the memory of General Eisenhower. The sight and sound of their singing was a truly moving experience.

Earlier this month, on March 2, another old soldier, a Christian soldier, died after 60 years of service to his God and to his fellowman.

Brig. Julius Mack Satterfield, of Winston-Salem, a pioneer in the work of the Salvation Army, passed away at the age of 83.

A story appeared in the Twin City Sentinel in Winston-Salem that day, chronicling Brigadier Satterfield's many works of kindness and community service.

A portion of that story serves as a fitting epitaph to this great Christian soldier:

The soft-spoken, sympathetic North Carolina native dedicated his life to giving comfort and spiritual guidance to those who needed help—the transient, the downtrodden, the alcoholic, the child without a proper home.

I am sure my colleagues join with me in extending most sincere sympathy to Brigadier Satterfield's wife and family, with our thanks for his great contribution to the lives of countless Americans, and thus, to the Nation itself.

I am inserting the text of the aforementioned article in the RECORD at this time for the benefit of my colleagues and as an inspiration for all Americans:

## SALVATION ARMY LOSES A PIONEER

Brigadier Julius Mack Satterfield, 83, of 1288 Cloister Drive, who served as an officer of the Salvation Army for 60 years, died at 3 a.m. today at Forsyth Memorial Hospital.

He had been seriously ill a week. The soft-spoken, sympathetic North Carolina native dedicated his life to giving comfort and spiritual guidance to those who needed help—the transient, the downtrodden, the alcoholic, the child without a proper home.

A woman who knew them well said that he and his wife, who served with him throughout his ministry, "treat you like you are a lady or a gentleman" no matter what your station in life.

"You just don't talk about bums, hobos, deadbeats or tramps when they're around—anybody has a chance where they're concerned. They're always ready to help you, even after you make mistakes."

Brig. Satterfield, who often said "I'm a salvationist from the soles of my feet," was born in Charlotte on Aug. 4, 1887 to S. S. and Addie Kimble Satterfield. He attended public school and began serving in the Salvation Army as a soldier at age 14.

He married Augusta Hammond in Greensboro in 1907. Four years later he decided to give up his job as a plumber and she her job as a linotype operator to become probationary captains in the Salvation Army.

Following regulations of the army, they shared the same rank throughout their careers, being named brigadier, the highest rank that may be held by field officers, in 1947.

They came to Winston-Salem in 1938 after serving in New Bern, Charlotte, Spartanburg, S.C., Rome, Ga., and Lakeland and Jacksonville, Fla.



He officially retired in 1952, but continued as city commander, a post he held since 1941, until 1963. At that time, he and Mrs. Satterfield, who had lived in Salvation Army quarters for 52 years, moved to their home on Cloister Drive.

When Brig. Satterfield first came here, the Salvation Army consisted of a rundown citadel on Dacian Street in Southside and the corps headquarters on Second Street.

He opened a home for transients in the tobacco market section, organized a summer camp program for youngsters, built the Red Shield Boys Club on Stadium Drive, replaced the Dacian Street citadel with a trim new building and raised money for the Red Shield Girls Club.

The brigadier lived to see the fulfillment of one of the Salvation Army's biggest dreams with the opening this year of the new \$250,000 headquarters on South Marshall Street. But because of his health he was unable to attend its dedication last Sunday.

Even after his second "retirement," his slightly stooped, white-haired figure was a familiar sight in downtown Winston-Salem as he went about army business.

And he continued to take his turn each December at the Christmas Kettle on Fourth Street, as he had done for more than 30 years, raising funds for the needy.

The brigadier once said that he felt the couple's most outstanding work in Winston-Salem was the organization of the Boys Club.

"I still remember how we started—in the basement of our headquarters on 110 W. Second Street, with a donation of \$125 by the Kiwanis Club," he said. "We operated on a budget of something like \$7 or \$8 a week."

A reporter once asked him if he had ever been "really discouraged" in his work.

"Never," came the reply. "Maybe I'm too much the other way, because when I have a conviction I follow it through. God has told us, 'I will supply all your needs' and He has never failed me. Mind you, He didn't say He would supply all our wants."

"Oh, we've had some disappointments," he said, "but for each of these we've had a thousand happy hours of knowing we have helped others."

For his work, Brig. Satterfield received the Salvation Army's highest honor, The Order of the Founder, in 1954. In 1952, he became the first Salvation Army officer to receive the Silver Keystone award of the Boys Clubs of America.

"Fifty years ago," he said at a testimonial dinner in 1961, "I locked up my box of plumbers tools and started to serve God in the Salvation Army. I've never gone back and I never will."

"My service is not through yet, because when I signed the Articles of War, I promised 'I will be a true soldier until I die.' And brothers and sisters, when that happens, don't bring me any private clothes to dress up in—I've got a new uniform for the occasion."

Surviving are his wife of the home; two sons, Rigby C. Satterfield of 3756 Avera Avenue and Richard A. Satterfield of Lakeland, Fla.; four grandchildren and 10 great-grandchildren; a sister, Mrs. Emma Eller of Charlotte, and two brothers, E. B. and Register Satterfield, both of Charlotte.

The funeral will be conducted at 2:30 p.m. Wednesday at Volgers Main Street Chapel by Col. Gordon Swyers. Burial will be in Salem Cemetery.

The family will be at the funeral home from 7 to 9 p.m. today.

They requested that memorials be made to the Salvation Army Boys Club or Girls Club.

## SUGAR BEET GROWERS IN TROUBLE

### HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5981, which authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to establish feed grain bases for a small number of sugar beet growers, is of particular concern to me. One of the three sugar beet factories being closed down is located in my district in the community of Chaska, Minn.

Only about 30,000 acres of sugar beets were grown for processing at the Chaska plant. But the closing represents an enormous blow to the family farmers affected. They have invested thousands of dollars in expensive equipment to tend and harvest the beets, and now they are left without a market for what they grow. Some, of course, may be able to ship their production to other sugar beet plants in Iowa or the Red River Valley. But for at least some of the beet growers, long-distance shipping will be so uneconomical as to be out of the question.

I am sure the same situation applies with respect to the beet growers affected by the closing of processing facilities in West Jordan, Utah, and Hardin, Mont.

Unless Congress acts affirmatively, these growers and their families may well suffer extreme hardship.

That is why this legislation is before us today, and I urge your affirmative support. As pointed out in the Agriculture Committee report which accompanies this legislation to the floor, the bill would authorize the establishment of feed grain bases for sugar beet producers who formerly processed their beets at a processing plant which ceased operations after December 31, 1969.

It would further provide that the establishment of such feed grain base be conditional upon the production of the commodity on the base. The Secretary would be precluded from providing any farm with a feed grain base larger than the number of acres on that farm devoted to sugar beets in 1959-60.

Provision is made to protect against any possibility of dual benefits to eligible farmers. The report also makes plain that such a farm would not continue sugar beet production with respect to the number of acres for which a farmer receives a feed grain base under the legislation.

The feed grain base acreage would remain in effect in subsequent years. The Department of Agriculture estimates that if new feed grain bases are established for these acres previously in sugar beets, the additional set-aside payments would amount to about \$700,000 in fiscal year 1972.

Now I recognize that a few of my colleagues object to this legislation on grounds it may unfairly benefit sugar beet growers because they are not grain producers. But this is simply not ac-

curate. In years past, it is fair to say that nearly all these growers did grow feed grains, switching more heavily to beets as that industry grew. Furthermore, by using the 1959-60 period of sugar beet acreage, it is obvious that these growers stand to receive a more limited base than is enjoyed by numerous feed grains producers.

It has been suggested that a more reasonable way to assist these beet growers is to amend the sugar act, so that they may receive "abandonment" or "deficiency" payments to compensate them, in the same manner as if they had experienced a natural disaster. But this remedy could only be temporary in nature, and hardly meets the long-range problem of helping to secure a reasonable livelihood for them and their families. Additionally, the sugar act does not expire until this December 31, and it is unrealistic to expect action to help these growers until such time as the entire sugar law is revised. This would accordingly leave them without any opportunity to make sensible crop planning decisions in advance.

I would like to point out that the 30,000 acres of sugar beets that have been produced for processing at the Chaska plant is only an insignificant fraction of the total Minnesota feed grain base of 7,471,995 acres. What we are talking about, insofar as Minnesota is concerned, is only a possible four-thousandths of 1 percent of Minnesota's total feed grain base.

The Agriculture Committee, which has studied the problem carefully, is of the opinion that this legislation will not adversely affect the feed grain program. I share this view, and hope that the Congress will act quickly to remedy the plight of these beet growers who have been thrown out of business through no fault of their own.

## SPEECH OF F. F. WOLFF

### HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, last month, F. F. Wolff, chairman of the Committee of the London Metal Exchange, delivered a penetrating and incisive address to the Copper Club Dinner in New York. In his relatively brief remarks, Mr. Wolff provided a tour d'horizon of the present state of the copper market worldwide. He also gave those of us on this side of the Atlantic a unique insight into the workings of the London Metal Exchange.

Because of the timeliness and value of Mr. Wolff's speech, I am inserting it at this point in the Record under unanimous consent. And since Freddy Wolff is a close friend as well as a distant relative, it is a particular pleasure to bring his speech to the attention of my colleagues:

SPEECH TO BE GIVEN BY F. F. WOLFF, CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE LONDON METAL EXCHANGE, TO THE COPPER CLUB DINNER IN NEW YORK, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1971

As a "Limey" I feel particularly privileged to have been asked to address this most distinguished gathering, all of whom are experienced in the copper world. But firstly, let me thank you for your most generous hospitality. A certain eastern bloc president when speaking to the Kremlin recently was heard on the telephone saying, "Da da da nyet da da da." When asked by those listening to the conversation how he dared to say "No" even once to the Kremlin he replied, "Well, they asked me if I always had to say yes." For my part, I could not even say "No" once to your kind invitation.

I also take it as a great honour to the London Metal Exchange that I, as chairman of the committee, should be invited to speak tonight, especially as there are bound to be people here this evening, despite this enlightened age in which we live, who are critical of our market. I hope perhaps that after tonight some of the critics will have a fuller appreciation of the value of the London Metal Exchange to the copper trade throughout the world and that, as a pricing medium, our market offers the fairest and the soundest basis. We were all delighted to have listened to Simon Strauss' excellent speech at the London Metal Exchange dinner last year, and I very much appreciate the opportunity you have given me in speaking to you on your home ground and being able, so to speak, to play in both home and away matches.

It is my invariable custom to say something flattering to begin with so that I shall be excused if by any chance I put my foot in it later on!

The whole philosophy of our exchange is based on assisting the metal trade, and an intelligent and professional use of our market is of immense value to everyone concerned in any way with the mining, smelting, refining or fabricating of metals. An example of the way the copper trade throughout the world is becoming more directly involved in our activities is the interest displayed by Japan—a country which is fast becoming an increasingly important influence in the copper world—in the workings of the L.M.E. active in the purchase of raw materials to feed their expanding smelter and refined production, the Japanese have wisely made good use of the L.M.E. and it is interesting to note their statesmanlike approach to operations on the market, as evidenced by the opening of the Japanese metal centre in London.

Our contracts are under constant review in order that they may be of maximum assistance and value first and foremost to the trade. This is why we changed our old standard contract to separate cathode and electrolytic wirebar contracts, and also why we extended our delivery points to warehouses in Antwerp, Hamburg and Rotterdam.

Further changes may be introduced for the same reasons; I mentioned at the last London metal exchange dinner that we might, at some time in the future, and I repeat—in the future—have to change the main trading basis of our copper contract to one based on cathodes (and this, I am sure you will all appreciate, will mean only one price basis for cathodes!) the possibility of opening markets in new metals is under constant review. You may be interested to know my committee has only very recently approved in principle the idea of introducing an aluminum contract as soon as possible. We may also extend our warehousing facilities to other parts of the world, including possibly New York. Let me emphasize that these developments are not for the

benefit of the speculator. If we wished to go solely after Tom, Dick and Harry's business, (welcome though that may be, and my best wishes to any Toms, Dicks and Harrys here tonight), we would not have troubled to alter the contract basis.

Having stressed the commercial attractions of our market, I must make it clear that any terminal market, with the variety of facilities which it provides, must attract a volume of speculation. Whilst this can, in the short term, accentuate price movements or a particular trend, it does also impart a greater degree of flexibility to the market. Speculators cannot control the market for any length of time nor make the prices, but they do sometimes act as a buffer and help to prevent a "run-away" market, since they are always operating both ways and prepared to be buyers or sellers at a time of rapidly moving prices. Moreover, if producers were to use the L.M.E. more imaginatively, it would also help to level out violent fluctuations and if they would only allow consumers to sell their copper or lend their copper to the L.M.E. it might have prevented those large and sudden backwardations for limited periods which the market has suffered in the past and which are intensely disliked by all members of the L.M.E. as well as by all members of the copper trade.

Why is the London Metal Exchange being used as the world's pricing medium for copper outside the United States? The reason is that it is an international market used by organisations, including governments, throughout the globe from north to south, and east to west: including the Eastern Bloc countries. Orders pour in daily from the four corners of the earth through members of the London Metal Exchange. A large part of these orders result from the need for hedging operations by those fabricators and producers who wish to keep a balanced book, and by those wishing to establish definite prices on purchases or sales sooner than they might otherwise have been able to do. Moreover, by adroit use of the market, a fabricator can lessen the cost of his purchases, while a producer selling his output on long-term contracts at open pricing terms may be able to effect worthwhile and sometimes substantial savings in freight costs by arranging with his customer to accept a certain tonnage of L.M.E. copper and so divert a part of his own production to more accessible areas.

In mentioning orders pouring into the market from all over the globe, I can quote a recent example with our own firm, but the same would apply to the majority of ring dealing members. Twice recently, we had a visitor on the market: on the first occasion I was able to point out that we were dealing on behalf of clients from no fewer than eleven countries, and on the second occasion from nine countries.

All this serves to demonstrate what an international market the L.M.E. is becoming—I deliberately use the present tense since I firmly believe that this process of development—of internationalisation—is by no means over—and I restate my conviction that the L.M.E. should continue to serve as the pricing basis for copper traded internationally.

Simon Strauss, in his provocative speech at the L.M.E. dinner, gave as his main reason for expecting no change in the U.S. copper pricing structure that, I quote, "The large buyers and the large sellers do not want it!" Perhaps the buyers are in the position of never having tasted freedom and, therefore, do not know what they are missing. With regard to the sellers, I suppose fortunate indeed are they who can unilaterally fix prices and remain assured of a tied market.

But then it must be remembered that some circumstances in the U.S.A.—such as the de-

gree of vertical integration in your market—are different from those obtaining in the rest of the free world. However, I am sure my producer friends here tonight will agree that it is no exaggeration to say that the current level of the L.M.E. price is a factor in their deliberations when establishing their producer prices.

How much greater then has been the influence of these vital factors on the posted prices which have, from time to time, been imposed by producers or by producer governments outside the U.S.A. and which in the last analysis have always failed. I remain absolutely convinced that the fairest, indeed the only realistic way of determining the price of a commodity which is subject to fluctuating demand and seemingly inevitable interruptions in supply, is by a free market, and I can only repeat what I have said many times in the past that it is well-nigh impossible to defeat by artificial means the inexorable law of supply and demand. When Simon Strauss mentioned that U.S. buyers were against a change in the U.S. copper pricing structure, he went on to say, and I quote again, "they have a strong preference for a producer's price as compared to a price which changes twice daily." My knowledge of European consumers leads me to believe that they are far less concerned with a daily moving price than they are with continuity of supply. As Michel Feron said in his speech at the American metal market forum in London last autumn, "rationing is less acceptable to consumers than price instability, and the lack of availability makes the question of price stability almost theoretical."

Since the re-opening of the London metal exchange copper market in 1953, there have been attempts at a controlled price; however, free market influences have ultimately prevailed as they always will do and the lesson learnt by industry is that such attempts at control produces a multi price system which is detrimental to all concerned.

I am only too conscious that the present price level is causing concern and that a further fall of any magnitude could well mean hardship for the people of the CIPEC countries. However, I still feel strongly that they should continue to base their sales on the L.M.E. Any contrary action could well bring only short-lived benefits, and I believe that through the medium of the market they can add a flexibility to their operations: Thereby in the long run maximising the return from their sales.

Permanent control of the free market is only possible with unlimited funds, unlimited material, and dictatorial powers to control the rate of production on a worldwide basis. Has the international tin council scheme, working through a buffer pool and supported directly or indirectly by most of the world, really been successful? It has kept the price of tin within the agreed limits—limits which nevertheless have been amended more than once—at times when the imbalance of supply and demand has been containable. But at moments of extreme stress it has failed both upwards and downwards, and surely it is at these moments when such a scheme has to work: Otherwise it must be considered a failure.

Look at the recent example of nickel prices, when their inability to supply sufficient metal made the producer price almost meaningless, and in the absence of an organised terminal market, the outside price rose and fell by approximately \$12,500 per ton within less than one year: leaving in its wake numerous cancellations of contracts and firms unable to pay for metal bought at the top, especially among stainless steel manufacturers.

In looking to the future of supply and demand in the copper industry I can only echo the sentiments of experts, whose think-



March 29, 1971

ing is that between now and the middle 1970's supply is likely to remain in excess of demand but that this situation could be reversed during the second half of this decade. There is a lot of new production of copper coming on stream but with the increased demand from countries such as the peoples Republic of China, whose use of copper per capita is at present low, but will inevitably rise within the next few years, the increase in aggregate demand taken over all could be stronger than the experts predict. Many of my American friends appreciate the gigantic potential of the Chinese market. The London metal exchange being a world's market, must obviously take into consideration the importance of the inbuilt demand from China.

Certain guesstimates have it that China may have imported close to 100,000 tons in 1970—the bulk of it having been purchased during the first half of the period, and demand from this quarter has been quiet in recent months, no doubt partly for the same reason that other consumers have kept out of the market.

Possibly a more important factor is that only now are they said to be finalising the new five year plan, the completion and implementation of which could shortly make its impact felt. Whether they use the same tactics as before, or whether they increase direct links with producing countries, is their own affair: whatever they decide I am sure that their purchasing will be carried out with the same acumen that they have shown in the past.

In the foreseeable future, an expression Simon finds difficult to understand, and so do I for that matter, I cannot personally look for any significant rise in prices. But, of course, the copper market always has unexpected surprises round the corner—will there be a strike in the U.S.A., and for how long? Will there be any curtailment of production due to natural causes or to labour unrest elsewhere? Will there be an increase of political troubles in the Middle East or elsewhere? etc. etc.

From what I have said, you may well have assumed that I am biased in favour of the London Metal Exchange. You would be quite correct. But I am not alone. Last October at the American Market Forum in London, Mr. H. Grillo, managing director of Wilhelm Grillo Handelsgesellschaft and former president of the West German Non-ferrous Metal Industries Association, stated that, "Consumers in Germany prefer a competitive free market price which guarantees them a larger security for their own business."

I am delighted that the London Metal Exchange is used so extensively withing the Common Market and I foresee no problems should the United Kingdom join the E.E.C., indeed, such a move can only strengthen the international basis of our market.

Mr. G. S. Somerset, Deputy Director of the British Nonferrous Metals Foundation, in his paper on the "Economic Aspects of Copper Production, and Marketing Possibilities for Developing Countries" stated that, "the basic function of any pricing system is to equate supply and demand. It should do this at a price level which is high enough to encourage new investment in mining and yet not so high as to price the metal out of the market and drive off its customers to use substitutes. The London Metal Exchange is a free market used by almost every country in the world. It, therefore, reflects the conditions of supply and demand in the world."

I know that Simon does not accept the theory that high prices encourage new investment, but I believe there is a good deal of truth in it, and I have no doubt that many of the new mining projects under way were conceived in the expectation of adequate copper prices and a good return on money invested.

To sum up, therefore, surely a market

which reflects all known factors and which records constant changes in values is a fairer basis on which to trade than the arbitrary fixing of prices with little or no flexibility. Earlier on I suggested that U.S. buyers had not tasted freedom. I did not mean to imply that they were slaves, but perhaps manacled would not be far from the truth. To reduce the buying function to one of calling copper forward for delivery the following month at a price outside your control is surely to reduce all buyers to the same level. This compares unfavourably with the freedom of being able to choose any market day to price in line with precise information received from the sales division, and at the same time to use market expertise to derive additional profit.

To my mind these attributes outweigh the advantages claimed for a stable price—even assuming that "stable" is the right word to apply to a price which can be moved unilaterally and without warning.

Naturally, no system, however devised will be completely perfect; as economists will point out, perfect markets are textbook myths. Nevertheless, the L.M.E. has shown itself over the years to be responsible to all—I repeat all—sectors of the industry internationally, and does constitute the least imperfect medium, provided of course, and of this I am certain, that it continues to operate in a responsible and flexible manner.

#### TWA, SURGEON GENERAL SUPPORT NONSMOKERS RELIEF ACT

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, letters from across America continue to flood into my office in support of the Nonsmokers Relief Act I introduced on February 22.

In addition to encouragement from thousands of nonsmoking citizens who are deeply distressed over being forced to breathe smoke-polluted air, I have received support from U.S. Surgeon General Jesse L. Steinfeld, and from one of the Nation's largest air carriers, Trans World Airlines.

So far I have received only two letters in opposition to this legislation. The reason there is so little objection to this bill is, I believe, because my proposal would place no burden on the smoker. It does, however, provide relief for the nonsmoker—a heretofore silent majority which believes it, too, has rights.

My good friend, Senator EDWARD GURNEY, of Florida, has introduced similar legislation in the Senate.

H.R. 4776 would require the Secretary of Transportation to establish regulations for a protected area to be set aside on airliners, trains, and buses for nonsmoking passengers.

All indications are that, while my proposal may cause some inconvenience, the transportation industry can easily learn to live with it. TWA's experience clearly shows that providing nonsmoking sections can be of considerable benefit to a carrier.

Here, for the consideration of my colleagues, are the communications I received from the Surgeon General and TWA:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,  
EDUCATION AND WELFARE,  
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1971.

Hon. C. W. BILL YOUNG,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your letter of February 25, enclosing your bill, which would seek to protect travellers from being forced to experience the tobacco smoke of others. As you know, I feel strongly that we should seek to accomplish this and I applaud your interest in the problem.

The Public Health Service is in the process of developing an assessment of the effect of tobacco smoke from other people's smoking on the nonsmokers and I will, of course, see that you receive this when it is published.

In the meantime, I am enclosing a bibliography on the subject which may be useful to you.

Please let me know if I can be of further help.

Sincerely yours,  
JESSE L. STEINFELD, M.D.,  
Surgeon General.

TRANS WORLD AIRLINES, INC.,  
Washington, D.C., March 24, 1971.

Hon. C. W. BILL YOUNG,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have noted with interest your introduction of HR-4776 which would require the Secretary of Transportation to establish regulations for non-smoking areas on board interstate carriers.

In July of 1970, TWA announced that it was initiating a program to provide for smoking and non-smoking sections on board its aircraft. Since that time the program has met with considerable success and wide acceptance by our passengers.

You are to be commended for your efforts in this regard.

With best wishes,  
Sincerely,

RICHARD S. TRIBBE,  
Vice President, Federal and Civic Affairs.

#### PASSENGER REACTION TO NO-SMOKING SECTIONS FAVORABLE, TWA REPORTS

NEW YORK.—In the past six months Trans World Airlines has received hundreds of letters complimenting the carrier for being the first to offer non-smoking sections on all of its aircraft.

"We began separating smokers and non-smokers in February, 1970, with our inauguration of Boeing 747 service," said Blaine Cooke, TWA's senior vice president of marketing.

"By July 1, 1970, no-smoking sections were set aside in each of our 238 jet aircraft, in accordance with a resolution adopted by the American Medical Association's House of Delegates," he added.

"Since then, TWA has received hundreds of letters hailing our move," Mr. Cooke said.

Under TWA's system, both first class and coach sections of every aircraft provide at least one no-smoking area. Passengers advise gate agents of their preference for smoking or no-smoking sections and are seated accordingly.

#### NATIONAL WEEK OF CONCERN FOR PRISONERS OF WAR/MISSING IN ACTION

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1971

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in observ-

ing the National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action. I supported the House passage of House Joint Resolution 16 on March 3 to set aside this week as a means of focusing national and world opinion on the plight of American servicemen who are being detained by the Republic of North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam.

North Vietnam is a signatory to the 1949 Geneva Convention Accord on Prisoners of War and as a signatory it has a responsibility to: identify all prisoners of war within a week of capture; to allow periodical inspection of prisoner-of-war camps by impartial parties; to release prisoners of war who are seriously ill or injured; to allow a free flow of mail between prisoners and their families. To date, the government of North Vietnam has not fulfilled its responsibilities under any of these provisions. It has shown contempt and disdain for the prisoners and their families and for worldwide public opinion.

In this session of Congress I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 220 providing for a congressional protest against the treatment of U.S. servicemen held prisoner by North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam. My resolution calls upon North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front to comply with the requirements of the Geneva Convention, and approves and endorses efforts by the U.S. Government, the United Nations, the International Red Cross, and other leaders and peoples of the world to obtain humane treatment and release of American prisoners of war.

I insert the text of my resolution in the Record at this point:

#### CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Whereas more than one thousand four hundred members of the United States Armed Forces are prisoners of war or missing in action in Southeast Asia; and

Whereas North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam have refused to identify all prisoners they hold, to allow impartial inspection of camps, to permit free exchange of mail between prisoners and their families, to release seriously sick or injured prisoners, and to negotiate seriously for the release of all prisoners and thereby have violated the requirements of the 1949 Geneva Convention on prisoners of war, which North Vietnam ratified in 1957; and

Whereas the United States has continually observed the requirements of the Geneva Convention in treatment of prisoners of war; and

Whereas the Ninety-first Congress formally condemned by resolution the uncivilized treatment of prisoners of war by the North Vietnamese; and

Whereas the United States Government has repeatedly appealed to North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front to comply with the provisions of the Geneva Convention: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress strongly protests the treatment of United States servicemen held prisoner by North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam, calls on them to comply with the requirements of the Geneva Convention, and approves and endorses efforts by the United States Government, the United Nations, the International Red Cross,

and other leaders and peoples of the world to obtain humane treatment and release of American prisoners of war.

#### GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION: TOUGH GOING

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal recently carried an article which provides vivid illustration of the ineffectiveness and waste that can result from the current scrambled and diffuse organizational structure of the Federal departments. In his message on departmental reorganization, the President listed the possibility that uncoordinated agencies may work at cross purposes as one of the most important undesirable consequences of the current system. This article by Burt Schorr of the Journal's Washington Bureau concerns just such an instance; in this case, the expenditure of nearly \$20 million by the Bureau of Reclamation for a water reservoir system that was rendered inoperative by projects of the Soil Conservation Service further upstream.

The point of this episode is not that certain individuals or agencies are deserving of blame; as President Nixon said in his message: "the ineffectiveness of government is not a matter of men or money. It is principally a matter of machinery." I believe that the President's reorganization plan could provide for the needed restructuring of the governmental machinery that will make it possible for us to avoid further developments like that of the Foss Reservoir. By placing all water resource functions within one agency of a single department, I am confident that we will have taken a major step toward ending the all-too-frequent situations in which one arm of the Government is doing precisely the opposite of that being done by another arm. I commend this article to all of my colleagues and include it at this point in the Record:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 26, 1971]

#### GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION: TOUGH GOING (By Burt Schorr)

WASHINGTON.—If President Nixon needs to dramatize the Cabinet reorganization proposal he sent Congress yesterday, a photograph of western Oklahoma's Foss Reservoir would serve perfectly.

A decade ago the Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation formed the reservoir by throwing an earthen dam across the upper Washita River. To carry the water to four thirsty Oklahoma towns, the bureau also constructed a 55-mile underground aqueduct and pumping system. Overall, Washington's investment totals more than \$20 million (although a bit more than a third of this was to be recovered through water purchases).

Today, Foss Dam stands sturdy, the distribution system is being maintained in tip-top condition and the lake, while 80% smaller than anticipated, sparkles nevertheless amid the gently rolling hills. All is serene—except for one problem.

Foss Reservoir water is undrinkable.

The lake, it seems, is loaded with minerals, and conventional filtering and softening methods can overcome neither the "dissolved solids"—or the obnoxious taste—nor the undesirable effects of the Epsom salts," as an official of the local agency that was supposed to market the water complained to Congress several years back. A \$1.5 million desalination plant has been proposed as a solution. Meanwhile, the aqueduct remains dry, and beyond some minor irrigation use, the lake's chief value has been to migrating water fowl.

#### BUNGLED PLANNING

Laying out \$20 million for a drink of Epsom salts is sad enough. But Foss Reservoir is an especially galling example of bungled planning: It is a story of two federal agencies at cross-purposes.

In the early 1950s, while the Bureau of Reclamation was still studying the project's feasibility (urged on by Oklahoma's late Sen. Robert Kerr, a powerful friend of big dams), the Agriculture Department's Soil Conservation Service was already building small flood-control dams on Washita tributary streams upriver. Ultimately, 204 of these dams were erected at a federal cost of \$6 million. And nobody can say they haven't worked.

Indeed, the reclamation people believe, the small dams are the major reason that the flow into Foss Reservoir has been only a third of that projected. (Dry weather is another reason.) The water blocked by the upstream dams, moreover, is of a higher quality than that available from other parts of the reservoir watershed. This aggravates the taste and purification problem.

Clearly, Foss Reservoir is the kind of thing the President's Council on Executive Reorganization, headed by Roy L. Ash, chairman of Litton Industries Inc., had in mind when it said federal water resources development suffered from "interagency rivalry, duplicative planning and conflicting policies." The council's proposed remedy: Gather water responsibilities now vested in three tradition-encrusted departments—Agriculture, Interior and the Army (Corps of Engineers)—into a new Department of Natural Resources.

This and other recommendations contained in the 160-page Ash Council report, completed last fall, have become the foundation for the government-wide reform envisioned by Mr. Nixon. Congress willing, Mr. Nixon would forge four super departments from the present Departments of Agriculture, Labor, Commerce, Interior, Transportation, Housing and Urban Development and Health, Education and Welfare, plus lesser assorted pieces of the federal bureaucracy.

"Over the years we have added departments and created agencies at the federal level, each to serve a new constituency, to handle a particular task—and these have grown and multiplied in what has become a hopeless confusion of form and function," Mr. Nixon said in his State of the Union message. "The time has come to match our structure to our purpose—to look with a fresh eye, to organize the government by conscious, comprehensive design to meet the new needs of a new era."

The congressional response, however, hasn't been the one Mr. Nixon was looking for. At this point, it can be described as overwhelmingly negative, if not actively hostile. "Grandiose in concept, monstrous in scope and impossible of achievement," is the way one senior House Democrat whose support is crucial recently described the proposal to a White House staffer.

Another Capitol Hill heavyweight, Sen. John C. Stennis, doesn't like the idea of the new Department of Natural Resources either. He sternly warned the other day that transferring some or all of the Corps of Engineers from the Department of Defense to the intended DNR "strikes at the vitals of our national defense posture." Vagaries of metaphor notwithstanding, Mr. Stennis' words



aren't to be taken lightly; the Mississippi Democrat commands the powerful Armed Services Committee and heads the Public Works Appropriations subcommittee. The latter parcels Corps dams and other pork barrel projects that benefit nearly every congressional district.

#### A THREAT TO CONGRESS

The Hill resistance to reorganization certainly reflects some genuine concern that creating still larger Washington bureaucracies may actually make federal programs less responsive to national needs. But a number of Senators and Congressmen undoubtedly see the Nixon plan as a threat to their power bases. "Seniority arrangements that have been worked out over the years suddenly would have to be realigned. This would shake up every committee of Congress," observes one lobbyist in frequent contact with members of the Southern Democratic bloc that largely dominates Congress.

The special constituencies of departments marked for extinction—notably farm organizations and labor unions—are no less concerned about losing influence. In a recent newsletter, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association razed Mr. Nixon for arguing that carving Agriculture into four superdepartments would mean four Cabinet members speaking up for farmers, rather than only one.

Asked the newsletter. Why stop at four? Why not split Agriculture into eight departments? "Think of it. Eight voices speaking up to the White House about the troubles of farmers, none of them really knowing anything about rural problems, but all of them using good grammar."

Though they were almost radical departments in their time, the Rural Electrification Administration, the Forest Service (both also in Agriculture), the Soil Conservation Service the Corps and the independent Atomic Energy Commission all have acquired an almost untouchable sanctity over the decades. Their dug-in positions are defended, moreover, by a fast-moving reaction force of lobbyists as well as strategically located congressional committee chairmen.

One is Democratic Rep. Chet Holifield of Los Angeles County, a leading AEC crusader. In Congress for 24 years, Mr. Holifield worries that placing the government nuclear-power activities in the Natural Resources superdepartment might allow coal and oil interests to sabotage development of atomic power. Whether this argument is valid or not, Mr. Holifield couldn't be in a better position to see that transfer never happens; he's chairman of the House Government Operations Committee through which all reorganization bills must move.

Actually, only one of Mr. Nixon's proposed changes, a Department of Community Development, is judged to have even faint prospects of passage—principally because it would consist mainly of the present Department of Housing and Urban Development and thus is calculated to provoke the least controversy. Nixon aides say that in an effort to salvage something in the current session, the President might settle for a DCD alone if he could get it. (Some Hill staffers believe, though, that no action on reorganization is possible at all until after the 1972 election, and then only of Mr. Nixon wins.)

Still, one can argue that the aspect of Mr. Nixon's plan that makes the most sense is the proposed Department of Natural Resources. For when natural resource agencies negotiate as equals from behind the parapets of their separated departments, a Foss Dam is only one of many possible boondoggles. Consider these equally depressing intragovernmental tangles cited by the Ash Council:

—The Soil Conservation Service is straightening and deepening streams in Southern states to control floods, while Interior Department men deplore the toll the work is taking of fish and wildlife populations.

—Authority over non-military public lands is shared by four agencies in two departments; federal recreation areas are administered by five separate agencies in three departments. (One consequence: a series of occasionally bitter struggles between the Forest Service and Interior's National Park Service over how and by whom newly designated wilderness and recreation areas will be administered. "Every time there's a proposal to make a park out of forest lands, there's a disagreement," says a Park Service official.)

—In Kansas, an existing Bureau of Reclamation project is threatened by a proposed upstream watershed development by the Soil Conservation Service. In Montana, the Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation are studying separate projects for the same site.

—Energy programs are scattered among several departments and agencies, the Ash report notes, "with no single agency charged with developing a unified approach to energy resource utilization and conservation." (Total federal outlays for development of nuclear power generation now approach \$3 billion, dwarfing the research spending for gasification of coal, say, or commercial uses of shale oil—an imbalance that soon could prove costly to U.S. energy consumers as world petroleum demand soars.)

To mute inter-agency conflicts and to try to eliminate duplication of effort, a mysterious and ubiquitous Washington institution has emerged, the Interagency Committees. The Ash Council counted some 850 of them, though many apparently haven't met for years. The committees can produce compromises, but are the compromises really in the public interest? The history of one super interagency structure, the Water Resources Council, suggests that the answer is often no.

Congress established the Council six years ago; membership today includes the Secretaries of Interior, Agriculture, Army, HEW, Transportation and the chairman of the Federal Power Commission. Its mission: Improve Washington leadership and coordination of government water planning and construction programs. Part of the task has involved supervision of 28 comprehensive federal-state studies of major river basins, studies reckoned to cost federal taxpayers about \$95 million in all.

#### SPLITTING UP THE TERRITORY

Now some basin study critics argue that the entire effort has largely been a waste of money and time. One of them should know: He's Council Director W. Don Maughan, a Nixon appointee who took over in mid-1969 (too late to have any impact on the basin work being done by interagency field committees). In Mr. Maughan's view the final basin reports are proving to be little more than formal agreements between federal water agencies not to intrude on each other's territory—that is, so many flood control structures for the Corps, so many dams for reclamation, so much land treatment by the Soil Conservation Service, with everybody living happily ever after.

What has been overlooked, Mr. Maughan believes, is the possibility, for example, that a basin or two might get along without any more big dams or without any more irrigation projects. "Nearly all the money's been spent and we don't have all the alternatives," he complains.

Could it have come out any other way? Probably not, considering that Congress deliberately chose to let each agency budget its own share of the basin study funds. Not surprisingly, some had much greater success with their respective appropriations subcommittees than others, creating an imbalance of basin study inputs. More important, the procedure left the Council almost powerless to force new thinking on case-hardened agency officials.

"Unless you hold the purse strings, indi-

vidual agencies tend to build up their own programs," one veteran water program man on the Council staff concludes.

Control of the purse strings, of course, is what reorganization is really all about, and apprehension about losing control is the reason that the most logical reorganization plans often get nowhere.

#### INEQUITIES IN THE NIXON REVENUE-SHARING PLAN

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, Mayor John Canfield, the distinguished mayor of Dearborn Heights, Mich., has recently indicated that he is beginning to see through the Nixon administration's revenue-sharing smoke-screen. As more information on this plan becomes available, I am confident that more local officials will reach similar conclusions.

In his comments before the delegates to the Legislative Conference of the National League of Cities and the United Conference of Mayors, Mayor Canfield points out some of the more apparent inequities which appear when this illogical scheme is applied to communities located in Wayne County, the largest county in Michigan. A careful appraisal of this analysis indicates that the true Republican philosophy is inherent in the Nixon revenue-sharing proposal—the rich get richer and the poor remain poor.

I am inserting a copy of this statement in the RECORD, and I would urge all my colleagues to study carefully the excellent analysis which is included at the conclusion of Mayor Canfield's remarks. The statement and analysis follow:

STATEMENT BY MAYOR JOHN L. CANFIELD

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: The prime purpose of this Conference, if I understand it right, is to discuss the question of Revenue Sharing at the Federal level with local Communities throughout the United States.

When this issue first came to the forefront a few years ago, it was a generally accepted idea that the Revenue Sharing should be based on a population basis primarily because we are talking about sharing a Federal Income Tax which is paid by the people throughout the country.

It is impossible for me to know what is happening in all parts of the Country but based on newspaper reports and the reports from the Congressman in my District, if the President's proposal were enacted into law, in many instances in Wayne County, Michigan, the rich Communities would get richer and the poor Communities would get poorer.

I am not just talking about the Central City but have compiled a list of most Communities in Wayne County which indicates the vast range of inequities that exist under this proposal. I assume that if this is true in Wayne County, Michigan, it is probably true in Cook County, Illinois, and in all of the other cities across the Nation.

As you can see by the table in Wayne County, the range is from \$1.20 per capita in Sumpter Township, which is one of the poorest communities in Wayne County, to a high of \$40.15 per capita in Highland Park, Michigan. In the case of the City of Dearborn, the per capita would be \$20.25, and in the City of Dearborn Heights, which is my home base, it would be \$4.65 per capita.

Approximately 70% of the income of the City of Dearborn is derived from an industrial tax base while in Dearborn Heights it is only 15%.

I submit to you that this is one of the greatest inequities that has ever perpetuated against the people of America unless it is the case of the Farm Aid Plan where millionaire farmers are made multi-millionaires.

I have attended most of the Conferences of these two great Organizations in recent years and I read with dismay that the League of Cities and the Conference of Mayors are taking credit for the President's proposal.

I urge the Delegates of this Conference to continue to press for Revenue Sharing but to absolutely insist that the inequities in this law are not put into effect.

Yes, Dearborn Heights needs the \$371,005 that we would get under this plan. We are in dire need of money with a population of 80,000 and a low tax base, but I cannot idly sit by and receive this \$371,005 while our sister City of Dearborn with a population of 104,199 receives \$2,113,705 when they are now trying to figure out how to spend their money.

Again, I urge that we oppose the proposal as it now stands.

#### CITIES AND TOWNSHIPS IN WAYNE COUNTY, MICH.

Cities	Federal revenue sharing amount	1970 census figure	Per capita
Allen Park.....	\$225,711	40,747	\$5.50
Garden City.....	160,482	41,864	3.80
Inkster.....	193,215	38,595	5.00
Lincoln Park.....	332,974	52,984	6.25
Melvindale.....	88,660	13,862	6.40
Wayne.....	229,126	21,054	10.85
Dearborn Heights City.....	371,005	80,069	4.65
Westland.....	190,389	86,749	2.20
Canton Township.....	36,853	11,026	3.30
Huron Township.....	18,015	8,030	2.25
Pomulus Township.....	61,108	22,879	2.70
Sumpter Township.....	9,773	8,091	1.20
Taylor Township.....	252,086	70,020	3.60
Van Buren Township.....	160,247	13,162	12.15
Dearborn.....	2,113,705	104,199	20.25
Detroit.....	24,901,847	1,511,482	16.45
Grosse Pointe City.....	104,437	6,637	15.70
Grosse Pointe Farms.....	135,992	11,701	16.60
Grosse Pointe Park.....	109,736	15,585	7.10
Grosse Pointe Woods.....	129,752	21,878	5.95
Highland Park.....	1,423,148	35,444	40.15

#### MUD FOR A MONUMENT

### HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, the attacks against law enforcement in general and the FBI and its Director, J. Edgar Hoover, in particular, continue to be heard from various sources. The distinguished editor in chief of the Hearst newspapers, William Randolph Hearst, Jr., in a recent column entitled "Mud for a Monument," very effectively summarized and put into proper perspective some of these charges. His column appeared in the March 14, 1971, issue of the News American of Baltimore, Md., and I think it would be beneficial for all of my colleagues to read this column. I, therefore, insert Mr. Hearst's column in the RECORD at this point:

#### MUD FOR A MONUMENT

NEW YORK.—Although the 1972 presidential election is a long 20 months ahead, hot political winds already are gusting across the land as Democratic White House hope-

fuls step up their search for vote-getting issues and campaign cash.

To date, and for compelling reasons of strategy, the hottest and most extreme blasts have emanated from Sen. George S. McGovern. Because he must overcome the Muskie steamroller to have a chance, he became the first to declare his candidacy—in January—and has been running desperately since.

In attempting to outdistance his still undeclared potential rivals, South Dakota's champion dove on Vietnam already has established himself as number one war critic of the pack. None could possibly surpass his election promise of a total and immediate American withdrawal.

My disgust over this position—which amounts to nothing less than abject surrender to Communism in Southeast Asia—has been voiced here before and there is no point in repeating it. The point to be noted is that the war is inevitably going to be a primary campaign issue in the months ahead.

This is as it should be. Vietnam is a legitimate campaign issue if there ever was one. And Sen. McGovern has a perfectly legitimate right to take any position he wants, no matter how reckless and harmful it might be.

The same cannot be said for another issue he has injected into the 1972 race. Thanks to Sen. McGovern, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover—if he stays in the post he has held since 1942—again is assured of becoming the political football he was in 1968.

Mr. Hoover, now 76, became a target because of his age and because of his eminence as a symbol of law, order and old-fashioned Americanism. The latter was anathema for the liberals. A critical pronouncement about the FBI and its head thus became a required act of faith for them in the 1968 campaign.

It was a phony and illegitimate issue then and it remains so now that McGovern has resurrected it.

What is tragic about the situation, is that the world-famous FBI—zealously built by Mr. Hoover during the terms of eight Presidents—faces a new barrage of the scurrilous partisan attacks which have done so much serious and possibly irreparable damage.

It is doubly tragic that this damage to its prestige has been especially noteworthy among the young people of our nation—the generation which will be influencing Congress and paying the nation's bills before long.

For the benefit of those coming in late—or who may not have been paying close attention—here is how Sen. McGovern has succeeded in re-establishing Mr. Hoover and the FBI as prime targets for forthcoming Democratic campaign criticism.

He started out by demanding a Senate inquiry into the resignation under pressure of John F. Shaw, an FBI agent who wrote a letter that included some criticism of Mr. Hoover. Subsequently, on March 1, the Senator made headlines by inserting in The Congressional Record an Anonymous letter he said came from 10 unhappy agents of the bureau.

Like the Shaw letter, the anonymous communication charged that the FBI director is a sternly demanding boss who tolerates no disobedience or criticism from his agents—a charge that certainly is true enough.

Throughout his long and distinguished career, J. Edgar Hoover always has imposed rigid discipline on his men. The total lack of any scandal in the ranks—ever—is a measure of his success in keeping unsullied the FBI motto: "Fidelity, Bravery, Integrity."

Over the years—as today—there, of course, always have been some agents unable to adjust to the necessity for such high standards. Yet the level of morale generally re-

mains as high as the standards. Some 62 per cent of the special agents on the rolls as of April 1, 1969, had been with the FBI for 10 years or longer.

This fact speaks loudly and clearly to any impartial observer. Yet it obviously was no concern of Sen. McGovern when he inserted the anonymous letter of criticism into The Congressional Record—along with his own comment that Mr. Hoover has "an overbearing concern for the FBI's public image."

As might be expected, responsible FBI officials were outraged by the publicity the Senator got through his act and comment. A total of 21 senior FBI officers subsequently wrote to him, denouncing him as an irresponsible, reprehensible opportunist.

The strongest came from Clyde Tolson, the bureau's veteran associate director. It said, in part:

"I term you an opportunist because it is no small coincidence that you have singled out a man of Mr. Hoover's national stature for attack at a time when waves of publicity are urgently needed to buoy your political career."

"You are not the first person I have encountered during 30 years in Washington whose ambition has far exceeded his ability, and I cannot help wonder how many other esteemed career public servants will be maligned and abused before your political balloon runs out of hot air."

The Tolson letter, as Sen. McGovern declared later, may well have "exceeded the bounds of proper comment by a high government official."

Considering the provocation, however—and particularly the irresponsibility of Senator McGovern in publicizing an unsigned communication throwing mud on a monument of integrity—I think I would have used even stronger language had I been Mr. Tolson.

It is impossible in this space even to summarize adequately the tremendous, 47-year record of Mr. Hoover and the FBI. It covers too varied a field of successful investigations of gangsters and kidnappings in the 30s, through Nazi espionage in World War II, and up to the present through Communist subversion, civil rights strife, city rioting and the plots of anarchy.

Headlines aside, the best proof of FBI effectiveness is the extremely high percentage of convictions it marks up in cases based on its investigations.

According to the Congressional Quarterly, in fiscal 1968 such convictions were obtained against 97.3 per cent of persons brought to trial during that year. And of the 13,059 convictions that year, 11,190 (or 95.7 per cent) were on guilty pleas; the rest following trials before judge or jury.

"These percentages," notes the eminently reliable Congressional Quarterly, "were typical of other years."

It is not the FBI and its director who need any justification. What cries out for any kind of justification are the shockingly unfair attacks of such short-sighted, self-serving politicians as Geroge McGovern.

The only possibly valid criticism that could be directed at J. Edgar Hoover would have to be based on his advanced age. And so far as anyone knows he is remarkably sound in both mind and body.

In a word, there is no justification whatever for the mud slinging—either in or out of a political campaign.

J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI have done nothing to deserve castigation. The exact opposite is true.

Politicians who go around seeking votes by knocking honorable men and their accomplishments make me literally sick at heart.

It is small wonder that so many of our youngsters are growing up with the idea that the whole establishment of our society is no good.



THE COST OF VIETNAM—920,028 DEATHS; \$115 BILLION TO AMERICAN TAXPAYERS

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, William McGaffin, of the Chicago Daily News Washington bureau, has performed a notable public service by compiling for his readers a tabulation of what the Vietnam conflict has cost.

Mr. McGaffin's report is journalism at its finest and deserves the careful attention of every Member of Congress as well as every American.

I am placing Mr. McGaffin's report in the RECORD today, and at the same time renewing my plea to President Nixon to impose a moratorium on any further shipment of American replacement troops to Vietnam.

On February 2, of this year I introduced House Joint Resolution 258 which calls for such a moratorium.

Under my proposal, the United States would not replace American troops being rotated home at the conclusion of their 1-year tour of duty. In 1 year, there would be no American troops in Vietnam.

I believe the Chicago Daily News article prepared by Mr. McGaffin provides the best argument for my proposal.

There are a number of proposals being discussed among House Members for American troop withdrawal from Vietnam, but none of these proposals addresses itself to the fact that regardless of which formula we use, we will continue sending to Vietnam more than 20,000 troops a month.

After we complete the present reduction phase on May 1 of this year, we will still have 285,000 troops left in Vietnam. After that date, through the normal 1-year rotation policy, we will be bringing back home 24,000 troops every month and replacing them with 24,000 being sent to Vietnam.

There are reports that President Nixon plans to announce on April 15 that we will be reducing our troop commitment to Vietnam by 16,000 a month beginning May 1.

At this rate, even with the stepped-up rate of reductions, we will still continue to send 8,000 troops to Vietnam a month or 100,000 a year for an indefinite period.

I have introduced House Joint Resolution 258 to approach this whole problem of disengagement from a different direction. My resolution calls for a moratorium effective immediately on all shipments of replacement troops to Vietnam. Under my proposal, as troops are rotated back home upon completion of their 1-year tour of duty, they would not be replaced and troops in Vietnam would be consolidated into new units as they are now being consolidated under the present monthly reduction policy.

Under my proposal, the attrition provided by rotation would lead to a total removal of our American troops within 12 months.

More important, I have reason to believe that a moratorium on shipment of fresh troops to Vietnam would open up a new dimension for the peace talks in Paris and hopefully bring about not only a cease-fire, but an exchange of POW's.

Mr. McGaffin's excellent article follows. I am also including a copy of House Joint Resolution 258 following the article. I hope the House will give careful consideration to my proposal in the wake of Mr. McGaffin's startling disclosure.

The articles follow:

[Chicago Daily News, Mar. 27, 1971]

THE COST OF VIETNAM: 920,028 DEATHS;  
\$115 BILLION TO UNITED STATES  
53,771 YANKS HAVE BEEN KILLED

(By William McGaffin)

WASHINGTON.—The Vietnam War has resulted in the deaths of more than 900,000 persons and has cost the American taxpayer \$115 billion.

It has, in addition, disrupted the lives of 2,855,700 young Americans who have served in Indochina and Thailand since 1965—the year that Vietnam became an American war.

These are some of the figures made available by the Defense Department in response to a request by Sen. George McGovern (D-S.D.). McGovern's request was prompted by a series of questions sent to him by Harry R. Booth, a prominent Chicago attorney.

In what is believed to be the most comprehensive accounting ever provided by the Pentagon about the magnitude of the war, it is acknowledged that the death toll from the start in 1960 has reached 920,028.

This breaks down as follows:

American soldiers, 53,771.

South Vietnamese soldiers, 131,995.

South Vietnamese civilians, 26,700.

Allied soldiers, 4,282.

Enemy soldiers, 703,280.

Of the 53,771 American deaths, 44,518 were killed or died from wounds resulting from enemy action. The other 9,253 were soldiers who died in airplane and helicopter accidents and from other causes that were not the result of enemy action.

In addition, the war has resulted in the wounding of nearly 900,000 persons, the Pentagon report revealed. This figure does not include any estimate of enemy wounded, which is not available.

It does show that 294,414 American servicemen, 20,211 allied troops, 320,970 South Vietnamese soldiers and 252,000 South Vietnamese civilians were wounded. These add up to 877,595.

The South Vietnamese civilian figures probably are on the conservative side. Those figures were supplied by the South Vietnam government.

The 26,700 civilian deaths reported by Saigon were those caused by enemy terrorist attacks. No figures were made available on the number of civilians killed by American forces. The 252,000 wounded were only those admitted to hospitals from 1967 through 1970.

The number of American servicemen in Vietnam at any one time has never been more than about 530,000. By May 1, the American strength is scheduled to be down to 284,000.

But each draftee and many regular soldiers have served only one year there. Because of the numbers required to replace them, the number of Americans who served in Vietnam from Jan. 1, 1965 through Sept. 30, 1970, was 2,885,700.

The Army, as might be expected, has supplied the lion's share—1,522,800 men. The rest came from the Navy and Coast Guard, 450,000; Marine Corps, 430,100; and Air Force 452,800.

Vietnam is only one place in the Pacific where the United States has military personnel on duty. On Feb. 18, for example, there were 330,600 in Vietnam and 168,000 in Okinawa, the Philippines, Formosa, Japan and Korea.

The \$115 billion cost of the war to the United States included only \$100 million in fiscal 1965.

In fiscal 1966, the cost went up to \$5.8 billion. In fiscal 1967, it jumped to \$20.1 billion. In fiscal 1968, it hit \$26.5 billion. It reached a peak of \$28.8 billion in fiscal 1969. And in fiscal 1970 it declined to \$23.2 billion.

The Pentagon estimates that by June 30, when fiscal 1971 ends, the United States will be funding the war at the rate of approximately \$14.5 billion a year.

H.J. RES. 258

(Urging the President of the United States not to send any United States Armed Forces to Vietnam after March 1, 1971, and for other purposes)

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the sense of Congress that, after March 1, 1971, the President of the United States shall not send any United States Armed Forces to Vietnam. No law, rule, or regulation in effect on the date of enactment of this resolution shall be amended or modified to authorize the extension of a tour of duty with respect to any member of the United States Armed Forces assigned to duty in Vietnam on such date of enactment.

Further, it is the sense of Congress that as present United States troops in Vietnam are rotated at the conclusion of their one-year tour of duty, their remaining units shall be consolidated until ultimately no United States troops will remain in Vietnam.

EXTENSION OF WAGE AND PRICE CONTROL AUTHORITY

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I was unfortunately delayed in New York by urgent business involving the welfare of my constituents and did not arrive in Washington in time for today's vote on Senate Joint Resolution 55, authorizing a temporary extension of the President's authority to set wage and price controls, stabilize interest rates, and expand credit controls. Had I been here, I would have voted for this legislation.

The fact that this legislation is needed is spelled out daily by statistics which tell the story of our continued economic distress. It is tragic that the President did not use the authority granted him under legislation originally passed by the 91st Congress. Even now, his reluctance to establish wage and price controls is damaging the economic well-being of our Nation and contributing to rising unemployment.

The overwhelming margin by which this authority is being renewed should be ample evidence of the seriousness with which Congress views our economic situation. Continued inaction by the President is clearly against the public interest.

IMPACT OF BRUSSELS ON  
U.S.S.R. AND WORLD

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I include herewith an excellent article by a distinguished jurist entitled "Impact of Brussels on U.S.S.R. and World." This article is written by a widely admired Boston attorney, Lewis H. Weinstein. Mr. Weinstein has held national leadership posts in Jewish organizations including the American Conference on Soviet Jewry. Mr. Weinstein was a central figure at the recently concluded Brussels Conference on Soviet Jewry on which his excellent and comprehensive article reports.

This article is reprinted from the Jewish Advocate of March 11, 1971. It follows:

IMPACT OF BRUSSELS ON U.S.S.R.  
AND WORLD

(By Lewis H. Weinstein)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Mr. Weinstein, author of this article, is a prominent Boston attorney. He has held national leadership posts in Jewish organizations, including the American Conference on Soviet Jewry. He was a central figure at the recent Brussels Conference on Soviet Jewry, on which he reports here.)

The Brussels Conference on Soviet Jewry dramatized the plight of three and a half million Jews deprived of their rights to religious and cultural freedom and to freedom from anti-Semitism, rights expressly guaranteed by the Soviet Constitution. It sharpened the issue of Soviet refusal to permit Jews to emigrate, despite the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, subscribed to by the U.S.S.R.

Some 850 Jewish delegates from 38 countries in all the continents unanimously agreed upon the Brussels Declaration of solidarity and action. The program was highlighted by a rare synthesis of logic, emotion, dedication and practical realism.

Arthur Goldberg, former Justice of the Supreme Court and Ambassador to the United Nations, presented a skillful analysis of the problem and the issues at the opening session. Dr. Albert Sabin of anti-polio fame, now president of the Weizmann Institute of Science in Israel, presided at the first plenary session, and was one of a group of scientists, scholars, philosophers, writers and artists who participated in various sessions.

Eli Wiesel, with his magic mysticism and his moving poetry, stirred the audience to tears and laughter. Otto Preminger, movie director, and Paddy Chayefsky, playwright and television writer, were not of the same caliber; they were brief, insulting and apparently unaware of the background or purpose of the conference.

Nehama Lifschitz, "The Nightingale of Soviet Jewry," and Chief Rabbi Jacob Kaplan of France, who had heroically survived two World Wars, touched the audience deeply.

David Ben-Gurion, approaching his 85th birthday, a delegate to the Conference, spent his days in Brussels in a sickbed, but was permitted by his doctors to make a short appearance, to express his solidarity with Soviet Jews and the conference. The rafters of the Palais des Congres resounded to the roar of welcome to this vital Jew.

In the session devoted to parliamentarians, Menachem Begin, who recently led the Gahal Party out of the Israel Cabinet, talked "unity" but used, unsuccessfully, divisive

tactics. A perfect reply to Begin was given by Liova Ellav, also of the Knesset, author of "Between Hammer and Sickle," in warm Yiddish, factual, precise, dramatic and devastating.

But the heroes of the conference were a group of young Russian Jews who had left the Soviet Union within a matter of weeks. Two girls in their early 20's, Ella Tamsha of Kovno and Kraina Shur of Leningrad, won the hearts of the conference as they gave testimony of their efforts for freedom. Major Grisha Pegin, a Red Army hero, forced into an insane asylum by the Soviet authorities when he wanted to emigrate to Israel, in simple, poignant, sincere words held the audience captive.

Five commissions devoted to work with governments, jurists, youth and campus and mass media and at the nongovernmental level, did the nitty-gritty work of the conference, hearing reports, presenting practical, workable programs, analyzing past efforts and outlining directions and guideposts for the future. The last named of these commissions had an omnibus function to include everything that had not been included in the ambit of the other four commissions.

As a sample of how these commissions functioned, let me describe the fifth commission, of which I was chairman. After a presentation by Dr. J. S. Roth of London and the World Jewish Congress, 63 delegates gave formal statements, suggestions and experiences and recommended programs. Consultants included two rabbis from the Hague and Washington and the head of the Department of International Law at Tel Aviv University, formerly a member of the Israel Delegation to the UN, intimately familiar with Soviet matters. A Buenos Aires Jewish leader was vice-chairman.

The panoramic sweep of dealing with political parties, including the Communists, inter-parliamentary bodies, new-Left groups, industry and labor, Jewish organizations of all kinds and varieties, other ethnic and racial groups, voluntary organizations including civil rights, international cooperation, supporters of United Nations and peace movements, professional, scientific, academic, artistic and intellectual leaders, religious leaders, lay and clerical, special women's groups and a host of others, was the subject of discussion and report.

The success of the Brussels Conference was insured by unsuccessful Soviet efforts to cancel the program and then to attempt a counter program. Without Russian intervention, the conference might have made a headline in the Yiddish and Anglo-Jewish press, but would have been buried in the back pages of general newspapers. The USSR charged that the conference was anti-Soviet and formally demanded cancellation. Claude Kellman, chairman of the Conference Secretariat and the ideal businessman-diplomat-leader, answered each allegation with precision and finesse. The Belgian Minister of Foreign Affairs responded with suavity that Brussels was known for its great Congress structures, its hotels and its hospitality. Moreover, he added: "we have always had room in Belgium for those who believe, rightly or wrongly, that they have suffered injustice or discrimination, like Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, both of whom enjoyed Belgian hospitality."

When the Soviets sent their puppets, a Lieutenant General, a vice-president of the Soviet Bar Association, a leader of a large co-operative farm and others, the response they received was negative. Their public programs were laughed at and announced movies were not even shown. Apparently the Soviet-Belgian Friendship League could not win the support even of Belgian Communists in this endeavor.

The conference ended with the adoption by acclamation of a declaration of solidarity with Soviet Jews, denunciation of Soviet

violations of human rights, rights to religious and cultural liberty, right of freedom from anti-Semitism and right to emigrate, and a call to the conscience of the world to ensure these rights.

The conference selected five representatives from France, Israel, Latin America, the United Kingdom and the United States to transmit the Declaration to the Human Rights Commission of the United Nations fortuitously then about to begin its sessions in Geneva. Leaving Brussels very early, we were in Geneva before the offices in the Palais de Nations opened.

Our program involved conferences with friendly delegates, including Rita E. Hauser of New York, representing the United States, and the President of the Human Rights Commission, Dr. Andres Aguilar, who was well acquainted with his fellow townsman, our Venezuelan delegate, Dr. Ruben Merinfeld. Despite reports, we did not ask for the privilege of addressing the Commission. We knew better, and even if the lawyer members of our group had not known that only accredited non-governmental organizations could address the Commission, our expert consultant on United Nations' matters, Professor Dinstein, had reminded us of this requirement.

President Aguilar did not refuse our request (JTA and other statements to the contrary). We asked him to file our Declaration with the office of the UN Secretary General in Geneva, which after translation into the five UN languages, was distributed to the Commission members. We obtained the assistance which we requested. And the members of the Human Rights Commission knew we were present. Even the Soviet delegate, Nikola K. Tarrasov, to whom Ambassador Hauser presented me, knew our mission.

At noon, Ambassador Hauser made probably the strongest statement ever made by an American representative at a UN meeting on the issue of Soviet Jewry. Two-thirds of a fifteen minute statement were devoted to the specific problem of Soviet treatment of Jews, a historic, juridical, nobly-stated review, in the highest traditions of American diplomacy. A summary would not do justice to her brilliant exposition.

Tarrasov immediately asked for the right to respond and his answers showed that raw exposed nerves had been touched. Mrs. Hauser had quoted from Pravda that any Soviet Jew who wished to migrate to Israel is automatically "an enemy of the Soviet people." The Soviet delegate said that Mrs. Hauser's quotation was baseless, slanderous and deceptive. He then read from the original which had said that any Soviet Jew who wished to migrate to Israel is a Zionist and thus automatically an enemy of the Soviet people. He then uttered a tirade against Zionism as racism, imperialism, etc., etc. When he added that the Pravda editor spoke only as an individual, even though Tarrasov agreed with him, the otherwise solemn assembly burst into laughter. Only the iron curtain and Arab representatives did not smile.

The delegate from the United Arab Republic joined the debate, but Mrs. Hauser responded with concise and effective words. Her performance rated an A plus.

That she made a deep impact was apparent by the remarks of the Iraqi and Lebanese delegates to a New York Times reporter with whom we sat. At lunch, Mrs. Hauser gave us additional insight into some of the Commission's members, programs and problems.

Unfortunately, efforts of Rabbi Meir Kahane to sensationalize his role and to disrupt the Brussels Conference received more attention than they deserved. The request of the Jewish Defense League to participate in the conference was turned down, because it has no relationship to any of the Jewish organizations, representing practically the



entire American Jewish community, under the umbrellas of the two American sponsoring organizations. A number of Rabbi Kahane's strong supporters were delegates to Brussels; they had been named delegates of the Revisionist branch of the American Zionist Federation, and Rabbi Kahane, I assume, might have come as a similar delegate.

The statement of the few Brussels followers of Rabbi Kahane that his arrest and deportation were the result of action by the officials of the Conference is not true. Security was strict. The Soviet authorities' unsuccessful efforts to cancel the Conference, the presence in Brussels of several Russian apologists for the Soviet authorities and the wild threats of Dr. George Habash, head of the Arab terrorist radical group (which had claimed responsibility for plane hijackings) that Jews going to the Conference would taste terrorist medicine, were responsible for large numbers of Belgian police at every entrance to the Conference Hall.

When Rabbi Kahane was denied admittance because he did not have a delegate's card, he called a "press conference" at the main gateway and, with a few others, apparently headed toward the entrance. The Belgian police detained him and Foreign Ministry officials ordered him out of the country.

The officials of the Brussels Jewish Conference had no part in the arrest or deportation of Rabbi Kahane.

The overwhelming number of delegates at Brussels believed that the methods of persistent diplomacy, of obtaining the support of governments, the United Nations, recognized non-governmental organizations (having status with the UN), men and women of good will of all religions, labor groups, business and industry, artists and intellectuals and all groups dedicated to human rights, are more effective in obtaining results than violence, harassment, breaking up cultural events or other extremist measures. They believe that the tactics of Rabbi Kahane and the Jewish Defense League are counter-productive of their announced goals, violative of the principles of democracy, dangerous to members of the League and harmful to the Jews of the Soviet Union. They prefer to penetrate the Iron Curtain with the support of the conscience of the world, rather than to rely upon strong-arm methods.

Some delegates, including some of the youth delegates, were frustrated in their efforts to establish a formal, permanent World Conference on Soviet Jewry, a highly commendable purpose. But, the B'nai Brith International Council, the Jewish Agency-World Zionist organization and the World Jewish Congress were not yet ready for this step, whatever their reasons may be. Since they were influential members of the Presidium, any floor effort would have succeeded. But anyone knowing the "art of the possible," the attainable, the achievable, knew that, willy-nilly, a secretariat and presidium of Jews throughout the world on the issue of Soviet Jews already exists and can be called into action immediately. And there is strong support for financially self-sufficient regional and national conferences. The need for top lay and professional direction is obvious. In the United States, the solution of this problem already has the attention of key national Jewish organizations and leaders.

What impact did the conference have on the Soviet Union? We know their immediate unsuccessful responses. But, as Winston Churchill once said, the USSR is "a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma." Within a week after the Conference, one planeload of 50 Jews, mostly young people from Moscow, Riga and Kishinev, arrived at Lydda in Israel, the largest group of Russian Jews to arrive at one time since the establishment of the State. Will many more be able to come?

What the Soviet Union will do at any time may be stupid, subtle, skillful, brutal or even humane. The answer is interwoven with the broad political goals of the USSR, its Middle East penetration, its relations with Arabs, its sensitivity to criticism, its adherence to certain slogans, all in the context of a totalitarian, monolithic structure, with internal forces struggling against one another—and all against a background of a long-standing, deeply-rooted anti-Semitism.

Svetlana Alliluyeva, Stalin's daughter, once told me that changes in Soviet policies on treatment of Jews would only come after the present Soviet leadership changes. Is she right? Kremlinologists in the State Department and elsewhere have emphasized to me the unpredictability of Soviet responses.

Our appeal to the conscience of the world must be continuous, fervent, at every level and into every corner. And our allies are many; among the strongest are the Soviet Jews of courage. Even the non-Jews of the Soviet Union, whether they now live abroad like Kutznetsov, or who remain within the Soviet Union, like the Nobel Laureate in Literature, Solzhenitsyn, or the poet Yevtushenko or the composer Shostakovich are our allies. And for a message of hope, listen to the first movement of Shostakovich's 13th Symphony to the Yevtushenko poem, "Babi Yar," banned in the Soviet Union.

The impact of the Brussels Conference will be felt in many corners of the world, if we cause it to be felt. The period between Purim, Festival of the Victory of Queen Esther and Mordecai over Haman in Persia, and Passover, Festival of Freedom from Slavery in Egypt, is a good time to reflect and to commit one's energy and to act. If not now, when?

#### GREEK INDEPENDENCE

### HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1971

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is the custom of the House to commemorate the national holidays and other dates of significance of those countries that have provided the United States with much of its sense of history and fundamental social outlook. Certainly, Greece is such a country.

The 150th anniversary of Greek independence was celebrated on March 25, 1971. Traditionally, this day is regarded as the first blow struck for Greek liberty.

We in America owe the Greek nation a large debt of gratitude. They have provided much of the philosophic underpinnings of our Declaration of Independence, the outlines of our basic structure of government, and the thrust of our heritage.

The contribution of Greece to civilization is difficult, if not impossible, to measure. The number of ideas, the objects of art, the governmental principles, the literature, the great thinkers—all are part of a culture that cannot and will not die.

Unfortunately, a police state now exists in Greece. The philosophy of this Government runs counter to the entire heritage of Greece. It is repressive. It is tyrannical. Curiously, the State Department of the United States has maintained an icy silence as to its posture on

the present rulers of Greece. It has been said that the military junta is making progress in the reestablishment of liberty, yet two Senate investigators have just filed a report that challenges this view.

I believe it is time that the United States use its influence and challenge the control of the junta; we should demand free elections and we should cut off military aid until reforms are made.

I am proud to honor the people of Greece, for they have been leaders in the quest for political freedom and individual thought. I can only hope that the freedom and independence will return once again to Greece and that the present rulers will realize that the dignity of a people cannot be compromised and cannot be denied.

#### RESOLUTION ON SOVIET JEWRY

### HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I attach herewith an important statement issued by the Great and General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

This statement memorializes the President of the United States to prevail upon the Soviet Union to allow Soviet Jews to freely practice their religion, maintain their culture, and to leave the Soviet Union on their own free will.

This resolution was unanimously adopted by all of the members of the Legislature of Massachusetts and was given to me by the Honorable Theodore D. Mann, a member of that great body, on the occasion of a rally attended by 2,000 people at the Newton, Mass., City Hall on behalf of Soviet Jewry.

The resolution follows:

Resolution Memorializing the President of the United States to prevail upon the Soviet Union to allow Soviet Jews to freely practice their Religion, maintain their Culture and to leave the Soviet Union on their own free will.

Whereas, Reports from Russia of the refusal of the Soviet government to permit Jews to leave the country and of the political and racist repression of these people is of great concern to all free men; and

Whereas, The General Assembly of the United Nations in 1948 adopted a resolution entitled "The Universal Declaration of Human Rights" and in 1965 adopted the recommendations of the International Convention on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination which further defined these human rights, condemned racial discrimination, agreed to pursue by all appropriate means, a policy of eliminating racial and political discrimination, and to promote a better understanding of this problem and guaranteeing everyone equal protection before the law; and

Whereas, The Soviet Union subscribed to the Declaration of Rights of 1948 and voted to ratify the recommendations of the convention of 1965; and

Whereas, Although the fate of an individual may still be at the mercy of his government, it is a matter of continuing and increasing international concern whenever such government is guilty of political and racist discrimination and of repression against any segment of its citizens; therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives hereby request the President of the United States to bring the question of the political and racist discrimination and repression of the Soviet Jews by the Soviet Union before the United Nations and to use the good offices of the United States government in urging the Soviet Union to allow Soviet Jews to leave the Soviet Union on their own free will; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to each member thereof from this commonwealth.

#### INFLUENCING A CONGRESSMAN

**HON. M. C. (GENE) SNYDER**  
OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I have enjoyed a healthy return on my annual questionnaire which was mailed out in the district in February. I received more

than 8,600 questionnaires with about 14,400 individual respondents participating in the poll.

Right after the questionnaire was distributed in the district, the Kentucky Post and Times-Star commented editorially on it. The text follows:

#### INFLUENCING A CONGRESSMAN

Rep. Gene Snyder's February newsletter is a two-way mailing piece containing the still-rising Kentucky congressman's annual questionnaire. This one is interesting in two particulars. For one thing it's tabulated for yes/no replies by two persons—designated "HIS" and "HERS," like two bath towels hung side by side.

Further, the 12 questions are highly pertinent if not downright critical, for they seek opinions on President Nixon's "state of the union" goals and broad questions of high-level policy.

We look forward with more than casual interest to a report on the returns from this mailer. They should indicate the thinking of concerned northern Kentuckians of both sexes on welfare, the budget, revenue-sharing, ecology, Cambodia, price-control, Communism, cabinet reorganization, Justice Douglas, UN membership for Red China and Nixon's leadership.

"Your answers," the newsletter concludes, "will be most helpful to me in performing my duties as your congressman." They should be so indeed. We like to see members of Congress as sensitive to the views of their constituents as this suggests. Snyder has just become the ranking minority member of the Rivers and Harbors subcommittee of the House Public Works committee, and his congressional star is much in the ascendancy.

Yet no mere weathercock is this forthright Kentucky Republican. He assumes, and rightly, we believe, that most Kentuckians would approve a massive crash program in cancer research—even if it meant abandoning the lunar wilderness and the SST. And he voices his own strong disappointment in Nixon's astronomical and inflationary budget.

We hope every couple who receives one of these questionnaires sits right down and fills it out, then invests six cents in good government. Any man who fails to do so overlooks an opportunity to be politically effective in the democratic tradition (if you'll pardon that adjective, Gene).

And any woman who neglects to check the "HERS" answers is disloyal to the Women's Lib.

The results of the questionnaire are as follows:

[In percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion		Yes	No	No opinion
1. Do you favor the proposed plan for a guaranteed minimum income for every family with children? (Total welfare cost estimated to be at least double under this plan)	6.6	92.4	1.0	7. Should the United States give arms and advisory support to Cambodia?	48.7	47.5	3.8
2. Do you believe the Federal budget should be balanced under today's conditions?	68.0	28.6	3.4	8. If prices could be stabilized, would you be willing to have your pay or annuity level frozen?	68.6	27.1	4.3
3. Do you favor tax-supported expansion of basic medical care for every needy family?	42.1	55.8	2.1	9. Do you feel the investigation of the conduct of Supreme Court Justice Douglas should be renewed in this Congress?	62.9	28.5	8.7
4. Do you favor returning a part of Federal revenues to State and local governments to spend as they please without Federal control?	40.4	57.5	2.1	10. Do you believe the United States has a global responsibility to prevent the spread of Communism?	52.7	44.1	3.2
5. Do you favor new and additional government spending to restore and enhance our natural environment?	65.5	32.3	2.2	11. Do you favor the admission of Red China into the U.N.?	33.3	62.5	4.2
6. Do you favor a plan to reorganize 7 cabinet departments into 4 new agencies?	53.2	36.0	10.8	12. Generally, are you satisfied with President Nixon's performance to date?	54.4	40.4	5.2

#### POTHOLE—TOP MAINTENANCE PROBLEM

**HON. JOSHUA EILBERG**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, streets commissioner Leo Goldstein announced today that since the city of Philadelphia began its "pothole reporter" campaign on February 16, some 50,000 pothole conditions have been repaired by city forces at a cost of almost \$300,000.

Commissioner Goldstein stated that over 1,500 tons of bituminous materials have been used to plug the potholes, which are conditions that occur when moisture seeps into roadway cracks, expands when it freezes, and cracks the concrete.

He added that the pothole is one of Philadelphia's top maintenance problems and said that it reaches its peak during the period of spring to early summer when the city spends \$11,000 a day for pothole repairs.

Goldstein urged Philadelphians to continue sending post cards identifying pothole locations to him in room 840, Municipal Services Building, Philadelphia, Pa., or calling MU 6-5508.

With the aid of "pothole reporters," he

pointed out, the city can more quickly schedule repairs of these roadway hazards, thus saving the taxpayers' money and minimizing possible damage to automobiles.

#### LUMBER PRICES ARE RISING

**HON. JAMES A. McCLURE**

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, lumber prices are rising as the housing industry moves out of a slump, so the Nixon administration has indicated it will investigate the lumber industry.

The Government's understanding and support of the forest industry is not exactly outstanding so I guess this latest is about par for the course.

The industry is accused of stalling on its Government timber contracts to wait higher prices. If waiting for market conditions to improve can be called "stalling," then that is exactly what they are doing. But why should they not? Their timber contracts were signed 2 years ago on the basis of high stumpage prices prevailing at that time. Recently as demand has increased, the Government has sold

less and less timber. If you cannot increase production, you have not got much to go on. Who is to blame here—the industry or the Government?

The administration will also investigate the trading of wood products on the futures market in Chicago and study the availability of boxcars for forest products. Both are welcome, but why did it have to take a change in lumber prices to stir the Government to action?

I also wonder where the Government's concern was as demands on timber resources grew. Forest research funds have not been increased to help meet the demand. Why did they not increase the funding of sales by the Forest Service? The problem is compounded by congressional failure to provide enough money for forest highway construction—but the administration even held back part of the funds that were provided. Now, just as we are moving into an expansionary budget, the administration announces the complete cancellation of the money which was held back. Even as the President was seeking money for the SST, and the Public Works Committee was announcing plans for a \$2 billion accelerated public works program, the OMB in the White House canceled plans to build forest roads.

Lumbermen should be commended for the good job they did in minimizing un-



employment during last year's depressed market period by keeping men at work and building up inventories. Instead of jumping on them when prices rise, we should be giving them credit for what they have done. The forest industry does not like fluctuating prices any better than anyone else. What would be welcome at this time is a statement from the administration pledging consistent support for forest management funds.

If you want to know what is ailing the lumber industry today, you have only to look at what the Government's policies were yesterday. Instead of investigating the lumber industry, the administration should be investigating itself.

#### HUMILIATION OF RUSSIAN JEWRY

##### HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, since December of last year, when the Lenin-grad show trial focused world attention on the humiliation of Russian Jewry, there has been a noticeable improvement in the Soviet attitude toward its Jewish community. New York Times reports that an average of about 15 Jews per day are emigrating from the country, as compared to about two a day in January and six a day in February. This is an encouraging sign to all men who cherish human freedom and value human dignity.

In large measure, this development owes to the constant pressure of world opinion on the Soviet Union, much of which was generated from within this very Chamber. That the Russian leadership is still sensitive to international comment—when rationally expressed and peacefully exercised—is surely a cause for hope in this body and around the world.

Still, the condition of the Soviet Jew remains unsatisfactory, and still, there is the fear that it will deteriorate even further once the pressure of world opinion has relaxed. I have little confidence that the Soviet Government will continue to pursue its new policy toward Jews without some prodding from external sources.

That is why I have introduced this week two pieces of legislation on this subject, both of which would increase American pressure on the Soviet Union to recognize the legitimate rights of its Jewish citizens. We cannot stand idly by while another wave of anti-Semitism sweeps through the Russian nation.

The first of my bills would provide 30,000 special refugee visas for Russian Jews who wish to come to this country. In a sense, this is a direct challenge to the Soviet Union and, particularly, to its emigration policy. In the past, most Jewish requests for emigration have been denied on the grounds that the emigrant had not received permission from the country in which he wanted to stay. In fact, this technicality merely clouded the real nature of Soviet anti-Semitism.

My bill would bring the Soviet policy of persecution into the open by eliminating the technicality: Soviet officials would know beforehand that a large number of Jews are entirely welcome in the United States.

This bill sets no precedent. Similar actions were taken to permit 30,000 Hungarian and 10,000 Czechoslovakian refugees to settle here after their 1956 and 1968 national conflicts. Moreover, 565,000 Cubans have made the United States their home through exemptions from the immigration laws. There is no reason why we should not extend this same privilege to the downtrodden Jews of the Soviet Union.

My second measure is a resolution calling upon the President to take appropriate action to reaffirm this Nation's commitment to basic human rights. He is directed to take steps to persuade the Soviet Union to grant religious and cultural freedom to its Jewish minority and to guarantee the rights of those wishing to emigrate. The President has already acted firmly in this regard through the United Nations. I ask only that the emphasis be spread to other diplomatic channels.

Mr. Speaker, our past efforts to relieve the plight of the Soviet Jew have already proven helpful. But much more remains to be done, if he is ever to be granted the rights we, as free men, so greatly appreciate.

#### PRISONER TREATMENT MUST CONCERN US ALL

##### HON. JOHN MELCHER

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1971

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, now, on the occasion of this "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action," is the time to look hard at the dilemma we face. Hundreds of Americans are held in North Vietnam with little or no communication with their families, contrary to the spirit and the rules of humanity and decency recognized by the world's nations.

I have joined in the introduction of House Concurrent Resolution 115 in the belief that it will demonstrate the deep conviction of the House of Representatives that North Vietnam must comply with the accords of the Geneva Convention.

On behalf of the people of Montana, and all Americans certainly, I ask the leaders of North Vietnam and the Vietcong—

One, to identify prisoners whom they hold;

Two, to treat prisoners humanely;

Three, To release the seriously sick or injured prisoners—at least to a neutral nation;

Fourth, to permit impartial international inspection of all prisoner of war facilities;

Fifth, to allow more frequent and meaningful mail contact between prisoners and their families, and

Sixth, to negotiate in good faith for the exchange and release of all prisoners.

I stand in quiet awe of the courage of the devoted wives and families of these imprisoned men. It is to the tireless efforts of family members like Mrs. Arvin Knutson of Billings, Mont., who is Montana's State coordinator of the efforts of the National League of Families of American Prisoners and Missing in Southeast Asia, that we owe the international focus on the plight of our men. Their frustrations are too great to imagine, yet their will is marvelous. Every man, woman, and child in this Nation must share their personal burdens.

There can be no rest in America, while this national grief hangs over the land, until our imprisoned Americans are freed from the prisons of North Vietnam.

#### EULOGY TO HERBERT KEALOHA KEPPELER—OUTSTANDING CITIZEN OF HAWAII

##### HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the period from March 1903 to March 1971 has been for Hawaii, as it has for the entire Nation, an eventful one. This period also marks the lifespan of Herbert Kealohe Keppeler, an outstanding citizen of Hawaii who passed away on March 18, 1971, just a few days short of what would have been his 68th birthday. Mr. Keppeler was for many years closely connected with the growth of Hawaii. As a friend I mourn over his death and send his family my heartfelt sympathy and condolences.

Herb Keppeler was a native son in every fine sense of the term. He was born in Pearl City, immediately north of Pearl Harbor, on March 26, 1903. He attended a Honolulu high school, and was graduated from the University of Hawaii in 1924 with a degree in civil engineering.

He joined the Bishop Estate as surveyor and civil engineer upon his graduation from college, and began an association which, except for a period of about 10 years, was to last a lifetime. The Bishop Estate was established under the will of Princess Bernice Pauahi Bishop, founder of the Kamehameha Schools, maintained and operated by the estate trustees.

Mr. Keppeler was promoted to the position of office manager in 1936 and to chief engineer in 1946.

After serving in a managerial capacity with a private firm in Honolulu from 1951 to 1962, he returned to Bishop Estate as a trustee and served in such capacity from 1962 to the time of his death.

From 1938 to 1943, Mr. Keppeler served on the board of regents of the University of Hawaii.

Following a period of service as a lieutenant in civil engineering in the U.S. Naval Reserve and as captain with the Businessmen's Military Training Corps, he served with the Army during World War II.

After the war, he found time to serve

in such important community posts as president of the Palama Settlement board of trustees and commissioner with the Honolulu Redevelopment Agency.

The senate of the State of Hawaii, in recognition of Herbert Kealoha Keppeler's outstanding community service, on March 19, 1971, adopted a resolution which I submit for inclusion in the RECORD at this point:

S. RES. 201

*Resolution in memory of Herbert Kealoha Keppeler*

Whereas, Herbert Kealoha Keppeler, Trustee under the Will of the Estate of Bernice Pauahi Bishop, Deceased, died on March 18, 1971 in the 67th year of his life; and

Whereas, since his birth two-thirds of a century ago in Pearl City, Herbert Keppeler's life has been inextricably bound with Hawaii and its people; and

Whereas, Herbert Keppeler was long associated with the Bishop Estate first as employee, later as an officer, and finally as a trustee; and

Whereas, Herbert Keppeler was also active in public, community and professional organizations, notably as Regent at the University of Hawaii; and

Whereas, by the passing of Herbert Keppeler, Hawaii has lost an able son and loyal servant; now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate of the Sixth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Regular Session of 1971, that it pays its final tribute to the memory of Herbert Kealoha Keppeler and joins the entire community in mourning the passing of a good and faithful friend of Hawaii; and

Be it further resolved that this Resolution be spread upon the minutes of the Senate and copies thereof be transmitted to his family and to the Trustees of the Bishop Estate.

SENATE OF THE STATE OF HAWAII

March 19, 1971

We hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was this day adopted by the Senate of the Sixth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Regular Session of 1971.

DAVID MCCLUNG,  
President of the Senate.

Attest:

Clerk of the Senate.

**A CALL TO ACTION—NATIONAL HOUSING CONFERENCE URGES RELEASE OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS**

**HON. JOE L. EVINS**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the National Housing Conference, composed of mayors, officials of housing authorities, and other municipal officials throughout the Nation, has strongly protested the withholding, freezing and impounding of funds for important programs for our cities by the Office of Management and Budget.

In this connection I place in the RECORD herewith a call to action by the National Housing Conference which includes a statement I recently submitted to the Subcommittee on Separation of Powers of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

CXVII—533—Part 7

This legislative information bulletin issued by the Housing Conference follows:

A NOTE TO THE ORGANIZATIONAL REPRESENTATIVES WHO COOPERATE IN THE HOUSING LEGISLATION INFORMATION SERVICE AND TO NHC'S FRIENDS IN THE FIELD

March 24, 1971.

The hearings before the Ervin (D., N.C.) Subcommittee on the Separation of Powers of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary end tomorrow. The record of the hearings, for statements to be filed and included therein, will be open for ten days. The Subcommittee tells us that all statements will be welcomed within that time limit.

We recommend to you the statement of Congressman Joe L. Evins (D., Tenn.) enclosed, which was presented to the Ervin Subcommittee. You recall that in the last session of the Congress, Congressman Evins chaired the Subcommittee on Independent Offices-Housing-Space-Science of the House Committee on Appropriations which handled the moneys for HUD. Twice, he had to take the measure to the House floor, the first bill having been vetoed by the President. As floor manager of such a measure, he is without peer.

Although Congressman Evins has now moved over to the chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Public Works of the House Appropriations Committee, he retains his seat as ranking majority Member on the Independent Offices-Housing—et al. Subcommittee under the chairmanship of Congressman Edward P. Boland (D., Mass.). From long experience, we will find in Congressman Boland a brilliant, able and eloquent champion of housing and its allied programs in the public interest.

From the attached, you will observe that Congressman Evins holds a lively interest—a deep burn you might say—in the withholding of funds by the Administration which were appropriated in the last Congressional session.

For the National Housing Conference, I will file a statement with the Ervin Committee objecting to the freeze of funds for urban renewal, low-rent public housing, model cities and water and sewer programs. A Suggestion for National Public Interest Organizations: To be sure that we take every opportunity offered, we believe that you will want to file a statement.

**STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JOE L. EVINS**

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of this Committee—I want to thank you for this opportunity of presenting my views on this most important matter of the separation of powers.

I want to commend you, Mr. Chairman, for conducting these timely and appropriate hearings.

As you know, our forefathers when they drafted the Constitution had some rather definite ideas concerning the doctrine of the separation of powers and checks and balances. This is, of course, fundamental to our system and through the years this sensitive system has worked remarkably well.

At times we have had strong Presidents—at other times we have had weak presidents and strong Congressional leaders—and at other times the judicial branch has been dominant.

However, the system has always worked—the pendulum has always swung back as the various constitutional checks and counter-measures available to the various branches were used to re-establish their rightful place in the American system of Government.

These hearings, Mr. Chairman, are most timely because it seems to me that at this time we are at a critical juncture in history with respect to preserving the powers and prerogatives of the Congress.

As you are aware, many of the powers

of the Congress have been eroded over the years. Many powers vested in the Executive in wartime have set precedents and established a trend of concentration of power.

Our Federal Government has grown in size, magnitude and complexity with the President, the Cabinet Secretaries and other high officials assuming greater and greater powers.

And I must say that Congress all too often has gone along with the recommendation of various Presidents and reorganization proposals which have served to negate its own power.

In any event there has been a steady encroachment by the Executive Branch on the Legislative Branch.

One of the most disturbing elements of this encroachment is the expanding power of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), formerly the Bureau of the Budget.

One of the most flagrant abuses of Executive power is the excessive employment of the freezing, withholding and impounding of funds appropriated by the Congress by the Bureau—now by the OMB.

The OMB was created in a reorganization last year allegedly to assure a more efficient management of Federal funds and Federal Departments and agencies.

This agency—OMB—within the Executive Branch is exercising enormous powers following this reorganization, and the Director of OMB is now referred to in the press as the "General Manager of the United States Government."

What we are actually seeing, gentlemen, is a tremendous concentration of power in a vehicle which was originally established to coordinate budgets for submission to the President.

OMB undertakes to overrule agencies on program policies, on such things as cost-benefit ratio components of public works projects, on standards for programs.

But more than that—the OMB is arrogating power vested in the Congress by the Constitution by disregarding priorities set by the Congress and substituting its own priorities—rewriting legislation and appropriations, in effect—exercising what amounts to unconstitutional item vetoes.

The OMB has impounded more than \$11 billion in funds appropriated by the Congress last year, I receive letters from constituents almost every day protesting the emasculation of some important project or program authorized by Congress.

We all know and understand that the Anti-Deficiency Act permits some limited control of funds to spread expenditures by an agency throughout the year on a uniform basis. But the intent of this Act was not to give the Executive Branch the power to impound monies in wholesale fashion—destroying or altering the priorities established by Congress and shifting funds willy-nilly according to the whims of the Budget Bureaucrats.

We all know and understand that Congress in the past several years has established a ceiling on expenditures. And we also know and understand that this is a flexible ceiling which goes up or down, depending upon appropriation actions of the Congress.

The ceiling is flexible and was designed to adjust automatically, based on appropriations passed by Congress.

For some months one excuse for impoundment was inflation. Currently the President has proposed deficit-financing in his expansionary budget with his primary goal and objective now as full-employment.

And yet the withholdings continue—and OMB continues to defend its policies before Committees of the Congress.

The OMB continues to say when and where funds appropriated by the Congress shall be expended while in many instances disregarding the will and intent of the Congress.

This is indeed a dangerous practice.



The precedents which this reorganized Budget Bureau is attempting to set can, if left unchecked, effect a shift in the balance of power than can inhibit the powers of Congress permanently and in large measure negate the appropriations process and the will of the people, expressed by their elected Representatives.

We all know that one of the keystones of the check and balance system is the power of the purse possessed by the Congress. From this power flows many corollary powers of examination, review, inquiry and investigation.

This power must be preserved, safeguarded and maintained.

Let me demonstrate the manner in which the OMB is chipping away and undercutting this power of the Congress.

On the two Appropriations Subcommittees on which I serve—the Independent Offices-Housing-Space-Science Subcommittee and the Public Works-Atomic Energy Commission Subcommittee—we find that the Office of Management and Budget has withheld and is withholding substantial funds approved by Congress last year.

The OMB has withheld \$1 billion 325 million from the HUD Appropriations Bill—shortchanging the urban renewal program \$200 million—the water and sewer grant program by \$200 million—the Model Cities program of \$727 million—and the public housing program by \$193 million.

In the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations, OMB has impounded funds totalling \$91 million 700 thousand for 145 public works projects for the Nation—funded last year. Funds for all projects initiated by the Congress last year were impounded. Funds for a few Administration budgeted projects included in the impoundment have been released.

In this bill Congress exercised its authority to set priorities. Recommended appropriations for some programs were reduced—some were increased—and some projects were added because of our determination and decision that they were in the public interest.

After the action by the Congress on this bill, there was a net reduction of \$26 million from the amount budgeted.

In other words, the bill which Congress passed and the President signed was \$26 million less than the President and the OMB had requested.

And yet these unelected officials in the OMB shuffle priorities—withhold funds arbitrarily—and in effect substitute their judgment for the judgment of the Congress.

Currently \$45,649,000 is being withheld on 107 projects of the Army Corps of Engineers. It is interesting to note that these projects are the additions and new construction starts added by the Congress. The add-ons and new starts which the President requested were briefly held in reserve and then released. In other words, Budget Bureau officials have chosen to ignore the Congress—the people's Representatives.

Now we are advised that all but \$5,145,000 of the \$45 million now held in reserve will be released next fiscal year. I am pleased and delighted that funds for these projects are being released—however, this action—this delay by impoundment in the first place—will result in more Federal expenditures in the long run. Labor costs, the costs of material, and other costs continue to increase.

In other words, the American people are subsidizing with their tax dollars the political maneuvering, slowdowns and delays of Budget Office of Management.

Mr. Chairman, two items appropriated for Atomic Energy Commission projects, which are being withheld by the Executive Branch, constitute in my judgment an item veto. Last year the Congress provided \$600,000 for the American Museum of Atomic Energy at Oak Ridge, Tennessee—an educational project which has been specifically authorized and will benefit the whole Nation. We also

provided \$500,000 to build an addition to the Argonne National Laboratory in Illinois, another important project of national interest. Not only has the President refused to release the appropriations for these projects, the President proposed in his new budget to Congress to divert funds for these items totalling \$1.1 million to another area in the AEC. This, Mr. Chairman, represents item vetoes which are unconstitutional.

Mr. Chairman, the time has come for Congress to stand firm against this encroachment and critical usurpation of powers of the Congress.

This is a dangerous precedent and a disturbing trend and should be stopped.

We must serve notice on the Executive Branch by every means possible that this usurpation will not be sanctioned or accepted by Congress.

The Constitutional balance of powers must be maintained.

### SKUBITZ CONTINUES OPPOSITION TO NUCLEAR WASTE DUMP

#### HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, the proposal by the Atomic Energy Commission to bury nuclear wastes in the salt beds of Kansas has generated widespread opposition by Kansas citizens. Loud objections are now coming not only from the Governor's office and the Kansas scientific community, but also from thousands of signatories to petitions being circulated all over the State. Hundreds of letters are being written to me, to Kansas editors, and to the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy opposing the facility and requesting more facts before it is established and before Kansas ground is used as an atomic waste dump. The people of Kansas covet the right to have a controlling voice over this proposal. They feel that no Federal agency should be allowed to decide a question so important to the State and to its environmental future.

As a part of my remarks I include news stories, editorials, and letters to the editor that have appeared in Kansas and elsewhere:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 25, 1971]  
ATOM-AGE TRASH: FINDING PLACE TO PUT NUCLEAR WASTE PROVES A FRIGHTFUL PROBLEM—AEC, PRODDED BY CRITICS, LOOKS HARDER AT SAFETY OF RADIOACTIVE DUMPINGS—STIRRING UP A DEADLY "SOUP"

(By Dennis Farney)

LYONS, KAN.—The phrase "peaceful atom" conjures up images of cleanliness and light; of white-gowned technicians and bright new reactors, of light and heat and power, seemingly without pollution.

The dark, dirty side of atomic energy is symbolized a half-mile east of this central Kansas town. It is an abandoned salt mine that may soon become this country's first atomic-age crypt.

There, in the perpetual darkness a thousand feet below the Kansas prairie, the Atomic Energy Commission plans to entomb all the "high level" (intensely radioactive) wastes generated by U.S. commercial atomic power plants for the rest of this century. So concentrated will be these wastes that, were they somehow evenly distributed, they could contaminate much of the nation. So

fantastically long-lived are they that they will have to remain sealed away for as long as 500,000 years.

The mine also symbolizes a growing, if belated, effort by the AEC to come to grips with potentially the most devilish pollution problem of all. This is the problem of isolating from the environment the growing volume of radioactive wastes—the result of weapons-making as well as commercial operations—for the centuries, even millennia, they require to decompose.

#### EXPEDIENCY IS CHARGED

Finding solutions hasn't been the AEC's top priority. Democratic Sen. Frank Church of Idaho has calculated that over the last 25 years, while the agency spent billions to develop military and commercial applications of the atom, it spent only \$50 million on waste disposal research. Today the nuclear industry is growing rapidly. But one of the AEC's own scientific advisory committees has characterized some of the agency's waste disposal practices as "expedients designed to make the best use of poor location."

For example:

In southeastern Idaho, one of the AEC's four major U.S. installations routinely stores a variety of radioactive wastes about 600 feet directly above the Snake Plain Aquifer, a huge underground river whose waters ultimately reach much of the Pacific Northwest. Sen. Church and Federal water quality officials are concerned that radioactivity might leach down into the aquifer.

Near Richland, Wash., the AEC's Hanford installation stores millions of gallons of high-level liquid wastes in huge underground tanks. The tanks have a life expectancy of 20 or 30 years, though the wastes within them will remain deadly for about 600 years. At least 11 times, the tanks have sprung relatively minor leaks.

Millions of gallons of high-level wastes rest in a similar "tank farm" at the AEC's Savannah River plant, near Aiken, S.C. The AEC hopes to dispose of these wastes by pumping them into a man-made cavern below the Tuscaloosa Aquifer, already heavily used for drinking water and industry. The AEC advisory committee has called this plan—in a report that was suppressed for four years—"in its essence dangerous."

#### AN INSIDER URGES HALT

Glenn T. Seaborg, AEC chairman, concedes that "you could argue, in retrospect, that the AEC might have moved faster" on waste disposal. But he says such work is moving rapidly now and argues "it was logical" to build up the industry first.

One of the commission's sharpest critics disagrees. Arthur R. Tamplin of the AEC's Lawrence Radiation Laboratory argues for a moratorium on growth of the industry "until we perfect the systems all along the line." He adds: "We really don't know what to do with wastes today. We haven't devised the systems. And we're starting to produce wastes at an ever-increasing rate."

The AEC puts the great bulk of radioactive wastes in the "low-level" category, and maintains that relatively simple disposal techniques are perfectly adequate. Some four million cubic feet of contaminated materials now lie buried in the Idaho desert, for example—everything from contaminated laboratory gloves to bricks and rubble, placed in steel drums or wooden containers and buried in shallow trenches.

There is growing concern that disposal practices for even low-level and intermediate-level wastes pose serious potential hazards. "The current practices of disposing of intermediate and low-level liquid wastes and all manner of solid wastes directly into the ground above or in the fresh-water zones, although momentarily safe, will lead in the long run to a serious fouling of man's environment," warned one AEC scientific advisory committee.

## DRAMATIC GROWTH SEEN

But by far the greatest concern is over "high-level" wastes, which account for more than 99% of all the radioactivity in materials on hand, though they account for a relatively small percentage of volume.

The exact volume of high-level wastes is classified because they are largely the result of AEC plutonium production for nuclear weapons. The AEC put the total at more than 80 million gallons; of this, only about 400,000 gallons are the result of commercial operations.

But this ratio is going to change dramatically as the U.S. nuclear power industry grows. Today that industry provides roughly 1% of all U.S. electric power; by 1980, the AEC estimates, it will provide 25%. By the year 2000, the industry is expected to generate some 60 million gallons of "high-level" waste (or its solidified equivalent), which will be from 10 to 30 times as radioactive as the weapons-related waste now on hand.

Nuclear reactors' uranium fuel elements, whether used to generate electricity or to produce plutonium for weapons, eventually become choked, in effect, with the radioactive fragments of split atoms. When this happens the fuel must be taken to a reprocessing plant. There, the fuel rods are dissolved in acid and the reusable uranium and plutonium are separated out.

What's left, in AEC jargon, is "the soup": A liquid laden with enough radioisotopes to make it one of the deadliest substances on earth.

Many of the radioisotopes decay to harmless levels in relatively short order. (An example is zirconium-95, with a half-life of 65 days; this means half of a given amount will decay in the first 65 days, half of the remaining half in the next 65, and so on.) At the other extreme is plutonium—some of which escapes reprocessing—with a half-life of 24,000 years.

Despite its extreme longevity, plutonium isn't considered the most dangerous component of the liquid waste. Its radiation is incapable of penetrating even a thin shield (a steel barrel, for example) and most plutonium compounds aren't readily soluble in water. Thus plutonium is considered highly dangerous only if actually ingested into the body, particularly if inhaled into the lungs.

The really troublesome radioisotopes are strontium-90 (half-life: 25 years) and cesium-137 (33 years). Unlike many radioisotopes, which are excreted by the body, strontium-90 concentrates in the bones. Cesium-137 emits gamma radiation, similar to X-rays, which can readily penetrate thick shields. In addition, both give off great amounts of heat as they decay, enough to make "the soup" boil furiously for years.

The waste liquid goes into enormous concrete-encased steel tanks, some more than a million gallons in capacity. Depending upon the tank design, the liquid is either cooled for years or simply allowed to boil (with its steam siphoned off to prevent tank rupture). Either way, the liquid loses much of its heat and radioactivity within a few years.

The problem is that the tanks wear out—to say nothing of their vulnerability to accidents—while some radioisotopes within them remain hazardous, in human terms, almost forever. (Strontium-90 and cesium-137 are considered hazardous for 600 years and plutonium for a half-million). Already there have been 15 recorded cases of tank failure, the 11 at Hanford and four at Savannah River. In one mishap at Savannah River, about 700 gallons of intensely radioactive waste overwhelmed safety devices and soaked into the ground.

## LONGER THAN HISTORY

Clearly, the AEC and its critics agree, a more permanent solution is needed. "We really can't talk about this in terms of 'waste disposal,'" says Mr. Tamplin. "It's 'waste guardianship.' . . . Somebody is going to have

to watch this stuff . . . for longer than the history of our country and, in the case of plutonium, longer than the recorded history of man."

The AEC has yet to decide upon a "final" solution to its weapons-related wastes. In the interim, it is solidifying much of them in the tanks they now occupy. But the agency does have a plan for the growing volume of commercial wastes: Solidification and shipment to the salt mine here at Lyons.

Many scientists, inside and outside the AEC, endorse this plan as the safest, surest available. Salt beds are dry and extremely stable geologic formations. Rock salt approximately equals concrete as a gamma ray shield and is so plastic under heat and stress that fissures are self-healing.

Beginning in 1975, if AEC plans hold, ordinary railroad cars would start hauling in barrels and containers of "low-level" wastes for burial here. At full-scale operation, 200 to 400 carloads might be coming each year.

## DEFYING THE IMAGINATION

The "high-level" wastes would start arriving about 1976. Concentrated and solidified, they might take the form of a greenish-black glassy substance, a ceramic-like material or a granular powder. This would be packed inside steel cylinders, each containing wastes so enormously radioactive as to almost defy imagination.

The standard unit of measurement for radioactivity is the curie. One AEC official calculates it would take 10 billion gallons of water to dilute one curie of strontium-90, the deadliest of all the radioisotopes in high-level waste, to the level that current guidelines consider acceptable in drinking water. By comparison, the strontium-90 in high-level wastes may run at 50 to 100 curies per gallon. Solidification of high-level wastes before shipment here would concentrate them sixfold or more.

Altogether, including curies of other radioisotopes as well as strontium-90, each cylinder to be buried here would contain a million or more curies. By 1990, when the disposal operation would be in full swing, some 1,200 or more cylinders would be arriving here each year—shipped in enormous 50 or 100-ton lead "casks" to contain their gamma radiation.

Once here, the casks would be unloaded by remote control behind heavy shielding. The cylinders would then be lowered to the caverns below and transported by a remote-controlled vehicle to their burial tunnels, holes drilled into the tunnel floor. Eventually the entire tunnel would be filled with crushed salt.

## TAKING THE LONG VIEW

The strontium and cesium within the cylinders would make them hot enough eventually to raise the temperature within the underground caverns to 200 degrees or more. This impresses laymen, but AEC engineers seem to take it in stride. Conducting a group of Lyons townsmen through the mine, AEC official assured them that "the heat drops off very rapidly. It would be essentially done . . . in a couple of hundred years."

None of this seems to worry many people in this town of about 4,800, who see a potential boom in the disposal project. "This is great," says Jack McClain, a local electrician. "We just couldn't get a cleaner industry." Declares C. R. "Tiny" Moorman, resident in his red "Lyons ambassador" boosters club jacket: "It's about the grandest thing that could happen to any place."

But farther away from Lyons, concern is rising.

The Kansas affiliate of the Sierra Club considering a court fight to block the project. Chairman Dale Saffels of the state corporation commission has expressed concern about derailments when the big shipping casks start coming in. Gov. Robert Docking has said he wants more facts. But perhaps the

most influential skeptic is William W. Hambleton, director of the state geological survey.

Mr. Hambleton was a member of an AEC advisory group that found salt mine disposal with qualifications, "the safest choice now available." Nevertheless, he's worried about a number of questions and says he isn't "horribly impressed by the enthusiasm they (the AEC) show for checking out these things."

One of his worries is what's known as the "Wigner effect." The wastes will bombard the walls of rock salt with intense radiation, causing energy to be stored in the salt. Under certain conditions this energy might be released in a sudden burst of heat, perhaps shooting temperatures in the underground caverns to 800 degrees centigrade. What would happen then?

"I don't know," he says. "One could speculate on all kinds of horrible things." An extreme possibility: An explosive upheaval, which could release radioactivity to the world above.

And Mr. Hambleton has another worry. "As far as we can tell, the AEC has no contingency plans for retrieval of this stuff should something go wrong."

In reply, an AEC official cites specific studies that "have virtually ruled out" the heat burst danger. And the AEC emphasizes that nothing in the disposal plan will preclude retrieval—although an official concedes the agency hasn't worked up detailed contingency plans for such an operation.

Questions about this project may seem mild, however, compared to the controversy likely to erupt if the AEC goes ahead with another proposal under evaluation. This is "Project Bedrock," the plan to pump millions of gallons of high-level liquid waste into a cavern below the Tuscaloosa Aquifer.

## ECONOMY GETS PRIORITY

The project here at Lyons is only for commercially related wastes; the AEC's enormous stores of high-level weapons-related wastes still remain. It seems generally agreed—even among AEC officials—that the safest answer to these wastes, too, is solidification and salt mine burial. Nevertheless, the AEC is seriously considering the bedrock plan, which another of its own scientific advisory committees not only described as "in its essence dangerous" but also predicted would be sure to "lead to public controversy."

Economy appears to be the foremost consideration. AEC officials say admittedly inexact estimates indicate it might cost 10 times as much to solidify the wastes and bury them in salt mines as to dump them into bedrock caverns. Another consideration: Project Bedrock would allow onsite disposal, eliminating potentially hazardous overland shipments. Finally, AEC officials argue, if Project Bedrock proves safe enough it's simply wasting money to buy an additional margin of safety.

The big questions, of course, are whether the wastes would seep upward through fissures in the bedrock into the aquifer itself—and, if so, how soon?

A majority of the AEC advisory committee—in a critical 1966 report that the AEC suppressed until 1970—concluded the risks of this happening were simply too great. In one of several projections, the committee theorized that wastes could possibly reach fresh water within 100 years; they will be hazardous for at least 600 years. A narrow committee majority recommended that the AEC abandon even attempts to study the project.

"You could never prove, even by all sorts of (exploratory) drilling, that bedrock storage would be as safe as solidification and storage in a salt mine," says Earl Cook, a Texas geographer who was executive director of the committee. "The only way you could be sure is to put this stuff down and wait and see. Unfortunately, that's the way we make too many decisions these days."

Project Bedrock has at least one Senator



worried Democratic Sen. Mike Gravel of Alaska has called on the President's Council on Environmental Quality to "immediately appoint a committee of independent and credible investigators" to look into it. Council member Gordon J. MacDonald says he's inclined to agree.

Nevertheless, the project is "still feasible; so far the feeling is that it looks quite good," says one AEC official close to the matter. The AEC feels confident at this stage of investigation that several barriers—including a layer of clay between the bedrock and the aquifer—would bottle up the wastes long enough to allow them to decay to harmless levels before reaching fresh water.

The agency says it plans to spend \$1.3 million for preliminary work and at least \$10 million to sink an exploratory shaft and tunnels. If tests prove favorable, routine pumping of the wastes into the cavern probably would start in the late 1970s. The agency might then go ahead with a similar project for the Hanford wastes. "We won't go ahead with (Project Bedrock) until we're sure it's absolutely safe," pledges Chairman Seaborg.

But, as AEC officials themselves testify, few problems in the arcane world of radioactive waste lend themselves to "absolute" answers.

"I'm often asked, 'Can you be absolutely sure this or that is safe,'" says John A. Erlewine, the AEC's assistant general manager for operations. "My invariable answer is, 'No, I'm not absolutely sure of anything on this earth.'"

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 4, 1971]

#### NINE STATES CHALLENGE AEC NUCLEAR PROTECTION RULES

(By Austin C. Wehrwein)

ST. PAUL, MINN.—"Possible Atomic Radiation Ahead—Road Closed," say some signs currently held in storage by the Minnesota Highway Department.

They are for possible emergency use near the state's first nuclear power plant at Monticello, a \$115-million, 545,000-kilowatt Northern States Power Company (NSP) project 40 miles upstream from Minneapolis-St. Paul on the Mississippi River.

Although NSP insists the shielding is so strong there's no chance of harmful radiation escape after any foreseeable explosion, and although prediction of a catastrophic blow-up has played a negligible role in a landmark controversy, the road signs are nonetheless most symbolic.

The controversy has turned into a "states' rights" battle with Minnesota authorities and the federal Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) as the main adversaries. The issue: Does a state have constitutional authority, regardless of federal statutes, to set protection limits tougher than the AEC's—in this instance, 50 times more stringent?

#### MARYLAND FACING THE ISSUE

Minnesota says it does have this right and it has been joined in court by eight other states—Pennsylvania, Michigan, Wisconsin, Vermont, Missouri, Virginia, Illinois, and Maryland—as well as attorneys for some members of the Southern Governors Conference.

Maryland faces the same issue, having set permissible discharge rules 100 times as strict for the \$387-million nuclear plant the Baltimore Gas & Electric Company is building at Calvert Cliffs on Chesapeake Bay.

According to the AEC, Vermont is considering regulations exceeding the AEC's; Michigan has legislation for concurrent control but apparently less restrictive standards; and Oregon wants equal authority with the AEC.

Minnesota's stored road signs summarize the state's case. Is there, as the state contends, indeed "possible atomic radiation ahead" from normal operations under the AEC's emission standards?

The Northern States Power Company and AEC prefer to state the question. Does the benefit outweigh what they insist will be infinitesimal risk?

An AEC spokesman said in 1969 that state ceilings above the AEC floor for rules would produce "total and utter chaos." And Earl Ewald, NSP board chairman, last year warned of power shortage brownouts, assailed "witch hunters," and said there was "not one shred of tangible, scientific proof . . . this power plant is hazardous."

#### ROUND LOST IN DECEMBER

After two years of political-legal-scientific sparring, the state lost a crucial round in December in a dispute with tremendous economic and environmental ramifications.

The power company refused to accept the stringent operating-permit limits of the State Pollution Control Agency (PCA). And U.S. District Court Judge Edward J. Devitt ruled that Congress had "preempted" the field for the AEC, leaving Minnesota without authority to regulate the release of radioactive discharges from the plant.

Judge Devitt, handed down a "declaratory judgment" on stipulated facts regarding the law—he did not rule on the "adequacy or inadequacy" of any regulations before him. He did note that NSP on one hand claimed the state's rules were impractical and uneconomic, but that on the other hand it might be true that "prudence dictates" standards stiffer than the AEC's.

Prof. Charles W. Huver, a University of Minnesota zoologist contends there are no "safe" levels for discharge. He has predicted a tenfold increase in leukemia and a "significant" increase in genetic mutations in the Twin Cities.

#### COURT FIGHT CONTINUES

But the Devitt decision, which ignored the state's contention that the Tenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution carved out a state's police power to protect its citizens against hazardous pollution, is not the last round. The final result will shape the future of an electricity source of great potential.

The outgoing Republican administration that began the fight started appeal machinery and the incoming Democratic administration of Gov. Wendell Anderson carried on with a formal notice of appeal to the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals, from which the case could go to the Supreme Court.

Meanwhile, the Minnesota plant operated at low power for testing, and the AEC Division of Reactor Licensing has granted NSP a full-power license based on the Devitt ruling. The AEC made its full-power permit effective Feb. 18, although the company did not immediately announce a precise date for full-power start-up.

Governor Anderson set up what might have proved another hurdle for the power plant on Jan. 11 when he asked the state pollution agency to defer action on another permit until additional testimony could be obtained. This second state permit covered the two 230,000-gallon recirculating storage tanks.

#### STATE PERMIT GRANTED

However, the Governor later indicated he believed the critics had had ample time. In any event, on Feb. 8, the state agency granted the tank permit to the Northern States Power Co. The action was taken over the objections of the St. Paul City Council and the Minnesota Environmental Control Citizens Association (MECCA), a leader in the first against the NSP plant. It contended there was risk of accidental leakage.

Bills to give states nuclear plant regulation jurisdiction were introduced by Minnesota congressmen in the last session but got nowhere; since, then, however, Congress gave California authority to impose air pollution regulations above the floor set in federal regulations.

There are now 20 operable nuclear power plants in the U.S., 53 under construction, and 44 planned. AEC Commissioner James T. Ramey, who has dismissed some of the criticism as "hogwash" and the product of "sensationalism and misrepresentation," has contended that the need for electricity will rise from 344 million kilowatts now to 1,260 million in 1990 and to reach this goal nuclear-powered plants are vital.

Mr. Ramey said that by 1980 there would be 100 nuclear plants or more, representing 25 percent of electrical generating capacity, and by 1990, nuclear plants would be generating 40 percent of the nation's electricity.

Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, AEC chairman, says the benefits we gain [from nuclear plants] will far outnumber the risks of the potential hazards."

But a growing body of critics contend that AEC's secrecy concerning nuclear hazards, actual accidents, and incidents of leukemia they believe were caused by atomic energy activities casts serious doubt on AEC data and theories.

With the experts divided and the technicalities baffling to the average citizen or congressman, the ultimate question will be whether the nation is willing to take the gamble to meet what the AEC and the power industry jointly assure us is likely to be a power shortage without nuclear power plants.

[From the Augusta (Kans.) Daily Gazette, Mar. 12, 1971]

#### FORTY-EIGHT REPRESENTATIVES TAKE ISSUE WITH NUCLEAR STORE IN KANSAS

TOPEKA.—Forty-eight members of the Kansas House of Representatives joined Thursday in introduction of a resolution opposing proposed Atomic Energy Commission authorization to establish a permanent nuclear waste storage facility in Kansas.

Republican Bob Talkington of Iola headed the list of sponsors of the resolution saying there are too many unanswered questions at this time to say go ahead.

Talkington said he thinks almost anyone would agree that the unanswered questions involve the safety of Kansas citizens.

The Kansas Senate federal and state affairs committee has approved several anti-pollution bills. One of the measures would prohibit publicly owned vehicles from using leaded gasoline after next Jan. 1. Another would prohibit the discharge of mercury into waterways.

The Kansas House has approved and sent to the senate a bill to set up a program in which approved inmates in the state penitentiary could donate blood for removal of plasma to be sold to pharmaceutical houses. The vote was 116 to nothing. Funds from the program would be used for prison improvements.

A resolution introduced Thursday asks congress to call a constitutional convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to make available to the states a portion of the federal income taxes.

The house also passed and sent to the senate a bill to designate an area on the proposed El Dorado reservoir as a state park. The vote was 105 to three. The measure is designed to facilitate negotiations with the corps of engineers in planning of recreation areas for the projected reservoir.

The elections, fees and salaries committee of the Kansas House has killed a bill to increase the filing fee for state senator or state representative to \$150.

The same committee also killed a resolution asking a study of the advisability of selection nominees for state office by party convention rather than direct primary.

The house federal and state affairs committee has killed bills exempting Kansas from daylight saving time and requiring a certificate of competency and safety in handling firearms when purchasing a hunting license.

The committee also killed a bill to require legislative or administrative bodies of the state or its subdivisions to hold open meetings with all final or binding actions by open ballot.

The group killed a bill which would prohibit political candidates to use pictures taken more than two years before the filing deadline for the office sought.

A controversial branch banking and multi-bank holding company bill has been killed in a committee of the Kansas House.

The bill had been strongly supported by some Kansas bankers and bitterly opposed by others.

Members of the house commercial and financial institutions committee indicated they're looking to the Kansas Bankers Association to work out a compromise in the problem acceptable to the various banking segments and then come back to the legislature.

The bill would have liberalized present laws against branch banking and multi-bank holding companies.

The Roads and Highways Committee of the Kansas House has killed a bill to reduce the so-called shrinkage allowance for gasoline dealers on the fuel tax they remit to the state.

The committee vote was ten to eight today although its chief sponsor first won adoption of an amendment softening its provisions.

When it was killed the bill simply would have reduced the allowance from three per cent to two and one-half per cent.

Overland Park Republican Wendell Lady said a reduction of the allowance would have increased the amount of money available for the Kansas highway program by \$420,000 a year.

The Kansas Senate gave preliminary approval Thursday to a bill which would exempt privately owned bodies of water from the state's water pollution statutes.

Senator C. Y. Thomas of Mission Hills said the bill was drawn up at the request of the Kansas City Power and Light Co., with consultation from the State Department of Health.

Thomas said the purpose of the bill is to give the largest power generating station in Kansas, currently under construction at La Cygne, assurance, in Thomas' words, "It will not be shut down by the board of health in a few years for violating pollution laws."

The plant is a joint venture of the Kansas City Power and Light Co., and the Kansas Gas and Electric Co.

In other actions, the senate approved a bill giving further homestead tax relief to persons over 65, and killed a measure which would have authorized signs warning people of the penalties for vandalism in state parks.

The Transportation and Utilities Committee of the Kansas House has voted to file a complaint against Topeka lobbyist Eugene Hiatt, asking that his privilege to act as a legislative agent be revoked.

The complaint will be considered by the Senate President Pro Tem, the Speaker of the House and the Republican and Democratic leaders of both branches.

The complaint involves an appearance by Hiatt before that committee in opposition to a proposed cable television bill introduced by members of the house delegation from Shawnee county.

The complaint says statements made by Hiatt during his testimony were totally untrue.

It says he also questioned the motivation and integrity of sponsors of the bill.

The Kansas Senate has killed a bill which would have given every home-owner in the state a \$1,000 homestead exemption on his ad valorem tax assessed valuation.

A 17 to 17 tie vote this afternoon on the measure was broken by Wichita Republican

Wesley Sowers, who was presiding over the senate session.

The bill's sponsor, Democrat Harold Herd of Coldwater, said the measure would have provided half the homes in Kansas with a reduction of one third or more in the amount of property taxes the owners are paying.

[From the Hutchinson (Kans.) News,  
Mar. 10, 1971]

#### JOE AND THE AEC

The war Rep. Joe Skubitz of the Kansas Fifth is waging with the Atomic Energy Commission and its chairman, Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, is worth the fight.

The present battleground is the Rice County salt mine in which AEC plans to store atomic wastes. Regardless of the merits or demerits of that scheme, Skubitz deserves credit for challenging AEC to prove its case.

The Congressman claims AEC has not done this. He demands complete reports of the project and a public accounting by the bureau of its research.

So far, AEC has responded coolly with the implication the Congressman is a know-nothing thwarting the public need. It has answered accusations with a verdict of "hogwash" and replied to serious questions with a charge of "sensationalism and misrepresentation."

Such tactics do not speak well for the AEC, or any other bureau. They indicate other Congressmen should join Skubitz.

Not only the Rice County project is at stake. At least nine states—not including Kansas—have gone to court to prove that states may set protective limits on atomic power plants and waste disposal. Twenty such plants are in operation, 53 more are under construction, and 44 are being planned.

These states have not been convinced that AEC has proper standards, or that it enforces the standards it has set.

Too many government bureaus have established little governments of their own, asking of Congress only that it write blank checks for what they want. AEC, by its arrogance in this matter, is demonstrating that it has become one of these autonomous agencies.

It's time Congress found out who's in charge.

[From the Fort Scott (Kans.) Tribune,  
Mar. 3, 1971]

#### KANSAS FOR DUMPING NUCLEAR WASTES?

Questions about the proposed dumping of atomic wastes in Kansas salt beds have been raised by Congressman Skubitz. He has been making a study of the plans for the past nine months, and he thinks more safeguards ought to be determined for the area than have so far been assured.

The waste products, most of which come from nuclear power plants of the East, amount to 80 million gallons of radioactive material. The stuff is 1,800 degrees in temperature and would remain hot for hundreds of years, according to Skubitz in a letter to Governor Docking, urging him to oppose the plan.

The congressman thinks higher technical safeguards ought to be assured before the plan is accepted. "Since we are dealing here with wastes that will remain dangerous for half a million years, who can be sure that underground water sources in adjacent Kansas, indeed the entire Midwest lower river basins, will not eventually become radiation contaminated?" he asks.

The technical questions are certainly pertinent ones. There is also the question as to why some more remote places than Kansas cannot be found, Skubitz suggests. But to many easterners, Kansas is a remote region. They seem to think that the Midwest is a wasteland itself quite appropriate for dumping nuclear wastes.

Even though the proposed storage area is outside the Fifth District which Congressman Skubitz represents, all of Kansas and the Midwest region should be concerned. The questions he raises about the waste deposits certainly are pertinent ones which all of this part of the country should want answered.

[From the Kansas City (Kans.) Times,  
Mar. 4, 1971]

#### SKUBITZ UNHAPPY OVER AEC WASTE PROJECT "DOUBLE TALK"

(By Joe Lastelle)

WASHINGTON.—Rep. Joe Skubitz (R-Kas.) yesterday accused the chairman of the Atomic Energy commission, Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, of "bureaucratic double-talk" in the answers he gave Skubitz about the proposal to store nuclear wastes in Lyons, Kas., salt mines.

Skubitz protested again in a 10-page letter to Seaborg that the AEC evaded his questions, which originated from Kansas scientists and others, and conducted a "big daddy knows best campaign."

Noting he began a series of inquiries in April, Skubitz said his first AEC reply was "one of those pat me on the head type of bureaucratic letters." That was followed by a report analyzing the population of Lyons and vicinity, a letter full of assurances, but no reports, a letter saying safety studies were being conducted, another that three firms had been selected to carry out the design work and another that core drilling had disclosed no geological problems.

Skubitz complained he had not received answers on safety, management of and transportation of nuclear wastes and other pertinent matters. He insisted work should not begin on the depository site until additional research proves the site safe for present and future generations. He pointed out the final report of the Kansas State Geological survey, conducted under contract with the AEC, was completed but under wraps. He asked the AEC to make it public.

Ever since he got into the matter Skubitz has had problems. Some Kansas editors have denounced him as "hysterical." Others have praised him. Gov. Robert Docking has not paid much attention to Skubitz and his suggestions. Rep. Garner Shriver (R-Kas.) complained that his colleague was getting involved in an area that was in Shriver's district.

To Skubitz the fundamental issue is not a scientific one of whether the AEC can prove that nuclear wastes are dangerous, or whether the Lyons salt beds are a safe repository or whether the waste dump is a matter of national public concern.

"The issue, so far as I am concerned," Skubitz told Seaborg, "is that the people of Kansas have the right to refuse to allow any part of their state to be made a dump for any garbage, not just radioactive nuclear garbage."

"The AEC case just won't hold water. It is full of the kind of bureaucratic assurances that I have come to mistrust in my long experience in Washington."

[From the Parsons (Kans.) Sun, Mar. 6, 1971]

#### WORTHY BATTLE

The Atomic Energy Commission and its chairman, Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, may belittle Rep. Joe Skubitz, the 5th District congressman, for seeking assurances that a thorough and competent study has been made of plans to store atomic wastes in perpetuity in a Kansas salt mine.

A politically-minded Washington correspondent of a midwestern newspaper, perhaps a part of the same cabal or simply insensated because Skubitz is a Republican, whets his knife for the 5th's man in print.

The congressman nonetheless has uncovered a wide public concern and given



the public a voice it has lacked before and which Seaborg obviously has sought to deny it.

Moreover, Skubitz has plenty of company in his insistence that the AEC be given something less than blank checks in the use of atomic power for peaceful purposes and in the disposal of its inevitable wastes.

Nine states, including Missouri, have gone to court to insist that states have the right to set protective limits on atomic usage which are more stringent than those of the captive AEC.

The issue centers primarily around atomic power plants, with their numbers growing steadily (20 in operation, 53 under construction and 44 in the planning stage).

The states aren't certain that the AEC has drawn proper standards or intends to enforce them. They feel responsible for the safety and well-being of their populations which live close to atomic plants and want to be sure that every protective precaution is pursued.

As with Skubitz, the states are not satisfied with answers of "hogwash" and "sensationalism and misrepresentation" from the AEC whenever a question is raised about the hazards involved. Nor should they be.

Dr. Seaborg goes so far as to say that "the benefits we gain (from nuclear plants) will far outnumber the risks of the potential hazards."

What, in all seriousness, does that statement mean?

No matter how munificent the benefits atomic energy may produce, what will they be worth if no one is left to enjoy them or if large numbers of humans die either quick or slow deaths or are otherwise jeopardized by inadequate controls and measures of protection.

Dr. Seaborg must be no fool, but his careless choice of words comes close to making him out as one. The nation is entitled to something better than his demonstrated arrogance in a wholly critical position of authority.

Skubitz is fighting a worthy battle. Many persons other than his constituents, if they don't count for enough, will be cheering him on.

[From the Sterling (Kans.) Bulletin,  
Mar. 18, 1971]

OLD HOME EDITOR

A New York Times reporter concludes that 99 out of 100 Rice County residents favor the AEC's radioactive waste project at Lyons. At least he was appalled at the apparent lack of concern, hinting that we are a naive and trusting lot.

Perhaps he should have extended his field of questioning beyond the Lyons city limits.

True, there has been no organized local opposition, chiefly for the reason that it has been difficult to know what to believe. But this is not to say there has not been deep concern.

Six weeks ago this column expressed serious doubt about the wisdom of allowing such an installation in our county—but the words were little noted and for the most part ignored.

The Lyons News has taken a fair position on the matter, saying, in effect, if responsible persons can find valid objections they should be heard.

The Bulletin takes the position that because of the many unanswered questions, we can in no way afford to take the risks involved. And these questions will remain unanswered for the reason that no one, not even the AEC, knows exactly what the results of such massive storage will have on the local environment.

Preliminary testing is meaningless.

Radioactive materials, the world's worst contaminant, are not to be trifled with. Only

time would tell what cataclysmic horrors might result—a rise in local radiation levels, an increase in surface temperatures, contamination of the all-important ground waters, any of a number of serious imponderables.

For what it is worth, we find a number of local citizens, certainly responsible—by Lyons News definition—share our concern:

Rollin Mead, president of the Sterling Drilling Company, a man who knows local geology as well as anyone, has serious doubts about the wisdom of such an installation. Geologists from outside the country have expressed their fears to Rol. (Several thousand oilfield holes have been bored in this county in the past thirty years, connecting the salt beds with higher water-bearing sands.)

Dr. George Gill, physician and biologist, who has handled more radioactive material (radium) than anyone in the area, considers the project an unquestionable risk. AEC designates such an installation as a "dedicated plot," which is in a sense saying that this ground—and the life around it—is expendable.

T. Marion Heier, with the life-long experience of an architect and builder, knows the nature of the geological structures which underlie the area. "These Arkansas River aqueous sands lie too near the site to risk contamination," Heier has contacted persons in Topeka in this regard.

Others, not wishing to block any economic benefits to be derived from the project, have not spoken out, but nonetheless harbor serious doubts.

Whether or not the plan is approved will not make much difference to this writer. He will be gone before any harmful effects develop. But there are young people at Lyons who hope to raise their families here in safety. How they can rationalize such a move, we cannot understand. Selling out for a mess of pottage?

As for economic benefit: Could the area hope to attract industry or even people, if such a risk hung over our heads?

At a time when pollution, contamination, ecological problems seem to be the No. 1 concern, how can we justify a move to deliberately jeopardize our environment.

Eighty million gallons of boiling liquid waste is now seething away at various AEC installations. Solidify this junk and bring it to us, we'll take care of it in Rice County, cesspool of creation.

[From the Parsons (Kans.) Sun, Mar. 6,  
1971]

ATOMIC DUMPING ISSUE—SKUBITZ SLAMS  
AEC: "FORKED TONGUE"

(By Lee Byrd)

WASHINGTON.—Rep. Joe Skubitz, R-Kan., has accused the Atomic Energy Commission of "bureaucratic doubletalk" in attempts to justify plans for a \$25-million radioactive dump in a salt mine near Lyons.

Dismissing the latest assurances offered by AEC Chairman Glenn T. Seaborg, Skubitz wrote back that "We are not country bumpkins who can be taken for granted."

Skubitz' complaint was based on a letter from Seaborg Feb. 23 which declared: "No radioactive wastes will be placed in the Lyons salt formation until all the necessary studies and safety analyses have been concluded and the commission is satisfied that it is safe."

Noting that the AEC, however, is asking \$3.5 million for an immediate construction start, Skubitz replied "I, for one, simply don't trust the AEC . . ."

Skubitz pointed out the Interior Department and private sources have questioned the wisdom of the project, which he said would be "handling highly radioactive wastes that will remain dangerous for a half-million years."

In an interview, Skubitz claimed widespread public opposition to the facility, which would begin operation in 1974 and handle virtually all wastes produced by commercial nuclear reactors through the year 2000.

The congressman said he does not know the number of persons who have complained to his office, and an aide, Mike Marden, said only that it was "several hundred."

"We haven't had but just one or two people disagree with us," said Marden.

Meanwhile, Jim Fairchild, an assistant to Rep. Gardner Shriver, R-Kan., whose district includes Lyons, said, "We have had very little correspondence from the people in that area."

"There has been no great outpouring of concern."

Skubitz hoped to block the AEC appropriation for the project by carrying his protest to hearings before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Copies of his 11-page letter to Seaborg went to each member of the committee.

Beyond the question of whether the project is safe, said Skubitz, "the people of Kansas have the right to refuse to allow any part of their state to be made a dump for any garbage, not just radioactive nuclear garbage."

He said also the AEC had failed to satisfy fears that earthquakes or other disasters might jar loose the radioactive materials. And he said the problem of transportation means "every damned state is going to be involved."

"I can't see where Kansas owes any private enterprise anything in order to take care of waste."

An AEC spokesman, Truman Temple, said the agency has received no protests over the plan except those from Skubitz and Ronald Baxter, president of the Topeka chapter of the Sierra Club.

Temple noted that AEC had experimented with radioactive storage in salt from 1962 to 1967, and the results were "very carefully analyzed." He said the Lyons mine was chosen "because of the great geologic stability of the area."

The salt deposit, said Temple, dates back 230 million years, providing "a pretty good basis for our judgment" over the possibility of geologic disturbances in the future.

Temple said the project had been endorsed by Jerry Allen, radiologist for the Kansas Department of Health, and Dr. Curtis Chezem and Prof. R. W. Klack of the Kansas State University nuclear engineering department.

[Letter to the editor, Wichita (Kans.) Eagle,  
Mar. 3, 1971]

READER NEEDS A REASON FOR AN ATOMIC  
DUMP ANYWHERE IN UNITED STATES

I have been impressed by several stories in other papers that quote more extensively than did your paper the questions raised by Congressman Skubitz about the safety and wisdom of the Lyons atomic waste site. Now your Feb. 21 editorial seems to chide the congressman in one breath for raising the issue and in the next breath the governor's office and the State Geological survey for not telling you about their own study.

As a long-time Kansas resident, it seems to me that you miss the basic point—even if the whole project were a safe one, what good is it going to do Kansas and Kansas people? Frankly, you haven't come up with a reason why there should be an atomic dump anywhere in the United States? Why should the taxpayers shell out for a facility for the benefit of a big, rich, out of state utility companies to dump their wastes? It would be just as logical to agree to let them pipe their smoke-stack gases and truck the ashes from their coal furnaces to Kansas to pollute our air and our ground.

RONALD G. ALDERMAN.

[Letter to the editor, Wichita (Kans.) Eagle, Mar. 5, 1971]

#### HE FEELS ACCEPTING ATOMIC WASTES AT LYONS IS VERY DANGEROUS

It is utterly appalling to see that the people of Kansas, and particularly the town of Lyons, seem willing to trade away their future health and safety for the pittance offered by the Atomic Energy Commission in trade for its atomic burial ground. Surely the meager benefits accruing from a few local jobs would never be worth even a single unforeseen accident.

The greatest accident potential, however, may not be isolated to the town of Lyons or even South Central Kansas because such a facility would receive atomic waste shipments by rail from reactors and fuel reprocessing plants all across the nation. The possibility of an accident may even be greater in the towns and cities along the shipment routes. Even with the relatively safe handling techniques that have been developed so far, possibilities still exist for high-speed derailments or sabotage incidents which would result in needless injury or death.

The AEC with its vested interests in promoting atomic power should at no time be entrusted with the authority to determine that the salt vault method of dumping waste is adequate enough for public safety. The citizens of this state should take it upon themselves to look over the shoulder of the AEC and establish rigorous safety standards that would be enforced by properly trained state health authorities.

Questions concerning safety inspection of railroad operations and roadbeds remain unanswered, yet no one can reasonably advocate that the railroad's current accident record indicates its ability to operate in the future without incident.

ERIK H. EAST.

[Letter to the editor, Wichita (Kans.) Eagle, Mar. 17, 1971]

#### SHE WOULD LIKE THE FACTS ABOUT THE PROPOSAL FOR LYONS

What do the people of Kansas want to read regarding the proposed Lyons repository? The facts please, not exclusively the views of the AEC.

I refer to the article of the March 9 Eagle which gives most of the space to discrediting the Kansas Sierra Club chairman. The article states, "The Department of the Interior rejected the AEC's environmental proposal on the basis that further tests needed to be carried out before approval could be given." The Sierra Club has thus assumed that further testing is required before even the AEC is satisfied the program is safe.

Misinterpretation by the Sierra Club? It really was difficult to determine from the context of the article.

Safe? Radioactive waste that will remain "hot" for thousands of years? Waste that could cause pollution of air, water and ground? Why Kansas? The people of Kansas are told our state was "chosen" because of our abandoned salt mines. There are salt mines elsewhere, there are areas of low earthquake probability. Unfortunately these other areas are located directly under or near densely populated areas. Perhaps Kansas is a safer place to store these wastes, but safer for whom? People other than Kansans, one would assume.

Mrs. SHERRIE YARD.

[From the Parsons (Kans.) Sun, Mar. 10, 1971]

#### PITTSBURG UNIT FIGHTS AEC PLAN

LYONS, KAN.—It was learned Thursday night that a Pittsburg, Kan., environmental group has started a petition campaign it hopes will become a statewide effort in opposition to the Atomic Energy Commission proposal to establish a nuclear waste storage facility near Lyons.

In Hutchinson, members of the Reno County Environmental Action Committee met Thursday night to discuss the petition and methods for circulating the statement, which calls for a "total and immediate suspension" of the AEC proposal "until clarification on this issue is possible for the people of Kansas."

In Topeka, 48 members of the Kansas House joined Thursday in introducing a resolution opposing the nuclear waste repository.

Use of a Lyons salt mine for burying radioactive wastes is expected to be a key topic at a meeting Saturday of the Kansas Academy of Science's Conservation Committee at Lawrence.

Joint congressional hearings on the proposal are scheduled to begin Tuesday in Washington.

U.S. Rep. Joe Skubitz, R-Kan.; William Hambleton of the Kansas State Geological Society; and Ronald Baxter, president of the Kansas chapter of the Sierra Club, are expected to testify against the proposal.

[From the Coffeyville (Kans.) Journal, Mar. 16, 1971]

#### DOCKING CRITICIZES AEC

TOPEKA.—Gov. Robert Docking accused the Atomic Energy Commission today of being more interested in conducting a public relations program regarding the proposed nuclear waste repository at Lyons, Kan., than in carrying out tests to prove the project is safe.

The governor made his feelings known in a prepared statement issued here as William W. Hambleton, director of the Kansas Geological Survey, represented the state at a Congressional hearing in Washington.

The hearing before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy involves the AEC's request for \$3.5 million in fiscal 1972 for site acquisition and planning on the Lyons project.

"Adequate funds should be provided for research to answer many questions associated with the Lyons site," Docking said, adding the AEC appears to be "more interested in convincing the public of the safety of the Lyons site rather than using these funds to carry needed studies to conclusions."

The AEC has proposed using abandoned salt mines near Lyons for storing nuclear wastes from all over the nation. The Kansas Sierra Club and Rep. Joe Skubitz, R-Kan., have led opposition to the project, which Docking tentatively endorsed last summer when it was announced, but said he expected to have tests conducted to prove safety features of the project.

Docking said Hambleton was instructed to ask the Congressional committees to defer funds for the proposed repository "until scientific tests determining the site's safety are completed."

Docking said the Commission has "exhibited remarkably little interest" in certain studies and "has not demonstrated a capability for solving other problems the repository presents."

The governor accused the AEC of being slow in responding to requested reports, said the AEC has failed to inform the state of other investigations and "treated our concerns as negligible and trivial in public statements."

#### PEARSON JOINS IN

WASHINGTON.—Sen. James B. Pearson, R-Kan., said today absolute safety must be guaranteed before nuclear waste is stored in the salt mines near Lyons, Kan.

In a statement submitted to a hearing of the joint Atomic Energy Committee, Pearson said:

"Under no circumstances should this project be allowed to be put into full-scale operation until it has been satisfactorily and

reasonably demonstrated that the storage of nuclear waste at this site is absolutely safe.

"On this there can be no compromise.

"Because questions of safety are of such vital importance I therefore urge the joint committee on atomic energy to authorize whatever additional funds are needed to carry out the necessary research. The Atomic Energy Commission should be authorized and indeed directed to carry out additional in-house research and also to make funds available to the appropriate research personnel and agencies in the state of Kansas."

#### PLAN STATE PETITION

PITTSBURG, KAN.—Plans for statewide circulation of petitions asking that implementation of the nuclear waste storage project at Lyons be suspended "until satisfactory clarification of this issue" is possible were announced today by a Pittsburg environmental organization.

Bill Summers, Pittsburg State College faculty member and chairman of the petition committee of the Environmentalist Club at the college, said petition forms have been sent to several school campuses and to environmental action groups.

Among organizations that will receive the forms, he said, are the Salina Consumers for Environmental Action, the Izaak Walton League of Wichita, the Environmental Concern Club of Ottawa University, the Greater Kansas City Environmental Action group, the Kansas Campers Association, the Kansas Association of Biology Teachers, the Citizens for Better Environment at Kansas State University, the Kansas Wildlife Federation, the Kansas Association of Teachers of Science, and the Association for Environmental Improvement at Wichita State University.

"It is important to emphasize," Summers said, "that the petition essentially asks for a suspension of all activity in any way related to implementation, pending a rigorous and exhaustive examination of the proposal. It does not ask for an outright rejection of the proposal."

The petitions will be sent, he said, to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. He said signatures from on-campus signing at Pittsburg State already have been sent to the committee.

[From the Iola (Kans.) Register, Mar. 1, 1971]

#### DOCKING STRESSES NEED TO DETERMINE SAFETY OF WASTE DUMP PROJECT

TOPEKA.—Gov. Robert Docking accused the Atomic Energy Commission today of being more interested in conducting a public relations program regarding the proposed nuclear waste repository at Lyons, Kan., than in carrying out tests to prove the project is safe.

The governor made his feelings known in a prepared statement issued here as William W. Hambleton, director of the Kansas Geological Survey, represented the state at a Congressional hearing in Washington.

The hearing before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy involves the AEC's request for \$3.5 million in fiscal 1972 for site acquisition and planning on the Lyons project.

"Adequate funds should be provided for research to answer many questions associated with the Lyons site," Docking said, adding the AEC appears to be "more interested in convincing the public of the safety of the Lyons site rather than using these funds to carry needed studies to conclusion."

The AEC has proposed using abandoned salt mines near Lyons for storing nuclear wastes from all over the nation. The Kansas Sierra Club and Rep. Joe Skubitz, R-Kan., have led opposition to the project, which Docking tentatively endorsed last summer when it was announced, but said he expected to have tests conducted to prove safety features of the project.



Docking said Hambleton was instructed to ask the Congressional committee to defer funds for the proposed repository "until scientific tests determining the site's safety are completed."

Docking said the Commission has "exhibited remarkably little interest" in certain studies and "has not demonstrated a capability for solving other problems the repository presents."

The governor accused the AEC of being slow in responding to requested reports, said the AEC has failed to inform the state of other investigations and "treated our concerns as negligible and trivial in public statements."

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Times, Mar. 17, 1971]

#### INSIST ON SAFETY AT LYONS (By Joe Lastelle)

WASHINGTON.—Kansans worried about using the salt mines at Lyons, Kas., to dispose of nuclear waste materials told the joint congressional committee on atomic energy yesterday they would insist that the project be safe.

The safety factor was the predominant theme at a hearing that opened yesterday and will continue today. The Atomic Energy Commission has asked for 25 million dollars for the project, with 3.5 million requested for the fiscal year that begins in July to buy land and begin developing the site.

"The decision belongs properly to the people of Kansas," Rep. Joe Skubitz (R-Kas.) told the committee. "They are entitled to have all the facts before such a decision is reached. I am trying to make some of the pertinent facts available to them."

Skubitz has been leading the parade of those who oppose the project. The opponents contend the AEC has not provided them assurances of safety in transportation of the wastes to the mines or storage once the wastes are encased deep in the mines.

Representing Gov. Robert Docking, Dr. William Hambleton, director of the Kansas State Geological survey, said the governor feels that title to the land should not be granted until the studies are completed.

"Kansans don't want the dubious honor of being the first laboratory experiment for burying lethal wastes in salt," Skubitz told the committee.

Hambleton said Governor Docking "reluctantly concludes that efforts of the AEC, to minimize safety problems and treat fears as negligible, support the fears of many Kansans that if funds are appropriated the project cannot be stopped at a later date if the project is found to be unsafe."

He said the AEC's justification for choosing the site represented "a simplistic view of geology" and said the agency had not studied sufficiently the long-term possibility of the salt's being subject to erosion.

Hambleton added: "Plans for the safe transportation of radioactive materials are completely inadequate and no plans for retrieval exist at all."

Rep. Garner Shriver and Rep. Keith Sebelius, Kansas Republicans, joined in a statement calling for abandonment of the project should studies reveal potential danger to the lives, health, and safety of Kansas citizens.

"We do not view the request for authorization of these funds at this time, nor the decision to conduct this demonstration project in Kansas, as a final or irrevocable step," they said. "We believe the people of Kansas and Congress must have assurance of the unquestioned permanent safety of this project before any nuclear wastes are buried in the Lyons salt mine."

Sen. James B. Pearson (R-Kas.) said there can be no compromise on the question of safety and he urged the committee to authorize whatever funds are needed to carry out research on that subject.

"Kansas officials must have complete confidence in the integrity of the scientific judgments regarding safety of this project," Pearson said.

Sen. Bob Dole (R-Kas.) said regardless of how very small the risks, a detailed analysis of them must be given to satisfy not only the federal government, but Kansans. He stressed he would insist that radioactive emissions from any proposed repository not be allowed to exceed those limits required for nuclear power plants and said there must be continuous monitoring.

[From the Coffeyville (Kans.) Journal, Mar. 11, 1971]

#### SOLONS OPPOSE AEC PROPOSAL NEAR LYONS

TOPEKA (AP).—Forty-eight members of the Kansas House joined today in introduction of a resolution opposing proposed Atomic Energy Commission authorization to establish a permanent nuclear waste storage facility in Kansas.

Rep. Bob Talkington, R-Iola, headed the list of sponsors of the resolution.

"I feel there are too many unanswered questions at this time to say 'go ahead,'" said Talkington.

Talkington said he thinks almost anyone would agree that the questions involve the safety of Kansas citizens.

"If in the future the questions are answered to the satisfaction of the people of Kansas, then I would say, 'go ahead,'" the Iola representative said.

Talkington said a recent review of earthquakes in the United States indicated the proposed storage location near Lyons is in an area moderately susceptible to earthquakes.

[From the Columbus (Kans.) Advocate, Mar. 1, 1971]

#### STORING ATOMIC WASTES HIT BY SKUBITZ

PARSONS, KAN. (AP).—Rep. Joe Skubitz, R-Kan., said Friday he is receiving nationwide support in a fight to keep atomic wastes out of Kansas.

"Why in the hell should we transport the stuff clear across the country to deposit it in an old salt mine in Lyons, Kans.?" he asked in a telephone interview from his office in Washington.

"Let Con Ed look out after its own atomic garbage. Why . . . should we take care of them?"

He had reference to Consolidated Edison, a New York electrical utility.

The congressman, who recently launched a campaign to prevent Atomic Energy Commission use of old salt mines in central Kansas, said a little-understood point is that atomic wastes in the next decade will originate largely from private power plants using that form of energy.

"We're not talking about federal installations," he said. "That being the case, the utilities should make their own provision for disposal of atomic wastes, and near their plants. There are salt mines in northeastern states, too, as well as Kansas."

In Washington, Skubitz accused Gov. Robert B. Docking Friday of "weasling" on the nuclear wastes issue. Skubitz said Docking has tried to shunt aside his responsibilities as governor.

He wrote Docking Feb. 12 and got a reply Feb. 20, then wrote back Thursday, saying, "You suggest that 'constraints be placed on development funding so that the project will be abandoned if studies and investigations reveal any potential danger.' Surely, governor, that's a weasling statement if you ever wrote one." Instead, Skubitz contended, the studies should be done beforehand and atomic wastes should be made safer.

The congressman said Docking seems to want the Kansas congressional delegation to take the leadership in the matter. Skubitz said Docking should go before the joint

Atomic Energy Committee of Congress and take a strong stand against the waste dumping plan.

"I continue to hope that your position will be less equivocal so that the committee and the AEC will understand that Kansas officialdom is unambiguously opposed to making our state a nuclear dump," Skubitz said.

[From the Fort Scott (Kans.) Tribune, Mar. 5, 1971]

#### SKUBITZ ACCUSES AEC OF BUREAUCRATIC DOUBLETALK ON KANSAS RADIOACTIVE DUMP

WASHINGTON (AP).—Rep. Joe Skubitz, R-Kan., has accused the Atomic Energy Commission of "bureaucratic doubletalk" in attempts to justify plans for a \$25-million radioactive dump in a salt mine near Lyons.

Dismissing the latest assurances offered by AEC Chairman Glenn T. Seaborg, Skubitz wrote back that "We are not country bumpkins who can be taken for granted."

Skubitz' complaint was based on a letter from Seaborg Feb. 23 which declared: "No radioactive wastes will be placed in the Lyons salt formation until all the necessary studies and safety analyses have been concluded and the commission is satisfied that it is safe."

Noting that the AEC, however, is asking \$3.5 million for an immediate construction start, Skubitz replied "I for one, simply don't trust the AEC . . ."

Skubitz pointed out the Interior Department and private sources have questioned the wisdom of the project, which he said would be "handling highly radioactive wastes that will remain dangerous for a half-million years."

In an interview, Skubitz claimed widespread public opposition to the facility which would begin operation in 1974 and handle virtually all wastes produced by commercial nuclear reactors through the year 2,000.

The congressman said he does not know the number of persons who have complained to his office, and an aide, Mike Marden, said only that it was "several hundred."

"We haven't had but just one or two people disagree with us," said Marden.

Meanwhile, Jim Fairchild, an assistant to Rep. Gardner Shriver, R-Kan., whose district includes Lyons, said, "We have had very little correspondence from the people in that area."

"There has been no great outpouring of concern."

Skubitz hoped to block the AEC appropriation for the project by carrying his protest to hearings before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Copies of his 11-page letter to Seaborg went to each member of the committee.

Beyond the question of whether the project is safe, said Skubitz, "the people of Kansas have the right to refuse to allow any part of their state to be made a dump for any garbage—not just radioactive nuclear garbage."

He said also the AEC had failed to satisfy fears that earthquakes or other disasters might jar loose the radioactive materials. And he said the problem of transportation means "every damned state is going to be involved."

"I can't see where Kansas owes any private enterprise anything in order to take care of waste."

An AEC spokesman, Truman Temple, said the agency has received no protests over the plan except those from Skubitz and Ronald Baxter, president of the Topeka chapter of the Sierra Club.

Temple noted the AEC had experimented with radioactive storage in salt from 1962 to 1967, and the results were "very carefully analyzed." He said the Lyons mine was chosen "because of the great geologic stability of the area."

The salt deposit, said Temple, dates back

230 million years, providing "a pretty good basis for our judgment" over the possibility of geologic disturbances in the future.

Temple said the project had been endorsed by Jerry Allen, radiologist for the Kansas Department of Health, and Dr. Curtis Cherm and Prof. R. W. Klack of the Kansas State University nuclear engineering department.

[From the Hutchinson (Kans.) News,  
Mar. 12, 1971]

#### PRESSURE MOUNTS AGAINST LYONS AEC PROJECT

(By Roy Miller)

LYONS.—With congressional hearings only four days away, pressure is intensifying against the establishment of a nuclear waste storage facility at Lyons.

The Atomic Energy Commission proposal will be the subject of a hearing before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy beginning Tuesday at Washington.

The News learned Thursday night that a Pittsburg environmental group has started a petition-signing campaign it hopes will become a statewide effort.

In Hutchinson, members of the Reno County Environmental Action Committee met Thursday night to discuss the petition and methods for circulating the statement, which calls for a "total and immediate suspension" of the AEC proposal until "clarification on this issue is possible for the people of Kansas."

In Topeka, 48 members of the Kansas House joined Thursday in the introduction of a resolution opposing the nuclear waste repository.

#### KEY TOPIC

Saturday, use of a Lyons salt mine for burying radioactive wastes is expected to be a key topic at a meeting of the Kansas Academy of Science's Conservation Committee at Lawrence.

U.S. Rep. Joe Skubitz, R-Kan.; William Hambleton of the Kansas State Geological Society; and Ronald Baxter, president of the Kansas chapter of the Sierra Club, are expected to testify against the proposal, a public information official of the AEC said Thursday from Washington.

Skubitz, who represents Kansas' 2nd District (primarily Southeast Kansas), has received national publicity for his attacks on the project.

The congressman, reportedly busily preparing testimony for Tuesday's hearing, could not be reached Thursday. But an aide indicated Skubitz' interest stems from the fact he was an aide to the late Sen. Andrew Schoepel, who was in Congress when the AEC proposed 17 years ago to store nuclear wastes in the Lyons salt beds.

"They proposed a big excavation that would look something like a laboratory flask," said Edward Cooper, a Skubitz aide. "They're going to just pour wastes down in liquid form and use a series of tubes to cool the gasses."

"He (Skubitz) remembered this. He remembered how Schoepel and the rest of the Kansas congressional delegation raised hell."

"So last summer when they brought this up again, Congressman Skubitz started asking questions. He didn't like some of the answers."

"He's busy now working up his paper. He really feels that he is required to document this thing as thoroughly as he can."

#### RIGHT TO REFUSE

In a letter to Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, AEC director, Skubitz has said "that the people of Kansas have the right to refuse to allow any part of their state to be made a dump for any garbage—not just for radioactive nuclear garbage."

"Even you will agree that neither the AEC nor any other federal agency has the right or the authority to compel them to do other-

wise. . . What disturbs me is the AEC's effort in this instance to subvert that lack of authority by a 'big-daddy-knows-best' campaign that is at best disingenuous."

Skubitz believes the AEC has not made enough studies into safety factors concerning the Lyons repository.

"(The) AEC should not put the cart before the horse by proposing actual site work be done while it carries out additional research to determine if what it has begun will be safe later on," Skubitz told Dr. Seaborg, adding, "We are here dealing with human lives, and we must know the facts beyond a reasonable doubt."

#### SENDING COPY

In Skubitz' hometown of Pittsburg, the Environmentalist Club is sending a copy of the letter and other statements to Kansas newspapers and petitions to other ecology groups.

The publicity includes excerpts of a State Biological Survey report which concludes that the AEC has "exhibited remarkably little interest in studies of radiation damage. The State Geological Survey regards this problem as extremely critical to safe storage of radioactive waste at the Lyons site."

The survey also raises questions about transportation of the materials, a point emphasized by critics of the Lyons site.

"We judge that plans for safe transportation of these radioactive materials are completely inadequate and that no contingency plans for retrieval of waste exists at all," the survey's report states. "We conclude that these two elements are critical and crucial to the safe storage of radioactive materials at the Lyons site."

The petition being circulated by the Pittsburg ecology organization also raises questions about transportation.

"Not to be overlooked, psychotic bombing or terrorist activity in Kansas and across America further complicates the risk factor involved in the transportation," the petition states.

Bill Summers, a high school counselor and Environmentalist committee chairman, said the petition campaign is being undertaken with the "hope to make known in Topeka as well as in Washington how the people of Kansas feel."

"The people have a right to have a say-so in this," Summers said. "We have called for responsible public opinion sampling throughout the state on the part of media sources."

#### GIVES CHALLENGE

"I challenge anybody to sample opinion outside of Rice County. I don't think the people of Kansas are in favor of it."

Inside Rice County, Lyons business leaders have endorsed the project, pointing to the new jobs (about 200) it will create.

"I personally think it is a tremendous opportunity for the state of Kansas, the city of Lyons and Rice County, John Johannes, then president of the Lyons Chamber of Commerce and manager of the Kansas Power and Light Co., said last summer. "Not only from the economic standpoint, but with your emphasis on pollution and the environment, we know that it can be stored safely here without dumping it in the ocean or where it is stored now."

While most reaction here has been favorable to the nuclear garbage dump, the feeling is not universal. Residents whose land will be purchased for the layout of about 1,000 acres are in an uneasy position as the issue is battled.

The property owners would admit to being selfish. They say land is scarce in Rice County. They don't want to lose their property.

While a Washington public information spokesman for the AEC says the only contact with property owners has been to seek permission for core drillings by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, persons owning

land adjacent to the salt mine once operated by the Carey Salt Co. of Hutchinson say appraisers have inspected their property.

Jack Stewart, whose land runs north of the salt mine, says the AEC will want 20 acres if Congress approves the project.

"I don't think a whole lot of it," Stewart said of the proposal. "I think they're more concerned about the economic part of it than the health part of it."

"It seems to me that the businessmen down here can't sleep until they can get it in here. It seems to me that they've talked only to the businessmen and not the landowners."

If the disposal project is approved and built, Stewart said he would remain on his land adjacent to the facility.

"I'm not that much afraid of it," he said. "As far as what they (the AEC) actually know, I don't know if it amounts to much or not. As far as misleading people, the government's always been pretty good at that."

#### WANTS ALL

Another landowner, Roy Dressler, said the government wants all of his 160 acres—"improvements and all."

Reflecting his uneasy feeling about the future, Dressler answered questions mostly in abrupt sentences.

Q. Has the land been appraised?

A. "Yes, but they wouldn't tell me what it is."

Q. Is it hard to find other land?

A. "Yes. Especially when you've been here 35 years."

Q. Are you in favor of the project?

A. "I sure am not."

Q. What about the safety?

A. "I don't know."

Q. Do you think the project will become a reality?

A. "I did. But they're getting a little static now. I'm hoping it won't but I don't know."

Q. Are you bitter about the stand taken by the business community?

A. "They're forgetting that we've done business here all this time. I just don't understand it. Everybody seemed to know about it before I did."

[From the Parsons (Kans.) Sun, Parsons, Kans., Mar. 20, 1971]

#### FROM THE BENCH

Look, if you will, at the ball carrier who rushed from the bench and picked up the ball on atomic wastes in Kansas once Joe Skubitz had cleared the field by mowing down the defense as a super-blocker.

None other than Bob Docking, who is making like a fleet-footed halfback after the Kansas congressional delegation, spurred by Skubitz in the first instance, united to bring the Joint Atomic Energy Committee to time on the question of making this state a dumping ground for atomic garbage.

The governor hardly had been as daring in the game's opening quarters. Indeed he glued himself to the bench, waiting to see what turn the combat would take.

His statements were reserved and cautiously phrased, as if there was great reluctance to take a stand. Skubitz meanwhile came on like a battalion of gangbusters. He spoke his mind first, placing the safety of Kansas first, and left his own flanks exposed while political opinion caught up with him. He was, to return to jargon of the gridiron for the moment, a lonely end for many months.

The cause became so popular, though, that Docking not only entered the fray but enlisted the advice and possible services of Vern Miller, the attorney general, on suing the federal government.

In the fashion of one who has just filled his mouth with sour grapes, Docking suggests that only action of the state may save Kansas from a calculated assault of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Far more effective, in reality, will be the



votes and influence of the Kansas congressional delegation and the extensive record compiled by Skubitz in his single-handed campaign against the hazards posed by the AEC's salt mine invasion of Kansas.

Citizens are not likely to be impressed by the brave pronouncements flowing from Topeka after the grubby preliminaries had been handled, and well, by others.

DAYTON, TENN.,  
March 3, 1971.

Mr. JOHN H. COLBURN,  
Editor, *The Wichita Eagle*,  
Wichita, Kans.

DEAR EDITOR: As former long-time residents of Kansas, who are still proud to claim the center of America as our native soil, we take sincere interest in the proposal to make Lyons a nuclear wastedump.

Our present residence near the Oak Ridge national laboratories of the Atomic Energy Commission (Oak Ridge, Tennessee) heightens our awareness of the development of nuclear power in this country. Needless to say, the local press is as sensitive to the problems of ORNL as you are to the problems of Boeing.

In all fairness, the most pressing problem of AEC is obviously the question of what to do with a dangerous accumulation of radioactive wastes. Local feeling is clear: Kansas is considered dusty, desolate, and scarcely populated. It is not uncommon to solicit an off-the-cuff response of "Can you think of a better place to dump this stuff than in Kansas?"

Personally, we resent this implication that Kansas, our native state, is a suitable dump. In your editorial of February 21, you appear to brush aside this regrettable stigma as a "catchy phrase." Unfortunately, this "catchy phrase" is the essence of the feelings of people aware of the nuclear waste disposal problem and not particularly concerned about Kansas integrity. In a state already burdened with the unwarranted stereotype of "western desert" by people who think of Kansas as "out there" it is difficult to understand your willingness to accept the additional tag of "nuclear garbage dump."

Kansas is being cheapened, Mr. Editor, and I don't think you know it.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. RICHARD HARRIS.

P.S.—Inasmuch as you have editorialized on this issue, we hope that in fairness you will publish this opposing view under letters to the editor. We are sending a copy of this letter to Representative Joe Skubitz of Pittsburg. From our standpoint, his "hysteria" appears to be honest concern for the future of Kansas.

#### GEORGIA TEEN ELECTED PRESIDENT OF FUTURE BUSINESS LEADERS OF AMERICA

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I know that many of my colleagues have been proud and pleased with the outstanding achievements of certain of our fine young constituents. I earnestly believe that when a young man does well, is a success in his endeavors, and demonstrates his devotion to the principals of true Americanism, then we should take note of this individual.

Therefore, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues an article about Jones Hooks from Metter, Ga., which

appeared recently in the Atlanta Journal and Constitution Magazine.

Jones Hooks in my opinion typifies the all American boy spirit which has become a rarity in our modern times and I hope that his good qualities will serve as an inspiration to other youth of America:

[From the Atlanta Journal & Constitution magazine, Mar. 21, 1971]

TEEN WHO HEADS AMERICA'S FUTURE BUSINESS LEADERS—THE ONLY THING LAZY ABOUT JONES HOOKS OF METTER, GA., IS HIS SOUTHERN DRAWL

(By Margaret Shannon)

"You should have seen those Yankee girls. They were just standing around and saying, 'Jones, say mayonnaise,' or 'Jones, say so-and-so.' They just went wild over this."

And so, for once anyway, a Southern drawl was an asset in a presidential campaign. Jones Hooks, a 6-foot, 18-year-old Metter High School senior with a true south Georgia molasses-and-cornpone accent, was elected president of the Future Business Leaders of America on the first ballot at the national convention in Philadelphia.

FBLA is an organization for high school students taking business and office training courses. It has 5,000 chapters with 98,000 members nationally. Dr. Russell J. Mercer, Georgia state supervisor of business education, is chairman of the national board of directors of FBLA and its college division, Phi Beta Lambda.

Georgia has more FBLA chapters (282) than any other State. But up there is Philadelphia, things were run on a sort of unit system. Each state delegation had two votes.

"I could just see Georgia getting about five Southern votes," says Mrs. Bernice Bland, chapter adviser and business education teacher at Metter High.

"Mrs. Bland said surely nobody from the South could ever win," Jones says—and laughs. But win he did, and he has been busy ever since with conferences and conventions and speeches and meetings, traveling to places like Washington and New Orleans and Chicago, an excited, enthusiastic young man with energy, drive and maybe even charisma.

What goes into the making of the president of a national teen-age organization? More, of course, than a Southern accent or a name that catches on.

"I think one thing that sold me at the national convention was my name," says Jones Hooks. "It's so unusual that it seemed like whenever you told it to anybody, they would repeat it and remember it. They asked me about it."

Carson Jones Hooks, second son of Mr. and Mrs. V. H. Hooks Jr., is named for his maternal grandfather. Their older son and only other child, Vendie, is a first year student in the Medical College of Georgia at Augusta. Mr. Hooks is a mortician.

As part of his vocational office training (VOT) course in high school, Jones works at the funeral home, mostly in the office. "Everybody says, 'Surely you're going to be a mortician,'" Jones said. "I say, 'Surely I'm not, either.'"

"He's a good employe," his father says. "He's just about been running the office, except for the accounting; the bookkeeper does that. Jones sends out statements. He helps with the insurance business, keeping up with premiums and the like. He answers the mail and that sort of thing."

"I don't know any other employer that would have been as understanding about me missing so much time in regular hours," Jones said. "The way it is, I can make up hours by working in the office late in the afternoons or if we have a Sunday afternoon funeral."

Mr. Hooks has been in the funeral home business for 25 years. "I guess you might

say Jones has been working around the funeral home all of his life—he and his brother both," Mr. Hooks said. "When they were little, they'd play hide-and-seek among the caskets in the storage room and this sort of thing."

"In the last four years Jones has gradually been working into various phases of the business. He will not take any part in preparation of the deceased, but he does help with the flowers at funerals."

"I mainly helped park cars for a while," Jones said, "but then I would leave with mother and her helpers if it was a church funeral and help decorate the church with flowers—place the racks and all and move furniture if necessary."

Jones worked several summers at a tobacco warehouse, too, but he skipped that job last year after his election as national president of the Future Business Leaders of America. He is local chapter president and state president also—a triple-threat man, you might say.

FBLA is not as old or as big as the 4-H organization or even the Future Homemakers of America, of which a Metter girl, Luck Hendrix, was national president in 1969-70. But it has a similar purpose: to offer activities that will keep young minds and hands occupied in a constructive way.

Down there in the small town of Metter in south Georgia, Vendie Hooks was an outstanding Boy Scout, a state typing champion and a top student and a big brother for Jones, who was five years younger, to look up to.

"I don't know but what there might have been a little bit of brother competition there," Mr. Hooks said.

"We just have two boys that have always wanted to do their best," Mrs. Hooks said. "I don't know if Jones has told you, but he took tapdancing when he was small. This made him have to dance before people, and he could learn not to be so stage-frightened."

"Later on, we got to where we had a right good band here, and Jones decided he wanted to be the drum major. A lot of the boys thought it would be so sissy, but he said he didn't care—they had drum majors at college that were boys. So he went to Florida State two summers to learn to be a drum major. There again he had to be a leader."

The making of the president had begun. Then the teacher, Mrs. Bernice Bland is a trim blonde whose eyes twinkle as she talks. She has been teaching business courses at Metter High for 25 years, and she is known at district and state literary meets as the maker of typing champions. Her students have won state titles in Class B school competition for the last 10 years. Three have set national records.

"I really wanted to run Jones for state FBLA president since he was in the ninth grade, because I knew he had the ability and the get-up-and-go to be a leader," she said.

Another of her students, Gall Robinson, was elected state president in 1969, a year before Jones was eligible. "I thought, 'That let Jones out,' but they told me at the State Department of Education, 'No, it doesn't. We want you to try again next year.'"

"Then when we went up to the state convention, they said, 'We want to run him for national president, too.'" That is when Mrs. Bland remarked that surely nobody from the South could ever win.

In the business education department of Metter High School, however, no one would have guessed that Jones Hooks' chances were regarded with pessimism by the teachers.

"The group that helped most was the VOT students," Jones said. "The whole last six weeks of school Mrs. Bland taught my campaign and the FBLA. We just had so many handouts and so many campaign posters to be done that we just about converted the whole business department into campaign headquarters."

VOT—vocation office training—is a high

school program in which students in business education work parttime in local businesses. They do it for pay, but the main idea is to get experience. On-the-job training, in other words.

Metter is a town with approximately 3,000 people, and Mrs. Bland didn't really know whether it was large enough for a VOT program when she started one four years ago.

"We only had 15 students to go out then," she said. "This year I have 35. They're working about every place you go in. Like Jones said the other day, he went to the hospital and met one in the office and one in the back at the nurses' station. She told me not long ago, 'Can you believe it—one of the doctors asked me to go with him on his hospital rounds?' They're at banks, the telephone office, lawyer's office, feed store, grocery store, insurance offices. The Guildo Evangelistic Association has four and wants another one."

"VOT is taking over the town!" Jones exclaimed.

Jones is an exclaimer. In Philadelphia at the national convention, he put his zest to full use. The Future Business Leaders of America doesn't allow any preconvention campaigning, and at the convention an advisory committee screens candidates to be sure they have the qualities to lead FBLA. Wholesome American youth—that's what they want. Jones and two others, another boy and a girl, qualified.

Tim Bagwell, son of a Methodist minister, formerly of Metter, now of Cuthbert, was Jones' campaign manager. The Georgia delegation set up a booth at convention headquarters.

"We had many giveaway things," Jones said. "We took 1,800 bags of Georgia peanuts and stapled 'Elect Hooks' labels on them. We took two bushels of Georgia peaches. It was the first of the season and they were just about green, but those people ate those peaches and thought they were the best things. We called back for more peaches, but we couldn't get any."

Jones undertook person-to-person campaigning. He spoke to state delegation caucuses.

"Jones did a real good job," Mrs. Bland said. "He tried to meet everybody. He was out campaigning while we were manning the booth."

"I never have been so tired in all my life," Jones said. "The personal contact with people—that just can't be beat. I could be just dying I was so tired, and smile from ear to ear and be so happy to see them. I guess it was kind of a fake front, but not really."

At caucuses delegates asked him what jobs he'd held, what he'd do about the FBLA's sagging budget, and how he'd solve other problems of the organization. One question sure to pop up—invariably asked by a girl—was: "You're so busy, being state president and all, if you get to be national president, too, when are you ever going to have time to have a date on the weekend?"

"I just told them that every now and then I do have a weekend free, and the things I go to, like the teenage nutrition conference—well, they had a dance. It's not all business."

At the rally that topped off the election campaign, Jones and the other candidates spoke to all the delegates. The convention hall blossomed with posters and resounded with cheers.

"I gave my campaign speech in a white blazer, red shirt, white tie and blue trousers," Jones said. "I think that must have been the reason they voted for me. Whenever I got an invitation to speak at the Arkansas state convention, they said, 'Please wear your red and white.' I wrote back, 'I'll be there in my red and white with bells on.'"

The Jones Hooks administration as FBLA president has been something of a family affair. "His mother and I have rather enjoyed it," his father said. "I believe we look forward as much as he does, when he gets

his mail, to seeing what different states the letters come from.

"His mother especially has seen that he has the proper clothing for the many meetings and other affairs he attends, and we've tried to furnish transportation to and from the airport in Atlanta or Savannah when he goes on his various trips."

Jones usually travels alone, and his parents don't worry about how he'll make it. "One reason we haven't been afraid for him to be by himself is that ever since Jones and his brother were big enough, when we'd go to get a new ambulance, we would carry them with us and drive the ambulance back. We usually would detour somewhere—like New York, for instance—and their father would take us to nice restaurants," his mother said. "So they grew up knowing how to do these things."

"You haven't done anything until you've driven a hearse right through the middle of New York!" Jones exclaimed.

"And everybody just looks at you," Mrs. Hooks said. "It's so much fun."

"You drive up to a hamburger joint," Jones said, "and everybody says, Oh, boy, that's the way to travel!"

The Metter FBLA chapter with Jones as president has stayed busy too. It has undertaken more than 50 projects. The most ambitious was staffing William Lanier's campaign center in Metter during his unsuccessful race for state agriculture commissioner last summer.

The club's postelection project was a clean-up drive. Members went all over Candler County taking down political posters—Lanier's and everybody else's.

In January, the young people solicited letters to Hanoi about the prisoner of war issue. "We ended up mailing around 700," Jones said.

The Metter High FBLA club has 102 members out of some 125 students enrolled in business education courses. Jones thinks they're great. "Everybody cares," Jones said.

Jones plans to enter the University of Georgia this fall. "I'll take business administration," he said. "Naturally! Then I may go on to law school."

"I have realized what the funeral business is and how confining it is, and I have never really tried to interest either one of our boys in it," Mr. Hooks said. "We wanted them to make up their own minds and decide what they want to do."

"I think Jones gets his 'political' talent naturally. His grandfather served in the General Assembly, in the House and Senate both, so I think it has rubbed off on Jones a little. His grandfather wanted one of his boys to study law, but none of us did."

Jones' year as national president ends with the national FBLA convention in Miami Beach June 19-21. There's a cruise to the Bahamas afterward. "I'm so excited," said Jones. "I can't wait!"

#### NATIONAL WEEK OF CONCERN FOR PRISONERS OF WAR/MISSING IN ACTION

#### HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1971

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, the first American still being held by the enemy was captured in South Vietnam on March 26, 1964. Now, with the seventh anniversary of that event approaching, the number of Americans missing in action or known captured in the Vietnamese conflict has grown to about 1,600. These men, who served their country

and are now held in prison camps which the world is not allowed to see, deserve the support of every American in seeking release and return to their families.

The North Vietnamese show their callous disregard not only for the Geneva Convention but for elementary humanitarian rights in even refusing to give lists of the prisoners of war and to allow them to send and receive mail.

The North Vietnamese should be exposed and condemned for such action and this process has been started. The pressure brought against them is bearing fruit and certain small concessions have been made. Mobilizing world opinion is in progress, and former astronaut Frank Borman has been the President's special envoy in seeking decent treatment for our men.

Recently there have been indications the enemy might allow some inspection of prisoners-of-war camps and talks with out men. The pressure is on, is working, and should be intensified.

As a Congressman, I intend to join all efforts to increase pressure on North Vietnam. President Nixon has proclaimed this a week of Concern for Americans who are prisoners of war.

The families of these men are suffering enough without being denied hope. Most Congressmen are united in their effort to supply hope, pressure, and action. The comments of men, such as Senator HARTKE, who when asked whether we could leave our prisoners of war in prison replied, "why not?" are atypical and reprehensible.

The President has stated his determination to free our men. His words are matched by his deeds, not only in sending missions into North Vietnam to try to free them but in making their release a prime point of negotiation with the North Vietnamese.

This week it would be well for every American to consider what it would be like to have a member of his family held in captivity. These men are our Nation's responsibility and we must not fail them. In so doing we would be breaking faith with ourselves.

#### AN ALTERNATIVE TO THE STATUS QUO

#### HON. WILLIAM R. ANDERSON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, many of us are hoping that the United States will, in the immediate future, withdraw our troops from Indochina. We have found, as past American leaders had warned, that U.S. troops should not be committed to wars on the Asiatic mainland. The American people have grown increasingly apprehensive about using our young soldiers, our infantry, as the point of America's security sword. We do not read of many alternatives these days but the attached letter printed in the Washington Post on March 2, 1971, does present at least one alternative for our consideration and



I request permission to enter it in the RECORD as a matter of interest to the Congress.

The article follows:

#### AN ANZUS PERIMETER

I propose that the United States withdraw completely from Asia and establish its line of defense in the Pacific, taking in no more than the three nations of the ANZUS Treaty—Australia, New Zealand and the United States itself. I propose also that it shore up this position by incorporating the islands of Micronesia, including Guam, into the State of Hawaii.

The United States would then maintain its security by means of the deterrent force of its long-range weaponry, and its present Asian allies, I expect, would maintain theirs by means of regional alliances.

Peace in Asia, as I see it, means an Asian balance of power which is entirely Asian. Peace at home means a stable western flank. The latter is a job, not for the Army but for the Navy—not for the infantryman on the Asian continent but the Pacific sailor.

Six months notice can be given at any time.

DAVID YUHAS.

Washington.

#### THE NEW MISSISSIPPI

### HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Anthony H. Harrigan, executive vice president of the Southern States Industrial Council, and author of the syndicated column *Sensing the News* which appears in more than 200 newspapers across the country, reports on progress made by Mississippi in his column of March 18, 1971.

Mississippi is meeting her problems head on, both economic and otherwise, and with much success. Unlike some cynical visiting journalists, Mr. Harrigan's comments on Mississippi are objective, informative, and timely. I recommend these observations for the consideration of every Member, as follows:

THE NEW MISSISSIPPI

(By Anthony Harrigan)

JACKSON, MISS.—Though this state has had many difficulties in modern times, its people are doing a remarkable job of creating new opportunities and building a bright future. The progress Mississippians have achieved in the last decade certainly deserves to be better known.

One of the most meaningful symbols of Mississippi today is the state's Research and Development Center, a handsome multi-story building set in rolling pineland east of the capital city. This center provides the state with a wide variety of research capabilities, including industrial planning, water resources studies and community development plans—the know-how essential to the economic, social and cultural needs of a modern industrial society.

If anyone imagines that Mississippi is parochial, he should visit with industrial and banking leaders in the state. One company in Jackson—to give an example of the state's outward-looking attitude—has had contracts in more than 40 states and overseas as well.

The visitor who comes to the state with stereotyped critical views of Mississippi is bound to be surprised. Driving south of Jack-

son one won't find the decrepit rural shacks that the TV networks like to focus on. Instead, the area is dotted with cattle farms. Splendid black Angus cattle graze in lush pastures.

There's prosperity in Mississippi's future. The state is strategically located in the mid-South, with the Mississippi River traffic artery on the west, the resorts of the Gulf Coast to the south, and important trade and communications centers a short distance across the state lines in Tennessee and Alabama. The City of Jackson understandably bills itself as the "Crossroads of the South." It has constructed a superb airport to capitalize on its role as a communications center.

The optimism about the future evident in the conversation of businessmen here is all the more commendable in view of roadblocks that have been placed in the path of the state. Public education continues to face grave handicaps imposed by federal authorities. Federally-decreed busing of students is enormously disruptive and causes many heartaches, not to speak of damage to the educational process.

A by-product of the extraordinary pressures placed on the public schools is a large and growing system of independent schools. One of these schools—Jackson Prep—has 500 students. Next year, I was told, enrollment may reach 900. Schools of this type are attracting high caliber teachers. While no one knows how extensive the private system will be in the mid-'70s or later, the long-range educational effects of a quality independent school system are bound to be beneficial to the state.

From the cultural standpoint, Jackson is a major force in the life of the state. It is the home of a variety of institutions of higher learning. Plans are being made for an art center. An evening spent at a little theatre production of an avant-garde play reveals the growth and ferment in the cultural life of Mississippi.

From modern cattle farms to modern theatre, Mississippi is moving ahead. It deserves a new image in the national news media.

#### ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE GRANTS OUTSIDE ORGANIZATIONS OPPORTUNITY TO BE HEARD

### HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, on March 23, the House Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member, granted the request of outside organizations to be heard before the committee on the military procurement authorization bill, for what may be the first time in its history. While outside witnesses have occasionally been heard by this distinguished committee, they have normally been at the invitation of the committee and in executive session. Now, thanks to the sense of fair play of the chairman, Mr. HEBERT, and because of the committee's interest in hearing not only the official point of view but that of other informed persons, the committee seems to have begun a tradition of permitting certain groups to apply to be heard on relevant matters of special interest to them, about which they feel strongly.

The potential value of this tradition was made evident immediately when the

first witness, Dr. Jeremy J. Stone, testified for the Federation of American Scientists as its director. With only 4 business days notice, Dr. Stone prepared 50 pages of detailed, documented, and persuasive testimony on ABM, MIRV, and the B-1 bomber. It presented a point of view that would not otherwise have been heard with regard to each weapon system arguing: that an ABM defense of Minuteman would be unreliable; that the B-52 bombers could and should be maintained in preference to buying a B-1 bomber; that it is wasteful to deploy multiple warheads on Minuteman; and that it is both premature, and arms race stimulating, to continue to deploy MIRV on Polaris submarines.

These dissenting points of view were backed up by the approval of the executive committee of the federation including Dr. Herbert York, former Director of Defense Research and Engineering, Dr. Marvin Goldberger, chairman of the Department of Physics at Princeton University, and Dr. George W. Rathjens of MIT. Many other eminent names, from the world of science and Government security policy, on the federation council, and board of sponsors, reflected the right of this organization to present such a document. In an hour and one half of question and answers, Dr. Stone made it clear that the federation knew its facts, as well.

One press article said that the committee was "ruffled" by this testimony. Far from it, Mr. Speaker, I was proud to see the committee take this step and hope it will continue. As a contribution to the debate over strategic weapons, and to make it evident to my colleagues what outside witnesses can do, I insert the text of Dr. Stone's testimony:

TESTIMONY OF THE FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SCIENTISTS ON THE FISCAL YEAR 1972 DEFENSE PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION BILL H.R. 3818

(By Dr. Jeremy J. Stone)

Mr. Chairman: It is a pleasure and a privilege to appear before this distinguished Committee, as a spokesman for the Federation of American Scientists. We welcome the Committee's decision to permit an outside organization like our own to voice its views.<sup>1</sup>

Speaking personally, Mr. Chairman, I have not forgotten the comments you made as Chairman of Subcommittee Number 2, on April 4, 1966, in your report on the "Department of Defense Decision to Reduce the Numbers and Types of Manned Bombers in the Strategic Air Command." You asked whether Congress had become only "a necessary, and to the Executive Branch on occasion, inconvenient step" in the determination of policy. Often, to be more than "an inconvenience", Congress may require independent sources of information and opinion. If so, perhaps we can help. The Federation has the expertise to provide just such alternative views on military procurement. Among our senior members are ex-Government officials whose tenure and experience in high Government office often exceed that of the senior officials who will be appearing before you in the coming months.

Obviously, in the four business days we have had to prepare and print this testimony, we cannot touch on all of the major items in a bill covering \$27,074,073,000 in New Obligational Authority. Our statement covers ABM, MIRV, and the B-1 Bomber

Footnotes at end of article.

only. For the same reasons of time, not all members of our governing board have had time to review it, in draft, as carefully as they might otherwise have. But the policy conclusions it reaches, which I shall now summarize, are explicitly endorsed by the Executive Committee of the Federation. And the larger document has been approved, as well, by the Strategic Weapons Committee of the Federation, which has special responsibility for these questions.

#### SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

In all of the questions discussed here—ABM, MIRV, and B-1—we find, in particular, that large sums are being proposed to provide marginal improvements in strategic forces that are secondary to our primary deterrent force. *Goldplating secondary strategic forces is not a sensible approach to national security.*

In procuring MIRV for our primary deterrent, Polaris, the Administration is acting prematurely. Since our answer (MIRV) to the threat of a Soviet ABM is now ready for deployment, the necessity for its immediate deployment has disappeared. Compulsive over-reaction can be just as dangerous as compulsive under-reaction. Bolting into a response to yesterday's fear, we are, at the same time, setting in motion a new and dangerous round of the arms race that will cost billions. Containing, limiting, managing, and ending the arms race will require a more restrained hand on the throttle.

1. **ABM:** We believe that all deployment funds for the SAFEGUARD ABM should be deleted.

The proposed system simply is ineffective in defending Minuteman, even if it works perfectly. The protection offered by SAFEGUARD for the Minuteman force is negligible. Even if SAFEGUARD functions perfectly, it offers significant protection to Minuteman only over a very narrow band of threats. If the threat grows rapidly, SAFEGUARD will be obsolete before deployed. If the threat levels off, SAFEGUARD will not be needed. Nor is it a sensible assumption that SAFEGUARD will work perfectly—it might well fail catastrophically. In fact, information on its vulnerabilities might become known to the Soviet Union. Alternatively, neutralizing methods might develop out of on-going technology. Speaking generally, political confidence in the safety of Minuteman cannot be retained by placing the Minuteman missiles under the umbrella of an ABM in which there is, after all, far less political confidence. No ABM can give Minuteman the security of Polaris.

As a proposed first step toward other defenses—against China or the Soviet Union—the system is unnecessary. And the full area defense SAFEGUARD would make U.S./Soviet agreement in the SALT talks, on ABM and many offensive systems, impossible. As a defense against accidents, SAFEGUARD is also either unnecessary or ineffective in most cases; moreover, it contains within itself the seeds of possible accidents as likely as those it may forestall.

SAFEGUARD is an ineffective, expensive, and arms-race stimulating mistake. As a bargaining chip, SAFEGUARD is to be feared only if it is likely to grow into a heavy defense. But both sides should be apprehensive about this.

2. **MIRV:** We believe that no further expenditures should be made in fiscal 1972 for deploying MIRV, and none should be permitted for improving the accuracy of multiple warheads under development. Authorization for the ABRES program should not include funds for further improvements in guidance and accuracy. Instead the Defense Department should have a program for putting a single warhead on Poseidon missiles, if the United States is to negotiate seriously at SALT for a halt to MIRV.

It is patently unnecessary to deploy MIRV before the Soviet ABM that motivated our

purchase of MIRV has arisen. The Soviets are talking of negotiating about ABM. *Rather than throw the MIRV punch, we could hold it cocked behind our ear.*

There is no sensible political or strategic theory that demands the installment of MIRV warheads now, unless the United States intends to purchase the capability of destroying Soviet land-based missiles with its MIRVed warheads. There is evidence, in our statement, that the President is following this course. If so, he is making a serious mistake. The United States may call such an effort "damage-limiting", but the Soviets will see it as an effort to get a first-strike capability.

It is not only inconsistent with U.S. policy—and pointless—to buy MIRV for attacks on Soviet weapons; it is also counter-productive. The very MIRV we buy will, when it is matched by a Soviet MIRV, undermine the utility of our second most modern deterrent system—Minuteman land-based missiles. An investment of perhaps \$10-\$15 billion for MIRV will only result, and promptly, in the obsolescence of an investment of a comparable amount in Minuteman missiles and silos when the Soviets build MIRV.

The threat of Soviet MIRV has already begun the process. We are acting on the assumption of missile obsolescence when we rip out older Minuteman models and replace them with MIRVed Minuteman III missiles. We hurry to put three warheads on each missile on the grounds that 95% of them may be destroyed—hardly a good investment. And why will they be destroyed? Because the Soviets are expected to match our purchase of MIRV!

Why not negotiate? The Committee should insist that all roads to an agreement be explored before MIRV deployment continues. And whether or not agreement is reached, the Committee should not authorize further procurement and improvement of MIRV unless, and until, the Soviet Union moves toward the imminent construction of a heavy ABM system requiring our reaction.

3. **B-1 Bomber:** We believe that funds for the B-1 bomber should not exceed those required for an on-going study—at a level of \$25 million or so. This study should include examination of an alternative, less sophisticated, long-endurance aircraft designed to first long-range missiles rather than to penetrate defenses.

In the perspective of our entire strategic policy, the advantages by buying a B-1 bomber, rather than maintaining B-52's for as long as possible, are not great. The B-1 would penetrate certain kinds of air defenses more readily. But the extent to which either bomber will penetrate is unknowable and may depend mainly on the effectiveness of missiles in destroying air defenses. Hence the differences between their penetration capabilities are not of great significance for either deterrence or counterforce purposes.

The B-1 would be somewhat quicker in leaving its ever more vulnerable bases and could be dispersed more readily. But both bombers are really secure only in the air and the advantages of dispersal and lift-off are essentially marginal. Certainly they do not give the new bomber the kind of security we have with submarine-based missiles. *In the final analysis, bombers are bombers.*

The Air Force is arguing for B-1 on the grounds that it is more economical than maintaining and modifying the B-52's. But there is testimony to suggest that this economy would not be realized until perhaps 17 years of the life of the B-1 have expired. The estimates undoubtedly favor the B-1 by ignoring the cost-overrun problem. The B-1 purchase requires large investments early in the period. And the B-1 purchase runs the risk of triggering Soviet air defenses against it that leave one with whatever questions about penetrability that one may have had before about the B-52.

#### I. INTRODUCTION

In discussing strategic forces we shall give, for each, different purposes it might serve and discuss these in turn. *In general, we urge the Committee to require the Defense Department to provide it with more analysis of the purpose of the strategic forces it wants and the ways in which the forces proposed fulfill that purpose, and to provide the Committee also with alternative purposes and the forces that might fulfill these other purposes.*

After all, it is Congress that must decide upon and approve strategic force goals. And it is Congressional authorization and investigation that must insure that the forces being procured and deployed fulfill the purposes approved. All too often, the weapon system which happens to be proposed by the Defense Department is put forward as the only live choice. Reasons are then adduced to justify that single possibility. Indeed, with the ABM, with MIRV, and with the B-1 bomber, it is a cliché that the purposes change while the systems remain the same. One too often sees shifting rationales and "weapons in search of a mission".

Practicing what we preach, we have listed alternative purposes for each weapon system discussed. We note, in passing, that we used this same format on March 11 in discussing the problem of Bomber Defenses before the Senate Special Subcommittee on Bomber Defenses chaired by Senator John C. Stennis. The material from that extended hearing will be put in the public record by the Senate Armed Services Committee and is not, therefore, included here.

We propose to discuss three parts of the strategic budget treated in H.R. 3813: the anti-ballistic missile SAFEGUARD; the funds for development and deployment of MIRV (Multiple Independently Targeted Re-entry Vehicles); and the \$370 million requested for Research and Development of the B-1 Bomber. But in order to discuss these matters, it is necessary to review our present strategic forces.

#### II. BACKGROUND

The primary United States deterrent force is the fleet of 41 Polaris nuclear submarines with sixteen missiles each. Thirty-one of these submarines are now gradually being retro-fitted to carry the Poseidon missile with approximately 10 nuclear warheads on each missile. The number of independently targetable warheads on this force is thus rising from 656 to over 5,000 as the force is retro-fitted.

The smaller warheads being emplaced are larger in yield than the Hiroshima bomb. At least half of this force (i.e., embodying 328 missiles now and, if retro-fitting is completed, 2,500 separately targetable warheads later) can be expected to be on station at all times. Virtually none of this force can be neutralized. As Secretary Laird observed in his Fiscal 1971 Posture Statement:

According to our best current estimates, we believe that our POLARIS and POSEIDON submarines at sea can be considered virtually invulnerable today. With a highly concentrated effort, the Soviet Navy today might be able to localize and destroy at sea one or two POLARIS submarines. But the massive and expensive undertaking that would be required to extend such a capability using any currently known ASW techniques would take time and would certainly be evident.<sup>2</sup>

Nor is neutralization of these missiles now possible with a Soviet missile defense even if the Moscow ABM system works perfectly, because that system has only about 64 interceptors and limited radar coverage as well.

For the foreseeable future, these missile-firing submarines could deter the Soviet Union from surprise attack by themselves. In early 1964, Secretary of the Navy Paul Nitze testified that eight on-station Polaris submarines could destroy 25 to 35 million



people and most of the war-making potential of the Soviet Union urban industrial complex.<sup>3</sup> Under normal circumstances, we might have three times that number of submarines on station (i.e., 24).

Thus, each submarine is itself a very sizable deterrent to the Soviet Union against initiating a nuclear attack. It is hard to believe that any Soviet planner—with any now-imaginable technology or tactics—could have high hopes of destroying simultaneously a few tons of such submarines. As Admiral Galantin has testified, each can travel in an area of 15,000,000 square (about five times the area of the United States) and still cover its important targets.

Because the technology for the Polaris submarine was not then available, the United States relied in the 1950's upon strategic bombers: first, B-36's, then B-47's, and, finally, 700 B-52's and about 80 B-58's. It early became evident that bombers were exceedingly vulnerable to Soviet missile attack. At first the bombers were pulled back from overseas bases lest they be destroyed by intermediate-range missiles.

Then, in the late fifties, concern arose that all SAC bomber bases—at home or abroad—might be destroyed by Soviet ICBM's and IRBM's. It was not really an impending gap in numbers of missiles, but the threat of a Soviet surprise missile attack against our bomber bases, that frightened American strategists.

One answer to this threat was to use aerial refueling of bombers so that they could be kept aloft in a crisis. This did not, obviously, eliminate the problem of surprise attack, and it was impractical to keep more than  $\frac{1}{2}$  to  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the force in the air even in prolonged crises. The technology of the land-based missile was the answer. President Kennedy eventually bought 1,000 Minuteman missiles.

It was evident to the experts, even in the early sixties, that increasing accuracy of missiles would make individual land-based missiles vulnerable to attack—no matter how well emplaced in hardened silos. For this reason, 41 Polaris submarines were ordered, although the cost of a Polaris weapon on station was perhaps three times that of a Minuteman.

This history is presented to make the following points. The obsolescence of bombers as a reliable deterrent encouraged the rapid deployment of land-missiles. And the foreseeable obsolescence of land based missiles accelerated the purchase of missiles based under water. There was not any idea that we needed three different deterrents each capable of destroying the Soviet Union. The necessity simply grew out of tradition as is evident in the following quotation of the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, Dr. John S. Foster:

We have long followed a policy of maintaining three independent deterrent forces any one of which should be sufficient to deter nuclear attacks on us. To maintain this *cornerstone national security policy*, we cannot defer corrective action.<sup>4</sup> (Italics added).

But first of all, "long followed" here meant only about eight or ten years. There was no such idea and ideology before that time. Then we simply relied upon the Strategic Air Command, and as a hangover from the still-earlier past—and as a result of service rivalry—we also maintained some strike forces on carriers.

Furthermore, it simply is not true that each of these three independent forces is now considered "sufficient to deter". For example, we bought the missile strategic forces because bombers were not by themselves considered sufficient to deter surprise attack. They are less sufficient today.

Today, the same problem we had with bombers is arising with land based missiles as we foresaw. The President's State of the World Address this year says:

Offensive systems have clearly developed to a point where certain further improvements as well as increased launcher deployments could pose a threat to land-based missile retaliatory forces and thus threaten stability.

In short, the "ideology" of the three-deterrent force flies in the face of a more evident fact. The United States has only one strategic force upon which we can rely to deter the Soviet Union from attack by itself alone. This dependence on one basic force is our real tradition. FAS accepts the political necessity of having a basic deterrent force beyond even politically motivated question. But the United States is following a policy of maintaining, improving and protecting two older kinds of strategic forces whose utility cannot be importantly increased through these expenditures. The question at issue is not one of how to keep in business three forces "each sufficient" by any standard to deter the Soviet Union. The question is how much money, if any, should be devoted to improving supplementary strategic forces—forces that were once our primary deterrent but which are now obsolescing.

### III. ANTI-BALLISTIC MISSILES

#### Purpose 1: Defend Minuteman Land-Based Missiles

The present rationale for the SAFEGUARD missile defense lies in its ability to defend a fraction of the 1,000 Minuteman land-based force. The previous discussion shows there is no tradition that requires that America have, for perpetuity, 1,000 survivable Minutemen. Whether or not there is an alternative for protecting Minuteman, the question at issue is whether the SAFEGUARD ABM adds, sufficiently to the necessary reliability of our strategic deterrent to be worth the cost.<sup>5</sup>

It seems useful to recount the political history of SAFEGUARD, without which no explanation of its function is intelligible. We begin by noting that the controversy over the "bombs in the backyard" of early 1969 forced Administration reconsideration of the Johnson Administration ABM program. As an outgrowth of that reconsideration, President Nixon made an unprecedented announcement. He noted that there was "no way" in which the United States could protect itself against a major Soviet attack and said that to try to do so with a heavy ABM system would be an arms race "provocation". There was little political support for an ABM to defend against Chinese missiles. Reserving the anti-Chinese defense as an "option for the future", the Administration shifted the basic rationale of the Sentinel program to defense of Minuteman missiles and renamed it "SAFEGUARD".

While the desirability of protecting our deterrent was strategically unexceptionable, it had the unfortunate political effect of requiring the Administration to justify its decision by emphasizing—if not vastly exaggerating—the threat to that deterrent. And it led the Administration to propose, as a way of improving confidence in Minuteman, the use of a weapon system (ABM) in which there was far less public and technical confidence than in Minuteman itself. Politically, it was an absurd idea. It forced the pro-ABM supporters to apply criteria of effectiveness ("The Soviet Union cannot be sure that it will not work") that would otherwise have been scorned as "facade defenses" by the hardnosed professionals.

In fact, however, the case against the SAFEGUARD defense of Minuteman did not rely upon the well-founded, and widely accepted, premise that ABM might not work well if it worked at all. Even if SAFEGUARD worked perfectly, cost-effectiveness calculations showed that it saved a single Minuteman missile only at a cost that would have made it possible to buy three to twelve more (i.e., \$25 to \$100 million per Minuteman saved).<sup>6</sup>

The graph of Wolfgang K. H. Panofsky made

it clear. If the Soviet Union did not build accurate MIRV warheads and emplace them on its SS-9, and did not sharpen the accuracy of its smaller missiles, no threat to Minuteman would arise. But if the Soviet Union did make these improvements, SAFEGUARD would be overwhelmed as a defense of Minuteman. In short, as a defense SAFEGUARD was either unnecessary or inadequate. In 1970 four senior members of the Federation formally subscribed to the assertions of Wolfgang K. H. Panofsky that:

"The protection offered by SAFEGUARD for the Minuteman force is negligible. Even if SAFEGUARD functions perfectly it offers significant protection to Minuteman only over a very narrow band of threats; if the threat continues to grow as rapidly as it is at present, SAFEGUARD is obsolete before deployed; if the threat levels off, SAFEGUARD is not needed. For SAFEGUARD to have any significant effectiveness at all in protecting Minuteman, the Soviets would have to "tailor" their threat to correspond to it."

(As is evident in this statement, the views expressed have nothing whatsoever to do with the number of Minutemen one deems it necessary to save—whether 300, or 100, or 50 of the threatened Minutemen, or all of them. The number 300 chosen in the graph above was simply illustrative).

The Senate Armed Services Committee report on this subject adopted a view championed by Albert Wohlstetter that is, in our view, irrelevant and incorrect. It said:

"The Committee accepts the view that the relevant criterion for the evaluation of a system of active defense is not the defense cost per Minuteman silo saved, or the relationship between the cost of the protection and the cost of the missile itself. It is, rather, a comparison of the cost of the defense to the cost of the offense to offset that defense."<sup>7</sup>

The point of view implicitly assumes that the Soviet weapons that may penetrate SAFEGUARD would be built only in direct response to it. But if part, or all, of the Soviet interest in building Soviet ICBM's, and Soviet MIRV, is based, for example, on a desire to have what the United States has, then it is not a "relevant criterion" to ask how much it will cost the Soviets to overcome our defense. They might simply overwhelm the defense as a byproduct of on-going efforts to catch up. Also, an easily overwhelmed active defense that the Soviets have no particular interest in overwhelming may be more effective than a difficult to overwhelm defense which, for doctrinal, imitative, or political reasons, the Soviets are willing to pay a great deal to neutralize.

This is no idle observation. Many analysts believe the gross size of the Soviet missile force is motivated by Soviet interest in maintaining a deterrent and by an urge to match us. Our own development of MIRV encourages the Soviet Union to build more land-based missiles and to build MIRV. It is therefore nonsense to talk of measuring the effectiveness of SAFEGUARD as if the only Soviet purpose in building forces was to overwhelm it. If, for whatever reasons, the Soviets are destined and determined to build enough warheads to make SAFEGUARD hopeless, we will achieve nothing whatsoever except waste of resources when we try to defend against it. And since we now plan to have enough warheads to make a (Soviet) SAFEGUARD impossible, so will they.

But even by offense-defense criteria SAFEGUARD would do badly. For one thing, there is a substantial and important possibility that SAFEGUARD might fall catastrophically for technical reasons or against novel tactics. These possibilities cannot be adequately considered in trade-off comparisons. Even with regard to trade-off comparisons of the Wohlstetter type, substantial disagreement exists and is inevitable.

The Posture Statement this year explicitly admits that SAFEGUARD "may not be suffi-

Footnotes at end of article.

cient" to cope with "all possible threats". Last year's posture statement was more candid when it noted that the expected threat would overwhelm SAFEGUARD.

"[If] the Soviets deploy a MIRV on the SS-9, improve their ICBM accuracy and do not stop building ICBMs at this time, but continue building them at their present rate, we would then be faced in the mid-1970s with a threat which is *much too large* to be handled by the level of defense envisioned in the SAFEGUARD system without substantial improvement and modification." (Italics added.)

At that time, the indicated intelligence estimates were for continued growth in numbers and accuracy of precisely the kind hypothesized. Indeed, Dr. Foster testified that SAFEGUARD could be "completely overwhelmed" by "early 1974". While the Soviet force has now slowed its growth in numbers, the Posture Statement of this year suggests that the accuracy of the SS-9 force could be "substantially improved." The obvious corollary is to expect larger numbers of smaller warheads per Soviet SS-9, each warhead still capable of destroying a Minuteman missile through use of that higher accuracy. Indeed the State of the World Address says:

"Nor is it clear that even at present levels of Soviet forces, future qualitative improvements would not endanger our ICBM forces." (Italics added.)

Evidently, no further numerical growth in the threat is now necessary to discredit Minuteman.

Nevertheless, the Administration wants \$1.278 billion for SAFEGUARD. It indicates in the Posture Statement that if SAFEGUARD is insufficient in itself, it can still "serve as a core for growth options" to defend Minuteman. This evidently means going ahead eventually with what is called the "dedicated" or hard-site defense, which W. K. H. Panofsky insisted from the beginning was the only defense worth buying in any case—if any was to be procured. Last year's Posture Statement expanded on the notion of a "core" by discussing, explicitly, Panofsky's approach of "new and smaller additional radars" that would have to be developed to make SAFEGUARD less dependent on its present smaller number of easily blinded \$150 million radars originally designed for city defense.

This Committee should at least delete the deployment funds for SAFEGUARD and those R. & D. funds that are not associated with the newer and more promising technique of "hard-site defense".

But we believe the Committee should go further. ABM defense of Minuteman should be discarded. The entire idea of defending Minuteman with an ABM has a serious political flaw. No reliable, or long-standing, public confidence can be generated in any strategic weapon system whose defense relies upon the effective working of an antiballistic missile. The protection will always be wide open, politically, to charges that it contains serious vulnerabilities. No weapon system is more discredited in the public mind. No weapon system is thought to be more complicated, or less reliable.

The political confidence in our deterrent which earlier came from putting our weapons under the earth, and which now comes from putting them under water, cannot be re-achieved by putting our weapons under an anti-ballistic missile system. And since a deterrent should be as far above question as possible, methods should not be used that lend themselves even to politically motivated attack.

Underlying these political problems are serious technical ones. The system may indeed fail catastrophically. Its limitations may become known—vulnerabilities of electronic equipment, shortcomings of the program-

ming, firing doctrines of the interceptors. Minuteman security could come to depend in part on secrecy—this would be unfortunate. Methods of circumventing the defense may be developed. For example, non-ballistic missiles, like our Scud, might be fired from bombers to attack the radars. A year after Safeguard was put forward, DOD was already finding vulnerabilities in it. Our experience with vast defensive systems has been of this kind. In 1960, shortly after the Sage air defense was completed, Herman Kahn wrote: "One way not to make a reputation as an analyst in the last five or ten years would have been to find a hole in our air defenses . . . ; people mostly think of it as being full of holes".<sup>10</sup>

Safeguard is repeatedly referred to in official documents as a system "designed to achieve several objectives".<sup>11</sup> It is not necessary to question the alternative objectives to be in opposition to Safeguard because, for these other objectives, Safeguard is basically research and development that could be carried out at a test site in the Pacific. Since we do oppose the procurement of Safeguard for these alternative objectives, however, we give—as additional reasons for halting Safeguard—arguments against its other purposes.

#### Purpose II: China and accidents

As the President's State of the World Message indicated, he continues to see Safeguard as related not only to the Soviet threat but to the "Chinese development of strategic forces" and to the "disturbing possibility of accidents". The Senate Armed Services Committee report on its Posture hearings last year said there was "no compelling need to move now" to an anti-Chinese defense and added that the wisdom of such a defense remained to be "demonstrated".<sup>12</sup>

In fact, the argument for defense against the Chinese is a thin one. I have incorporated here, Mr. Chairman, an excerpt from an Adelphi monograph of my own entitled: "The Case Against Missile Defenses", printed by the Institute for Strategic Studies in London. If the word Safeguard is substituted for the word Sentinel, this excerpt precisely indicates my present view:

#### Does China Warrant a Missile Defense?

"Virtually all China experts deny the image of a Communist China that 'seeks' nuclear war. They suggest instead the likelihood that Peking will seek low-risk strategies of political intervention, assistance to insurgents, propaganda, and so on. More generally, the Chinese leadership can hardly remain oblivious to the stark nuclear realities that have persuaded everyone else. A Chinese attack upon the United States is Chinese national suicide, and Chinese leaders, or committees of them, can be expected to see it this way. Attack from China is very well deterred.

"Many American supporters of a defence against Chinese missiles quite openly want to retain the ability to attack China preemptively or the threat to do so. Thus one American analyst asserted: 'American leaders probably would develop different attitudes towards the Chinese according as the United States did or did not have BMD'. However, American Presidents are not likely to put as much confidence in these very involved computations of the Defense Department as all that, and even these computations always leave open the possibility of losing a city or two. Presidents know that Defense Departments—indeed, government agencies generally—are capable of making mistakes. This particular estimate concerns a system that is especially complicated and untestable—as we noted. In short, the President is likely to be deterred from pre-emptive attack of China.

"But would the Chinese know it? Might they not be sobered by an American defence? Again, their most likely strategies are ones to which nuclear conflict and the threat of it are irrelevant. In any case, can they be

expected to believe in the defence? Whoever heard of a defence that was alright? Chinese planners will not have to be optimistic to be skeptical of the optimism of American planners they need only share the attitudes of almost everyone but strategic analysts.

"In addition, this posture of seeming to threaten pre-emptive attack is not desirable. The temptation to carry out the threat gives to risks of general nuclear war. To the extent that the threat of attack is successful, it might only induce in the Chinese a policy of holding Asians hostage. It could also induce them to develop weapons less desirable than missiles. In any case, the very effort to defend against Chinese missiles is likely to enhance China's status in Asia. And if Chinese missiles are worth such an effort on the part of the United States, it may be that Asians will be pressed by parties in opposition to take the Chinese threat more seriously than they might have otherwise. The pre-emption possibility itself might be considered very undesirable by friendly Asians and very dangerous. War with China, like war with North Vietnam, will be much more destructive in the theatre of conflict than it is to the United States, and this possibility will not be lost upon Asians.

"In general, to base Western steadfastness in Asia upon the ability of the United States to reduce American casualties is to make the same mistake just made in Europe. There the United States has recently avoided basing her commitment on her ability to cut her own losses in a nuclear exchange—that posture has totally lost credibility. An analogous policy would lose that same credibility in Asia fast enough. The United States should therefore develop a rationale for Asian guarantees with greater staying power. As in Europe, she should avoid playing into the hands of those who doubt her commitment by basing it on ever more dubious calculations of casualties.

"Notwithstanding all this, would the system work against China? No one really knows because the type and sophistication of future Chinese missiles cannot be known. The most effective counter-measures of the 1970s are not known either (nor whether they will be expensive or cheap). Whatever they are, they will be openly discussed in the American press, and the Chinese will learn them. The Defense Department estimates that attacks which might otherwise kill 7 million people could be held to 1 million or less. And it believes that as the Chinese ICBM force grows, 'for relatively modest outlays' Sentinel could be improved to limit Chinese damage into the 1980s. But 1985 is as far in advance as 1950 is behind, and since the first Soviet atom and hydrogen bombs were detonated in 1949 and 1952, it has become clear that an awful lot of technical advance is possible in time spans of this order.

"Can the Chinese-oriented system be dissociated from a larger Soviet-oriented one? The Chinese force is likely to require improvement in Sentinel earlier than the United States expects, and these improvements may blur the difference. More immediately, many in the United States see Sentinel as a suitable beginning for an attempt to maintain or increase American nuclear 'superiority'; Secretary Clifford might be in that category. Certainly Sentinel could be a building-block to a larger system. (It is also what the Defense Department calls a 'foundation' for a future defence of Minuteman forces.)

"Most relevant, the Soviet leaders are likely to see this system as a first step to a defence against their missiles, because that is the problem they worry about and because they need lead-time to take the appropriate preventive measures. Certainly, Sentinel is far more effective in neutralizing overall Soviet capabilities than the primitive Soviet efforts around Moscow are in reducing those of the United States. And consider how much the latter overreacted to the Soviet efforts.



"Mr. McNamara called the American decision to build *Sentinel* 'marginal'. But in terms of the American-Soviet arms race, the balance seems quite in the other direction. *Sentinel* seems likely to cost the United States a great deal in time."

Finally, concerning the possibility of accidents, the following arguments are relevant. No accident of the kind contemplated has ever occurred. If it did occur, our ABM is unlikely to be primed to fire. If the ABM is being held at a high state of readiness—primed to fire at all times—it may itself give rise to accidents. The risks of self-generated accidents from our ABM are no less, one might speculate, than the chance that an accident from an ICBM might be successfully intercepted. For one reason, ICBM's are not normally at a high state of alert. The risk of accidents from an *alerted* ABM seem *a priori* certain to be higher than those from an *unalerted* ICBM at least. Further, the constructed ABM might fail to intercept the ICBM anyway, but every accident the ABM itself induces adds to our peril.

In any case, our most serious relevant danger is not that of losing, due to an accident, a missile site or even a city. The most serious danger is that of a totally accidental World War III. The ABM does not completely resolve that problem (an accidentally fired ICBM might trigger a war, *even if intercepted*). Nor is the ABM necessary to resolve the problem. The true solution is a strategic force—and a strategic doctrine—that makes our half-trigger reaction to attack unnecessary. Since we should buy this kind of force and doctrine in any case, it is a zero-cost substitute for an accident-intercepting ABM.

#### Purpose III: Matching

Some believe that we must match the Soviet ABM. But why should we duplicate Soviet mistakes in building an ineffective system—with critical deficiencies of a kind that caused us to avoid such procurement years ago? The present strategic situation is so complicated and asymmetrical that it seems ridiculous to believe that an imbalance of 64 ABM interceptors would embolden the Soviets.

#### Purpose IV: Bargaining chips

It is no accident that the most potent argument for the ABM in Congress is based on a political factor nowhere alluded to in Posture Statements, or State of the World Messages. It is critical to the support of SAFEGUARD but will not stand the light of day.

The argument is, of course, that we need an on-going ABM deployment program, in the SALT talks, to counter the Soviet SS-9 buildup, now said to be slowed or stopped. The assumption is that our ABM system is a weapon system of which the Soviets are highly apprehensive. The argument is highly speculative. Indeed it is the precise opposite of the speculations that were offered by the Administration, when the goal was to persuade the public that SAFEGUARD was not destabilizing. Thus the following statements were made in early 1969:

"... it would be my judgment that ... to proceed with *Sentinel* would have little, if any, impact on the Soviet interest in negotiating strategic arms limitations."

Gerard S. Smith, SALT negotiator and Director, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency March 6, 1969 before Gore subcommittee

Question: Do you have reason to believe that the Russians will interpret your ABM decision today as not being an escalating move in the arms race?

President Nixon: "I have reason to believe ... that they would interpret it just the other way around ... the Soviet Union recognizes very clearly the difference between a defensive posture and an offensive posture ... an interesting thing about Soviet military history: They have always thought

in defensive terms ... the Soviet Union cannot interpret this as escalating the arms race."

President Nixon at press conference announcing Safeguard, March 14, 1969

Senator Gore: "(what) if the United States modified this program to be ... a hard defense against offensive missiles from the Soviet Union, what would be their reaction?"

Mr. Smith: "I would not think that it would have a great effect on the Soviet mentality ... Their general attitude in the past has been, 'Well, defensive missiles systems don't threaten anybody. If you want to spend a lot of money on them, that is your business'."

Gerald C. Smith, SALT negotiator and Director, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, March 6, 1969 before Gore Subcommittee

The Soviet Union can hardly be afraid of an effort of ours to defend our Minutemen. Hence, they can only be frightened, alarmed, or nervous—if they are frightened at all—about the possibility that a U.S. ABM program will grow out of control, into trying the impossible feat of neutralizing all Soviet weapons, despite certain Soviet efforts to avoid just that. The likelihood that we might attempt to build such a defense should alarm Americans and Congressmen just as much as the Politburo. It will cost us no less money than the Soviets, and stimulate an arms race no less dangerous to either side.

#### IV. MIRV: MULTIPLE INDEPENDENTLY TARGETED RE-ENTRY VEHICLES

A variety of purposes have been given for MIRV. We discuss them in turn.

##### Purpose I: Penetrating a Soviet ABM (By Overwhelming It With Warheads)

This has been the only purpose for MIRV that was sufficient—historically—to induce a Secretary of Defense to approve large development and deployment funds. Here MIRV is simply the ultimate decoy. Every incoming object is a warhead that must be shot down. No amount of discrimination of incoming objects reduces the problem of interception. The need for independent guidance arises because the warheads must be separated far above the target to avoid the destruction of the unseparated warheads by a long range exo-atmospheric interceptor. Separated so far from earth, the warheads would normally fall outside a given target area. Hence they require independent guidance to be useful.

At the outset, it should be emphasized that neither side can rely upon its anti-ballistic missile system. It is fully tenable to argue that the existence of an opponent's ABM requires no penetration aids at all. After all, whether or not an ABM would work is not something a political leadership is likely to rely upon for surprise attack or crisis attack. (And, as noted, U.S. interest in killing innocent Russians is not significant so actual penetration is not important). *A fortiori*, it is even less necessary to build decoys that are all independently guided reentry vehicles. MIRV represents an extraordinarily—and unnecessarily—conservative point of view for insuring against deliberate attack.

But even if MIRV is deemed necessary to penetrate a Soviet ABM, or to discourage the Soviets from building an ABM, it is patently unnecessary to deploy MIRV before the Soviet ABM is built. It has been true for several years that the United States could deploy its MIRV more rapidly than the Soviet Union could build the necessarily thick ABM. And it has been true for some years that the Soviet Union might well not be interested in making these pointless expenditures. We need not throw the MIRV punch but could hold it cocked behind our ear.

##### Purpose II: Increasing the number of survivable warheads

This year, for the first time, the Defense Department gave greater emphasis to the importance of increasing the number of survivable warheads than it did to penetrating a Soviet ABM system; this may reflect the strength of the arguments against Purpose I. The Posture Statement said:

"Should part of our missile force be unexpectedly and severely degraded by Soviet preemptive actions, the increased number of warheads provided by the remaining MIRV missiles will insure that we have enough warheads to attack the essential soft urban/industrial targets in the Soviet Union."

Even if all of our bombers, and all of our Minuteman missiles, were lost, we do not lack for survivable warheads with our Polaris missiles to destroy the urban-industrial complex of the Soviet Union. According to statements of Secretary Laird's Posture Statement last year, 25% of the Soviet population and 50% of its industry lie in the largest 100 Soviet cities. We have already noted that 8 submarines could destroy half of these people and most of the industry.

Furthermore, the Minuteman missiles, on which MIRV is being emplaced, are missiles that the Defense Department has indicated are rapidly becoming vulnerable. As noted, the President's State of the World message even says: "nor is it clear that even at present levels of Soviet forces, future qualitative improvements would not endanger our ICBM forces". (*Italics added*). It seems especially wasteful to substitute a MIRV Minuteman III for 550 of the 1,000 Minutemen already installed, if 95% of the force can be destroyed.

##### Purpose III: Attacking Soviet land-based missiles

The Defense Department has conceded that the MIRV concept was "originally generated" to increase our "targeting capability" rather than to penetrate ABM defenses. It noted, in answers submitted in 1968 for the record by Dr. John Foster, that, in 1961-62, it had been found that the "total number of aim points exceeded the number of Minuteman missiles". MIRV was "originally born" to split up the payload to cover more targets. It was then found that the previously generated MIRV concept could "equally well be used" against ABM.

The President's thinking seems to be moving away from the historically secondary use of MIRV—protecting our deterrent by insuring penetration—and toward the original use of MIRV, which was counterforce. Indeed, he seems to be moving beyond finite deterrence itself to some kind of counterforce strategy.

In the State of the World Message of February, 1970, President Nixon said:

"Should a President in the event of nuclear attack be left with the single option of ordering the mass destruction of enemy civilians, in the face of the certainty that it would be followed by the mass slaughter of Americans?"

In the State of the World Address of February, 1971, the President said:

"I must not be—and my successors must not be—limited to the indiscriminate mass destruction of enemy civilians as the sole possible response to challenges. This is especially so when that response involves the likelihood of triggering nuclear attacks on our own population. It would be inconsistent with the political meaning of sufficiency to base our force planning solely on some finite—and theoretical—capacity to inflict casualties presumed to be unacceptable to the other side." (*Italics added*).

It is known that the strategic force plans already include options for the use of nuclear weapons against one or more targets

that are not simply cities. General Curtis LeMay once testified before Congress that—in answer to the Kennedy interest in options—"We have tried to comply by producing as many as possible. I am talking about our strategic plans now."

Under these circumstances, the President's statements seem to suggest interest in putting a high accuracy on MIRV and using its almost 10,000 warheads to attack the Soviet land-based force, if war occurs. Also, it is unusual to think that the option of attacking more than 1,400 Soviet land-based missiles would not trigger nuclear attacks upon us! The President may be one of those rare believers in limited strategic nuclear war.

Other evidence supports the conclusion that this is the Presidential policy. For example, consider the following history. On October 7, 1969 the Air Force Chief of Staff, General John Ryan, alluded to an accurate MIRV by telling the House Appropriations Committee:

"We have a program we are pushing to increase the yield of our warheads and decrease the circular error probability so that we will have what we call a hard target killer which we do not have in the inventory at the present time."

In answer to a letter of Senator Brooke, Mr. Nixon said: "There is no current U.S. program to develop a so-called 'hard-target' MIRV capability". (Italics added). He said that the program to which General Ryan had referred had not received funding in the forthcoming (i.e., fiscal 1971) defense budget.

Nevertheless, a year later, on September 22, 1970, in a speech before the Air Force Association, General Ryan effectively repeated his remarks. He praised the Minuteman III MIRV as the "best means of destroying time urgent targets like the long range weapons of the enemy". And he hailed MIRV as a way of attacking "... the remaining strategic weapons which the enemy would no doubt hold in reserve".

In answer to a further letter of Senator Brooke, Secretary Laird simply repeated, in a letter of November 5, 1970, a formula he had used before:

"We have not developed, and are not seeking to develop a weapon system having, or which could reasonably be construed as having a first-strike potential."

He went on to say that General Ryan's comment had been made "in the context of limiting damage to the United States by second-strike employment against remaining weapons of an aggressor nation which had struck first."

It seems evident that these assertions rest on the view that the Soviets have no right (perhaps considering their underwater missile firing submarines) to interpret our deployment of MIRV—and the related threat to Soviet land-based missiles—as a weapons system that could "reasonably be construed as having a first-strike potential". Nevertheless, the United States, which has more and better nuclear submarines, does adopt quite a different standard in its analysis of the Soviet threat.

The double standard that compares what we are now doing with what they might in future, do is clear in this quotation from the President's State of the World Message:

"Deployed in sufficient numbers and armed with the multiple independently targetable warheads (MIRVs) of sufficient accuracy this (SS-9) missile could threaten our land-based ICBM forces. Our MIRV systems, by contrast, do not have combinations of numbers, accuracy and warhead yield to pose a threat to the Soviet land-based ICBM force."

The Committee will recall that Secretary Laird told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1969 that this threat to our "land-based missiles" was a sign that the Soviets were "unquestionably" developing a "first-strike" capacity.

There is much other evidence to support

the idea that technology is moving the United States in the direction the President's remarks indicated. Herman Kahn told the House Foreign Affairs Committee that, if MIRV is "reasonably accurate and flexible," it might easily provide the U.S. with an "annihilating first strike capability against even one or two thousand Soviet ground-based missiles".<sup>14</sup> The Chairman of our Federation, Dr. Herbert F. York, said much the same thing when he told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1969 that an improvement of "somewhat less" than a factor of 2 in guidance accuracy would "almost certainly" give our planned forces the capability to destroy "virtually all" Soviet silo-based missiles in a surprise attack.<sup>15</sup> In 1970, he told the same committee that accuracy has improved "four-hundred fold in only 25 years". He went on to note that "any conservative Russian planner" considering these figures would have to conclude that "in a relatively short time U.S. technology could improve missile accuracy by another factor of two or four and thus convert not only the Minuteman MIRV but even the Poseidon MIRV into a missile silo destroyer".<sup>16</sup>

Donald G. Brennan, a supporter of ballistic missile defenses, told the House Foreign Affairs Committee that MIRV could be developed with self-contained guidance that would produce accuracies "in the neighborhood of 50-100 feet".<sup>17</sup>

A recent report to a 1970 Pugwash conference, confirmed that "an overall ICBM CEP of 30 meters may be expected with reasonable and practical application of science and technology to this task".<sup>18</sup> The author was D. G. Hoag, Director of the Apollo Guidance and Navigation Program.

Dr. Freeman Dyson, of the Institute for Advanced Study, another supporter of ballistic missile defense, has testified that our deployment of MIRV—to which he was "strongly opposed"—"directly threatened" the Soviet deterrent and "must" be perceived by Soviet decision-makers as a "potential U.S. first-strike capability". Calling our announced deployment a "major escalation" of the arms race, that would "compel" a Soviet expansion, Dyson said that many of the evils popularly thought to follow from ABM "will in fact" result from deploying MIRV.<sup>19</sup>

Under these circumstances, it is Kafka-ish for the President to advise Senator Brooke that we have made it "perfectly clear" that we do not "intend to develop" counterforce capabilities which the Soviets "could construe" as having a first-strike potential.<sup>20</sup> And it is preposterously disingenuous for the Defense Department to respond to such questions of Senator Brooke, as it did, by saying that it had "no reason to believe" that the Soviets were worried.

By emphasizing accuracy now, the Administration is reaching precisely the opposite conclusion reached by Secretary McNamara when he discussed eventual accuracy. Then, in 1967, Deputy Secretary of Defense produced the following chart which showed, he noted, that MIRV's provide "much more effective" payloads by "every relevant criterion" of military effectiveness, though they deliver much less total megatonnage.

COMPARATIVE EFFECTIVENESS OF 2 HYPOTHETICAL MISSILE PAYLOADS

(Number of targets destroyed)

Type of target destroyed	10		1
	50-kiloton warheads	10-megaton warhead	
Airfields.....	10.0	1.0	
Hard missile sites.....	1.2-1.7	1.0	
Cities of 100,000 population.....	3.5	1.0	
Cities of 500,000 population.....	0.7	1.0	
Cities of 2,000,000 population.....	0.5	.6	
Total megatonnage.....	0.5	10.0	

Footnotes at end of article.

Finally, the Administration has a program, ABRES, designed to improve the maneuverability of ICBM reentry vehicles, and the effectiveness of penetration aids. Under this program individual guidance units could be placed on each reentry warhead in such a way as to provide terminal guidance with an associated very high accuracy. Unquestionably the Soviets must see this program as a threat to their land-based missiles. So long as ABRES is not precluded from developing high accuracy for MIRV, it must be assumed that the accuracy of MIRV is being increased, and the Soviets will certainly reach that conclusion.

#### MIRV and SALT

Still other facts militate for deferring MIRV. The Soviet Union has proposed an agreement on ABM. The possibility of imminent agreements makes it especially peculiar to be deploying a premature, and possibly unnecessary, U.S. MIRV.

If the United States achieves some kind of agreement on MIRV, Minuteman will be far more secure than if it does not. The cheapest protection for Minuteman is a MIRV agreement. There has probably been no better example of arms race futility than the sequence in which we deploy MIRV, we then assume the Soviets will deploy MIRV, and the Minuteman missile then becomes—as a direct result—hopelessly discredited as a reliable deterrent.

MIRV is rapidly ensuring and becoming a self-inflicted national security disaster requiring billions of dollars for deployment, forcing the obsolescence of billions of dollars' worth of existing weapons, and undermining the utility of our second most valuable strategic force. We invented it first. We deployed it first. We should stop it now and make every effort to negotiate a solution. FAS emphasizes that, in its view, there is no necessity whatsoever for MIRV deployment now on the basis of any sensible political ideology or strategic theory.

#### V. B-1 BOMBER

The current question at issue in the defense community is not the question of maintaining a strategic bomber as a supplement to our submarine-based missile force. It is whether and when to replace the B-52 bombers with a new strategic bomber B-1. For that reason, we will not, at this time, analyze the purposes of a strategic bomber. We will address, instead, the critical differences between the policies at issue. But we think the time has long passed when strategic bombardment should be considered an unquestionably necessary part of our strategic posture.

As Senator Warren G. Magnuson noted in 1969, in a speech on bombers: There is nothing magical about the number "three" when speaking of deterrents. We can and should reduce or expand the number of our deterrents in response to technological change, scientific evidence, and international agreements.<sup>21</sup>

#### Can B-52's be maintained?

Is it possible to maintain our strategic bomber force of 255 B-52F's and B-52G's, along with our newer force of 75 FB-111's, for a considerable further time? These B-52's were built in the 1960-62 period, and they are about nine to eleven years old now. (Soviet heavy bombers are now more nearly 15 years old).

Historically, estimates of the further life-span expected of the B-52 have increased with passing time. In 1960, the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee concluded, in an investigation chaired by Lyndon B. Johnson, that the B-70 had to be built lest the B-52 have no replacement when it "enters its period of obsolescence (mid-1960s) ...".<sup>22</sup> This suggested the B-52 force had about five good years left.

Six years later, a sizable B-52 force was given eight or nine years life when, in 1966, the Secretary of the Air Force, Dr. Harold



Brown, told this Committee that the 255 B-52 G-H's could be maintained in a satisfactory operational status at least through Fiscal Year, 1975 . . ."<sup>23</sup>

A year later, in 1967, the same bombers had been given an additional five years of life, as the Defense Department testified that: "There appears to be no reason why the B-52G's and H's cannot be maintained through 1980, if that should prove necessary."<sup>24</sup>

Two years still later, in 1969, the exact same bombers had been given another few years. In a letter to Senator George McGovern, Laird said:

"It is presently expected that the structural life of the newest model B-52's will last, under projected usage, until sometime in the early 1980's with appropriate modifications."<sup>25</sup>

Thus, in 1960, Congress was urged to replace planes that had five years of life before "obsolescence". In 1966, it was urged to replace planes that had "at least" eight or nine years of life. Now, in 1971, it is urged to replace the same planes although they will last "under projected usage" for ten or twelve more years. Furthermore, "projected usage" could be changed—just fly the bombers less often. Bombers have no rigid life span.

Indeed, the Air Force is not flatly claiming the B-1 is needed because an end to the useful life of the B-52 is approaching. Instead, Secretary of the Air Force Robert C. Seamans is suggested that the M-1 is more cost-effective:

"The B-1 will be expensive, but as I mentioned earlier, it will be cheaper than modifying and maintaining our B-52s for the same period of time. And we expect the B-1 to be flying and strengthening American security well into the 1990's."<sup>26</sup>

Similar implicit assumptions were made in 1968 by Secretary of the Air Force Harold Brown in these detailed calculations:

"Over the first ten-year period, the program cost of an AMSA bomber force would be considerably higher than that of the B-52 and FB-111 force because with selective modifications to the structure and avionics, the lifetime of many B-52's can be economically extended to the late 1970's. Over a period of about 17 years, the costs of a bomber program phasing to (deleted) AMSA's, compared with a program continuing the 255 B-52's and the 210 FB-111's would be the same, \$22 to \$23 billion."<sup>27</sup> (Italics added).

Thus, B-1 is economical only if one wants to invest in it for more than a 17 year long run! (And as every Congressman knows, the estimates for the new investment will not have taken into account the certainty of cost overruns, mis-estimates, estimates that ignore related equipment, and estimates that ignore inevitable program changes. The TFX started at "less than \$3 or \$3½ million per plane" but it ended up costing more than \$9 million).<sup>28</sup>

In short, we could keep the B-52's for a very long time, much as we have continued to hang on to the B-47's if we had not built the B-52—and as the Soviets will surely hang on to their heavy bombers if they do not build a new one.

The question is, therefore, what advantages are there to buying the B-1 now, and what costs?

#### Purpose I: Deterrence

For the purpose of deterring Presidents or Premiers, or even export Generals, the advantages of one strategic bomber over another are not highly important. Unless the enemy planner can expect to destroy the bombers on the ground, he can have no very clear idea of whether some or all or none of the attacking bombers will get through. For one thing, more than one salvo of a missile war will precede bomber penetration. Some of these missiles are designed to neutralize the

Soviet defense, and no one knows what effect this will have. In other words, surprise attack planners will not find the "radar cross section" of our bombers critical to their calculations to strike or hold fire.

Even before missiles had entered the picture, in answers to questions from Senator Stuart Symington, the Commander-in-Chief of the U.S. Air Defense Command, General Partridge, said:

Senator SYMINGTON. Do you think you could knock down 50 percent of the attacking force?

General PARTRIDGE. I would not hazard a guess.

Senator SYMINGTON. 75?

General PARTRIDGE. The way to evaluate our air-defense system is to try to think of it as insurance which you carry for years and hope the house will not burn down.

Senator SYMINGTON. You just don't know what you could do?

General PARTRIDGE. No, Sir; I have no basis on which to guess. . . .<sup>29</sup>

Furthermore, it is not a pressing matter to us—to say the least—that our bombers actually succeed in destroying larger numbers of Soviet citizens than they otherwise would. Nuclear war will be destructive enough for the greatest revenge seeker—and the civilians of both sides will be innocents anyway.

#### Purpose II: Counterforce

So long as it remains U.S. policy not to make a major effort to limit damage from a Soviet attack, it seems absurd to put much store on the counterforce (damage-limiting) capabilities of bombers. No really essential task of destruction can be reliably assigned either the B-1, or the B-52, because the survivability and penetrability of neither can be assured. And both are less effective for time-urgent targets than missiles because they arrive so late. While the B-1 is taking four hours to fly 6,000 miles, for example, eight successive missile salvos—four on each side and each "answering" the other—could take place. The war may well be over before the bombers arrive. (If the war has been formally terminated, perhaps by use of the hot line, the late arrival of the bombers will be an unmitigated disaster. Contrary to the impression given by bomber advocate slogans, the bombers cannot be recalled where it really counts. We mean that a missile can be recalled—by not firing it—one-half hour before it hits the enemy; a bomber cannot be recalled within such a short time of target arrival).

#### Survivability

The differences between the B-1 and the B-52 in survivability are marginal. One plane can be kept on 15 minute alert. The other might be kept on a somewhat tighter alert. True, every minute counts in determining how many planes leave which fields in the face of what attacks. This is especially true with regard to the possibility of a submarine launched missile attack. But from the vantage point of our entire strategic posture, the differences are marginal. Both planes are basically vulnerable on the ground. And both are secure in the air. Better not count on either of them against surprise attack. And in crises, both should be put, insofar as possible, into the air.

Nor should we count too much on the B-1's improved ability to be dispersed. It should not be dispersed, in crises, to the airports of major cities—as was done with B-58's during the Cuban Crisis—because the Soviet Union would then be encouraged to attack cities early in any nuclear war. And if the B-1 is dispersed to locations without facilities, its efficiency is reduced and costs of maintenance are increased. Wherever dispersed, it can still be attacked. Remember that the Soviet Union may have on its submarines, during the useful life of the B-1, the 5,000 separately targetable warheads that we may have shortly.

If great weight is to be put on the ability of the B-1 to survive, these advantages must

be realized by its tankers. The Air Force has shown some equivocation about the need to keep pre-launch survivability consistent with that of the B-1 by replacing the existing KC-135 tankers. Perhaps the KC-135's can be better dispersed eventually than the B-1's themselves, so that the ability to survive attack is equalized. But this matter deserves careful attention which it does not seem to have received so far.<sup>30</sup> And the Air Force should resolve its debate over the need for a new tanker to "off-load" more fuel.<sup>31</sup> If a new tanker is required, then the cost of those tankers should be included in the cost of the B-1 itself, when comparing its cost with the cost of maintaining B-52's. A new fleet of tankers might cost \$7 billion, adding enormously to the cost.

#### Purpose III: Conventional wars

It is hard, to say the least, to find a conventional war in which some 200 B-1's would be an important improvement over the 76 FB-111's and 225 B-52's. In particular, the Air Force has admitted that the FB-111 can do a "credible strategic mission job" with "certain specific advantages" over the B-52 C-F's. (These are the B-52's being used in Vietnam). The FB-111 was termed "completely acceptable" as a replacement for these B-52's.<sup>32</sup> (In fact, this Committee concluded that the FB-111 could be "utilized effectively" as a strategic bomber that would reach 70% of Strategic Air Command targets).<sup>33</sup>

#### Purpose IV: Goldplating

Air Force supporters are, almost of necessity, technological enthusiasts. They want to "get the best", "incorporate new technology", and fly faster (and either higher or lower) than before. These are not, in themselves, national security interests, and they do not provide a sensible argument for building a new bomber, now or later.

#### If a New Bomber, Which One?

Not only are the advantages of moving ahead with a B-1 marginal, but the B-1 may be the wrong plane to buy. There is a traditional uncertainty, even among bomber supporters, about the kind of bomber to buy. For example, in 1964, Senator Richard Russell, Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, said:

"I want us to move ahead with a new manned aircraft. But I must confess I have some qualms about it. What is the primary consideration in this new aircraft to replace these aging 52's and 58's? Is it speed or altitude or ability to carry long-range missiles, or are you seeking all of these things in this bomber?"<sup>34</sup>

Six years later, the Deputy Chief of Staff for Development Plans of the Air Force, General Glasser, was quoted as saying that ". . . it simply is not possible to specify with clarity what a weapon system such as the B-1 will be actually used for ten or fifteen years from now."<sup>35</sup>

In the end, the Air Force has been confounded by the ability of Soviet air defense planners to devise methods which, at least in principle, might neutralize the bombers that the Soviets see coming along in the U.S. inventory. Thus, when the Soviet Union developed air defenses for which the B-52 was thought to be too slow, the Air Force proposed the high speed, high altitude, B-70 on which \$1.5 billion was spent. The Soviets subsequently deployed large numbers of SA-2 high altitude bomber interceptor missiles which, using nuclear warheads, had the potential of defeating the B-70.

Now the Air Force proposes high speed low-level penetration. But at the very same time, our Director of Defense Research and Engineering is exclaiming: "revolutionary advances in airborne radar technology have made possible a major revision in our strategic air defense". The new air defense, centered around AWACS, would be "capable of seeing and engaging aircraft at very low altitudes".<sup>36</sup> The Soviets could build the

Footnotes at end of article.

same AWACS system of ground-looking radars and high speed interceptors and hence could, in principle, neutralize the B-1.

In this case, as with the B-70, we would presumably cancel the B-1 after large sums, perhaps \$2 billion, were spent on development of it. This would simply repeat the tragedy of the B-70. Worse, without great courage in the Executive Branch, we would make the mistake of buying a bomber in whose penetration capabilities the planners had no more confidence than they might have in that of the present bombers. Since the whole purpose of the B-1 procurement, according to the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, was to replace the B-52's and FB-111's, because they may be "incapable of coping with the sophisticated defense environment which is expected . . .", this would be tragedy repeated as farce.<sup>17</sup>

We ought not become prematurely wedded to the necessity for penetrating Soviet defenses at all. If one wants a manned aerial platform that can be "recalled", it may well turn out to be more in keeping with the technology of the 80's and 90's to put a very-long-range missile on the bomber, and let it patrol far outside the borders of the Soviet Union. This Committee should ask the Air Force to present, in contrast to the B-1, the advantages and disadvantages of buying such a bomber. This request would have the important advantage of preventing participants in the procurement process from blandly assuming — notwithstanding any "milestone" approach—that the B-1 is certain to be built. Only a week ago, on March 18, in his prepared remarks to Senate Armed Services, Dr. John S. Foster talked of the B-1 "which will replace the aging B-52" (italics added). No such commitment has been made or even proposed.

More is changing in the strategic situation that affects bombers than just revolutionary improvements in bomber defenses. Bomber bases may get hopelessly vulnerable to submarine-based weapons, and some new threat to the bases may come onto the horizon, such as orbital bombs. In this shifting background—even for those who want America to have a strategic bomber forever—no major expenditures for strategic bombers would seem warranted unless the expenditures are clearly necessary and provide for clear improvements in overall U.S. strategic security. Bombers face too uncertain a strategic future to justify long-term investments.

The B-1 Might Re-ignite Bomber and Air Defense Races of the 50's.

Finally, whether or not the Soviet Union builds a new heavy bomber may be determined by our decision with the B-1. Just as U.S. bomber supporters use Soviet activities as an argument for the funds they want, so do Soviet analysts use U.S. activities in their lobbying. Both sides could make do, for as long as possible, with existing bombers. Or both could egg each other on into buying new bombers and larger numbers of them.

A Soviet decision to buy a new bomber might not only increase the number of B-1's we felt obliged to buy. It might also trigger strong U.S. interest in bomber defenses, including and especially AWACS and a new modern interceptor. Since an anti-Soviet bomber defense, without an anti-Soviet missile defense, is an absurdity, we ought to try to avoid making this mistake.

Even if the Soviets do not buy a new bomber in response to our B-1, they may well buy AWACS-type bomber defenses against it. In this case, our Air Force will want an air defense no less modern. In considering our influence over Soviet procurement it is worth pondering the comments of Dr. Harold Brown:

The Soviets, 4 or 5 years after we did each of the following things, also did them. They dispersed their silos, they hardened them, they put in the equivalent of a BMEWS to warn their bombers. They built nuclear submarines, with ballistic missile launch capability".<sup>18</sup>

All in all, we ought not encourage the Soviets to imitate us in buying a new bomber, or new bomber defenses. This will, in turn, hold down our expenditures on bombers and bomber defenses, both of which we ought not to buy in any case.

(NOTE.—Dr. Jeremy J. Stone received his Ph.D. in mathematics, but has since become widely known for his analysis of national security and arms race issues. He has been a staff member of the Hudson Institute, a Research Associate at the Harvard Center for International Affairs, a Social Science Research Council Post-Doctoral Fellow in Economics, an International Affairs Fellow of the Council on Foreign Relations and is now Director of the Federation of American Scientists and one of its elected Council members. He is the author of "Containing the Arms Race" (MIT, 1966) and "Strategic Persuasion" (Columbia University Press, 1967). His articles have appeared in, among others, Foreign Affairs, The New Republic, Commonweal, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, Survival, The Washington Post, Boston Globe, and Los Angeles Times.)

#### FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> The Federation of American Scientists is a 25-year-old, nonpartisan organization of natural and social scientists and engineers concerned with problems of science and society. For those Committee members who may be curious about the Federation's goals, we have appended a copy of our brochure to this testimony.

<sup>2</sup> See pg. 32, Hearings before the Senate Armed Services Committee on Military Procurement for Fiscal 1971, Part 1.

<sup>3</sup> New York Times, March 3, 1964.

<sup>4</sup> Statement of Dr. John S. Foster, Jr., Director of Defense Research and Engineering, Department of Defense, before the Joint Committee on Armed Services and Defense Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, Feb. 26, 1970, pg. 10.

<sup>5</sup> To take an analogy, we could keep 1/3 of our strategic bombers in the air at all times. This would clearly improve their chances for survival but the cost would be enormous in resources, crews, and plane fatigue, so we do not do it. For the most part, we have simply let the bombers become more vulnerable to enemy missile attack.

<sup>6</sup> See Testimony of Dr. George W. Rathjens, Before Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, March 1969, pg. 364, Part 1, Hearings on Strategic and Foreign Policy Implications of ABM Systems.

<sup>7</sup> These members were: Herbert F. York, Marvin L. Goldberger, Herbert Scoville, Jr., and Jerome B. Wiesner.

<sup>8</sup> Pg. 21, Senate report 91-1016, on H.R. 17123, July 14, 1970, Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate.

<sup>9</sup> See the Senate Armed Services Posture Hearings, pg. 327, Volume 1.

<sup>10</sup> Kahn, On Thermonuclear War, pg. 345.

<sup>11</sup> Posture Statement of Secretary Laird, Fiscal 1972, pg. 70.

<sup>12</sup> Report 91-1016, 91st Congress, 2nd Session, Report on H.R. 17123, pg. 19.

<sup>13</sup> Senate Hearings on Department of Defense Appropriations, Fiscal 1969 (90th Congress, 2nd Session, 1968), Volume IV, pg. 2310.

<sup>14</sup> Pg. 99, Strategy and Science: Toward a National Security Policy for the 1970's; Hearings before the Subcommittee on National Security Policy and Scientific Developments of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, 91st Congress, 1st Session, March 1969.

<sup>15</sup> Pg. 659, Volume 3, Strategic and Foreign Policy Implications of ABM Systems, Hearings before the Subcommittee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, 91st Congress, 1st Session.

<sup>16</sup> Pg. 61: ABM, MIRV, SALT, and the Nuclear Arms Race; Hearings before the Subcommittee on Arms Control, International Law and Organization of the Committee on

Foreign Relations, United States Senate, 91st Congress, 2nd Session, March-June 1970.

<sup>17</sup> Pg. 113: Diplomatic and Strategic Impact on Multiple Warhead Missiles, Hearings before the Subcommittee on National Security Policy and Scientific Developments of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, 91st Congress, 1st Session, July-August 1969.

<sup>18</sup> Ballistic-missile Guidance by D. G. Hoag, pg. 81 of Impact of New Technologies on the Arms Race, edited by B. T. Field, T. Greenwood, G. W. Rathjens, and S. Weinberg.

<sup>19</sup> Pg. 1353, Volume 2, Senate Hearings on Military Procurement, Research and Development, Fiscal 1970, 91st Congress, 1st Session.

<sup>20</sup> Pg. 2172, Volume 3, Senate Hearings on Military Procurement, Research and Development, Fiscal 1971.

<sup>21</sup> Congressional Record, vol. 115, pt 19, p. 25583.

<sup>22</sup> Report of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee on the "B-70 Program". . . July 8, 1960.

<sup>23</sup> Pg. 6090, Hearings before Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives on the "Department of Defense Decision to Reduce the Number and Types of Manned Bombers in the Strategic Air Command," January-February, 1966.

<sup>24</sup> Hearings on Military Posture, House Armed Services Committee, February-April, 1967, pg. 499-500.

<sup>25</sup> Quoted from Congressional Record, vol. 115, pt 19, p. 25585.

<sup>26</sup> Speech at the National Security Seminar, Anchorage, Alaska, January 12, 1970.

<sup>27</sup> Pg. 54, Status of U.S. Strategic Power, Hearings before the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate, 90th Congress, Second Session, April 1968.

<sup>28</sup> Senate Hearings on Defense, 1963 (87th Congress, 2nd Session, 1962), testimony of Harold Brown, pg. 977. The second estimate was reported by Senator Carl T. Curtis.

<sup>29</sup> U.S. Congress, Senate, Subcommittee on Air Force of the Committee on Armed Services, Air Power (84th Cong., 1st Sess., 1961), Part 3, pg. 55.

<sup>30</sup> See the speech of Senator McIntyre, *op. cit.*

<sup>31</sup> Armed Forces Journal, June 20, 1970.

<sup>32</sup> 6098-6099, Hearing Before Subcommittee Number 2, *op. cit.*, January-February, 1966. Among the specific advantages were: supersonic capability, comparable range during a typical refueled nuclear mission employing extended low-level flight, high-speed penetration, more modern avionics, and characteristics that make dispersed operations feasible.

<sup>33</sup> Pg. 6564, Report of Subcommittee Number 2, April 1966, on Department of Defense Decision to Reduce . . . *op. cit.*

<sup>34</sup> Senate Hearings on Military Procurement, 1965, pg. 714.

<sup>35</sup> P. 38, Air Force/Space Digest, April 1970.

<sup>36</sup> Status of U.S. Strategic Power Hearings, *op. cit.*, p. 56.

<sup>37</sup> See Congressional Record, vol. 115, pt 19, p. 25588.

<sup>38</sup> Pg. 238-239, Status of U.S. Strategic Power, *op. cit.*, 1968.

#### PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO H.R. 6531

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN  
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the Legislative Reorganization Act, Public Law 91-510, I am herewith insert-



ing in the RECORD the text of the amendments, one or both of which I intend to offer on behalf of Mr. MITCHELL, of Maryland, and myself, and several of our colleagues, to H.R. 6531, the Military Selective Service Act.

The text of the amendments follows:

Amendment to H.R. 6531, as reported. Offered by Mr. RYAN:

On page 19, line 18, immediately after "strength," insert the following: ", no part of which may be used for assignment to South Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, and North Vietnam, and the waters immediately adjacent thereto, after December 31, 1971."

Amendment to H.R. 6531, as reported. Offered by Mr. RYAN:

On page 20, line 3, immediately before the period, insert the following: ", but no part of any such active duty personnel strengths, whether or not increased by the President, may be assigned for use in South Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, and North Vietnam, and the waters immediately adjacent thereto, after December 31, 1971."

### THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE

### HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1971

Mr. PUCKINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this month commemorates the 150th anniversary of the 7-year battle for the independence of Greece.

As the most hallowed of the nations of the ancient world for its development of democracy and self-determination, it was natural for our own earliest patriots to revere the traditions of Greek civilizations.

In 1821, under the leadership of Theodore Kolokotronis, Petrompes Mavromichalis, Andreas Zaimis, Andreas Lontos, Gregorios Papafiesas, the Greek people joined once more to become a nation.

Thomas Jefferson wrote of this struggle in 1823, 5 long years short of eventual victory:

No people sympathizes more feelingly than ours with the suffering of your countrymen, none offers more sincere and ardent prayers to heaven for their success. . . . Possessing ourselves the combined blessings of liberty and order, we wish the same to other countries and to none more than yours, which, the first of civilized nations, presented examples of what man should be.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in saluting the men and women of Greece. Greek independence is a very special sense represents independence for all men on all continents.

Included in my remarks today is a brief synopsis of some of the important historical factors that contributed to this great quest for independence and its ultimate success. Anyone who knows the Greek people, knows they will always seek to retain their independence.

I support the efforts of those who are advocating a commemorative stamp to honor this important date in man's search for the right to call his life his own.

Mr. Speaker, a brief history of this revolution follows:

### THE 1821 GREEK WAR OF INDEPENDENCE: MARCH 25, 1821, TO MARCH 25, 1971

(NOTE.—Since the year 1971 marks the 150th Anniversary of the 1821 Greek War of Independence, the Order of Ahepa has prepared a fairly comprehensive historical booklet covering the events of the War for Independence, which includes America's contributions to the Greek cause. This history of the Greek Revolutionary War of 1821 is available and can be ordered from Ahepa Headquarters, 1422 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005 at a cost of \$1.00 per copy. Please forward check or money order with your request.

(We feel that this booklet will be of great value not only to the Ahepa Family as source material for addresses at March 25th Celebrations in your community, but also of great interest to the younger generation, whose knowledge of the events and personalities of the War of Independence may be limited. We suggest that this booklet will make a fine gift to your friends who may be interested in the subject.

(The following abbreviated history of the Greek War of Independence is limited due to lack of space in this magazine, however it does touch upon most important aspects. For a more comprehensive history, we recommend that you order one or more copies of the longer history from Headquarters.)

(By George J. Leber, Executive Secretary)

### I. THE BACKGROUND AND EVENTS LEADING UP TO THE REVOLUTION

#### *The Fall of Constantinople*

On May 29, 1453, Constantinople finally fell before the onslaught of the Turkish armies, and this date also marks the beginning of virtual slavery for Greece, for a period of nearly four hundred years.

During the early years following the Fall of Constantinople, the Greek Orthodox Church did not suffer greatly at the hands of the Turk, however, during the two centuries preceding the Revolution, bans were put on the Church, and cruelties to the priests and followers became common. Small outbreaks among the Greeks resulted in reduced liberties, slavery to women and children, and oftentimes, wholesale murders and massacres. The Greek Orthodox Church held its place and its power throughout Greece and the Near East mainly because of the constant energetic fight of the Patriarchs, who never relaxed their vigilance, and who carried on their struggle for maintenance of their faith.

#### *The Phanariotes*

The Phanariotes were men of great learning, taught at Phanari in Constantinople, under the Patriarchate. They kept alive the Greek language both in the Church and in the communities of all Greece. These men because of their learning, gained rank in Turkish diplomatic and business circles. The Phanariotes were given ambassadorial and diplomatic positions to all parts of Europe. They rose to high positions, and secured lands, and titles for their families, which placed them in strategic positions for the revolution to come.

With the fall of Constantinople, the scholars in Greece immediately fled to the other parts of Europe, taking refuge in Holland, England and France. This left little source of learning for the people, for soon the schools themselves were closed for lack of teachers and because of Turkish pressure. Finally, in the 18th Century the prosperous Greek community of traders and merchants in Venice started its own small Greek school and Church. The Black Sea communities followed suit, and then the program was broadened to include schools in Athens, with aid from these outside communities. Schools were also established in Giannena, Levadia, Patmos, etc. Among the teachers who carried on this work were Eugenios Voulgaris, Nikeforos

Theotokis, Constantinos Economos, Vamvas, Georgios Gennathios, and others. These teachers not only taught their pupils the Greek language, but also taught the hope of freedom, someday, for Greece. They preached a greater and free Hellas for the future.

#### *Adamantios Koraes*

The greatest of these Greek teachers was Adamantios Koraes, of Chios. However, he never actually taught in a school, as an instructor. Through his writings, he did more to instill the thought of freedom and of the glory of the Greek language and name in the mind and heart of the Greek, than any other person. He brought back all of the deeds of ancient Greece—informed these Greeks that they were descendants of these great men—and that slavery was never meant for them. He is credited with giving new life to the Greek language, for he took the work of the ancients and explained them in his writings, using them as a means of portraying the action he believed that the modern Greek should follow. He did much to bring out a Greek language now bereft of the many dialects and instructive tongues it had acquired throughout the centuries under various overloads. He died in 1833, at 85.

#### *Regas O Fereos*

Regas O Fereos was born in 1757 in Velesino, Thessaly. He studied and became a teacher in Bucharest. At this time, the French Revolution had begun, and Regas began to think of freedom for his country, Greece. He began writing letters to all influential men in Greece, urging freedom for the country, asking them to work towards that end. He also wrote many poems and songs of the greatness of Greece, and of freedom—hoping to instill within the hearts of his countrymen more than an ordinary desire for freedom. These spread over all of Greece. He also wrote to Napoleon, and arranged for an audience with him. On the way, he was stopped by the Austrians, searched, and incriminatory papers were found on him which caused his return to Vienna, and later, he was turned over to the Turkish authorities in Belgrade. There, he died in prison, but his memory lived forever after in Greece, where he was a hero, and his songs and poems lived on, feeding the flame of revolt.

#### *Philiki Etairia*

The great national secret society, which was international actually in scope, was the Philiki Etairia. This society was formed by three Greek merchants of Odessa—Skoufas, Tsakaloff, and Xanthos. The membership was secret for it would mean death at the hands of the Turks to be known as a member of the society. Headquarters were established in Constantinople, and the movement officially opened for freedom for Greece, Alexander Ypsilanti, a general in the Russian army, was chosen the leader of the Philiki Etairia. (June, 1820)

On Easter Day, at the close of the services in the Greek Orthodox Churches, Turkish soldiers forced their way into the Greek Patriarchate in Constantinople, and showed papers to the Patriarch, which stated that he had been evicted from his post as Patriarch by the sultan. The soldiers then put the Patriarch in prison, where he remained for some time. The Patriarchate was given orders by the sultan, on pain of death, to select another Patriarch.

Finally, the Patriarch was taken from his prison, to the Patriarchate, and there hanged from the Inner Gate. His body was left there for three days, while all Christians hid in their homes for fear of their lives, as the Turkish soldiers roamed the city, searching for Greek Christians. Those that they found, were slaughtered. Then, the body of the Patriarch was taken down, weighted with a heavy stone, and thrown into the sea, by the Turks. However, a Greek ship captain,

several days later, sighted the floating body, which had come to the surface, brought it abroad his ship upon recognition, and carried it immediately to Odessa in Russia. There, the Czar gave the Patriarch the honor due him, with a state funeral, and great mourning. After fifty years the body was exhumed and taken to Athens, where it lies today.

#### II. MEN AND EVENTS OF THE REVOLUTION

In 1821, through the efforts of the Philiki Hetairia, the secret society, some semblance of organization and planning had been brought about, and in March of that year, under the leadership of such men as Theodore Kolokotronis, Petrompess Mavromichalis, Andreas Zaimis, Andreas Lontos, the Metropolitan Palaios Patron Germanos, Gregorios Papaflessas—the revolution opened in Greece.

Kolokotronis arrived at Mani, in January of 1821, and his very presence in Greece was enough to arouse the spirit of the patriots, for his name was already known throughout the country, as a fearless patriot, and leader. In 1818, the Turks had evicted him from the Morea, or Peloponnesus, because of his aggressiveness and rebellious spirit.

On March 21, 1821, the patriots besieged the city of Kalavrita, and in five days had taken the town. On the 22nd, Mavromichalis and his Maniates, with Kolokotronis and others, besieged Kalames and took it on the 25th. In Patras, the Metropolitan Palaios Patron Germanos, with Andreas Zaimis, Lontos and others, struck the colors for freedom, on March 25, which date is recognized as the official beginning of the Revolution. With their force, these leaders besieged the town of Patras. At the same time, Lala, Corinth, Monemvasia, Navarino, Argos, and Nauplion were besieged by the patriots.

The revolution was raised in Sterea Hellas by Panourgias at Amphissa, by Thanasis Diakos at Levadia, and by Diouvouniotis at Voudounitsa.

A large Turkish force, under Kioshe Mehmet and Omar Vronis, advanced upon the Greeks in Sterea Hellas, and dispersed the force advanced upon the Greeks in Sterea Hellas, and dispersed the force that came to meet them—all except for forty patriots and Thanasis Diakos, who decided to hold at Thermopylae. They were finally all dead except Diakos, who was taken prisoner and taken to Lamia. There, the two Turkish leaders asked him to join with them for they both admired and feared his bravery. He cursed them instead of agreeing, and he was consequently spitted upon a large stake by the Turks, where he died, pierced the length of his body by the stake.

The revolution opened on May 20 in northern Greece. Because of the heavy Turkish forces in that section, the struggle did not meet with any success. In Thessaly, the uprising was quickly downed by the Turks who massacred and destroyed as they went through the countryside. In Macedonia, the heavy Turkish forces spelled defeat for the Greeks there, also. In Crete, in the south of Greece, the Greeks arose in revolution, but had to flee to the hills for safety where they remained for the duration of the struggle, fighting for their lives.

In the islands, lay the greatest wealth of Greece, because of trading and commerce which they carried on. The islands joined with the rest of the country in the revolt, and on April 3, the Septes Isles revolted, sending 58 ships to besiege Nauplio from the sea. Hydra, Psara, and Spetses bore the brunt of the revolution among the islands, since they led them in importance. Shortly after Samos, the Cyclades, and the Dodecanesa, except for Rhodes, also joined in with the revolutionists.

#### The first government

The first government of the revolutionary forces was formed at Epidaurus. A committee was selected to rule, with Alexandros Mavro-

kordatos as the president, and leader. From this seat, the revolution was directed, and the forms of attack were planned. However, shortly thereafter, at Peta, the Greeks suffered their first great loss, losing 3500 men, being routed from the field, to Missolonghi, where the survivors took refuge while the Turkish forces besieged the city. The siege lasted for years, resulting in hardships and suffering for those in the city. It was here at Missolonghi that Marco Bozzaris first sprang into fame for his bravery and leadership.

#### Kolokotronis

During these dark days, it was Kolokotronis who saved Greece from being taken again by the superior forces of the Turks, for time and again, through his strategy and leadership, he constantly harried the enemy, keeping them at bay, and worrying them keeping them disorganized. Kolokotronis asked the other Greek leaders to follow his plan for he realized that the Turks would march towards Corinth, instead of retreating as the other leaders insisted. They scoffed at him, but he took up his position in the hills, and when the Turks did appear on the way to Corinth, he was the actual savior of Greece, for he engaged them with his small force, until aid came from the other leaders.

#### Konstantinos Kanaris

Konstantinos Kanaris is renowned for his feats of daring and bravery on the sea, of which he had gained control over the Turks, with his Samians. On one occasion, the Turkish fleet had two giant warships anchored at Chios. Kanaris came into the harbor with his small boats, unseen. Kanaris succeeded in tying the kegs of gunpowder to an open gun-turret of one ship, but his companions failed to secure their kegs to the other ship. They rowed away, while the fuse burned, and finally the kegs exploded, setting fire to the one ship. The fire reached the powder rooms, and the entire warship went into the air, with a loss of 2,000 lives to the Turkish fleet.

#### Marcos Bozzaris

Marcos Bozzaris has been immortalized by an American poet (Halleck) for his bravery. He did not care for honors, but only liberty for Greece. While the various other leaders fought amongst themselves for medals and honors, and credit for victory, he sought only to do his work, unmolested.

Bozzaris was the leader of the Souliotes, described as the most-fearful fighters among the patriots. He conceived the daring plan of attacking a force of Turks, 4,500 in number, as they were encamped during the night. He took with him only 350 of his Souliotes, and they attacked the camp, and were well on the road to a complete rout and massacre of the Turkish force, when a stray bullet struck Bozzaris in the head, killing him. His Souliotes then took his body and fled to the hills, leaving behind them over 2,000 dead of the enemy! His loss was one of the greatest of the war, to the patriots.

#### Internal troubles

Two factions appeared within the government itself—one demanding that Kolokotronis become the leader of all the forces, and the other which demanded Mavrokordatos as leader. There were now two governments among the revolutionary forces—one headed by Petrompess and the other by Koundouriotes. The government of Koundouriotes won out, and Kolokotronis was imprisoned by the government at Hydra, the monastery of the Prophet Elias. Oddessus Androutsos bitterly complained of the treatment given Kolokotronis, and was himself consequently accused of being in alliance with the Turks. Cauras was sent after him with a force—he has seized and imprisoned on the Acropolis, in Athens. However, within a few days his body was found at the bottom of the slope, broken on the rocks. The

mystery of his death was never solved. At this point, the Greeks were saved from their own foolishness and jealousy through aid from the rest of Europe. The various nations were attracted to the scene and offered their aid.

#### European philhellenism

When news of the Greek Revolution spread throughout Europe, the great scholars on the continent saw once again the rise of the Glory of Ancient Greece. With this ideal before them, they began the campaign for aid to Greece, which led, ultimately, to financial and material aid in soldiers and ships, to the patriots. The little country had not been heard from for over 1,000 years, and the magic of the word "Greece" and "Hellas" brought immediate aid. In Switzerland, France, and Germany societies were formed to aid the patriots. The government of England was not in favor of the revolution at the first, however after constant pressure from internal groups, she was forced to accede to their demands of the English, and favor swung towards aid for Greece. It was Lord Byron who raised his voice and power to bring material and financial aid to Greece, and he went so far as to expend his own personal fortune in aiding the patriots, and died in Greece, at Missolonghi, during the siege, of fever.

#### Naval battles

In 1824, the Turkish fleet sailed to Samos, to attack the island and to punish the populace, however they were met by the Greek fleet, under Kanaris and were forced to flee, retreating to Ko.

In August of that year, the Egyptian fleet reached the islands and with an additional 56 warships, and 150 smaller ships, the Turkish-Egyptian fleet sailed against the Greeks again, but in two battles, at Geronta and at Samos the Greeks were again the victors, although they had to fight against overwhelming odds. Miaoulis was the naval hero in these two engagements. However, now the Greek fleet was in sad need of repairs, and they returned to Hydra for the winter, believing that the Egyptians and Turkish fleets would not engage in activity for the rest of the winter. However, in February, 1824, Ibrahim, the Egyptian leader landed 4,000 soldiers on the Peloponnesus, with 500 cavalry, at Methonis, from 50 ships.

#### In the peloponnesus

The entire Peloponnesus now clamored for the freedom of Kolokotronis, still in prison. The government would not listen, even though Papaflessas, himself, asked for his release. Consequently Papaflessas with his 1,000 Roumeliotes took the stand against the Turks, and although they fought bravely, they were slain to the last man. Now, the government seeing disaster before it freed Kolokotronis and his friends, who had been imprisoned because of jealousy and political reasons, for the patriots needed a good leader now, if ever they had.

The news that Kolokotronis, O Geros Tis Moreas, was free spread like wildfire over the Peloponnesus, and his name drew thousands of patriots to the fight, under him, as their leader.

Kolokotronis was faced with the problem of meeting the Turks in battle whose superior fighting forces, in numbers, could not be easily met in open battle on the field. Consequently, he fell back to the Kleftiko method—with lightning thrusts at night or day, from the hills, upon the enemy, furious fighting that demoralized the Turks, then back into the hills would sweep the patriots until the next opportunity. He constantly harried them with this guerrilla warfare for it was Greece's only way out.

At this time, the siege of Missolonghi was underway in earnest and he was called to go to the aid of the Turkish troops besieging the city. After months, finally the Turkish forces had worn down the resistance of the Greeks, and they determined to break



through, to safety. However, almost to safety, fear overtook the patriots, and half of them turned back to the city, while the other half continued on to freedom in the hills. Those who had turned back were followed closely by the enemy, who broke into the city, and began the massacre that alarmed all of Europe. When they had finished, Missolonghi was nothing but a smoking ruins. The fall of Missolonghi, now named the Holy City, (Iera Polis) because of the massacre, also spelled the downhill of the revolutionary government in power, and a new one arose, with Zaimis as president. Koutahis was in command of the Turkish troops in central Greece at the time, while Ibrahim returned to the Peloponnese where he began laying waste the countryside, killing as he drove relentlessly onward. Koutahis meanwhile advanced into Attica, and laid siege to the Acropolis.

#### Karaiskakis

Karaiskakis, the leader in the central Greek front, was a small, sickly man, who was described as having the "heart of a lion." It was his strategy and bitter defense that was of such aid to the patriots. He was given command of the Greek forces in central Greece by the government. In July, 1826 he went to Salamina where he gathered together 3,500 patriots, among whom were Kriezotis, Vasos, Panourias, and others, and a force that had been gathered together by the Frenchman, Faviero. This force was defeated by the Turkish cavalry at Haidari, near Daphni of Attica, but shortly thereafter, Kriezotis with 500 men under him, broke through the Turkish lines and reinforced the small group of patriots who were defending the Acropolis. Their leader, Gouras, had been killed shortly before.

Then Karaiskakis decided to gather as large a force as possible, in order to trap Koutahis, and his forces, in Africa, where they were besieging the Acropolis. He sent Kouletis by sea to Atalanta to take Dombrina, and Ibrahim sent a force under Mustapha Bey to oppose him, and Kouletis was forced to leave without victory. Karaiskakis then guessed that Mustapha Bey and his Arvanites would go to Salona, so he sent Griva, the Gardikiotis, to Arahova, to take that position, which he held, so that when the Turks arrived, they found him there. Griva engaged the Turks and thus gained time for Karaiskakis to put his plan into effect. Karaiskakis then sent other troops against Mustapha Bey and his Arvanites. The Greeks closed in, scoring a decisive victory—only 300 of the Arvanites escaping their vengeance. This victory was made at Parnassus, in November, 1826. After this the patriots scored other victories and retook all of central Greece with the exception of Vonitsa, Missolonghi and Naupakto. The Turks retired to Phaleron, where the big engagement would take place on April 23.

#### Aid from the European powers

At this moment, when the revolution seemed doomed to failure, the European powers entered the picture, officially. England, France, Russia and Austria had previously lent no governmental aid to Greece, nor sanctioned the revolt, because of fear of international complications. France, England, and Russia met in London in 1827 and signed a secret treaty, agreeing to support the revolutionary government of Greece, and to rid Europe of Turkey.

England, France and Russia immediately sent their fleets to Greek waters, and ordered the Egyptian and Turkish commanders to take their troops and their ships and vacate the Peloponnese and its waters. The Turks refused, upon further orders from Constantinople. In the meantime, the Greek forces had taken new heart upon the good news, and the revolution sprang up anew. Ibrahim then began anew to scourge the Peloponnese sweeping through Messenia, Arcadia and Laconia. Following this

action, the French, Russian and English ships swept into Navarino and gave final orders for the Turkish-Egyptian fleets to leave the waters of the country at once. The Turkish fired and sank a small English boat. Following this action, Codrington, the English commander, gave orders to start firing. Within four hours, only 20 of the original 120 Turkish-Egyptian ships remained afloat on the water. All the rest had been sunk. This destroyed Turkey's power in Greece forever. French soldiers were then landed in the Peloponnese, and Ibrahim was forced to flee the country with his Egyptians, back to Egypt. Finally, on September 12, 1829, all of central Greece and the Peloponnese had been cleared of Turkish forces.

#### Recognition and freedom

John Capo D'Istrias was elected as governor of Greece by the nations and the revolutionary government. He had been striving since 1822 to influence the Czar of Russia to aid Greece without success, and then had gone shortly after to Switzerland to try to raise funds for the patriots. He had been quite influential in Russia, within the government there. In 1828 he arrived in Greece.

It was decided by the three powers, England, France and Russia, that Prince Leopold of Coburg should become ruler of Greece. It was their wish to establish a monarchy in Greece. Capo D'Istrias also had the same idea and upon the eviction of the Turks from the land, he dissolved the legislative chamber of the revolutionary government, and took charge of all the affairs. This action by Capo D'Istrias caused internal dissension and strife, for the men who had led in the revolution, and had risen to power, now found themselves without power and without positions, and unrecognized, in a sense—or so they felt. They also regarded Capo D'Istrias as an opportunist, who wished to make himself king, which was not the case. Capo D'Istrias wished to prepare the government to receive the monarchy, and he believed his action the best in the way of preparation. Finally, things became so bitter that on September 27, 1831, Capo D'Istrias was assassinated.

Immediately following the assassination, violent civil war broke out in Greece, and the three European powers looked on with alarm. Leopold had refused to accept the throne of king, because he learned of the destitute conditions of the country following the effects of the revolution, and the powers then selected Prince Othon of Bavaria, son of Ludovici, King of Bavaria, to rule as the monarch of Greece.

Othon, only seventeen years of age, assumed the crown as King of Greece on January 25, 1832, and peace reigned in the land for the first time in almost four hundred years. The people welcomed him as a saviour for now they were united, as a recognized nation of the world. And freedom came to Hellas, again.

#### THE BEGINNING OF AMERICA'S INTEREST IN GREECE

On May 25, 1821, Petros Mavromichalis, Director General of the Messenian Congress at Kalamata, wrote a letter addressed to the people of the United States, in which he asked for America's help.

This letter reached the attention of American Ambassador to France Albert Gallatin, Secretary of State John Quincy Adams, and Dr. Edward Everett of Harvard University. A letter to Everett was also sent from Paris, and Adamantios Korais was one of the signers, asking for assistance from America. Dr. Everett published these letters in his North American Review, and through his personal efforts, the Greek War of Independence received wide publicity in America, resulting in widespread support from the American people.

Adamantios Korais wrote to Thomas Jefferson, from Paris, on July 10, 1823, asking

for America's help, and support, and Jefferson replied with fervent hope for Greece's success, and his support, and with suggestions. In addition, there was correspondence from Lafayette to Jefferson urging American recognition of the Greek stand for independence.

#### AMERICAN PHILHELLENES IN THE GREEK WAR OF INDEPENDENCE

Although we hope to briefly recount the story of the American Philhellenes who assisted Greece during her War of Independence, tribute must first be paid to the great English poet Lord Byron, who called the attention of the world to Greece's desperate struggle for freedom and existence.

Lord Byron arrived at Missolonghi on December 24, 1823, where he was warmly welcomed by the Hellenes. He delighted in wearing the Greek foustanelle. With his own money, he supported 500 Soullotes soldiers, and gave greatly of his own wealth for the cause of Greece. However, illness struck on April 6, 1824, and on April 7, 1824, he died, at 37 years of age, with these words on his lips: "Greece, I gave you everything that any one man can give. I gave you my wealth—my every hour—my health, and now—my very life. My sacrifice is for your salvation."

Monuments now stand to his memory in Missolonghi, and also at the Zappeion in Athens.

#### SONS OF PERICLES MEMORIAL

These monuments include a memorial erected by the Order of Sons of Pericles, the Junior Order of Ahepa, in 1939, and placed there in memory of the American Philhellenes.

This 10-foot-high monument erected by the Sons of Pericles was dedicated and unveiled in the Garden of Heroes at Missolonghi on June 25, 1939, in the presence of representatives of the Sons, Ahepa, and the American and Greek governments. The Congress of the United States passed a unanimous Joint Congressional Resolution which read: "The President be authorized and requested on behalf of the Order of Sons of Pericles, the Junior Order of Ahepa, a national fraternity of youthful Americans of Hellenic descent, to provide through the American Minister to Greece for the presentation to the people of Greece of the monument recently erected in the Garden of Heroes at Missolonghi, Greece, the shrine of Greek Independence, as a tribute to and in commemoration of those patriotic Americans who, aided by the moral and material support and assistance of the entire American people, gave their services, their fortunes, and their lives to the cause of Greek Independence in the Greek Revolutionary War of 1821."

#### YPSILANTI, MICHIGAN

*Ahepa Erected Statute of Demetrius Ypsilanti in Ypsilanti, Michigan on August 29, 1928*

Harvey C. Colburn in his book "The Story of Ypsilanti, Michigan" says:

"Among the notable world events of the time was the Greek revolution. In the splendid struggle of the Greek people against Turkish tyranny, appeared an outstanding heroic figure, Demetrius Ypsilanti.

"Judge Woodward proposed that the name of the new city be Ypsilanti—and Ypsilanti it was. (1826.)

"It was a wise providence that guided the good judge in his remarkable suggestion.

"In the city hall hangs a fitting portrait of the Greek general. The cause of human freedom is largely indebted to him, and besides, he left us a good name."

#### PRESIDENT JAMES MONROE

On December 3, 1822, President James Monroe included the following words in his Message to Congress: "The mention of Greece fills the mind with the most exalted sentiments, and arouses in our bosoms the

best feelings of which our nature is susceptible. That such a country should have been overwhelmed, and so long hidden as it were, from the world, under a gloomy despotism, has been a cause of unceasing and deep regret to generous minds for ages past. A strong hope is entertained that these people will recover their independence, and resume their equal station among the nations of the earth."

DANIEL WEBSTER OF MASSACHUSETTS, U.S.  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

U.S. Representative Daniel Webster of Massachusetts introduced a resolution in the House of Representatives during the 1823-1824 Congressional 18th Session that: "That provision ought to be made, by law, for defraying the expense incident to the appointment of an agent, or commissioner, to Greece, whenever the President shall deem it expedient to make such an appointment."

In speaking for his resolution, Webster said: "This people, a people of intelligence, ingenuity, refinement, spirit, and enterprise, have been for centuries under the most atrocious, unparalleled Tartarian barbarism that ever oppressed the human race. It has been as truly, as beautifully said, that 'The Turk has now been encamped in Europe for four centuries. Yes, sir—it is nothing else than an encampment. They came in by the sword, and they govern by the sword. . . . Does not the land ring from side to side with one common sentiment of sympathy for Greece, and indignation towards her oppressors? Sir, while we sit here deliberating, her destiny may be decided. . . . They look to us as the great Republic of the earth—and they ask us by our common faith, whether we can forget that they are now struggling for what we can now so ably enjoy? . . ."

HENRY CLAY OF KENTUCKY,  
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

U.S. Representative Henry Clay of Kentucky spoke in the same Session of Congress in support of the resolution introduced by Daniel Webster, as follows:

"Are we so low, so base, so despicable that we may not express our horror, articulate our detestation, of the most brutal and atrocious war that ever stained earth, or shocked high Heaven, with the ferocious deeds of a brutal soldiery set on by the clergy and followers of a fanatical and inimical religion, and rioting in excess of blood and butchery, at the mere details of which the breast sickens?"

"Go home, if you dare; go home, if you can, to your constituents, and tell them that you voted it down—meet, if you dare, the appalling countenances of those who sent you here, (I mean no defiance) and tell them that you shrank from the declaration of your own sentiments—that you cannot tell how, but that some unknown dread, some indescribable apprehension, some indefinable danger, affrighted you—that the spectres of scimitars, and crowns, and crescents, gleamed before you, and alarmed you; and that you suppressed all the noble feeling prompted by religion, by liberty, by national independence, and by humanity."

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS  
(President of the United States. Annual message, Dec. 4, 1827)

"The sympathies which the people and Government of the United States have so warmly indulged with the cause of Greece have been acknowledged by their government in a letter of thanks, which I have received from their illustrious President, a translation of which is now communicated to Congress. We hope that they will obtain relief from the most unequal of conflicts which they have so long and so gallantly sustained; that they will enjoy the blessing of self government, which by their sufferings in the cause of liberty they have richly earned, and

that their independence will be secured by those liberal institutions of which their country furnished the earliest examples in the history of mankind, and which have consecrated to immortal remembrance the very soil for which they are now again profusely pouring forth their blood."

HENRY W. DWIGHT  
(Member of the House of Representatives from Massachusetts)

No, sir, not to England, but to America, did Greece appeal from the Senate of Calamata, in language which we cannot refuse to hear, "That having deliberately resolved to live or die for freedom, they were drawn by an irresistible sympathy to the people of the United States."

DANIEL P. COOK  
(Member of the House of Representatives from Illinois)

On these principles (of the Declaration of Independence) Greece has dared to act; she has broken her chains, and set up for herself an independent Government; in recognizing that Government, we break no international law.

PATRICK FARRELLY  
(Member of the House of Representatives from Pennsylvania.)

We are not sending an agent to Greece to excite her to begin a rebellion against the Turk; that is begun already, and more than half finished too, sir. For one, I believe they are able to maintain their independence, and well maintain it; they will not forget their ancestors. And, as a confirmation of this opinion, I pray you, sir, look at the last news from there. The coincidence of their modern and their ancient spirit is striking indeed, sir, the selfsame act has now been performed in Attica that was done two thousand five hundred years ago—the inhabitants of Athens have all migrated to Salamis, to avoid subjection.

#### SUPPORT FROM CITY COMMITTEES

Sentiment was expressed in popular assemblies which drew up resolutions of sympathy for Greece and urged Congress to do likewise. Philadelphia was among the leading cities to champion the Greek cause.

On December 11, 1823, in the City of Philadelphia, a committee sent a resolution to the Congress of the United States urging it to recognize Greek independence in the following words:

"Having read the appeal of the Messinian Congress to the United States, can we any longer shut our hearts to such an appeal? No! No!"

On January 18, 1824, in Philadelphia, the Reverend Gregory T. Bedell of Saint Andrew's Church, appealing to his congregation for aid to Greece, said:

"The struggle of the Greeks finds a defender in our hearts, since it is connected with reminiscences of our own history."

The resolution from Washington City, typical of the rest, is:

"Praying Congress to assure the people of Greece of the deep interest felt by the people of this country in their contest for emancipation and freedom, and of the sincere good wishes of the Congress of the United States for the ultimate success and triumph of their cause."

DR. SAMUEL GRIDLEY HOWE  
Dr. Samuel Gridley Howe, who completed his medical studies at Harvard University in 1824, departed that same year for Greece, to observe the struggle for independence and to assist the Greeks.

He was the author of a book, "An Historical Sketch of the Greek Revolution," which was published upon his return to America, and which received wide readership. The Howe book has been reprinted by Dr. George C. Arnakis of the Center for Neo-Hellenic

Studies, of Austin, Texas. (1010 W. 22nd St., Austin, Texas.)

Dr. Howe stayed in Greece from his arrival at the close of the year 1824, until November 13, 1827, when he departed for the United States. On November 12, 1828, he arrived back in Greece at Aegina, and stayed until June of 1830, when he returned to America to continue his professional career as a doctor.

While in America between the trips to Greece, he spent almost all of his time campaigning for Greek relief, lecturing in behalf of the many Greek committees in the United States, and working on his book for publication.

During his first years in Greece he was a surgeon in the Greek armed forces and was given the title of "Surgeon-in-Chief" by the Greek government. Dr. Howe also took part in several engagements, wore the *foustanella* on some occasions, and gave invaluable service to the Greek forces.

On his second trip to Greece in 1828 he escorted a large supply of American aid materials, which he distributed to the Greek war refugees, with the assistance of Jonathan P. Miller and George Jarvis.

Dr. Howe again visited Greece in 1844 for a brief time, and in 1867 he returned to Greece with his family, at a time when the Cretans were fighting for freedom from Turkey.

The following excerpt is taken from one of Dr. Howe's letters:

"Greece is my idol, and the sufferings and privations I have endured in her cause have rendered her fate and her future to be more interesting. I can say sincerely that I have found the Greeks kindly, affectionate, truthful, grateful and honest. There is a spark left of the spirit of ancient Greece which four hundred years of slavery has not been able to blot out."

In 1939, the Order of Ahepa dedicated the Dr. Samuel Gridley Howe Flag Mast on the campus of Brown University, Providence, R.I., as a memorial to the contributions of this American Philhellene to the Greek War of Independence.

COL. JONATHAN P. MILLER

In 1824, Colonel Jonathan P. Miller of Vermont was sent to Greece by the Greek Committee of Boston, to observe conditions of the war, and he made the long voyage which took 45 days.

Speaking of Colonel Miller, Dr. Howe says in a letter to his father, dated March, 1825:

"Captain Miller you have seen. He is as brave a man as ever stepped foot in Greece; has the most sterling integrity, and an entire devotion to the cause of liberty. You would laugh to see him; he has his head shaved, has on the Greek *floccata*, and petticoat trousers, and with his pistols and dagger stuck in his belt, and his musket on his shoulder, cuts a most curious figure. He serves as a captain, and if his life is spared, he will be of the greatest use to the cause."

Upon his return to America, Colonel Miller brought with him two Greek orphans, a boy and a girl. He adopted the boy, whom he named Lucas Miltiades Miller. Lucas Miltiades Miller became the first American Congressman of Greek descent, when elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1891. He was a resident of Oshkosh, Wis., at the time of his election.

#### WAR ORPHANS FROM GREECE

Under the auspices of the various Greek Committees in the United States, and individuals, several war orphans of the 1821 Greek War of Independence were brought to the United States.

Fotios Kavasalis, age 14, and Anastasios Karavelis, age 11, arrived at Salem, Mass., in 1823.

Two brothers, Stephanos and Pantelis Galatis, 16 and 12 years of age, arrived here



in October, 1823, and were sent to the United States by a theologian named Temple.

Konstantinos and Pantelis Rallis, 16 and 14 years of age, arrived here in May, 1824.

Nicholas Petrokokkinos came to America also in 1824 at 16 years of age.

Alexander Paspatis arrived here in 1824 at age 12.

Three young Greeks, Nicholas Prassas, age 16, Nicholas Vlassopoulos, age 22, and Gregorios Perdicaris, age 22, arrived in Boston in June, 1826, on board the ship *Romulus*, under shipmaster John M. Allen.

Other young Greek orphans who came to the United States were: Konstantinos Fountoulakis, Christos Stamatis, Epaminondas I. Stratis, Christos Vangelis (Vangale), and Ioannis Zachos.

Athanasios Kolevelonis was born in 1815 in Missolonghi, and was brought to New York sometime in the latter part of the war by shipmaster Nicholson of the ship *Ontario*.

George Mousalas Calvocoressis was brought to Baltimore, Maryland, with other Greek orphans on board the ship *Margarita*.

Ioannis Kilivergos Zachos was brought to America by Dr. Samuel Gridley Howe in about 1828.

Christoforos Kastanis also arrived in the United States at the same time as John Zachos.

In the book, "The Greek Exile," by Kastanis, he mentions that about forty (40) Greek orphans were brought to the United States by American Philhellenes, and that they studied at Yale University, Amherst, Princeton, Hartford, Athens, Ga., Kenyon College of Ohio, Easton College, Pa., and at Knoxville Tenn. He states that these 40 young Greek lads were from Chios, Epiros, Athens, Macedonia, and Asia Minor, and that most of them returned to Greece after completing their studies in the United States. He also says that in 1839 three young students came from Epiros to study at Princeton University.

Another young Greek who studied at Yale College in 1840 was Vasilios Argyros.

Evangelinos Apostolides Sophocles came to America in 1828, at 24 years of age, at the invitation of the theologian Josiah Brewer.

#### LUCAS MILTIADES MILLER

When Colonel Jonathan P. Miller of Vermont returned to America after serving so courageously with the Greek forces, he brought with him two orphans, a boy and a girl. The girl was adopted by the Winthrop family of Massachusetts (and we assumed this was Governor Winthrop of Massachusetts), and Miller adopted the boy, giving him the name Lucas Miltiades Miller.

The boy was born in Levadia in 1824. He was educated in Vermont, and at 21 years of age became an attorney. Lucas Miltiades Miller moved to Oshkosh, Wisconsin, in 1846, and in 1891 was elected to the U.S. Congress as a U.S. Representative from Wisconsin. Insofar as we know, Lucas Miltiades Miller was the first member of the U.S. Congress of Greek descent.

#### LIEUT. GEN. GEORGE JARVIS

George Jarvis, an American from Massachusetts, was the first American to join the Greeks in their struggle for freedom.

He went to Denmark, where he was born, and from there to Greece in early 1823. Along with Jonathan P. Miller, Jarvis fought with the Greeks to the defense of Nauplia against the Egyptians (who were allies of the Turkish forces) in 1825, as well as in other battles.

Also with Miller, Jarvis helped Dr. Samuel Gridley Howe in the distribution of American food, clothes and medicine which were sent to Greece from the United States, and also helped in the establishment of a hospital, created by Dr. Howe, for Greek veterans. Jarvis also originated the idea of a model agricultural settlement for the war refugees, which Howe established at Hex-

amilla, and which was named "Washingtonia," sixty-six families were established at this settlement.

Lieutenant General George Jarvis was the son of an American diplomat stationed in Germany. He fought with the Greeks against the Turks for almost seven years. He died of illness at Argos, Greece, on August 11, 1828.

Speaking of Lieutenant General Jarvis in a letter written to his father in March, 1825, Dr. Samuel Gridley Howe says:

"General Jarvis has been in Greece three years, has been in many engagements, has become a complete Greek in dress, manners, and language; he is almost the only foreigner who has uniformly conducted himself with prudence and correctness; and he has reaped his reward. He has gained the confidence of the Greeks, he has rendered great service to their cause and now is made Lieutenant General. He is a man I am proud to own as a countryman."

#### OTHER AMERICAN PHILHELLENES

Among other American Philhellenes in Greece were:

George Wilson, from Providence, Rhode Island, who served with the Greek naval forces.

James Williams, from Baltimore, a Negro, who also served with the Greek naval forces.

Estwick Evans, from New Hampshire.

John M. Allen, shipmaster, who had previously served in the American naval forces, and who was a close friend of Lafayette.

William Washington, who died at the battle of Palamidiou.

Also Christ Bosco, John Getty, Alexander Ross, John Villen.

Intensive research on the subject would no doubt bring other names to light, and the subject should be pursued further.

#### AMERICAN & EUROPEAN PHILHELLENES

According to available figures, about 450 Philhellenes from Europe and America went to Greece during the 1821 Greek War of Independence, to assist the Greek cause.

Germany, alone, was represented by about 150 men, and the other 300 were from America, Italy, Poland, England, Switzerland, Denmark, Sweden, Finland, Russia, Holland, Belgium, Hungary, Portugal and France.

### RETURN OF AN OUTCAST

#### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in the last year or so, leading members of the business and academic communities have expressed deepening concern over the direction in which the American economy will progress during the decade of the 1970's.

With greater and greater repetition, critical comments are surfacing as to the benefits of economic competition, and recently several proposals have been introduced in this body to examine and evaluate the effectiveness of our Federal antitrust enforcement. This country has been built upon the economic concept of free enterprise and vigorous competition. It is surprising to find suddenly that the basis upon which this country's greatness was built is now being challenged.

The March 22 issue of the Wall Street Journal carried a thought-provoking editorial entitled "Return of an Outcast." This editorial, Mr. Speaker, dramatically warns of the dangers inherent in a move

away from competition toward an economy based on accommodation and co-operation. The insight that I have gained over the last 7 years, while having the honor of serving on the House Small Business Committee under the capable and able leadership of Chairman Joe L. Evins, Democrat, of Tennessee, has firmly instilled in me the dangers inherent to the small business community of this country whenever competition is removed from the marketplace. Economic history has shown that removal of competition is the catalyst which brings upon concentration whether by governmental action or industry agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I include the entire article in the RECORD at this point:

#### RETURN OF AN OUTCAST

Old ideas, long thought to be dead and discredited, have a way of returning, in a fresh suit of clothes, trying to look respectable.

Take the idea of cartels, where a benign government permits competition-limiting agreements among commercial firms. We thought that one had been killed off long ago by countless demonstrations of market competition's superior power to create economic wealth.

But in the last several days we have heard an airline chairman, Eastern's Floyd D. Hall, and a chemical company president, Douglas Grymes of Koppers, sounding a lot like advocates of movement towards cartelization in American industry. Mr. Hall argues that greater freedom for inter-airline discussions could "minimize the wasteful byproducts of excessive competition." Mr. Grymes, in a speech before a steel industry group in Pittsburgh, called for "both business and government to face up to the existence of a planned economy—to stop pretending that we exist in a truly free enterprise system—and to begin performing as 'partners' trying to reach the same goals."

Well, businessmen undoubtedly get tired of the rigors of competition. And the interaction of government, business and labor as adversaries creates an atmosphere of contentiousness and struggle. There certainly is no harm in intelligent executives' occasionally stepping back from the arena to ask if there might not be a better way. But from our vantage point, any argument that important problems can be solved by reducing competition will not make much of an impression. We've heard it all before.

Mr. Grymes insisted that since business is heavily regulated and taxed by government, "free enterprise" died ages ago, and that the present system isn't working. "Our economy is neither free nor enterprising," he declared.

Of course, the term "free enterprise" is always a good target because it is not very descriptive; freedom is relative, not absolute. Business enterprise probably has never been totally free, here or anywhere else. Our modern economic system is based on private, competitive enterprise—subject to government regulation. Yet to argue that it isn't working comes as a shock to some of us who thought we were participating in an economy generating a trillion dollars worth of goods and services a year.

What Mr. Grymes is really concerned about—and it is a legitimate and useful concern—is the possibility that some other national economies are working better than ours. He cites Germany and Japan. He is concerned lest the products of these allegedly more effective economies "clobber" those of the United States in international markets. He suggests that they can do this because the relationship between business and government is so close that business is allowed to form exporting cartels.

We don't accept the assumption that Ger-

many is highly tolerant of cartels, although it does permit limited forms. Former Chancellor Ludwig Erhard, usually credited as the architect of Germany's postwar economic "miracle," was a strong believer in competition and helped smash postwar efforts by some German industrialists to re-establish prewar-type cartels.

There probably is more cooperation between government and industry in Japan than in the United States. Still, anyone who would recommend that the United States try to emulate Japan grossly underestimates the complexities of Japan's cultural and political traditions. American consumers would not so willingly sacrifice their own interests to national foreign trade goals, for one thing. And even in Japan, government stimulation of competition in important industries has figured heavily in the rapid postwar economic growth.

Business-government cooperation has been close in other places; France and Spain are examples. The economic success of those two countries, however, has hardly been startling.

It should be further noted that the United States is not without its own version of business-government alliances. The U.S. government promotes exports, operates barriers against certain foreign imports, grants subsidies to some industries, and very often, through regulatory agencies, actually discourages rather than encourages competition.

No one would argue that the United States economy has no problems. But to argue that those problems would be diminished by weakening the antitrust laws, permitting or encouraging a reduction in competition or fostering a cozier relationship between business and government is to grossly misinterpret past lessons. What the economy needs, in fact, is a relentless effort to counter the constant tendency for producers to try to limit competition, whether those producers be bricklayers, doctors or giant industry. This is the role of government and it cannot perform that role through alliances.

We're afraid this is not an academic argument. Not long ago, the U.S. government looked the other way while most of its major oil companies joined in an international cartel in Tehran that set terms for buying Persian Gulf crude oil. We also read that Congress is being asked to pass a law that would legalize a pipeline acquisition made by El Paso Natural Gas Co. in 1959, which courts have declared illegal under antitrust laws. And the Civil Aeronautics Board is proving receptive to airline requests for greater freedom to collaborate.

As we say, old ideas have a way of creeping back after they have been discredited. One of the most persistent is the idea that we can have a vigorous and fruitful market economy and at the same time spare ourselves the rigors of competition. The simple answer is that we can't.

#### A DISTINGUISHED PUBLIC SERVANT—NICHOLAS OGANOVIC RETIRES AS EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

**HON. JOE L. EVINS**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding career executives in the U.S. Government—Nicholas Oganovic, executive director of the Civil Service Commission—has announced plans for his retirement, June 1.

CKXVII—534—Part 7

Mr. Oganovic is one of the most able, competent, and effective career executives in the Federal Government today. As Executive Director of the Civil Service Commission, he has contributed greatly to the growth and progress of the Federal career system.

As Mr. Oganovic takes his leave of absence from a long and distinguished career of public service his friends wish for him the very best of good luck and success and happiness as he enjoys a richly deserved retirement.

#### TEXTILE INDUSTRY

**HON. HUGH L. CAREY**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Louis Stulberg, president and general secretary of the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union, is an admirable and respected American whose friendship I have long valued. He is among those historical labor leaders who have worked their way up in the ranks in a gruelling, demanding, trade—from a fabric cutter to a leader of one of the finest labor organizations in the world. From this part of the House of Labor, I have seen Lou Stulberg educate children of families with modest means and produce some of our finest professional people in the fields of medicine, law, and education. Mr. Stulberg, however, has never forgotten that at the heart of the American system, there must be a dignified employment situation that can only be achieved through collective bargaining and a private enterprise system comparative in all respects with any in the world. The article I wish to now submit for the record points out, however, that this system of ours is under serious stress as a result of successive imports. I think it is worth the attention of all of our Members who are concerned with our problems of trade and tariffs. I, therefore, ask that it be printed in the Record at this point.

#### THE WORKERS' IRE

I.L.G.W.U. IS ANGRY ABOUT APPAREL IMPORTS

(By Isadore Barmash)

There is a pickup in sales and manufacturing on Seventh Avenue—"almost imperceptible in nature and too soon for the figures to show it"—but the industry recession is hardly over. Women are still generally afraid to buy, preferring to save their money. But manufacturers are so anxious to please the customer that they are trying every sort of styling in their lines. One result is "terrific diversification, short production runs and slightly lower work-weeks."

This might be said to be a capsule review of the women's garment industry by a man who ought to know. He is Louis Stulberg, president and general secretary of the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union, the 450,000-member union representing plants in the United States, Puerto Rico and Canada.

Not as flamboyant as his predecessor, David Dubinsky, but as vehement in his own way against what he considers inequities, Mr. Stulberg pinned much of the continuing in-

dustrial recession to the national economy. But, in an interview late last week, he expressed bitterness and determination to act against the "growing inroads" created by apparel imports.

Action on imports—"the industry's first and foremost problem"—and on the continuing recession and inflation will take these forms:

The I.L.G.W.U.'s general convention, due to be held in Miami May 6-14, will be asked to approve a union-wide, consumer educational program, involving widespread picketing of stores that sell apparel imports. "We will allot as much money as it needs to inform the public of the personal and economic effects of imports," he said. This campaign will begin in the fall.

The union is looking into the advisability of asking the industry for a cost-of-living increase to cover the constant encroachment of inflation on salary increases won in contracts. Mr. Stulberg said, "In a couple of weeks, we'll know for sure."

Retailers arouse Mr. Stulberg's particular ire because, "There is little way in which we can stop them from selling imports. If it were only producers who were going abroad to manufacture or join in manufacturing abroad, we could control them. But retailers? That's why we are going to picket as many of them as we can."

The I.L.G.W.U. has at this point organized about 55 per cent of the 800,000 workers in the United States and Puerto Rico in the women's and children's apparel industry. In Canada, the union has organized about 28 to 30 per cent of the workers, or about 23,500 employees.

Total unionized employment is currently down between 2 per cent and 3 per cent, a decline that Mr. Stulberg considers "not significant." But the decrease in hours worked, from 34½ to 33½ hours per week, while seemingly small, does worry him. "You can," he said, "attribute it to the import problem."

Mr. Stulberg rose from his wide desk on the fourth floor of the union's headquarters on Upper Broadway, a desk once used by the late Edsel Ford when the building was owned by the Ford Motor Company, and paced the floor. "Years ago, we fought the sweatshop and now they have established it all over the world. I have no quarrel," he said, "with the native industries that produce for their country's consumption, but when they export in large numbers 'what' happens to our own workers? Where are the people in this country who used to make cameras and toys?" he asked.

The domestic sweater industry is being hurt by the flood of imports, he went on, and the brassiere industry "is being ruined."

A peculiar social problem being created by the adverse effects of imports, he said, is the flow of workers into metropolitan areas after "one-shop" towns lose their apparel industries. "Such workers, strangely enough, refuse to die," Mr. Stulberg said, "so what do they do? They come up to the big city, looking for work that isn't there, and many wind up on the welfare rolls. So who is paying for the so-called privilege of being able to buy imports? The same consumer who is paying for the cost of welfare."

On other subjects, Mr. Stulberg replied more calmly, such as:

The recent announcement by Genesco, Inc., that it would employ a laser-beam, computerized cutting device on apparel is "still an unproven development. How many workers will it displace and how much money will it save the manufacturer? I don't know the claims; I just don't think the answers are available as yet." The union has never opposed any technological developments, he stressed, "but we would also like to be the beneficiaries of such developments."

Conglomerates that come in from outside



the industry and acquire old-established apparel companies are "worrysome." The union head is especially concerned when such outsiders impose their own management and policies on their new subsidiaries because, he asserted, "usually this results in a negative effect on the acquired company's fortunes."

Is he concerned by the number of small- and medium-sized companies that have liquidated since early 1970 because of the downturn in the economy and the skirt-length confusion? Mr. Stulberg said he wasn't particularly worried by it inasmuch as "some people go out of business because of the surrounding circumstances, but as many give up because there is no one else for them to turn the business over to." But often when a son does take over, he proves to be just as well-endowed for business as his father, he said.

Back at his desk, interrupting himself with some anecdotes of his many years as a clothing cutter and then as a union officer, the lean, calm-eyed, labor official summed up some of his own conclusions:

"I don't know of anything in the wind that will eliminate the industry tradition of having a worker work on one garment, one piece, at a time. . . . If people will pay attention to their businesses, and especially if they will be lucky enough to get their talented sons involved, it will be good for all of us. . . . The fact that is hard to ignore about imports from low-wage countries is that our union's fringe benefits are still higher than the hourly wages that those foreign workers earn."

#### AUTOMOBILE ABUSE AT GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

#### HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, the powers-that-be at George Washington University, evidently unmoved by concern for the environment, are proceeding with plans to build three elegant new garages that eventually will draw an additional 3,000 cars into downtown Washington.

The automobile, of course, is at the root of our pollution problems. Emissions from the more than 105 million motor vehicles now on the road account for at least 90 percent of our smog—and upward of 90 percent in some metropolitan areas.

When autos die—and many of them have notoriously short life spans—they fill unsightly junk yards. The automobile, with its insatiable fuel appetites, can even be blamed, albeit indirectly, for tragedies such as the Santa Barbara Channel oil leak.

Granted, many people have to drive, in part because public transportation is so sorely deficient in many areas. But I question whether such a vast number of the healthy young students at George Washington University need be as dependent on their wheels as university officials seem to think.

Such excessive and selfish use of the automobile is hardly compatible with the youthful idealism we hear so much about. Could these be the same students who lobbied so vigorously against the alleged environmental hazards of the

SST? And unlike other parts of town, the GWU area does enjoy excellent bus service.

Unfortunately, a federally supported agency, the National Capital Planning Commission, has consented to the woefully short-sighted garage project. Perhaps the NCPG should be asked to explain itself.

The "car first" philosophy of the GWU administrators was revealed in a column published Saturday in the Washington Star. Star staff writer Christopher Wright points out that the cars already on hand around the campus have forced a pediatrics professor to build an airlock in order to get a pollution-free room for his young patients.

Mr. Wright's column follows:

THE NEW COLLEGE ECONOMICS: CARS FIRST, STUDENTS LATER

(By Christopher Wright)

George Washington University, unimpressed by popular outcry and technical evidence, has decided that now is the time to embrace the automobile. University officials, fearing fewer students will crowd its classrooms if fewer cars jam its streets, are planning to build a series of new garages to house the wheels of students and faculty.

True, there was a time when college students begged on bended knee for permission to park a car on campus. But times have changed. Nowadays, if they can't bring the Belchère 90 to class, they go someplace else.

"There are numbers of students who just would not come to the university if there weren't parking available," says Charles Diehl, vice president for development at George Washington.

Sadly, it seems, GW's courses aren't worth a bus ride.

And so, to encourage its students, the university is planning to build the fourth big-est auto garage in the District.

The \$4.5 million, seven-story edifice—surpassed only by the catacombs under such monsters as the Rayburn Building—will store 1,020 cars. On the school's master plan it is called "First Parking Garage" because there are two more to come, eventually increasing the capacity to 3,000.

Many people would ask, "What's wrong with that? It gets the cars off the street, doesn't it?" So it does. Only problem is, it's five years behind the times. And even the highway engineers are against it.

"Here we are, going around trying to convince people to get into car pools, to ride mass transit, to leave their cars at home," grumbled one District engineer, "and now these guys are out there building garages: That's going to draw cars into the area like a magnet."

Meanwhile, GW's own law students have helped form GASP, a group devoted to stemming the tide of air-polluting automobiles in the city, and its own hospital is busily trying to measure just how dangerous the automobile is to the city dwellers in this respect.

Have the university fathers ever met in a classroom where the windows have to be kept closed to ward off the smell of auto exhaust and the roar of faulty mufflers? Have they ever noticed the creeping traffic, the double-parked delivery trucks, the already jammed intersections?

One might have thought that this was the time for some courageous administrator to say STOP! No more automobiles on this campus. No more superpolluters outside the classrooms. Let them ride buses; let them ride bicycles; let them walk!

Unfortunately, GW needs black ink more than clean air, to balance its ledgers.

Students mean solvency.

With only a tiny fraction of its expenses coming from endowment funds, the university is totally dependent upon student tuition. Like suburban shopping center magnets, university officials see more parking places as more cash in the bank.

Although the university doesn't "encourage" parking, it charges its 7,193 part-time and 7,895 full-time students about \$2.50 a week to park in the existing 2,000-car open lots.

Ironically, GW can be reached by some of the best bus service in the District and someday it will have its own subway stop. The trouble is, few college students these days want to ride the bus. How they will feel about the subway is a question still years away.

Of course, the city could step in.

Students in most Eastern university cities know how the local potentates felt about their automobiles—it was no use crying to the dean when your car was dragged away by some black-jacketed tow truck driver while you were in economics class.

But the District's wrath is strangely muted—possibly because GW boasts of being the biggest employer of the city outside of the federal government.

When the garage plans reached the National Capital Planning Commission last month, opponents drew a picture of a campus choked by exhaust fumes, strangling in its own traffic. Even the commission staff reminded the panel of plans to curb traffic in the area.

But the call to stop the automobile was too jarring for the planners' ears. Instead of arguing whether the garage should be built, NCPG members debated how it would be built.

"What are the walls going to be? Just concrete?" asked the committee chairman. "Is that coping along the top going to slope forward?" asked a colleague.

And so, GW will get its garage.

It is hoped that at least it will contain a place for Dr. Frederic Gerard Burke, the university pediatrics professor who found he had to build an air lock to get a pollution-free room for children suffering from such common illnesses as hay fever, eczema and asthma.

#### ALTERNATIVE TO ABORTION

#### HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, as an alternative to abortion, a new organization has appeared on the scene. Aptly named "Birthright", the group offers a telephone counseling service to those in search of help and information.

The Evening Star on March 3, 1971, carried an article by Ruth Dean on "Birthright". Because of the hope this group offers to pregnant girls and women, I call this article to the attention of my colleagues.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Mar. 3, 1971]

#### ALTERNATIVE TO ABORTION

(By Ruth Dean)

Birthright is a new volunteer group in the Washington area offering an abortion alternative to women with unwanted pregnancies via its telephone "hot line."

Already in the month it has been an operation, Birthright has received 200 phone calls, both for help and for information, on its special number, 526-3333, Mrs. Robert

L. Connelly, its Washington founder, said last night.

Of these, 70 were pregnant women whom volunteers were able to refer to agencies that could help them, and "all but two, who were angry with us," sought information or offered financial help to the organization.

"Birthright itself is not a legal lobby, not a group of women fighting, carrying banners, yelling against abortion, although it is obvious we are against abortion and feel it is a basic evil," Mrs. Connelly told new volunteers at a training session in the Blessed Sacrament School auditorium, loaned to them for the meeting.

The group included Catholic and Protestant women, housewives, military nurses, retirees and college students. All were there to learn how to handle the knotty questions they will be asked during the one hour a month they've volunteered to man the phones.

#### BORROW TECHNIQUES

Many of the techniques used in the successful phone suicide-prevention services around the county are used, Mrs. Connelly explained.

"Ask yourself, how are you really listening to the woman or the girl on the other end of the phone," Mrs. Connelly told the volunteers. "She's really concerned about herself, not the baby at this point. Are you able to put yourself in her shoes and have empathy with her?"

Mrs. Connelly warned the women "you are not social workers or psychiatrists, and don't try to be. Refer them to those who are when they ask. The important thing is to keep them talking, find out the problem, then refer them to the agencies that can give them the professional help they need."

Mrs. Connelly and her husband (a supervisor at Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Co.), Mrs. Thelma Mullin, a former psychiatric case worker, and the Rev. Donald Dugan, director of the Family Life Bureau of the Archdiocese of Washington, founded the group, patterned after one founded in Canada two years ago.

Mrs. Mullin explained there was a need "to give women with unwanted pregnancies a balanced view of abortion so they could make an intelligent decision. Up until November, when we began our organizing meetings," she said, "there had been no central counseling service other than how to obtain an abortion here in the District or in New York City."

#### WHY THEY JOINED

Most of the women at last night's meeting were new volunteers. They came, they said, in response to publicity in county newspapers and radio spots or contact through a friend.

Mrs. Benjamin Carroll, choir director at the Emory Methodist Church, said she joined "because I have two daughters in Women's Lib who are very pro-abortion. We've had some hot family discussions on the subject," she admitted.

"I'm anti-abortion, with reservations, naturally," she said. "I am for medical abortion when it's obvious the child will be born a monster, or if a woman is raped. But I believe in the sanctity of life. And if you're 45 and faced with an unwanted pregnancy, let's face it—you've known about birth control all the time, and if you didn't have enough sense to use it, then tough beans; you better take the pregnancy."

Mrs. Lewis E. Berry Jr., member of the McLean Baptist Church, wife of a lawyer and mother of nine children, said she volunteered to help Birthright because "I'd been quite disturbed the last year about the lowering of our national values, and I didn't know what to do about it by myself."

"I consider abortion infanticide; there is no other name for it. I don't think the ovens

at Buchenwald and Auschwitz burned so brightly as they're burning now in these hospitals in the District and New York."

Mrs. Berry said that as a pre-med student at the University of Houston she'd seen films showing the aftermath of abortion, such as were shown last night by Dr. Edward J. Connor, chairman of the department of obstetrics at Cafritz Memorial Hospital.

#### ANGRY

She said her reaction was anger "that the rights of the child, and yes, of the father whether married or unmarried, are being deprived. Really, I get incensed over the fact people glibly go about saying abortion is so easy, abortion is nothing," she said.

Lt. Comdr. Elizabeth McCormick, a retired Navy medical service corps officer, who headed the blood bank at Bethesda Naval Hospital several years, said the hearings on legislation to repeal the Maryland abortion law prompted her to join Birthright.

"It seems to me that in a country where we make much objection to Vietnam war deaths which are now approaching 45,000," she said, "it is ironic we let go by the loss in life of thousands (through abortion) in our own states."

In her hospital work, Comdr. McCormick said she'd assisted with transfusions to those who'd had abortions and those who had died from abortions due to blood poisoning "from improper methods being used." She added she didn't think it "right that my funds are used to destroy life when I've worked 30 years as a technician in keeping life."

#### COED HELPS

The Annapolis hearings on Maryland's abortion law last May also moved 19-year-old Kathy Goldbeck, a University of Maryland sophomore, to join last night's group.

Kathy learned about it through her mother whom she said "works for a Catholic organization called CANA." She said she wanted to assist with the Birthright calls "because I feel abortion is really killing a person, and to me life is very important."

Mrs. Connelly emphasized to the volunteers that their telephone role will involve "no religious or moral brain washing, no judgment of these girls influenced by your own religious feelings. It has very little to do with it," she emphasized.

"The actual fact of abortion is a very human problem, which as far as Birthright is concerned is the right for every baby to be born, if at all possible."

#### JIM WIEGHART OF NEW YORK DAILY NEWS REPORTS ON INDO- CHINA WAR—II

#### HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I today commend to the attention of my colleagues the last of a series of articles on the Indochina war by Jim Wieghart, military affairs reporter for the New York Daily News, who has well conveyed the paradoxes and tragedies of U.S. involvement:

[From the New York Daily News, Feb. 25, 1971]

SOUTH VIETNAM—SCARRED, STOICAL, BEAUTIFUL

(By James Wieghart)

SAIGON, February 24.—No nation can be at war for 25 years without bearing the indelible imprints of prolonged conflict on its

land, its institutions and the faces of its people. South Vietnam is no exception.

But what first strikes the visitor forcibly is that despite the long, bitter battle—first for freedom from French colonial rule after World War II, then the continuing struggle with the North Vietnamese, South Vietnam remains an incredibly beautiful country.

From Saigon down, the southern third of the country is flat, marshy lowlands dominated by the Mekong River system. The Mekong Delta area, similar to the Louisiana coastal region, is one of the richest rice-growing areas in the world and normally provides more than enough to feed the 60% of the nation's people who live there.

#### LIKE FLAWS ON A CANVAS

To the north, along the coast, white sandy beaches, set off by sharply rising plus green hills, provide a natural resortlike setting that in more peaceful times could rival Hawaii as a tourist attraction.

To the north and west, over the steep rising Annamite Mountain chain covered by dense tropical rain forest, are a series of plateaus along the Cambodian and Laotian borders that resemble in appearance and beauty the area around Denver, Colo.

But even from the air the signs of war—gaping bomb craters, black, burned-over vegetation, ruins of buildings—dot the landscape like flaws on an impressionistic canvas.

The scars are least noticeable in the mountains where the dense jungle growth, spurred by steaming tropic heat and six-month-long monsoon rains, quickly obliterates the works of man.

Some of the war's devastation has also been erased along the fertile coastal plain and in the rich Mekong Delta by the intensive agricultural practices by stoical South Vietnamese peasant farmers. They appear to view the war mainly as an unwanted interruption of their labors and any outcome, so long as it is quick, would apparently be satisfactory to them.

#### DESTRUCTION, CONSTRUCTION

The destruction looks worst around the imperial city of Hue, overrun and held by the Communists for almost a month during the 1968 Tet offensive, and in the northwestern border area around Khe Sanh, not far from Laos.

Once a prosperous tea-producing area, the region around Khe Sanh is a wasteland. Heavy allied bombings and constant Communist artillery bombardment during the 77-day siege of the Marine garrison there in the summer of 1968 destroyed virtually every building, denuded the terrain and drove the inhabitants into already swelling refugee camps.

Even more impressive than the destruction wrought by the war, however, is the massive construction it generated, particularly during the six years of heavy U.S. involvement. Among the hundreds of military construction projects scattered across the countryside are:

Scores of heavily sandbagged fire bases, perched on bulldozed mountain tops or alongside strategic roads or waterways. The fire bases complete, with underground concrete-and-steel-reinforced command bunkers, are armed with long-range artillery and usually have helicopter landing pads.

Complete military communities housing thousands of men, like Camp Eagle near Hue, headquarters for the U.S. 101st Airborne Division, or Camp Baldy, south of Da Nang, headquarters for the 5th Marine Regiment.

Dozens of military airfields, ranging from small landing strips for helicopters and light observation planes to full-fledged airports capable of handling huge four-motor cargo planes.

Hundreds of miles of roads and countless bridges built by U.S. military construction battalions equipped with trucks, road graders, dirt movers, bulldozers and cranes.



Extensive seaport and docking facilities at coastal cities like Da Nang, Cam Ranh Bay and Saigon, to handle the millions of tons of food, ammunition and other supplies funneled into South Vietnam from the United States over the last six years.

Elaborate, fully stocked supply depots with fuel tanks, acres of motor vehicles, ammunition dumps, equipment repair shops and warehouses crammed with food, clothing and medical supplies.

#### ECONOMY GEARED TO WAR

But military fortifications don't end at hamlet, village or city limits in a guerrilla war like South Vietnam's. Since the entire nation is the battlefield, the whole country has become, of necessity, an armed camp and the war is institutionalized—a fact of daily life for every citizen.

In every hamlet, village and city in the country, barbed wire, machine-gun emplacements, sandbagged bunkers and guard outposts ring government buildings, police stations and the homes of important local and national officials.

In fact, so pervasive are such accouterments in the civilian sector that they now attract no more notice from residents than a tree or a post or a garbage can. The same is true for the daily sight of large numbers of armed men walking down busy city streets—only visitors take notice.

Such relative invisibility is no mean feat when one considers that in a nation the size of Florida there are now a million South Vietnamese servicemen and a million more armed civilian defense forces—about 12% of the nation's total 17.9 million population—plus about 325,000 American military personnel roaming about.

As could be expected of a nation in a prolonged war with no end yet in sight, the conduct of the war and the war's aftermath has become the chief preoccupation of the central government; it also dominates an economy, which is geared to war and dependent on its continuation, and it is the single, most important fact of life for every South Vietnamese citizen.

The corrosive effect of the war on society's fabric is everywhere visible in South Vietnam, particularly in the large cities of Saigon, Da Nang and Hue.

The streets there are alive with the casualties of war—armless and legless veterans, napalm-burned men, women and children. The halt, the lame and the blind—women and children, some with noses, ears or jaws blown away—creep or crawl or simply lie on crowded downtown sidewalks begging for just enough money to stay alive another day.

#### INACCURATE ON LOW SIDE

The official 1970 caseload figures of the South Vietnamese ministry of Social Welfare and Assistance lists 51,000 disabled veterans, 156,000 disabled citizens, 258,000 war orphans and 131,000 war widows, but officials agree the actual figures are many times higher.

The ministry, short of manpower and funds, has a long waiting list for assistance and many thousands of victims, not even aware of the program, have simply fled to the cities in hopes of somehow finding the means to sustain life.

Similarly, government statistics on refugees—victims whose homes and villages have been destroyed by allied bombs or Communist shellings or a combination of the two—have proved to be consistently inaccurate on the low side.

No one really knows how many people have been displaced by the war, but it is generally agreed that the figure may be as high as four million, almost 25% of the population. The government reported last year resettling 735,000 refugees in their former homes and began 1971 with an estimated 250,000 backlog.

But the government's count does not include the enormous flow of refugees from rural to urban areas over the past few years. As a result of that flow, the populations of the major cities have doubled, tripled and even quadrupled over the last decade while the nation's population increased by about 10%.

For instance, Saigon's population, estimated at 400,000 in 1962, is approaching the three million mark. During the same period, Da Nang's population soared from 120,000 to 415,000, while Hue grew from 104,000 to 170,000.

Having been victimized by the war, many of these people are now dependent on the war's economic dislocations to save them. Many who are able find work, primarily in the wide variety of service industries that inevitably spring up around military bases—laundries, restaurants, taverns, shops, taxi companies and shoeshine parlors. Others are directly employed by the military for mess service, cleanup work, maintenance and minor clerical duties.

But an alarming number, especially the young, have turned to vice and crime for their livelihood. Day or night, the downtown streets of the major cities are lined with youthful pickpockets, purse snatchers, black marketeers, dope peddlers, panderers, prostitutes, illegal money changers and con artists. The police, seemingly overwhelmed by the problem, appear more interested in getting their cut than in stopping the illegal traffic.

Graft and official corruption, long a problem in South Vietnam and every other Far Eastern country except Japan, has been intensified by the enormous pressure of inflation, which has made it virtually impossible for low-paid government employees to live on their salaries.

#### PRICE INDEX UP 700 PERCENT

Last year alone, the cost of living went up 29.8% here and this was on the heels of an even greater 32.1% jump in 1969. Between 1965 and 1970, the retail price index in Saigon rose an unbelievable 700.

Although the economic pressure on civil servants was eased somewhat by a recent 17% general wage increase and by stepped-up government efforts to slow inflation, government workers and servicemen continue the kind of hand-to-mouth existence that breeds corruption.

The difficulties of the South Vietnamese economy are easily traceable to the war and to the massive infusion of American dollars into a small, relatively underdeveloped nation.

During the high point of the U.S. buildup in 1968, the United States was spending about \$2.5 billion a month to support the war, more than half the nation's gross national product for the year. Although the Nixon administration does not separate out Vietnam war costs in its budget, informed estimates set this year's cost at about \$15 billion or about four times greater than South Vietnam's GNP.

Over-all, American officials have estimated that the United States has spent more than \$100 billion on the war and has pumped another \$4.2 billion in economic assistance into South Vietnam. American nonmilitary aid to the Saigon government continues to run at a rate of about \$700 million a year.

When viewed in the context of the current U.S. withdrawal program, under which President Nixon hopes to have all U.S. personnel out by the end of 1972, South Vietnam's already difficult economic problems will become clearly unmanageable.

#### AID MUST GO ON AND ON

American officials agree privately that the United States will have to continue massive economic aid to South Vietnam for years after the last U.S. troops are gone.

Obviously, there can be no meaningful solution to the tremendous physical, social

and economic problems confronting South Vietnam until peace is restored.

No nation with limited resources and a population of 17.9 million can support two million men under arms in a widespread modern war without eventually collapsing under the strain. The same, of course, can be said for the Hanoi government, whose own war effort is increasingly reliant on outside help from Red China, the Soviet Union and other Communist countries.

But still, the war has gone on for 25 years and it seems to have developed a curious momentum of its own that defies ordinary logic. Perhaps it can only be ground to a halt when the outside forces helping to sustain it are finally gone.

[From the New York Daily News,  
Feb. 26, 1971]

#### BRASS DIDN'T THINK REDS WOULD STAND IN LAOS

(By James Wieghart)

SAIGON, February 25.—Although they considered it a possibility, few of Gen. Creighton W. Abrams' top planners actually believed the North Vietnamese would "stand and fight" a bloody battle of attrition to defend the Ho Chi Minh Trail against South Vietnamese raiders in Laos.

Yet, 17 days after the border crossing, the spearhead of 16,000 crack South Vietnamese troops has been stopped in its tracks 15 miles inside Laos, far short of the original goal of severing the vital supply link through which North Vietnamese infiltrate arms and men into Cambodia and South Vietnam.

Despite assurance by Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird in Washington that the operation is preceding on schedule, it is not, according to advance briefings given to reporters in Saigon early this month.

Likewise, the Nixon administration claims that the incursion has seriously disrupted the flow of supplies down the trail are at variance with the contention of Air Force sources that electronic monitoring devices along the trail indicate that stepped-up movements on the western branches have partly compensated for the incursion on the eastern side.

#### BUT THE BUILDUP IS HURT

This is not to say that the Laotian operation, dubbed Lamson 719, has been a failure. There has been a disruption on part of North Vietnam's only supply network to the south.

This means that the dry season buildup planned by the North Vietnamese will fall below expectations, perhaps enough so to cause them to scale down, if not postpone, a summer offensive.

But in light of the stiff Communist resistance, it is surprising that the conventional military wisdom among Abrams' advisers before the operation began was that the bulk of the 60,000 North Vietnamese defending the trail would "melt" into the rugged, jungle-covered mountains, leaving behind only small units to fight a rear guard action.

Abrams was less sanguine about the prospects of a bloodless victory. Too old a Vietnam hand to be confident of any prediction on how the wily Communists would react, the 56-year-old veteran tank commander was supremely confident before the action that the allies would inflict a defeat on the enemy no matter how he reacted.

In a far ranging, hourlong interview on the eve of the border crossing, Abrams praised the South Vietnamese forces. He made it plain that he believed the South Vietnamese, backed by overwhelming U.S. air power, could handle anything the Communists might throw at them in Laos.

Abrams attributed the improvement in the South Vietnamese army to their successful Cambodian invasion last May, saying:

"The generals I deal with now are not the same people I was dealing with a year ago.

Their men are better equipped and better trained. It is a formidable military force—a fine military organization, tactically and logistically. The South Vietnamese have grown in maturity and have gained the confidence that they can, in fact, handle their problems."

Still, despite Abrams' caution, there was strong circumstantial evidence to support the viewpoint that the North Vietnamese would sidestep a full-scale battle in Laos. For almost two years, they have generally avoided major actions in an apparent return to a protracted war posture of small-unit hit-and-run guerrilla warfare.

This posture was encouraged by the phased withdrawal of American troops, under which more than 200,000 U.S. servicemen have been pulled out of Vietnam since President Nixon announced the Vietnamization program in mid-1969.

Even May's daring U.S.-South Vietnamese invasion of the Cambodian sanctuary areas at the foot of the Ho Chi Minh Trail did not prod the North Vietnamese into a major fight.

Therefore, most senior American military officials concluded that the North Vietnamese were seeking to build up their forces, strengthening their supply and infiltration routes through Laos, preferring to wait until the bulk of U.S. combat troops are withdrawn before launching any major attack.

#### HEAVY TOLL OF COPTERS

It was precisely this conviction that prompted Abrams last month to seek White House approval for the invasion by 20,000 Vietnamese troops, backed by 9,000 American troops used to support the vital Highway 9 supply route from Quang Tri through Khe Sanh and up to the Laotian border.

As the complex operation swung into motion three weeks ago, the first stages went as smoothly as a textbook military exercise unfettered by any enemy resistance, making the initial optimism seem justified.

But the enemy reaction since then has been intense and costly to the allies. Unexpectedly heavy and accurate antiaircraft fire has taken a heavy toll of U.S. helicopters—some estimates run as high as 60—and have seriously limited their ability to support and resupply men on the ground.

At the same time, the Communists have unleashed withering ground fire against forward elements and have launched several major ground attacks.

Clearly the enemy's willingness to "stand and fight" and his ability to do so have been underestimated by U.S. planners. It also seems likely that the effectiveness of American air power in rugged mountain areas, largely obscured by triple canopy jungle, has been overestimated by the Allied command.

It is also possible, though the evidence on this is not yet in, that the South Vietnamese—while admittedly improved—are still no match for the North Vietnamese regulars when not accompanied by U.S. advisers.

Abrams hotly disputes this contention, adding that, in his opinion, many of the South Vietnamese units are the equal of any American force, however elite.

#### BELIEVES IT WAS VITAL

Abrams also denied that the operation was running behind schedule. He insisted that the intention never was to "cut or block" the Ho Chi Minh Trail permanently and said it should not be measured in terms of such an objective.

But whatever the outcome of Lamson 719, whether it meets the objectives originally assigned it or the scaled-down version now ascribed to it by Laird and Abrams, a bigger question sure to be a matter of controversy in the future is whether the operation was justified at all.

Abrams believes the Laos incursion was absolutely vital before further American

withdrawals can be made after U.S. troop strength dips to the 284,000 level May 1. The U.S. commander said the enemy supply buildup in the Laos panhandle indicated that the Communists planned an offensive this summer in the northern provinces of South Vietnam that would have made further American withdrawals from that area hazardous.

He said that the Cambodian incursion last year not only thwarted a planned Communist offensive in southern South Vietnam but so weakened the Communist forces out off in the Mekong Delta area that enemy activity there was sharply curtailed and the entire region is now considered secure by the Saigon government.

A successful Laotian incursion, he said, could achieve the same beneficial effect for the northern provinces.

Naturally, Abrams' view is shared by most in the upper echelons of the U.S. military and diplomatic establishment here, including U.S. Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker.

But there are some high-ranking officers in his command who privately disagree. One ranking diplomatic official said that he felt the South Vietnamese had effectively met the challenge in their own country and should now devote their energies to consolidating their gains by attacking the social and economic problems at home.

An Army colonel with wide experience as an adviser to South Vietnamese troops agreed with Abrams' assessment that they have improved markedly, but strongly disagreed with his decision to invade Laos.

#### COLONEL TAKES DIFFERENT VIEW

"They (the South Vietnamese) now have a million-man army, well armed and most of them well-trained," the colonel said. "I think they should use this force to increase the security within their own borders and not go chasing off to Laos after the enemy. When they do that, they are giving the Communists the advantage of shorter supply lines and favorable terrain for their kind of fighting."

The colonel also favored a substantial speedup in the withdrawing of U.S. troops, adding that he believed all American ground troops could be safely pulled out of Vietnam by the end of this year. He conceded, however, that the South Vietnamese would need considerable U.S. air support for a much longer time period than that.

While none of them would say so publicly, those American officials critical of the decision to invade Laos pointed out that the logic behind that decision, if carried to its ultimate conclusion, would inevitably lead to a decision to invade North Vietnam sometime in the future.

They agreed that no responsible American official was advocating such a course, but they added that South Vietnamese President Thieu and Vice President Ky have spoken of a possible invasion of North Vietnam recently and that President Nixon pointedly refused to rule out such a possibility in a meeting with reporters last week.

[From the New York Daily News, Feb. 27, 1971]

#### SKEPTICS ARE NOW ADVOCATES OF VIET PULLOUT

(By James Wieghart)

SAIGON, February 26.—Perhaps the best measure of the success of President Nixon's Vietnamization program is that fact that American officials here who were most skeptical of the phased U.S. withdrawal when it was unveiled in mid-1969 are now its strongest supporters.

The original skepticism was based on the fear that pulling U.S. troops out at the rate of 15,000 per month would leave dangerous defensive gaps because the South Vietnamese would never be able to train and

equip men fast enough to replace the GIs.

But the program has worked—the skeptics have become advocates—and even such cautious men as U.S. Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker and Gen. Grieghton W. Abrams are now saying privately that the U.S. troop withdrawal rate can be safely speeded up.

The main reason for the turnabout in official opinion is the dramatic change in the military situation in South Vietnam brought about by a serious weakening of the Communist forces and a startling improvement in South Vietnamese army (ARVN), particularly since last May's successful Cambodian invasion.

#### LARGEST IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Indeed, a visitor cannot help but be impressed at the size of the ARVN force—1 million men under arms, well equipped and fairly well trained, backed up by another 1 million civilian-soldiers being armed and trained to defend their own hamlets and villages.

In addition, the South Vietnamese air force and navy, both equipped with modern U.S. planes and ships, are the largest in Southeast Asia.

The upsurge in military power and the attrition suffered by Communist forces in the South, have permitted the Saigon government to expand remarkably its control over the countryside. The latest survey by the American pacification team indicates that 95% of the population lives in relatively secure areas, compared with 65% registered in 1968.

Just as every silver lining has its cloud, there are soft spots in the South Vietnamese military posture that concern American advisers.

#### GRIND, RACE AND SQUEAL

The ARVN have serious maintenance problems. Many of their troops have a cavalier "easy come, easy go" attitude about their expensive American hardware which prompts them to abuse it rather than care for it properly. Riding in an ARVN convoy, for instance, can be an ear-shattering experience—what with grinding gears, racing motors and squealing brakes—and it only slightly less dangerous than going into actual combat.

And although many South Vietnamese are skillful screwdriver mechanics—capable of somehow keeping in operation the enormous number of 20-year-old cars, trucks and taxi cabs seen daily on city streets here—there is a serious shortage of trained technicians needed to keep their new, highly sophisticated war machinery operative.

The South Vietnamese are also short on pilots, management personnel, engineers, electronic specialists and competent senior noncommissioned and field grade officers.

Some critics feel there is a tendency among the South Vietnamese and American government officials here to use these shortcomings as a crutch to prolong U.S. involvement in the war. The critics contend the question is not really whether the South Vietnamese can operate as effectively without American presence, but whether they can operate effectively enough to do the job without American help.

#### ANTI-AMERICAN FEELING

There are other less positive but perhaps equally persuasive reasons for speeding the U.S. withdrawal. As the South Vietnamese assume more of the burden for the war—they already are carrying on a lion's share of the combat load—and the American presence becomes less vital, the natural frictions between the two cultures become less tolerable to the South Vietnamese.

In short, incipient anti-American feeling is certain to grow as the U.S. winds down its participation in the war. Such sentiment is clearly on the rise and has reached potentially dangerous levels in some areas.

For instance, Americans involved in traffic



accidents with a South Vietnamese, regardless of whose fault it is, often find themselves surrounded by crowds of angry, fist-waving Vietnamese. Frequently the crowds refuse to permit the American to proceed, even after the police arrive at the scene, until an American official shows up to make an on-the-spot compensation payment, actually a form of ransom.

Worse yet, there have been numerous anti-American demonstrations, sometimes bordering on riot, in some of the major South Vietnamese cities during the last year.

More than 2,000 student demonstrators hurled rocks and fire bombs at American compounds in the coastal city of Qui Nhon earlier this month to protest the accidental slaying of two Vietnamese citizens by an American soldier. One U.S. building, two buses and five vehicles were burned and 15 other vehicles were damaged by rocks in the ensuing daylong riot.

The city, South Vietnam's fourth largest, has been off limits to U.S. personnel since last December when smaller scale rioting broke out after a high school student was shot and killed by a G.I.

Not surprisingly, anti-American demonstrations in turn anger the G.I.s, especially those who did not choose to come here in the first place, thus contributing to the so-called "morale problem."

#### BEHAVIOR PATTERNS

The rash of "morale problem" stories, which have appeared over the last six months usually center on three behavior patterns—disciplinary problems, including fragging and refusal to obey orders; increased drug use by G.I.s, and racial problems.

Thus far, the U.S. military command concedes that while there are some morale problems, they exist mostly in rear areas away from combat zones and are no more widespread in Vietnam than they have been in any other war.

A Marine colonel at the U.S. Military Command Headquarters who holds this view, said: "Any military unit anywhere has to work hard to keep peak morale. The threat of lagging morale always comes up in a withdrawal situation. It happened after World War II and after the Korean War—everyone wants to be the first on the list to go home."

The colonel said that attitude is now developing here and is complicated by the fact that the Vietnam withdrawal is underway while the war is still going on. No one wants to be the last American killed in Vietnam, he explained.

He discounted the significance of the recent widely publicized cases of enlisted men who attempted to kill superiors they felt were too gung ho. This practice has been called fragging because fragmentation grenades were used in several of the cases. The colonel said such things happened, with probably the same frequency, in previous wars.

He agreed that in two areas—racial friction and excessive drug use—the Vietnam experience differs from the past. "But keep in mind," the colonel added, "that we did not originate these problems in the services, they came to us from society outside and we're doing the best we can to cope with them."

#### MORALE PROBLEMS PROBED

Although the U.S. command denies a serious morale problem exists among the troops, it was learned that under orders from Abrams, an in-depth study of morale problems was begun here quietly two months ago. The study, still several months from completion, is designed to find the extent of any morale slippage and the underlying causes for it.

My own observation is that the morale is generally high among U.S. combat troops and among those engaged in stimulating work, such as serving as advisers to ARVN forces. At the same time, there appears to be a seri-

ous morale problem in rear echelon units. This is particularly true where the G.I.s have little useful or interesting work to do and where they are stationed in areas near big cities which have been placed off limits.

When discussing the American withdrawal rate with reporters on the record, military commanders insist their judgment is based primarily on military criteria. Yet, in private informal discussion these same officials repeatedly refer to the morale problem and the growth of anti-military feeling at home as reasons why "we should get the hell out of here." And again in informal discussions only, American commanders from all services increasingly cite what they consider a growing Soviet military threat to justify a quicker withdrawal from the war. They express concern that unless the United States can spend more of its defense money on new weapons systems "we will fall behind the Russians."

#### THE RED CHINESE THREAT

Thus far, few in the military establishment here seem to attach much importance to what many Senate doves feel is the most compelling reason for a speedy withdrawal—the danger that the spreading war, already sloped over into Cambodia and Laos, will draw in Communist China and precipitate a nuclear showdown.

There is, in fact, a worrisome lack of concern among U.S. officials that Communist China would intervene in the war, however widespread it becomes. But important diplomats representing countries friendly to the United States do not share this complacency.

One pro-American ambassador said privately that in view of the menacing statements emanating from Peking following the South Vietnamese invasion of Laos, he does not see how the possibility of Chinese intervention can be ruled out.

#### THE GREEKS—GUARDIANS OF FREEDOM

#### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, as the people of Greece mark the 150th anniversary of the beginning of the Greek War of Independence—1821-29—which culminated in their freedom from almost 400 years of Ottoman rule and the winning of their independence from Turkey, it is proper that Americans express their appreciation to the Greek people for their brave struggle for freedom. Throughout the centuries—and especially more recently in 1967 when the freedom loving Greeks subdued an imminent Communist takeover; and restored order by rounding up and jailing the Communist leaders, organizers, and agitators—the Greek people have resisted outside suppression and tyranny. Under the leadership of their diligent and competent Prime Minister George Papadopoulos, the Greek people in 1968 approved at the ballot box by an overwhelming majority a new reform constitution.

The history of Greece has been the story of a constant struggle to keep burning the flame of liberty. The achievements of the Greek people and their contributions to western civilization in art, architecture, science, mathematics, philosophy, drama, and literature have been unsurpassed by any other culture.

Both the U.S. Government and people expressed a warm and sympathetic feeling toward the Greeks during their period of struggle for freedom from the Turks and extended to the Greeks at that time moral and financial help. Today, voices are heard in our Government highly critical of the present Greek Government for its implacable and oppressive opposition to Communist totalitarianism.

Yet, today Greece stands as the greatest bulwark against Communist tyranny in all Europe. Were it not for the present Greek Government the U.S. Sixth Fleet might well have been excluded from the Mediterranean. Our Greek friends, despite the few American antagonists, remain freedom's strongest bastion on the Mediterranean.

Americans have good reason for being grateful to the Greeks for manning the ramparts of freedom in 1971 as they have done throughout the ages.

I insert at this point in my remarks a letter from the chairmen of the Justice for Greece Committee, Greek Proclamation Committee, and Greek Evzones of America; a newsclipping from "Hellenic News," a letter from his Excellency Archbishop Iakovos of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America, a reprint entitled "How Americans Responded to the Greek Revolution of 1821," a paper by Prof. Charilaos Lagoudakis entitled "New York State and the War of Greek Independence 1821-30," and an American opinion article by Thomas J. Haas entitled "George Papadopoulos and the Greeks":

MARCH 17, 1971.

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

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RARICK: Your objectivity in connection with the present Greek Government is greatly appreciated by the "JUSTICE FOR GREECE COMMITTEE", the "GREEK PROCLAMATION COMMITTEE", and the "GREEK EVZONES OF AMERICA".

The members of our respective groups believe that the Greek Government has been dedicated to sound remedial reforms (social and economic) and that these have greatly benefited the entire nation. The progress and tranquility, resulting therefrom, was evident to the 1½ million tourists in 1970, many of whom were Greek ethnics from various parts of the world.

We regret to observe that the Foreign Relations Committee has been burdened with another attempt to discredit the Greek Government by former Greek politicians whose allegations to Greece and the United States is suspect.

Unfortunately, the latest Foreign Relations Committee "investigators" confined themselves to the projected politicians that were responsible for the chaotic situation in Greece prior to April 21, 1967. This cannot be considered an impartial investigation of popular sentiment in Greece, by any stretch of the imagination.

Contrary to the misleading reports of anti-American and anti-Greek Government sentiment circulated by a small, vociferous minority, the Greek Government has the overwhelming support of the majority of the Greek people. The United States Government has the respect and admiration of the majority of citizens in Greece, Greece has now become the most loyal NATO member.

We enclose for your consideration an article that appeared in the Hellenic News, an independent Greek American newspaper. It

has been translated into English at the request of the undersigned. It reflects, not only the majority view of the populace in Greece, but also the majority view of Hellenes throughout the world.

It would be greatly appreciated by the undersigned, therefore, if the article were entered into the Congressional Record as an expression of the popular sentiment of the Hellenic Community of America.

Respectfully yours,

Dr. NICHOLAS DESTOUNIS,  
National Chairman, Justice for Greece  
Committee.

P. B. BOORAS,  
National Chairman, Greek Proclamation  
Committee.

C. B. ROCHE,  
Secretary, Greek Evzones of America.

[From Hellenic News, Feb. 11, 1971]

ON MR. BLANK'S "INVESTIGATION"

(By Spyros Triantafyllou)

Every so often, Senator Blank comes out with his statements in various forms to assert that he is struggling for Greece's return to democratic life, "protecting" thus, in his opinion, the liberties of the Greek people. In this way, Mr. Blank justifies his assaults against the Greek Government and the National Revolution of April 21, 1967, as well as his protests to the Nixon Administration to suspend the American aid until Greece pulls back to the parliamentary "normalcy."

Besides Mr. Blank, there are some other Senators and Members of the House, as well as some American newspapers—with "The New York Times" first in line—who insistently charge against the Greek Government established by the National Revolution of April 21, 1967, and use repetitiously the rational that they act . . . "in the name of Democracy."

It is, indeed, very . . . touching to see these distinguished American politicians and journalists being concerned about Greece, her Democracy, the freedoms of the Greek people, however distant they may be from the fact that the National Revolution of April 21, 1967, averted the threat of a new Vietnam in Europe, and that without the present Greek Government the Americans and their 6th Fleet would have been thrown out of the Mediterranean and that NATO would have crumbled into pieces.

It is a happy coincidence that the bitter political experience and the prudence of the Greek people, the Revolution's composure and the national responsibility of the present Greek Government did not allow an explosion of the Greek temper to happen as a result of these unjustified insults, and cause an anti-American feeling as exists presently in Turkey.

That is also because the Greeks are still teaching Democracy; because they know better than anyone else what freedom means throughout centuries of innumerable historical examples with their struggle, sacrifice and bloodshed to preserve their freedom and Democracy.

The Greeks have never asked from friendly nations or allies any protection or assistance to secure their political liberties—which they are able to restore and preserve when it becomes necessary. In the past, and particularly during the German occupation, the reaction of the Greek people—the most recent example of Greek mentality—proves that the Greeks would have overthrown the present Revolution if they had not been convinced about its national necessity.

The Greeks are not naive nor cowardly people by letting their Armed Forces interfere, in protecting and restoring their institutions, with no sign of protest. It is simply because, in the past, these institutions were under constant jeopardy and their very existence was threatened by ambitious and

ruthless politicians who pursued personal and partisan gains at the expense of national interest. Above any other political, economic or social freedoms the Greeks place their national freedom, which they value as the dearest of all freedoms.

Obviously, the foreign zealots who supposedly "defend" freedom and democracy—and particularly the Americans, whose national freedom was never threatened—ignore this fact. Furthermore, the Greeks know that Democracy and Civil Rights in their Country are protected by the Greek Armed Forces which have been guarding them ever since the new Greek State was constituted after 1821's Revolution.

The Greek Armed Forces, acting within the spirit of preserving Democracy in the Country, often obliged in the past the Crown, bad political leaders or worse politicians to accept the Constitutions on which the Country relied until April 21, 1967, when the National Revolution took over and with the people's consent voted the new Constitutional Chart of 1968. Mr. Blank and the others—the few or many American politicians—should therefore know that if they want to restore in Greece the same political chaos with such leaders as Kanellopoulos, Mavros, Papaspyrou, Averof, A. Papandreou, Glezos, Kefallinos and others, and return to the same era, with the Lambraki's gangs and the red or reddish pimps of democracy, they should know that under no conditions will the Greek people accept such "restoration."

In the Greek conscience, the Revolution and the Papadopoulos' Government are comparatively speaking, a thousand times better than the corrupted prerevolutionary political establishment, even more so, because during this Administration no one was hurt or abused.

These gentlemen should also know that that Greek people have never forgotten the Bloody December of 1944, the nightmarish days of mass executions by the communists, the communist guerrilla war—the so called civil war—and the turbulent era of 1963–1967.

However, Mr. Blank and the other American politicians and journalists—who appear to be fighting a good-intentioned battle for a so-called "democratic restoration" in Greece—must know, for if they don't know we are telling them now, that their political tactics and their assaults against the National Revolution and the Greek Government do not promote the cause of Democracy, but rather help and directly support the Soviet policy and propaganda, which for many years have been working to create anti-Americanism in Greece. Where then the Soviet policy and propaganda failed, acting in isolation, to cause corrosion in the Greek-American friendship, this failure is being transformed gradually into a successful accomplishment on Russian account (!) by these American Senators and their press who express Mr. Blank's views. For their statements and articles are insults against the Greek, self-esteem and patriotism and enrage the Greeks against the United States.

Did Mr. Blank ever stop to think what the repercussions would be in the case of Greece's neutrality, or even her participation in the Eastern Alliance?

Because we don't think that the tactics of the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee in the American Senate support the Greek-American relations, or serve the American interests . . .

The Greeks have survived through thousands of years, before America was discovered and without . . . American aid, in situations far more critical than today's; and they are now doing their best for their country, even withstanding a slight and insignificant deviation from the parliamentary system, trying to restore everything that was destroyed by the unscrupulous politicians of the past.

By this, we are not referring to the accomplishments made by the National Revolution and the Papadopoulos' Government in improving the standards of living in Greece and fostering a healthy economy with a steady growth. It is not our intention to become advocates, to herald these successes and plead for their stay in Greek Administration. We are limiting ourselves only within the area of national sovereignty, in order to underline the importance of National Revolution's contribution to Greece and the Greeks, who, even with none of these improvements in their lives, would still support the present Government. With no hesitation, the Greeks will be eternally grateful to them because this Government literally saved them from a serious national danger and secured for them their national freedom.

Of course, it is Mr. Blank's right to believe in whatever he thinks right, even in matters concerning Greek affairs. But no Greek is responsible for his impatience to reasonably wait and witness the end, the fulfillment of the National Revolution in which the Greeks believe deeply.

As of this moment we don't know the content of the report that Mr. Blank's special emissaries are writing on Greece, nor are aware of the Senator's future plans . . . What we know, however, is that the patience of the Greek people, the National Revolution and the Greek Government cannot remain calm forever; their patience has limits which are getting increasingly narrower, because the Senator's rhetoric on a non-existent for the Greeks issue creates a crack in the Greek-American relations, with possible international consequences threatening severely the Free World.

In spite of malicious propaganda, there is no such thing as Fascism, Nazism or Dictatorship in Greece. What we have there is a peaceful Revolution which enjoys the trust and support, not only of the Greek people in the Motherland, but of all around the world, because today's Greek Government is building the future Greek Democracy totally freed from the perils it experienced in the past.

Four million tourists who visited Greece during the last 3 years is very impressive a number to provide the factual evidence and confirmation of the peaceful nature of the National Revolution, even though Mr. Blank's special envoys may probably ignore it. But Greece won't get lost in spite of such biased reports. She was not lost when she rejected with contempt the decisions of the "European Coffee-Shop," known as the Council of Europe, and she is still glowing against the ridiculous discussions and the meaningless books by authors such as Mrs. Vlachos and Mrs. Margaret, as well as against Melina's telegenic hysteria . . .

It is a really happy coincidence, for the United States and the Free World, the fact that the U.S. Government and the great majority of the American people look at the so called "Greek issue"—which in essence does not exist—in its real dimensions and not from a prejudicial position which characterizes the demagogic attitudes and sophistries of the suspicious "protectors" of democracy in Greece.

GREEK ORTHODOX ARCHDIOCESE  
OF NORTH AND SOUTH AMERICA,  
New York, N.Y., March 22, 1971.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In prideful anticipation of the 150th Anniversary of Greek Independence, which will begin on March 25, 1971 and be commemorated throughout the year by our Greek-American Communities, Schools and organizations, we take the liberty of sending you the enclosed material describing the interest and enthusiasm which the brave struggle of the enslaved Greeks for their liberty stirred in the minds and hearts of Americans of that day.



Thomas Jefferson, James Monroe, John Quincy Adams and Daniel Webster spoke eloquently on behalf of Greek Independence in the Congress, and used their influence to have it supported by the Great European Powers; while high-minded Philhellenes like Samuel Gridley Howe of Boston and George Jarvis of New York fought in Greece, the latter losing his life, as did Lord Byron, and other non-Greeks, in a noble cause.

For those of us who are of Hellenic descent, it is most moving that the struggle of the Greeks to free themselves from Ottoman rule generated such passionate fervor among Americans, some of whom had themselves fought in the American Revolution a half century earlier and had been sustained by the eternal democratic principles for which Greece had always stood.

This fervidness of the Americans is strikingly demonstrated by the names directly associated with Greek Independence—like Ypsilanti (in Michigan) and Navarino (in New York) given to American towns and cities; while older Greek names like Troy, Syracuse, Ithaca, Solon, Ulysses, Hector, Corinth—to take only a few of many examples from New York State alone—had earlier been bestowed in appreciation of the Hellenism for which they stood.

Americans have traditionally championed the causes of freedom, justice and equality for all nations and peoples, and it is our prayers and hope that our observance of the 150th Anniversary of Greek Independence, will strike responsive chords in the minds and hearts of our Americans of today.

Yours most sincerely,

ARCHBISHOP IAKOVOS.

#### HOW AMERICANS RESPONDED TO THE GREEK REVOLUTION OF 1821

Reaction to the Greek Revolution of 1821 varied considerably with Europeans and Americans.

While official standpoints among the governments of Europe did not as a rule reflect the feelings of the populace towards the Greeks fighting to shake off four hundred years of slavery, in the United States both government and people developed from the very beginning a very sympathetic and warm attitude towards the enslaved descendants of the ancient Hellenes and extended to them substantial moral and financial help. The fighting Greeks felt that their natural ally in a struggle for freedom were the Americans, who had themselves gone through the ordeal of liberation, and their appeals to the government and people of the United States are animated with the kind of trust entertained for those whose faith in eternal ideals had been sealed with blood and victory.

Here are some eternal values that man, going through the fortunes of good and evil in community and nation, has come to believe in. The thought of the fighting Greeks expressed simply yet magnificently by the slogan "freedom or death," finds an equally magnificent response on the part of the leaders of a new nation, the destiny of which had already ordained it to guide the peoples of the earth in the manner in which the Greeks had done two thousand years before.

The Appeal of the Messenian Senate written in Kalamata, May 25, 1821, translated from the French and published in "The North American Review," October 16, 1823:

To the citizens of the United States of America: Having formed the resolution to live or die for freedom, we are drawn toward you by a just sympathy; since it is in your land that Liberty has fixed her abode, and by you that she is prized as by our fathers. Hence, in invoking her name, we invoke yours at the same time, trusting that in imitating you, we shall imitate our ancestors, and be thought worthy of them if we succeed in resembling you.

Though separated from you by mighty oceans, your character brings you near us.

We esteem you nearer than the nations on our frontiers; and we possess, in you, friends, fellow-citizens, and brethren, because you are just, humane and generous; just because free, generous and liberal because *Christian*. Your liberty is not propped on the slavery of other nations, nor your prosperity on their calamities and sufferings. But, on the contrary, free and prosperous yourselves, you are desirous that all men should share the same blessings; that all should enjoy those rights, to which all are by nature equally entitled. It is you, who first proclaimed these rights; it is you who have been the first again to recognise them in rendering the rank of men to the Africans degraded to the level of brutes. It is by your example, that Europe has abolished the shameful and cruel trade in human flesh, from you that she receives lessons of justice, and learns to renounce her absurd and sanguinary customs. This glory, Americans, is yours alone, and raises you above all the nations which have gained a name for liberty and laws.

It is for you, citizens of America, to crown this glory, in aiding us to purge Greece from the barbarians, who for four hundred years have polluted the soil. It is surely worthy of you to repay the obligations of the civilized nations, and to banish ignorance and barbarism from the country of freedom and the arts. You will not assuredly imitate the culpable indifference or rather the long ingratitude of some of the Europeans. No, the fellow-citizens of Penn., of Washington, and of Franklin, will not refuse their aid to the descendants of Phocion and Thrasybulus, of Aratus and of Philopomen. You have already shown them esteem and confidence in sending your children to their schools. You know with what pleasure they were welcomed, and the steady kindness and attention which they received. If such has been their conduct when enslaved, what friendship and zeal will they not manifest to you, when through your aid they shall have broken their chains. Greece will then furnish you advantages, which you can in vain seek from her ignorant and cruel tyrants; and the bonds of gratitude and fraternity will forever unite the Greeks and the Americans. Our interests are of a nature more and more to cement an alliance founded on freedom and virtue.

At Kalamata, May 25, 1821. Signed, The Messenian Senate at Calamata, Peter Mavromichalis, commander in chief.

Excerpt from "The North American Review" commentary on the above, October 16, 1823:

The Greeks have taken the liberty, as we did in 1776, of declaring themselves free; they have raised armies and navies; they have defeated the Turks in several engagements, both at sea and on land; they have taken some of the most important fortresses, particularly Napoli di Romania, by its position and strength the most important of all; they have organized a system of government, which, though far from being faultless, is upon the whole a judicious system; and finally they have made such progress in the war, that a writer in the last number of the *Quarterly Review*, a journal not friendly to insurrection against masters, civilized or barbarous, has ventured to say, "that it now appears extremely probable (we might indeed, we believe, use a still stronger expression) the Greeks will be able to establish their independence."

Excerpt from James Monroe's annual Message to Congress, December 2, 1822:

The mention of Greece fills the mind with the most exalted sentiments, and arouses in our bosoms the best feelings, of which our nature is susceptible. Superior skill and refinement in the arts, heroic gallantry in action, disinterested patriotism, enthusiastic zeal, and devotion in favor of public liberty are associated with our recollection of ancient Greece. That such a country should have

been overwhelmed and so long hidden, as it were, from the world under a gloomy despotism, has been a cause for unceasing and deep regret to generous minds for ages past. It was natural, therefore, that the reappearance of these people in their original character, contending in favor of their liberties, should produce that great excitement and sympathy in their favor, which have been so signally displayed throughout the United States. A strong hope is entertained that these people will receive their independence and resume their equal station among the nations of the earth.

Excerpts from James Monroe's annual Message to Congress, December 2, 1823:

Our policy in regard to Europe, which was adopted at an early stage of the wars which have so long agitated that quarter of the globe, nevertheless remains the same, which is, not to interfere in the internal concerns of any of its powers, to consider the government de facto as the legitimate government for us; to cultivate friendly relations with it, and to preserve those relations by a frank, firm and manly policy, meeting in all instances the claims of every power, submitting to injuries from none.

A strong hope has been long entertained, founded on the heroic struggle of the Greeks that they would succeed in their contest, and resume their equal station among the nations of the earth. It is believed that the whole civilized world takes a deep interest in their welfare. Although no Power has declared in their favor, yet none, according to our information, has taken part against them. Their cause and their name have protected them from dangers which might ere this have overwhelmed any other people. The ordinary calculations of interest, and of acquisition, with a view to aggrandizement, which mingle so much in the transactions of nations, seem to have had no effect in regard to them. From the facts which have come to our knowledge, there is good cause to believe that their enemy has lost forever all dominion over them; that Greece will become again an independent nation, that she may obtain that rank, is the object of our most ardent wishes.

Excerpt from James Monroe's annual Message to Congress, December 7, 1824:

In turning our attention to the condition of the civilized world, in which the United States have taken a deep interest, it is gratifying to see how large a portion of it is blessed with peace. The only wars which now exist within that limit, are those between Turkey and Greece, in Europe, and between Spain and the new Governments, our neighbors, in this hemisphere. In both these wars, the cause of independence, of liberty and humanity, continues to prevail. The success of Greece, when the relative population of the contending parties is considered, commands our admiration and applause, and that it has had a similar effect with the neighboring Powers is obvious. The feeling of the whole civilized world is excited, in a high degree, in their favor. May we not hope that these sentiments, winning in the hearts of their respective Governments, may lead to a more decisive result? That they may produce an accord among them to replace Greece on the ground which she formerly held, and to which her heroic exertions, at this day, so eminently entitle her?

Excerpt from John Quincy Adams annual Message to Congress, December 4, 1827:

From the interest taken by this sovereign (the Emperor Nicholas of Russia) in behalf of the suffering Greeks, and from the spirit with which others of the great European Powers are co-operating with him, the friends of freedom and humanity may indulge the hope, that they will obtain relief from the most unequal of conflicts, which they have so long and so gallantly sustained; that they will enjoy the blessing of self-government, which by their sufferings in the cause of liberty they have richly earned; and that

their independence will be secured by those liberal institutions, of which their country furnished the earliest examples in the history of mankind, and which have consecrated to immortal remembrance the very soil for which the people and the Government of the United States have so warmly indulged with their cause, have been acknowledged by their government, in a letter of thanks, which I have received from their illustrious President, a translation of which is now communicated to Congress, the Representatives of that nation to whom this tribute of gratitude was intended to be paid, and to whom it was justly due.

Excerpts from the speech of Daniel Webster during the discussion of the "Greek Question" in the House of Representatives, as published in the *Howard Gazette*, January, 1824:

It was difficult, on any occasion that called the attention to a spot on the globe so connected with association and recollections as Greece, to avoid some degree of warmth and enthusiasm. Yet, he was entirely sensible that, in gravely legislating on the present subject, those feelings must be chastised. He should endeavor, in what he had to offer to the House, to repress such feelings as far as it was practicable; yet, if we would wholly escape from them, we must fly beyond the limits of the civilized world; we must go beyond the limits of social order, the bounds where laws and knowledge are found; nay, we must have this Hall, before we can turn away from the memorials of ancient Greece. What, he asked, is this popular assembly? what this free discussion of public measures? what this open, unreserved action, of mind upon mind? what that popular eloquence which, if it were now present, would on such a theme, shake this hall to its centre? what are these but such memorials? This magnificent edifice, these columns, with their stately proportions, this fine architecture by which we are surrounded, what are these, but so many witnesses of what Greece once was, and what she has taught us to be? Yet sir, I have not introduced the resolution, now on your table, with any view towards repaying aught of the debt, which we, in common with the civilized world, owe to that land of science, freedom, arts, and arms. It is a debt that never can be paid. Whatever may be our feelings of gratitude for these gifts, we are constrained to act with a view alone to the present state of the world, and of our relations to it. What I propose, and what I shall say, has reference to modern, not to ancient Greece—to the living, not to the dead....

Within the last thirty or forty years, the condition of that country has undergone a great improvement. Her marine produces the best sailors in the Mediterranean—better in that sea, than even our own. Their commerce, before the present commotions, had begun to extend itself to France and Spain. Hobhouse (our best authority) states their seamen at fifty thousand; but that number is certainly much too large—they have 153,000 tons of shipping, which is equal to about one fifth of that of the United States. Their population in European Turkey is about five millions, and in Asia Minor about two millions more. Their moral state is advancing rapidly in all respects—the literati of Europe conceived a strong interest in their behalf, and sent books and scholars and printing presses into Greece—many of the works of modern Europe have been translated into their language, and they have produced many works entirely original. This people, a people of intelligence, ingenuity, refinement, spirit and enterprise, have been for centuries under the most atrocious, unparalleled Tartarian barbarism that ever oppressed the human race....

The situation of Greece had excited the sympathies of Western Europe for 30 years past. Societies had been formed in Germany

to improve the condition of the suffering people—branches of those societies were extended into Greece—many of their youth were carefully instructed in literature—many disbanded officers from the European armies entered into the Grecian service, and a considerable amelioration of their condition with respect to the advantages of education began to be effected. In 1821, the revolt took place in Moldavia and Wallachia: a revolt which was supposed to have been fomented by Russia. The Emperor brought down a large force upon the Bosphorus—and a rupture seemed immediately impending. Russia demanded that the Turkish forces should be withdrawn from those two northern provinces. At the same time that Ypsilanti was in rebellion on the North, the Porte had to carry on a desperate struggle with Ali Pacha in the West. And another war with Persia threatened in the East. "Then it was that the Greek revolution burst forth. They soon possessed themselves of the open country of the Morea, and forced the Turks to flee for refuge into the cities. Of these, Tripolizza soon fell into their hands; and then they began to contemplate a government. They assembled a Congress (the name is hallowed on this side of the Atlantic—it is a name dear to freedom), and began to organize a system of laws....

Talking about the slaughter and burning of Chios, he states:

And, Sir, on the wharves of Boston did I see the utensils from the hearths of that polished, refined, and literary people, selling for old copper. Numbers of children, all whose relatives had been slaughtered, were picked up by the merchants in the Mediterranean, and some of them are now among us....

Mr. Chairman, there are some things which, to be well done, must be promptly done. If we even determine to do the thing that is now proposed, we may do it too late. Sir, I am not of those who are for withholding aid when it is most urgently needed, and when the stress is past, and the aid no longer necessary, overwhelming the sufferers with caresses. I will not stand by and see my fellow man drowning without stretching out a hand to help him, till he has by his own efforts and presence of mind reached the shore in safety, and then encumber him with aid. With suffering Greece now is the crisis of her fate—her great, it may be, her last struggle. Sir, while we sit here deliberating, her destiny may be decided. The Greeks, contending with ruthless oppressors, turn their eyes to us, and invoke us by their ancestors, slaughtered wives and children, by their own blood, poured out like water, by the hecatombs of dead they have heaped up, as it were to heaven, they invoke, they implore us for some cheering sound, some look of sympathy, some token of compassionate regard. They look to us as the great Republic of the earth—and they ask us by our common faith, whether we can forget that they are struggling, as we once struggled, for what we now so happily enjoy? I cannot say, sir, that they will succeed; this rests with heaven. But for myself, sir, if I should to-morrow hear that they have failed—that their last phalanx had sunk beneath the Turkish cimeter, that the flames of their last city had sunk in its ashes, and that nought remained but the wide melancholy waste where Greece once was, I should still reflect, with the most heartfelt satisfaction, that I have asked you, in the name of seven millions of freemen, that you would give them at least the cheering of one friendly voice....

Excerpts from the Appeal to the House of Representatives of the citizens of the State of New York, December 29, 1823:

In the opinion of the meeting the independence of the Greek nation was a subject of the highest concern to the interest of the human race, and recommended itself

to the approbation of every civilized people by the most powerful considerations that could possibly be addressed either to the judgment or to the sympathy of mankind....

The committee conceived that they will have discharged their trust when they make known to Congress the anxious desire of the citizens of New York, either that the independence of the Greeks may be speedily and formally recognized or such steps preparatory thereto taken as may, in the opinion of Government, be consistent with its interests, its policy, and its honor....

Excerpts from the Appeal to the House of Representatives of the citizens of the City of Boston, January 5, 1824.

That the contest of an oppressed and enslaved people for the invaluable blessings of self-government, and of a Christian people for the enjoyment of religious liberty, has a claim to the best wishes of this nation, for its eventual success, and to whatever aid and encouragement, consistently with the primary duty of self-preservation, it may have the ability to afford.

No one who has duly reflected upon the consequences which have resulted from our own successful struggle in the cause of civil liberty, not as respects the interests of nation only, but as it has affected also the condition of the whole civilized world, can hesitate to admit that the question of the erection of a new independent Christian State is the most momentous that can occur in the program of human affairs, and especially deserving the attention of the representatives of a free people. Centuries, whose annals are filled with the common succession of wars and conquests, may pass away, without being attended with any important result to the great cause of civilization and humanity; but the emancipation from a barbarous despotism of a gallant and enterprising and intelligent people must be followed by the most propitious consequences, and cannot fail to add to the security of all free Governments, by increasing the number of those who are devoted to their common defence....

Excerpts from an Appeal by American students resolved in Andover, Mass., December 13, 1823:

To Americans, any brave and generous nation, struggling for civil and religious freedom, is a spectacle never to be regarded with indifference; but when a people, inheriting a spirit which ages of suffering have not subdued, and professing the same Christian faith with ourselves—breaking the chains of their oppressors, not only look to us as the chosen people of freedom, gathering strength from our example, and hope from our history; but call on us as Freemen and as Christians to aid them in their hour of peril;—if we should turn away from that appeal, and refuse to hear their cry, we should prove ourselves unworthy of the name in which we glory....

Resolved:

1. That the members of this Seminary deeply sympathize with the Greeks in their present struggle.

2. That a Committee, consisting of one from every college and state, represented here be appointed to confer with our Professors on the subject; to take up a contribution, and receive subscriptions here; and to propose a Circular for the various colleges and professional seminaries in this country.

3. That if the members of the other literary institutions concur in the plan, it be represented to the government of Greece, as our wish, that the money contributed in these institutions, be devoted, after the establishment of Grecian freedom, to the promotion of literature in that country, in some such way, so that it may become a permanent token of the respect and esteem with which the Greeks are regarded by the American youth devoted to study.



## GREEK SONG OF LIBERTY

Greeks!—the battle paeon's sounding,  
Our bosoms are for freedom bounding,  
Then fly in arms to frame or death;  
Greeks!—can History show a story,  
Like thine so fraught with stars of glory,  
A page so bright—a page so gory?  
No,—Fame owns thee great in every breath,  
Behold in Sparta's crumbling pile,  
Our country's wrongs,—her trodden name,  
See Athens hurled in bondage vile,  
A haunt of slaves—a nest of shame!  
The churls who spurn the bliss of freedom,  
Who fawn and crawl where tyrants lead  
'em,  
Oh, let them live and die like slaves:  
That star o'er Helle's waters gleaming,  
Immortal rays of glory beaming,  
Shall, with our banner proudly streaming,  
Sink blood-red on our humid graves,  
To arms!—ye brave, the great decree  
Is breathed from heav'n—then wake to  
frame,  
For, O, one breath of liberty  
Is worth an age in chains of shame!  
Greeks! let our inmost cares inherit  
Firm Leonidas' patriot spirit;  
He died to guard his country's laws;  
Firm as the peak of Ida towering,  
Swift as a tempest downwards shower-  
ing,  
Like Eagles o'er their nestlings lowering—  
Arise!—and shield a legal cause!  
Our umpire is our common God,  
No oracle speaks his decree;  
But who will fear to kiss the sod  
When made a couch of Liberty?

A MEMORABLE FRAGMENT OF GREEK-AMERICANA  
FROM THE YEAR 1823

(By N. D. Diamantides)

In commemorating Greek Independence day this month as Americans of Greek descent, we acknowledge an attachment to the remarkable Grecian past that is part and parcel of what America is supposed to stand for.

In this context and at this time of the year, therefore, we may indulge in an interesting fragment of Greco-Americana that transpired in 1823 between two notable historical figures, one revered in America and the other in Greece: Thomas Jefferson and Adamantios Coraes.

Long retired from the highest offices of the land, Jefferson had returned to Monticello where he "felt free from the shackles of power", as he said, "to cultivate those tranquil pursuits of science for which nature had intended him." In this serene environment, he probably never thought of Coraes, whom he had met thirty-five years earlier while minister to France.

Coraes, on the other hand, born in Smyrna to a family of rich merchants, abandoned the mercantile pursuits, and in 1785 settled as a doctor in Paris. His love for the classics and his insatiable urge for literary research made him one of the most renowned Hellenists of his time and one whose reputation had become international. Not only did he publish many learned translations of the ancient Greek writers in French as well as in modern Greek, but he also became the veritable "teacher" of the Greek nation then smarting under the Turkish yoke for more than three hundred years. As a matter of fact, he is the father of . . . (purist) version of modern Greek that links our language today to the form into which it had evolved during the Hellenistic period, about the time of Christ. Because of all this, contemporary Greek history has elevated him to the status of . . .

In July of 1823, the learned teacher sent a letter to the sage of Monticello written in French, and on a subject that was very close to his heart. The Greek War of Independence

was two years old in 1823 and destined to continue for five more years, filled with victories as well as reversals, sacrifices as well as indomitable determination. Theodoros Kolokotronis had emerged as the top military commander, and Alexandros Mavrocordatos had already made his mark as the foremost statesman among the war leadership. Mavrocordatos was a descendant of a distinguished Byzantine family, and served the revolution primarily as the head of the executive branch of the provisional government. After the war, he served as ambassador to Constantinople and Paris. Seven of his ancestors between 1670 and 1786 had been governors of the province of the Ottoman Empire that is now Romania.

By 1823, the Peloponnese, the southernmost province of the Greek mainland, had been cleared of the Turks. Outside of it, most all other Greek territories were still under the Turkish rule and, therefore, subject to bloody reprisals, with the exception of the Ionian Islands, which were a British protectorate since 1815.

It is in this setting that Coraes, then seventy-five years of age, wrote his appeal to Jefferson from Paris.<sup>1</sup> Here it is translated from the French by my daughter, Niki, the linguist of the family:

MONSIEUR: Perhaps you remember a Greek who was introduced to you some years ago by the late Mr. Paradise, and who even had the pleasure of dining at your house at Chailiot. It is this same Greek, now advanced in age, who takes the liberty of writing this letter to you at a moment when his country is about to be reborn.

It is not in the power of our tyrants to prevent this renaissance. However, it is primarily because our liberty is still only a child that its education requires help and care for it not to perish in its cradle. And one can hope for such help only from men who are truly free.

It is unfortunate for us that we revolt at a time when our public instruction has barely started. We come from a very bad school, a Turkish school, and that says everything.

It is true that modern Greece has unexpectedly produced some Leonidas and Miltiadeses, but, in emerging from a long oppression, she was unable to produce all of a sudden legislators such as the ones who appeared in ancient Greek times, or the one seen in your country today.

It is also unfortunate for us to be neighbors of the so-called enlightened European nations at a time they find themselves in a crisis. Because when that crisis threatens even the little liberty they enjoy, one fears that they will allow only as much of it to Greece as it suits their interests.

The English have just embraced our cause, and started giving us aid. But you know only too well the nature of the embrace of your dear fathers who do not resemble their children at all. They have already begun by praising the excellence of our political officials, and will probably finish by advocating an Upper House to us, which under the present state of our body politics, would end up by being composed of all the corrupt parts of this body. What should we do under these circumstances I do not know. To return under the Turkish yoke appears to me as something physically impossible. But I consider it equally impossible that our dear friends and neighbors next to the Peloponnese will ever permit us to have a form of government of our liking. It is not in their interests to permit such a bad example within sight of the Greeks of the Ionian Isles whom they have been treating in a manner hardly liberal.

You see, Monsieur, the perplexity in which those Greeks, who desire the happiness of their nation, find themselves. I am the senior of these Greeks, and the one who for

the last thirty years, seeing the present era approaching, has not ceased exhorting my compatriots to prepare themselves for it through education. The benevolence with which they honored my exhortations encouraged me to continue until the present. But what can I do now, being so old and ill?

Mavrocordatos, whom some flatterers have begun to call a Prince, and who could conceivably come to believe these imbeciles, has just written to me for the first time. His style, far from being that of a prince, speaks of a man who works in good faith for the happiness of his country. I believe his letter to be sincere and have responded accordingly. This letter renewed my regrets for not having you as neighbors, and at the same time, gave me the idea to write to you and solicit your advice.

Since the distance which separates us prevents you from helping us materially, let me at least ask you the following questions:

1. Would it be possible for you to dispatch to Greece two or three well known persons ostensibly for negotiating commercial transactions? Indeed, I do not believe that you could find a time for such negotiations more suitable to your interests. While on official business, these men will be able at the same time, through their ideas and zeal for freedom, to encourage those of the Greeks who are heading public affairs in their noble resolution to preserve their independence, and advise them of all the proper ways of forming a good government. Their presence in Greece would provide us with the antidote for neutralizing the pernicious influences coming from the foes of our liberty.

2. In case you do not intend to send negotiators, or do not believe that the time is yet appropriate, wouldn't you, or some one else of your countrymen possessing the same prestige as you do, be able to publish in one of your newspapers a consultative letter on the affairs of Greece? The letter could be a response addressed to an anonymous Greek who asked you for advice; and if you are so kind as to send me a copy of the paper, I will be able to translate the letter into modern Greek. Unless I am completely mistaken, such a letter should produce a beneficial effect on my countrymen's minds, many of whom know and respect your name. If I am asking you not to reveal my name, it is because my position requires caution. Other than that, you are not restricted as to the form of the letter; you may, if you wish, present your advice in the form of reflections prompted by the interest you take in Greece.

I take the liberty, Monsieur, of sending to you along with this letter, the *Ethics* and the *Politics* of Aristotle which I published a short while ago. I beg you to acknowledge the receipt of this letter by addressing your reply under cover to my dwelling: Rue Madame No. 5, derrière le Luxembourg.

Help us, fortunate Americans; it is not charity we ask. Rather an opportunity to augment your happiness.

Accept, Monsieur, the assurance of the profound respect that your person always inspired in me.

Paris, July 10, 1823.

CORAES.

The reply came three months later in a tightly handwritten letter seven pages long, packed with all the political, legislative, and constitutional wisdom that one of the foremost lawgivers of modern times could, and cared to, pass on to a nation just emerging into statehood. Only the opening paragraphs can be given here:<sup>2</sup>

MONTICELLO IN VIRGINIA,  
October 31, 23.

DEAR SIR: Your favor of July 10 is lately received. I recollect with pleasure the short opportunity of acquaintance which you afforded me in Paris by the kindness of Mr. Paradise, and the fine editions of the classical

<sup>1</sup> D. M. Robinson, D. Litt: "America in Greece," Anatolia Press, pp. 1948, 36-38.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 41-46.

writers of Greece which have been announced by you from time to time have never permitted me to lose the recollection. Until those of Aristotle's *Ethics* and the *Strategica* of Onasander, with which you have now favored me, and for which I pray you to accept my thanks, I had seen only your *Lives* of Plutarch. These I had read, and profited much by your valuable Scholia, and the aid of a few words from a modern Greek dictionary, would, I believe, have enabled me to read your patriotic address to your countrymen.

You have certainly begun at the right end towards preparing them for the great object they are now contending for, by improving their minds and qualifying them for self-government. For this, they will owe you lasting honors. Nothing is more likely to forward this object than a study of the fine models of science left by their ancestors; to whom we also are all indebted for the lights which originally led ourselves out of Gothic darkness.

No people sympathize more feelingly than ours with the sufferings of your countrymen, none offers more sincere and ardent prayers to heaven for their success, and nothing indeed but the fundamental principles of our government, never to entangle us with the broils of Europe could restrain our generous youth from taking some part in this holy cause. Possessing ourselves the combined blessings of liberty and order, we wish the same to other countries and to none more than yours, which, the first of civilized nations, presented examples of what man should be. Not indeed that the forms of government, adapted to their age and country, are practicable or to be imitated in our days although prejudices in their favor would be natural enough to your people. The circumstances of the world are too much changed, and all other useful sciences should be taught in their highest degree . . .

So spoke Thomas Jefferson.

These echoes from an exchange that took place nearly 150 years ago make it sound as if we, the Americans of Greek descent, have indeed the best of two very worthwhile worlds.

#### NEW YORK STATE AND THE WAR OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE: 1821 to 1830

(By Prof. Charilaos Lagoudakis)

The 150th anniversary of Greek independence, celebrated in 1971, will recall the "Greek fever" that spread throughout the United States during the decade from 1821 to 1830, when the Greeks rose to free themselves from Ottoman rule. The State of New York is foremost in the Union that can tell the story of America's interest in the rebirth of Greece as a free nation. The philhellenic activity in the Empire State alone illustrates America's contribution to the independence of Greece. New York City was the principal center from which most of America's assistance went to the fighting Greeks.

#### NEW YORK IS FIRST TO RECEIVE THE GREEK NEWS

The first news of the Greek uprising against the Ottoman Empire reached New York City on May 20, 1821, brought by the brigs "Manhattan" and "Importer". New Yorkers received the report with some caution, remembering the previous failure of the "Neapolitan Rhodomontades".<sup>1</sup> It was not long, however, before the Greek revolt drew their serious attention. Subsequent dispatches concerning Greek gallantry were released from New York to other parts of the Union, and American sympathy for Greece soon grew to such an extent that even the

strange sounding Greek name "Ypsilanti", then in the news, was given to a town on the American frontier in the territory of Michigan.

Two weeks later the New York *Commercial Advertiser* voiced the feelings of the American people editorially: "This portion of the Globe, always intensely interesting to the scholar, the artist and the antiquary, becomes still more important at the present crisis. Greece under any circumstances, can never be mentioned, without awakening a train of recollections and associations which absorb the mind . . . The Greeks have the strongest and tenderest claims upon our sympathies . . ."

Interest heightened, however, when the New York press in February, 1822, reported that "the Greeks of Morea has established a Federal Constitution like that of the United States, and have elected their president, senators and representatives." This was important news at a time when the government in Washington was hastening to recognize the South American Republics, for fear the Holy Alliance of Europe would interfere in Latin America and extend its doctrines and despotic system to the New World.

#### WASHINGTON VOICES AMERICAN EXCITEMENT

Canaris attacked and destroyed by fire the Ottoman fleet in the bay of Chios. This naval exploit was the first spectacular news that reached the shores of America in June 1822. And subsequent news from Greece stirred the American public to seek ways and means to support the cause of Greek freedom. Voicing popular American feeling in 1822, President James Monroe registered in the U.S. Congress the first official expression "in favor of Greek liberties", pronounced by any head of a sovereign state. The President of the United States stressed: Superior skill and refinement in arts, heroic gallantry in action, disinterested patriotism, enthusiastic zeal and devotion in favor of public liberty . . . these examples could not have left the American people indifferent to the fate of a people, who, numbering less than a million souls, were fighting not only against the superior forces of the Ottoman Empire but also had faced the opposition of the despotic powers in Europe." In this same message to Congress, Monroe concluded his reference to Greece saying: "A strong hope is entertained, that these people will recover their independence and resume their equal station among the nations of the earth".

#### NEW YORK'S CAPITAL UNFURLS THE BANNER

The capital of New York is on record as the first city to translate American sympathy for Greece into action. In December 1822 Albany's citizens held an enthusiastic meeting for the Greeks at the Capitol of the Empire State. Governor Yates made the first contribution to a Greek Fund for "the prosecution of the war in Greece." His messages in both State Houses form a moving record for any generation to read. A year later the "Albany Argus" published the eloquent declarations on Greece by Salem Dutcher, Jacob Lansing and J. Chester. A Greek Committee was formed under the chairmanship of James Edwards and V. S. Kane as secretary. The Committee met at the Court Room of the Capitol and composed a memorandum asking the U.S. Congress to recognize Greece as an independent state. In the meantime New York City was keeping pace with the Capital of the State.

The "Greek fever" spread to other New York cities. In Troy, the wife of the city's Mayor, Albert Paulding, gave for the Greek cause her elegant gold watch and its trimmings. Mrs. Paulding was the chairman of the Troy Greek Committee, of whom the *Sentinel* wrote: "She is worthy of the character of the lady, who is connected by blood with one of the most strenuous defenders of his country's rights during the last war (1812) and by marriage with one of the

patriots of the (American) revolution." Other New York cities followed the example of Troy: Buffalo, Batavia, Oxford, Cortland and other smaller towns like Hudson, Sag Harbor, Monticello, Ludlawville, Blokefield, Victor, Gorham, Rushville, Kingston, Norwich.

The New York *Commercial Advertiser* reported that "we cannot keep record of the numerous meetings called in every part of the country; it is sufficient to say that the feeling for Greece is universal." Even the frontier town, Niagara, which itself at that time needed relief, joined the Greek cause. The Albany *Argus* wrote: "Our hearts are sensitive to the sufferings of the Greeks at 6,000 miles distance."

#### NEW YORK TOWNS NAMED "GREECE" AND "NAVARINO"

American concern for Greece was carved on the land of the Empire State. In 1824 the New York legislature gave the name "Greece" to a township as a token of American hope for an independent Greece. Three years later New Yorkers were jubilant over the Battle of Navarino, which brought victory to the Greeks on October 2, 1827. The news of Navarino reached Manhattan 57 days later, but still New York's merchant John Pintard excitedly declared "the winds of heaven favoured the rapid transmission of this glorious event!" To honor the event the New Yorkers placed the name Navarino in the County of Onondaga. Today, the 500 Navarinoans and 2,000 Grecians of that town are celebrating the rebirth of Greece, which means their name-day.

There were other New York towns with Greek names active for Greek freedom: Troy, Syracuse, Ithaca, Lysander, Homer, Solon, Ulysses, Marathon, Plutarch, Attica, Hector, Phoenix, Corinth, Esopos, Mycenae, Sparta, Argus, Athens, Socrates, Plata, and Eureka that reflected the "glory that was Greece"—to use the expression of New York's poet, Edgar Allan Poe, who was reputed to have gone to fight for Greek liberty. Some of these names illustrate the impact of the Greek uprising in American nomenclature, but most of these Greek-named frontier towns of New York were part of the so-called "Military Tract" in which veterans of the American Revolution were settled.

#### FROM ALBANY TO NEW YORK'S FRONTIER

The philhellenic activity in New York's frontier reveals the extent to which the "Greek fever" spread. Rochester was a little frontier town of the Empire State. Its chief citizen, Col. Nathaniel Rochester, gave his fellow townsmen the signal on Greece with these prophetic words: "It is not visionary conjecture to anticipate that the assistance of the United States may terminate the contest, and that we shall soon hail the Greeks as an emancipated, independent and happy people . . ." And reminded them that Greece "is the seat of Science and of Arts."

The response was prompt. A large meeting was held at Christopher's Mansion House, where James K. Guernsey took the chair. Dr. Levi Ward was appointed secretary. And the *Rochester Observer's* editor wrote of the meeting: "Let our sympathy be shown by acts. Hereafter let the name American be associated in the mind of the Greek with the most sublime and heavenly virtue, BENEVOLENCE, manifesting itself in deeds: feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, administering the wants, mitigating the sufferings of widows and fatherless children . . ." The Greek subject crowded out almost every other topic from this weekly little paper.

Rochester's benevolent activity started in 1823. Here is what General Ripley and his partner, Colonel Dissell, did. They sold a corner lot on New Main and Ohio streets for \$200, and offered this proceed for the inhabitants of Chios. This gesture was carried a step further. In appreciation of the "undaunted spirit with which the people of the Island of Chios withstood the massacres that

<sup>1</sup> This refers to the revolution which broke out in Naples in 1820 under the leadership of the Carbonero. It was soon suppressed, and the Austrian Army wiped out the democratic constitution to which Ferdinand of Naples had sworn.



shocked the world," Rochester named one of its streets CHIOS. This little frontier town then had problems of its own. The people were clamoring for more fire engines, as the greatest need of the town, and for "at least two more lamps on the Main Street Bridge." The town council found no way of getting the needed money, but within a short three months the Rochester Greek Fund had a round figure of \$1,500—a considerable amount for a little American town 157 years ago.

How did Rochester raise its Greek Fund? Daniel Penfield can tell the story of his own "fine fat ox," which was offered to the Greek cause. He proclaimed that his ox "would be sold for freedom" at 25 cents a pound for the "choicest portions." Penfield garlanded his ox with evergreens and decorated its flesh with ribbons and led it through the streets of Rochester, preceded by a band of music. He carved the "illustrious ox" that was slaughtered for Greece. (Jenny March Parker, who wrote the *History of Rochester*, doubts if the beast would go down to posterity!)

#### NEW YORK TOPS ALL AMERICAN CITIES IN THE GREEK CAUSE

No other American city did as much as New York City for Greek independence, although Boston and Philadelphia could also show a philhellenic activity that would be had to match in any European city. Seventy distinguished Americans were elected to form the Greek Committee of New York. They held a meeting on December 3, 1823, at the Totine Coffee House<sup>2</sup> corner of Wall and Water Streets, under the Chairmanship of William Bayard, whose family produced public leaders, statesmen and jurists, during the 18th and 19th centuries. The purpose of the meeting, open to the public, was to adopt resolutions "to render every possible aid toward the promotion of their (Grecian) emancipation." Charles King was elected Secretary and Charles Wilkes as Treasurer. He was known to have discovered the Antarctic Continent.

The first acts of the New York Greek Committee was an appeal for funds from all the states of the Union and a petition to Washington, urging the US Congress to recognize Greece as an independent state. The appeal was sent to leading citizens in other cities to form similar Greek Committees. In the course of a single month \$34,402 were raised, which were remitted to the Greek Embassies in London. At the same time muskets and swords were shipped direct to Greece along with medical supplies and clothing. No complete account is available of the amounts collected following the first dispatch of funds and provisions.

The New York Greek Committee held open meetings to report the progress of the campaign in America and the war in Greece. In one of these meetings an old veteran of the American Revolution, Colonel Willet, took the floor. With a moving oration he offered his 2,000 acres of land for the fighting Greeks. This gesture illustrates the "Greek fever, which raged with violence" in the metropolis of the Empire State, according to the *New York Statesmen*, during the winter months of 1823-24. The press continued to report exciting news from Greece. When Admiral Miaoulis set on fire two frigates and ten brigs of the enemy, the same New York paper headlined its column: "Glorious news from the Greeks." And its editorial began "we return to the affairs of the Greeks as of the first importance to the cause of freedom and humanity."

<sup>2</sup> The Totine Coffee House was the place where New York business men and members of the Chambers of Commerce held their meetings. It was constructed in 1772 and razed in 1827.

#### GUNS FOR GREECE AND VOLUNTEERS

The New York Greek Committee petitioned Washington to recognize the independence of Greece and armed New Yorkers were ready to embark for Greece. Early in 1826, Colonel Duff of the 106th Regiment of New York, ordered Major Samples to hold the First Battalion of the regiment in readiness "for a march in defense of the Greeks":

"Attention, Battalion! In consequence of the above requisition of Colonel Duff, the enrolled militia within the bounds of the 106th Regiment are ordered to hold themselves in readiness to march at a moment's warning, in the defense of the Greeks."—February 27, 1826. (Signed) Major Thomas Samples.

This order remained symbolic of American public opinion as was the New York Congressman's proposal that American troops be sent to Greece and the U.S. Squadron in the Mediterranean join the Greek Navy. U.S. foreign policy, as defined by the Monroe Doctrine, blocked all military moves; the impulse, however, for armed action was present in American manifestations favoring the Greeks.

The manifestation of the people in the New York town of Courtland defied the neutrality of their government. They sent to the New York Greek Committee a double fortified four pound ship cannon for shipment to Greece. It was mounted and "completely in order", but there is no record if it ever reached the land of Themistocles. About the same time New York welcomed a band of volunteers from Georgia, under the command of Captain C. N. Higgins, but they were probably held back from going to Greece as "Impractical". Both actions, however, were indicative of the public mood in America, which was more cogently seen at a 4th of July celebration in 1823 dedicated to the cause of Greek freedom. On this occasion a New Yorker, Albermar McQueen, presented a "42 Pounder" which was named "The Greek Gun." This gun was used in the American Revolution. In dedicating it to "Greek freedom", the officiating Dr. Perkins offered the following toast: "May the Greek Gun report in favor of Liberty, and speak Greek as well as it ever did Yankee!"

#### DAUGHTERS, SISTERS AND MOTHERS OF AMERICA

The women of New York joined their men in the Greek cause. On behalf of the "daughters, sisters and mothers of America" they erected on September 6, 1823, a 20-foot cross on the Classic Heights of Brooklyn with the inscription: SACRED CAUSE OF THE GREEKS. To this "insignia of Grecian devotion to his God and Country", General Swift drank a toast: "May the Grecian Cross be planted from village to village and from steeple to steeple, until it rests on the Dome of St. Sophia". The daughters, sisters and mothers of America had read in their press of the Greek women in the war. It was moving to learn that "the Grecian mother, after arming her husband and with her children for the battle, goes with them, to conquer and die."

The Greek cause had the blessing of the American Church. Special services were held in New York's churches urging their congregations to give support to the people whose forefathers were the first to spread the gospel of Christianity. This was the message of the sermon on Greece by the Rev. John Henry Hobart, the Bishop of the Episcopal Church and Rector of Trinity Church in the Wall Street district of New York.

#### THE YOUTH OF NEW YORK IN THE VANGUARD

The youth of New York was in the vanguard. At West Point, the cadets were stirred to exalted demonstrations. An extract from a cadet's letter to his father demonstrates the exaltation in unaffected language: "The Greeks and their cause seem to be the most popular subject on the tapis. We had a meeting a few days since, when we

resolved to send to the Committee here in New York \$500, which is \$2 for each cadet, thinking this is the most ready way to demonstrate our attachment to the cause of Greece." And it was not long after in 1827 that one of the West Point Cadets, Lt. William Townshend Washington, a grand nephew of the President, fought and died in Greece.

The students of Columbia University were not less aroused than the cadets of the United States Military Academy. They held a meeting on December 9, 1823 at College Chapel "for the purpose of aiding the Grecian cause." The President of the College, William Duer, chaired the meeting, who later in 1831 sponsored the project for a college in Greece. A Greek Committee, consisting of eight students from each class, was formed to campaign for funds, but more significant was the resolution adopted at this meeting "in the anxious wish that Greece may once more be free". The resolution said:

"It may be thought unbecoming in persons of our age and devoted as we are, exclusively to study, to interfere in the politics of the day, but the present occasion conceived, is one upon which without fear of censure, all ages and classes may come forward . . . Our daily studies bring to our recollections Greece in the period of her glory, and if we did not sympathize in her misfortunes and rejoice that she is at length awakened from her long degradation to a remembrance of what she once was, we should be strangers to those generous feelings which in youth it may sometimes be pardonable to carry to excess . . ."

The Columbians established their "Grecian Fund", but so did the students of New York University. They formed a Greek Committee from students representing each state of the Union, which devised ways and means to assist the "heroic people of Greece". Other New York colleges, such as Hamilton College in Clinton, held vigorous campaigns for the Greeks. The students of the Union Hall Academy in Long Island contributed \$32 and the New York High School collected \$90 for "glorious Greece".

The wealthy youth of New York had their own way of raising funds for the liberation of Greece. They organized a young men's ball for the most fashionable set of New York. It was held at the elegant room of Washington Hall, which was decorated with American and Greek colors, on the day commemorating the American victory at New Orleans. The proceeds from the fifty dollar ticket went to the New York Greek Committee.

#### MARCO BOZZARIS, AND NEW YORK'S POETS

When New York poet James Gates Percival published his "Ode on the Emancipation of Greece" on July 25, 1821, the youth of America had a slogan: "Greeks! arise, be free, Arms for Liberty . . ." This poem was inspired by Rigas Fereos' verses calling the Greeks to rise, which were translated by the Rev. George W. Doane and published in his "Songs by the Way" (New York, 1824). Rigas became a popular name in America, but Marco Bozzaris was made prominent in American literature by New York's poet Fitz-Greene Halleck, whose poem "Marco Bozzaris" was first published in the *New York Review* and *Athenaeum Magazine* in June 1825.

Halleck's "Marco Bozzaris" was one of the best American poems in the 18th century—

<sup>3</sup> Near the site of the battle of Plataea (479 B.C.) where the Greeks under Pausanias defeated the great Persian army (not far from Thebes), Marco Bozzaris with his small band, fell in the Ottoman's camp (August 20, 1823). Here Bozzaris was fatally wounded, in a moment of victory: "To die for liberty is a pleasure, not a pain", were his last words.

a poem that the next two generations of American boys and girls learnt by heart at school. Theodore Roosevelt had to recite the poem at his commencement exercises:

At midnight, in the forest shades,  
Bozzaris ranged his Sullot band,  
True as the steel of their tried blades  
Heroes, in heart and hand.

Strike—till the last armed foe expires;  
Strike—for your altars and your fires;  
Strike—for the green graves of your sires;  
God—and your native land!

Come . . . Death! . . .  
But to the hero, when his sword  
Has won the battle of the free,  
Thy voice sounds like a prophet's words.

Bozzaris! . . .  
We tell thy doom without a sign  
For thou art Freedom's now, and Fame's—  
One of the few, the immortal names,  
That were not born to die!

Halleck's "Marco Bozzaris" was translated in Greek during the Revolution but the original in English has a quality that can hardly be rendered in another language. His feeling for Greece was expressed in another earlier poem, which reveals the poet's own yearning in 1823 to join the fighting Greeks. Halleck's poem "Magdalen" may reflect also the desire of Edgar Allen Poe who had announced his departure for Greece, but in any case the poem portrays the first American who went to fight and die in Greece. "Magdalen" fits the young man of a New York family, George Jarvis, who left for Greece on March 12, 1822, long before Lord Byron, to fight for freedom and die in Greece on August 11, 1821.<sup>4</sup> Halleck may have not known of George Jarvis when he wrote this poem:

In Greece, the brave heart's Holy Land  
Its soldier-song the bugle sings;  
And I had buckled on my brand,  
And waited by the sea-wind's wings.  
To bear me where, or lost or won  
Her battle, in its frown or smile,  
Men live with those of Marathon,  
Or die with those of Scio's isle;  
And find in Valor's tent or tomb,  
In life or death, a glorious home.

#### THE "FRIGATES SCANDALS" AND HOPE BECOMES HELLAS

Public opinion in America, particularly in New York, ran high in the year 1826, over the so-called "frigates scandals". The Greeks ordered two large war vessels from a New York ship-building house, the cost of which ran higher than the contracted price. Out of national embarrassment, the U.S. Government bought one of the frigates, the "Liberator", making possible for the other, named "Hope", to sail for Greece on October 12, 1826. The following day, the *New York Statesman* wrote: "We are happy to state that the Greek frigate HOPE unfurled her canvas yesterday, and is now on her way to render, as we hope, good service to the cause of liberty and Christianity."

"Hope" created much excitement among Americans. Many young men wanted to make the voyage to Greece. Some 200 applied to serve as the Captain's clerk. Several officers of the U.S. Navy requested leave of absence to sail for Greece with the frigate. Four of them, with Lt. Francis H. Gregory in command, took charge of the ship. American concern for HOPE and the LIBERATOR became the subject for poetry.<sup>5</sup> "Hope" reached

<sup>4</sup> Halleck asked that the "reader will have the kindness to presume that he died there"—that is, in Greece, as did George Jarvis.

<sup>5</sup> In a poetry competition, Grencille Mellen won first prize for his poem *Our Chronicle of '26* and the second prize went to Dr. Henry T. Farmer for his poem *The Woes of Modern Greece*. The competition was held in Boston in 1827.

Nauplion on December 6, 1827, too late to prevent the fall of Messolongi. Admiral Miaoulis became the commander of the celebrated "Hope", renamed HELLAS, which became the pride of the Greek fleet. Jonathan Miller, the American volunteer in the Greek forces, noted in his *Journal* that "a finer frigate than HELLAS is not to be found."

#### THE FALL OF MESSOLONGI STIMULATES AMERICAN CONCERN

The fall of Messolongi, the controversy of the frigates and reports of growing distress in Greece heightened American concern for Greece in 1826. The New York Greek Committee was reorganized in January 1827 to conduct a larger campaign for funds "to save the orphans and widows of the war". Its new Chairman was Stephen Allen. A year later he was succeeded by George Griswold. The Secretary was Samuel Akerly. Other prominent New Yorkers of the new committee were William Maxwell, Robert Sedgwick, Linde Catland, Preserved Fish, Peter Sharp, James I. Jones, Frederick Shelton, F. Vandenburg and Hiram Ketchum.

A new appeal was issued by the Greek Committee, which read: "The inhabitants of Greece are contriving for civil and religious liberty. The exertions they have made, the sufferings and sacrifices to which they have submitted in a war, nearly as long as our revolutionary struggle, prove them worthy of the object for which they contended." Within three months New York City alone, with a population of 150,000 raised \$40,000. Brooklyn contributed \$3,000. The total figure for the whole state was estimated at about \$300,000. Five of the eight ships that carried relief supplies to Greece departed from New York: The total value of these relief cargos for the years 1827 and 1828 cannot be estimated, but for Greece this support was crucial. Dragoumis, the secretary of Governor Capodistrias, recorded in his memoirs that were it not for American philanthropy, the officials and the population of the provisional seat of the Greek government in Poros would have perished.

The 150th anniversary of Greek independence in 1971 recalls the words of James Monroe, the 5th President of the United States who retired in New York, "that Greece will become again an independent nation; that she may obtain that rank is the object of our most urgent wishes." New York's faith in what the Greek struggle for freedom meant was shared by most Americans a century and a half ago. In more specific terms Americans had the satisfaction of seeing the doctrines of the Holy Alliance in Europe give way to free institutions in the achievement of the Greeks to attain independence. For, popular feeling in America was on the side of Daniel Webster, who most eloquently voiced this sentiment, when he declared in the U.S. Congress: "We must avail ourselves of the Greek Revolution to make our protest against the doctrines of the Allied Powers, both as they are laid down in principle and as they are applied in practice."

Therefore, there is a deep rooted reason in the conclusion of the late Professor Edmond Mead Earle of Columbia University, when he wrote: "American sympathy with the cause of Greece did not die with the birth of the Greek Kingdom . . . Philhellenism has come to stay . . . For over a century it has colored American public opinion concerning the Near East."

[From American Opinion, July-August 1970]

#### GEORGE PAPADOPOULOS AND THE GREEKS

To understand Greek Premier George Papadopoulos—the man and his mission—we must consider the historic role of the nation which produced him. The great contributions of Greece to sculpture, painting, literature,

medicine, science, and philosophy are well known. But the role Greece has played in preserving and defending this heritage is often overlooked in a day when Western Civilization is under attack everywhere.

When the Persian kings, first Darius and then Xerxes, led their million-man Army against a divided Greece in the Fifth Century B.C., there seemed no hope for the Greeks. Yet, in one of the greatest and most important series of campaigns in history, at the cost of countless Greeks dead and Athens burned, the Persians were defeated. If the Persians had been victorious, their occupation and influence would almost certainly have prevented the development of Western Civilization as we know it.

In any case, that Civilization would have been destroyed in its infancy if the Greeks of Constantinople had not later stopped the sweep of the Moslem hordes by guarding the invasion route to the West for nearly eight centuries. When Constantinople finally fell, a Europe immensely more powerful than the one at the time of the first assault nearly fell also, with the Moslems reaching the very gates of Vienna. Again the Greeks had saved Europe, and again they paid a terrible price—this time, four hundred years of Turkish occupation.

Today the world is faced with the greatest threat in history—more brutal than even the Persians could imagine, more powerful than any ever dreamed of by the Moslems. And, again, it is the Greeks who man the ramparts of the West. Little Greece, ancient Hellas, today stands as the most committed opponent of Communist tyranny in all Europe. If Greece falls to the Communists, the Mediterranean Sea will become a Russian lake.

The Soviet fleet is already in the Mediterranean in strength, and the Communists completely control the land base from Syria to Algeria. The apparent "Eastward look" of Spanish policy will, if continued, leave only Greece as an obstacle to unquestioned Soviet domination of the Mediterranean and Red seas. With such control the Soviets can use their troops in Czechoslovakia as a powerful threat behind ultimatums to the nations of Europe which few will dare reject. Without exaggeration, the fall of the present Government in Greece could seal the fate of all Europe. And the destiny of Greece, and thus of Europe, is in the hands of George Papadopoulos.

Who and what is Papadopoulos? First, last, and always he is a Greek. He was born on May 4, 1919, in Eleochorion, a small and rather poor village in the Achaia region of Greece. But Papadopoulos was not warped and twisted by early years of poverty, as the radical Press would have us believe. His family was poor, yes; but not desperately so. His father's salary as the village schoolmaster did not allow much room for luxuries after providing for the needs of his wife and five children, but he gave his son George something far more important than an easy life—he gave him a sound discipline of mind and body, and an unquenchable thirst and love for knowledge.

After receiving primary education in his father's school, young George Papadopoulos attended secondary schools in Patrai and then went on to the War Academy, graduating in 1940 as a second lieutenant. He had attained the highest possible grades there, and it was at the Academy that he began collecting books. This scholarly avocation resulted in his having at the time of the April Revolution the best and most complete library of Greek authors, from ancient to modern, in the entire country.

Here indeed was a rare personality—an intellectual, a soldier, a strict disciplinarian, and a man of the people. And he was steeled by fire. Two months after his graduation from the War Academy the Greek-Italian war



broke out and the young officer was assigned to the Albanian front. His combat record was "excellent," and he was awarded the Medal of Valor and twice the War Cross. During the German occupation he joined the national resistance units. From November 1944 to January 1954 he was a staff officer, and then served in Intelligence until May 1946.

With the outbreak of the Communist guerrilla war, Papadopoulos served nineteen months as a commander of artillery and took part in operations on Grammos Mountain, at Souli, in the Peloponnese, in Roumeli, and at Agrafta. After the Communists were defeated in the field, he was assigned to the Artillery School as an instructor, and attended the School of Army Engineers Corps. He had earlier graduated from the Artillery School and the Officers Training School. From 1955 to 1957, Papadopoulos served at the Intelligence Bureau of the Army General Staff and attended the Higher War School (1955), the Naval Academy (1956), and the Armed Forces School of Special Weapons (1958)—always graduating with academic distinction.

From August 1959 to July 1964 George Papadopoulos was posted at the Central Intelligence Service. And, after an artillery command, he served from August 1966 until April 21, 1967, at the Third Staff Bureau of the Army General Staff.

As Papadopoulos moved up the ranks, he watched the political situation in Greece go from bad to worse. By the early months of 1967 the crisis was reaching catastrophic proportions. The nation faced a complete economic collapse and a Communist takeover. Radical Premier George Papandreou and his Communist Harvard-trained son, Andreas, were throwing the nation to the Reds. The Communist terrorists Papandreou had released from prison were tearing Greece apart. Strikes, demonstrations, and riots led by the Reds were paralyzing the nation. The end was near. Parliament, which should have moved forcefully to avoid the imminent disaster, was too steeped in corruption to act. And the corruption was not limited to monetary affairs alone. As one Greek citizen told me: "It is so good now to have a government run by men instead of homosexuals."

Papandreou even had the university fees raised so high that only the sons of the wealthy or the graft-soaked politicians could obtain a college degree. No one would deal with the national crisis or the corruption because nearly all were in on the take. With seventeen different Parties there was always the chance of Deputy A and his Party forming a Government and really getting to the big money—to hell with the people.

The situation in Greece seemed hopeless when on April 21, 1967, a group of Army officers took charge of the Government and made George Papadopoulos Prime Minister. The corrupt Parliament was suspended.

We have now answered: Who is George Papadopoulos? But what is he? More specifically, is he a dictator? This is, of course, a matter of semantics. If by dictator one means a tyrant in the fashion of Josef Stalin, no. If one means dictator in the ancient sense—a man who is selected for leadership in a time of national emergency, and who takes upon his shoulders, with no thought of his own well-being, the cares of his nation for the duration of a crisis... a man such as Pericles—then, yes, George Papadopoulos is a dictator.

Here is a man who has voluntarily undertaken a task nearly impossible to complete successfully. Here is the material of legends; here the stuff of ancient Greece. Papadopoulos works eighteen to twenty hours a day, seven days a week. When he returns home to his wife, Despina, and two daughters (his son, an engineer, is married and lives elsewhere), it is not to a palatial villa. His home is typical of the residence of a moderately successful Greek doctor or lawyer; not spec-

tacular by the standards of his country, and quite humble by those of the United States.

What has Papadopoulos done? First, and most important, he has saved Greece from a Communist takeover. If he had waited a year, six months, a month, it might have been too late. But he did not wait. And, after becoming Prime Minister, he rounded up the Communist leaders, organizers, and agitators... and jailed them. These were no idealists or parlor pinks—they were hard-core Reds, many of whom had been serving prison terms for mass murder and atrocities before being released by Papandreou. Premier Papadopoulos simply put them back in prison. Yet, since the April 21 Revolution, and contrary to Communist propaganda, not one drop of blood has been shed by the Government.

What is more, lesser offenders have been offered their release by simply signing a pledge to refrain from political activity. But few of the Comrades will sign. They have been directed by their superiors to stay in prison and play martyr, in the hope that the *New York Times*, America's slick media, and "our" State Department will be successful in destroying the present Government. Such Communists hope then to become the masters of Greece.

Meanwhile, the new Government's five-year economic development program is running well ahead of schedule. Furthermore, decentralization is the keynote of the regime. And, Premier Papadopoulos is making powerful attempts to distribute the political, economic, social, and intellectual life of Greece over all the country, rather than permit Athens to continue sapping the vitality of the nation for its own benefit.

When Prime Minister Papadopoulos introduced a new reform Constitution, it was supported at the ballot box by an overwhelming majority of the Greek people. The Prime Minister and his Government are working feverishly to complete the mechanics of this new Constitution. When it goes into effect, in a year to a year and a half, George Papadopoulos will be excluded from serving in the Government by an age-limit clause upon which he personally insisted.

What kind of dictator is this—an anti-Communist intellectual who works eighteen to twenty hours a day preparing a new governmental order which will exclude him from any political power?

Yet, if the International Establishment and the kept Press have their way, the new anti-Communist Greece will be smothered in her cradle. The "East" will be victorious! Christian charity and national interests demand that the American people come to the defense of Papadopoulos and Greece. But, even more important, the West must come to realize that the attack on Greece is only one more part of the Communist strategy. Greece is the key to the Mediterranean. The Communists need it to turn the lock on an imprisoned Europe. Only George Papadopoulos and his anti-Communist Government stand in their way.

#### WAR CRIMES IN VIETNAM

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, the March 28, 1971 *New York Times* Book Review carried as its lead article a lengthy analysis by Neil Sheehan on the question of war crimes in Vietnam and our Nation's response to it. The article is based on 33 books published in this country in the recent past, including sev-

eral reports and hearings from various U.S. Senate committees, which are representative of the growing body of literature on the causes and consequences of our involvement in the bitter, unending conflict in Indochina. It is a disturbing, thought-provoking piece. It comes at a time when people all over the country are beginning to pay increasingly close attention to a problem which heretofore seemed too awful and too far from the realm of possibility to consider.

Mr. Speaker, this question can no longer be ignored. Our perceptions of the Indochina war have changed radically since the early 1960's, and they must continue to evolve until we face squarely the full implications of our national war policy. As Mr. Sheehan says:

The more perspective we gain on our behavior, the uglier our conduct appears. At first it had seemed unfortunate and sad; we were caught in the quicksand of Indochina. Then our conduct had appeared stupid and brutal, the quagmire was of our own making, the Vietnamese were the victims and we were the executioners. Now we're finding out that we may have taken life, not merely as cruel and stubborn warriors, but as criminals. We are conditioned as a nation to believe that only our enemies commit war crimes. Certainly the enemy in Indochina has perpetrated crimes. The enemy's war crimes, however, will not wash us clean if we too are war criminals.

Mr. Sheehan closes his article with a call for a congressional inquiry into the war crimes question. Twenty-one Members of Congress have already cosponsored House Joint Resolution 409, which calls for just such an investigation. I urge the Rules Committee to take speedy and favorable action on that resolution.

In the meantime, I commend Mr. Sheehan's article which follows to the attention of all those in the Congress who are considering our Nation's policies abroad, both past and future:

#### SHOULD WE HAVE WAR CRIME TRIALS?

(By Neil Sheehan)

"The tragic story of Vietnam is not, in truth, a tale of malevolent men bent upon conquest for personal gain or imperial glory. It is the story of an entire generation of leaders (and an entire generation of followers) so conditioned by the tensions of the cold war years that they were unable to perceive in 1955 (and later) that the Communist adversary was no longer a monolith... Lyndon Johnson, though disturbingly volatile, was not in his worst moments an evil man in the Hitlerian sense... Set against these facts, the easy designation of individuals as deliberate or imputed 'war criminals' is shockingly glib, even if one allows for the inexperience of the young."—Townsend Hoopes, the former Under Secretary of the Air Force, January, 1970.

Is the accusation glib? Or is it too unpleasant to think about? Do you have to be Hitlerian to be a war criminal? Or can you qualify as a well-intentioned President of the United States? Even when I saw those signs during the March on the Pentagon in 1967, "Hey, Hey, L.B.J. How many kids did you kill today?" they didn't make me think that Lyndon Johnson, the President of the United States, might be a war criminal. A misguided man perhaps, an egomaniac at worst, but not a war criminal. That would have been just too much. Kids do get killed in war. Besides, I'd never read the laws governing the conduct of war, although I had watched the war for three years in Vietnam and had written about it for five. Ap-

parently, a lot of the men in Saigon and Washington who were directing the war didn't read those laws either or if they did, they interpreted them rather loosely.

Now a lot of other people are examining our behavior in Vietnam in the light of these laws. Mark Sacharoff, an assistant professor of English at Temple University, has gathered their work together into this bibliography. By this simple act he has significantly widened our consciousness. If you credit as factual only a fraction of the information assembled here about what happened in Vietnam, and if you apply the laws of war to American conduct there, then the leaders of the United States for the past six years at least, including the incumbent President, Richard Milhous Nixon, may well be guilty of war crimes.

There is the stuff of five Dreyfus affairs in that thought. This is what makes the growing literature on alleged war crimes in Vietnam so important. This bibliography represents the beginning of what promises to be a long and painful inquest into what we are doing in Southeast Asia. The more perspective we gain on our behavior, the uglier our conduct appears. At first it had seemed unfortunate and sad; we were caught in the quicksand of Indochina. Then our conduct had appeared stupid and brutal, the quagmire was of our own making, the Vietnamese were the victims and we were the executioners. Now we're finding out that we may have taken life, not merely as cruel and stubborn warriors, but as criminals. We are conditioned as a nation to believe that only our enemies commit war crimes. Certainly the enemy in Indochina has perpetrated crimes. The enemy's war crimes, however, will not wash us clean if we too are war criminals.

What are the laws of war? One learns that there is a whole body of such laws, ranging from specific military regulations like the Army's Field Manual 27-10, "The Law of Land Warfare," to the provisions of the Hague and Geneva Conventions, which are United States law by virtue of Senate ratification, to be broad principles laid down by the Nuremberg and Tokyo war crimes tribunals. These laws say that all is not fair in war, that there are limits to what belligerent man may do to mankind. As the Hague Convention of 1907 put it, "The right of belligerents to adopt means of injuring the enemy is not unlimited." In other words, some acts in war are illegal and they aren't all as obviously illegal as the massacre of several hundred Vietnamese villagers at My Lai.

Let's take a look at our conduct in Vietnam through the viewing glass of these laws. The Army Field Manual says that it is illegal to attack hospitals. We routinely bombed and shelled them. The destruction of Vietcong and North Vietnamese Army Hospitals in the South Vietnamese countryside was announced at the daily press briefings, the Five o'Clock Follies, by American military spokesmen in Saigon.

So somebody may have committed a war crime in attacking those hospitals. The Manual also says that a military commander acquires responsibility for war crimes if he knows they are being committed, "or should have knowledge, through reports received by him or through other means," and he fails to take action to stop them. President Johnson kept two wire-service teletypes in his office and he read the newspapers like a bear. There are thus grounds for believing that he may have known his Air Force and artillery were blowing up enemy hospitals. He was the Commander in Chief. Did his knowledge make him a war criminal? The Army Manual says that "every violation of the law of war is a war crime."

Let's proceed to one of the basic tactics the United States used to prosecute the war in South Vietnam—unrestricted air and ar-

tillery bombardments of peasant hamlets. Since 1965, a minimum of 150,000 Vietnamese civilians, an average of 68 men, women and children every day for the past six years, have been killed in the south by American military action or by weapons supplied to the Saigon forces by the United States. Another 350,000 Vietnamese civilians have been wounded or permanently maimed. This is a very conservative estimate. It is based on official figures assembled by Senator Edward M. Kennedy's Senate Subcommittee on Refugees and on a study for the Subcommittee by those eminent Government auditors, the General Accounting Office. The real toll may be much higher. This conservative attitude makes the documentation put together by the Senator and his staff aides, Jerry Tinker and Dale S. de Haan, among the most impressive in the bibliography. Many, perhaps the majority, of those half-million civilian casualties were caused by the air and artillery bombardments of peasant hamlets authorized by the American military and civilian leaders in Saigon and Washington.

The United States Government tried and hanged in 1946 a Japanese general, Tomoyuki Yamashita, because he was held responsible for the deaths of more than 25,000 noncombatants killed by his troops in the Philippines.

Can a moral and legal distinction be drawn between those killings in World War II, for which General Yamashita paid with his life, and the civilian deaths ordered or condoned by American leaders during the Vietnam war? Again, if you accept only a portion of the evidence presented in this bibliography, and compare that evidence to the laws of war, the probable answer is, No. And President Nixon has spread this unrestricted bombing through Laos and Cambodia, killing and wounding unknown tens of thousands of civilians in those countries.

Looking back, one realizes that the war-crimes issue was always present. Our vision was so narrowly focused on the unfolding details of the war that we lacked the perspective to see it, or when the problem was held up to us, we paid no heed. This lesson becomes clear in reading the proceedings of the Russell Tribunal now published in "Against the Crime of Silence." The proceedings were widely dismissed in 1967 as a combination of kookery and leftist propaganda. They should not have been. Although the proceedings were one-sided, the perspective was there.

One saw the substance all the time in Vietnam in the bombing and shelling of the peasant hamlets. In November, 1965, I found five fishing hamlets on the coast of Quangang Province in central Vietnam, not far from My Lai, which had been ravaged over the previous two months by the five-inch guns of United States Navy destroyers and by American and South Vietnamese fighter-bombers. The local Vietnamese officials told me that at least 184 civilians had been killed. After a day of interviewing the survivors among the ruins, I concluded that a reasonable estimate might run as high as 600 dead. American Army officers working in the province told me that the most serious resistance the Vietcong guerrillas in the hamlets had offered was sniper fire. The hamlets and all their inhabitants had been attacked just because the Vietcong were present. I discovered that another 10 hamlets in the province had also been gutted and about 25 others severely damaged, all for like reasons.

Making the peasants pay so dearly for the presence of guerrillas in their hamlets, regardless of whether they sympathized with the Vietcong, seemed unnecessarily brutal and politically counter-productive to me, since this Hun-like treatment would alienate them from Saigon authorities and the American forces. No common-sense military purpose seemed to be served. When I wrote my story describing the agony of the fisher folk,

however, it did not occur to me that I had discovered a possible war crime. The thought also does not seem to have occurred to my editors or to most readers of *The Times*. None of the similar stories that I and other reporters wrote later on provoked any outrage, except among that minority with the field of vision to see what was happening. As Lieutenant Calley told the prosecutor at Fort Benning, "It wasn't any big deal, sir."

Reading through the news dispatches from 1965, 1966 and 1967 that Seymour Melman of Columbia and Richard Falk of Princeton assembled to document accusations of war crimes made by The Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam, "In the Name of America," is to view those scenes again in this new and disturbing perspective. Frank Harvey, in "Air War—Vietnam," recounts with the power of anecdotal narrative the casual destruction of peasant hamlets in the Mekong Delta by the United States Air Force. Usually the excuse was that a squad or so of guerrillas might be present in the hamlet or the mere location of the hamlet in guerrilla-dominated territory. Harvey is a convincing witness because he concludes with a defense of the war.

You might argue that this destruction, and concomitant loss of civilian life, were not deliberate, that they were among those haphazard horrors of war. The record says otherwise.

As early as the fall of 1965, the American Embassy in Saigon distributed to correspondents a Rand Corporation study on the air and artillery bombardments. The study concluded that the peasants blamed the Vietcong when their hamlets were blasted and their relatives killed; in effect, that shrapnel, white phosphorous and napalm were good political medicine. The study was dismissed by reporters as macabre proof that the Government could always find a think-tank to tell it what it wanted to think.

In the summer of 1966, however, a lengthy secret study of the pacification program was done for the Embassy and military headquarters in Saigon by some of the most experienced Americans in the country. One of the study's recommendations was that this practice of unrestricted bombing and shelling should be carefully re-examined. According to the study there was evidence that the practice was driving hundreds of thousands of refugees into urban slums and squalid camps, causing unnecessary death and suffering, and angering the peasantry. The proposal for a re-examination was vetoed at the highest levels of American authority in Saigon.

By deciding not to reconsider, the American leadership in Saigon was deciding to ordain the practice, to establish a de facto policy. During those earlier years at least, the policy was not acknowledged in writing, as far as I know, but neither can there be any doubt that this was the way things were to be done and that those American military and civilian leaders directing the war knew the grim cost of their decision not to look. Why did they establish the policy? Because devastation had become a fundamental element in their strategy to win the war.

I remember asking one of the most senior American generals in the late summer of 1966 if he was not worried by all the civilian casualties that the bombing and shelling were causing. "Yes, it is a problem," he said, "but it does deprive the enemy of the population, doesn't it?" A survey of refugees commissioned later that year by the Pentagon indicated that 54 per cent of those in Dinh Tuong Province in the Mekong Delta were fleeing their hamlets in fear of bombing and shelling. So this was the game. The firepower that only American technology can muster, the General Motors of death we invented in World War II, was to defeat the Vietnamese Communists by outright mili-



tary attrition, the body count, and by obliterating their strategic base, the rural population.

If you destroyed the rural society, you destroyed the resources the enemy needed to fight. You deprived him of recruits in the South, of the food and the intelligence the peasantry provide; you reversed Mao Tse-tung's axiom by drying up the sea (the peasantry) in which the guerrillas swam.

All of those directives issued by the American military headquarters in Saigon about taking care to avoid civilian casualties, about protecting the livestock and the homes of the peasantry, were the sort of pharisaic prattle you hear from many American institutions. Whenever you say the institution is not behaving as it says it should, the institution can always point to a directive and say you must be mistaken. (General Electric had directives forbidding price fixing when some of its vice presidents were convicted of price fixing.) No one was fooling himself when he marked off those "free-fire zones," and ordered those "pre-planned airstrikes" and that "harassing and interdiction fire" by the artillery. People and their homes were dehumanized into grid coordinates on a targeting map. Those other formalities, like obtaining clearance from the Vietnamese province chief before you bombed a hamlet, were stratagems to avoid responsibility, because he almost never refused permission. (Such legal fictions, by the way, are expressly forbidden by the laws of war.)

Out in the countryside the captains and majors did not disguise the design. One day in a heavily-populated province in the Mekong Delta, a young Army captain swept his hand across the map over a couple of dozen hamlets in guerrilla-dominated territory near the provincial capital and remarked that the peasants were evacuating them and moving in near town. Why? I asked. "Because it's not healthy out there. We're shelling the hell out of them," he said.

By 1967, this policy of unrestricted air and artillery bombardments had been orchestrated with search and destroy operations by ground troops, B-52 strikes, and crop destruction with chemical herbicides into a strategy that was progressively laying waste much of the countryside. (The question of whether herbicides were dumped on the landscape to an extent that may constitute a separate war crime is treated at length in several of the books Mr. Sacharoff lists.) That year Jonathan Schell went to Quangnai to document the creeping destruction of the rural society in a two-part article that first appeared in *The New Yorker* magazine. It was later published with a title of understated irony, "The Military Half." Schell estimated that by this time about 70 percent of the 450 hamlets in the province had been destroyed.

Did the military and civilian leaders directing the war from Washington know what was happening in Vietnam? How could they have avoided? The newspapers, magazine articles like Schell's and the reports of the Kennedy Subcommittee indicated the extent of what was being done in their name. The statistics alone are enough to tell the tale: five million refugees, nearly a third of South Vietnam's population of 16 million people, and that conservative estimate of the civilian casualties from what is called "friendly" military action, of at least 150,000 dead and 350,000 wounded or maimed.

These peasant hamlets, one must bear in mind, were not being plowed under because American or South Vietnamese ground troops were attempting to seize them from the enemy in pitched battles. The hamlets were being bombarded in the absence of ground combat.

One might argue that though regrettable, though even immoral, the indiscriminate air and artillery bombardments of civilians in Vietnam were not a war crime. The Allies

engaged in terror bombing of Japanese and German cities in World War II. Look at the incendiary raids on Dresden and Tokyo and the nuclear holocausts of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. None of the defendants at the Nuremberg and Tokyo trials were convicted of war crimes involving the bombing of civilian populations, because the prosecutors had done the same thing. By custom, therefore, one might argue, terror bombing is an accepted practice of war. Similarly, in the Korean War, the United States Air Force bombed Korean towns and cities.

But is Vietnam the same kind of war? There is good reason to think that it is not. In World War II opposing industrialized societies were fighting a war of survival. In this context of total war, the cities inevitably became targets to be destroyed. They contained the industries that fueled their opponent's war machine and the workers who manned the factories. The worker was as much a combatant as the uniformed soldier. Korea was also, more or less, a conventional conflict between uniformed armies, although bombing practices there would bear examination in the perspective of history.

In Vietnam, however, the most advanced technological nation in the world intervened in a civil war in a primitive, agricultural country. The Vietnamese Communists possess negligible industry, no air force of any size, and no intercontinental missiles that pose a threat to the survival of the United States. The intervention was, rather, undertaken for reasons of domestic politics and foreign policy, to avoid the repercussions at home of losing a war to Communists and to maintain a position of power and influence for the United States in Southeast Asia.

Moreover, as the literature in Sacharoff's bibliography amply documents, the use of the air weapon underwent a subtle and important change in South Vietnam from the previous two wars. Air power, and artillery as a corollary weapon, were directed by an occupying power, the United States, at the civilian population in the rural areas of the country under occupation. The targets of the bombs and shells were the noncombatants themselves, because it was believed that their existence was important to the enemy. Air Power became a distinct weapon of terror to empty the countryside. Samuel P. Huntington, of Harvard, has even coined a marvelously American euphemism for the technique—"forced-draft urbanization and modernization." Some of us prefer a quotation from Tacitus that the late Bernard Fall was fond of citing: "Where they make a desert they call it peace."

One key to understanding this use of airpower in South Vietnam is to compare the unrestricted bombing in the south with the elaborate restrictions that surrounded the air campaign against North Vietnam.

Although the North Vietnamese may not believe it, in the North a conscious effort was made to bomb only military, and what limited industrial targets were available, and to weigh probable civilian casualties against the military advantages to be gained from a particular airstrike. The ultimate objective of the air campaign against the North was, to be sure, political rather than military. It sought to intimidate the North Vietnamese into withdrawing their forces from the South and taking the Vietcong guerrillas along with them. And undoubtedly the restrictions were also designed to escape the unfavorable publicity that would result from severe civilian casualties in the North.

The mere fact that an attempt was made to avoid them throws into sharp understanding the very different motives that lay behind the bombing in the south and the inherent acceptance of great civilian suffering. When Harrison Salisbury, an assistant managing editor of *The New York Times*, visited North Vietnam in December, 1966, to write

his memorable series of articles on the destruction wrought by American air raids there (civilian homes, schools, hospitals and churches had been wrecked because the air campaign had never been the surgical operation Pentagon propaganda portrayed it as being), the most severe example of civilian deaths the North Vietnamese claimed was 89 in the town of Nandinh southeast of Hanoi, from six months of bombing, less than half the official South Vietnamese estimate of the number of civilians killed in the five hamlets I found on the coast of Quangnai Province in 1965.

Did the employment of the air weapon and the artillery in South Vietnam thus exceed the limits sanctioned by the laws of war?

The United States Army Field Manual says: "The law of war . . . requires that belligerents refrain from employing any kind or degree of violence which is not actually necessary for military purposes and that they conduct hostilities with regard for the principles of humanity and chivalry." The Manual goes on to explain what is meant by "actually necessary for military purposes," i.e. military necessity. "The prohibitory effect of the law of war is not minimized by 'military necessity' which has been defined as that principle which justifies those measures not forbidden by international law which are indispensable for securing the complete submission of the enemy as soon as possible. Military necessity has been rejected as a defense for acts forbidden by the customary or conventional laws of war inasmuch as the latter have been developed and framed with consideration for the concept of military necessity." In short, if you can demonstrate certain measures are required to defeat the enemy, and those measures are not specifically forbidden by the laws of war, you employ them.

Assuming that the use of air power in South Vietnam was not specifically forbidden by the laws of war, was this means necessary to defeat the enemy? He could have been deprived of the rural population by another, more humane method. This would have involved putting sufficient American ground troops in South Vietnam to occupy most of the countryside and thereby gain control over the rural hamlets. National mobilization and the dispatch of upwards of 600,000 troops to South Vietnam was proposed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and rejected by President Johnson and his advisers, because this strategy would have meant higher draft calls, wage and price controls, and other measures that would have been unpopular with the American public. So there are grounds for believing that the use of the air weapon in the South was not a military necessity but a political convenience, a substitute for sufficient infantrymen to hold the countryside.

I am not saying that garrisoning South Vietnam with ground troops would have made the war a sensible enterprise. I am suggesting that the war's impact upon the Vietnamese might have been more merciful. The Marines, because of their pre-World-War-II experience with pacification in Central America and the Caribbean, did make an attempt to hold a good many of the hamlets in central Vietnamese provinces where they operated. Life for a Vietnamese farmer within these zones was safer than for his brethren in other regions.

In any case, to address the basic question of legal sanctions, it appears that the employment of air and artillery to terrorize the peasantry and raze the countryside was an act specifically forbidden by the laws of war. The Geneva Convention of 1949 Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War states:

"The High Contracting Parties specifically agree that each of them is prohibited from taking any measure of such a character as to cause the physical suffering or extermination of protected persons [civilians] in their

hands. This prohibition applies not only to murder, torture, corporal punishment, mutilation and medical or scientific experiments not necessitated by the medical treatment of a protected person, but also to any other measures of brutality whether applied by civilian or military agents.

"No protected person may be punished for an offense he or she has not personally committed. Collective penalties and likewise all measures of intimidation or of terrorism are prohibited.

"Pillage is prohibited.

"Reprisals against protected persons and their property are prohibited."

The paragraphs seem to be a reasonably fair description of what was inflicted upon much of the South Vietnamese peasantry by the United States.

The Army Field Manual is more specific. "The measure of permissible devastation is found in the strict necessities of war," it says. "Devastation as an end in itself or as a separate measure of war [italics added] is not sanctioned by the law of war."

The adoption of devastation as a basic element of strategy also seems to have led American leaders into what may be related war crimes against South Vietnamese civilians. The Geneva Convention of 1949 states that a belligerent power has a duty, in so far as it is able, to care for the victims of war.

"The wounded and the sick, as well as the infirm, and expectant mothers, shall be the object of particular protection and respect. As far as military considerations allow, each party to the conflict shall facilitate the steps taken to search for the killed and wounded, to assist the shipwrecked and other persons exposed to grave danger, and to protect them against pillage and ill-treatment."

The consignment of Vietnamese civilian war wounded to provincial hospitals that were little better than charnel houses has been a national scandal for the United States. The reports of the Kennedy Subcommittee describe the scenes of two wounded to a bed, no sheets or mattresses, no showers, filthy toilets, open sewers and swarms of flies spreading infection. In contrast the United States military hospitals are models of medical science. Given the wide publicity the deplorable conditions in these Vietnamese civilian hospitals have received over the years, would it be possible for the responsible leaders of the United States to contend that the neglect was not deliberate?

A similar war crime may have been committed against civilians forcibly evacuated from their homes. These persons would appear to fall under the category of internees in the Geneva Convention of 1949. The Convention lays out in great detail the obligation of a belligerent power to provide such persons with adequate food, housing and medical care. Here is an excerpt from a report to the Kennedy Subcommittee by a team from the General Accounting Office which inspected so-called refugee camps in South Vietnam last summer. The excerpt describes a camp in Quangnam Province on the central coast:

"At this location, there were about 2,070 people. We were informed that only 883 were recognized as refugees and that they would receive temporary benefits. We were advised that these people were all Vietcong families and that they were relocated by force in February or March 1970. These people are under heavy guard by the Vietnamese military.

"During our inspection, we observed there were no latrines, no usable wells, no classrooms, and no medical facilities. The shelters were crudely constructed from a variety of waste material, such as empty ammunition boxes and cardboard. We observed that the number of shelters would not adequately house these people.... The [American] refugee adviser stated that there were

no plans to improve the living conditions at this site."

The fact that these persons are being held by the South Vietnamese authorities apparently does not absolve the United States of responsibility under the laws of war. Legally they remain our refugees. As the Army Field Manual explains:

"The restrictions placed upon the authority of a belligerent government cannot be avoided by a system of using a puppet government, central or local, to carry out acts which would be unlawful if performed directly by the occupant. Acts induced or compelled by the occupant are nonetheless its acts." The Saigon regime is not a puppet government, but it is a client regime whose existence is dependent upon the United States. A good argument could be made that because of this client relationship, the United States induces these acts. Telford Taylor, of Columbia, the former chief American prosecutor of Nuremberg, quantifies the neglect of the civilian war wounded and refugees. In "Nuremberg and Vietnam: An American Tragedy," he notes that the United States spent, at the most, a quarter-billion dollars to ease the civilian plight over the three years from 1965 through 1967. You will think this is a lot of money, until he tells you the amount was less than four per cent of the cost of air operations over the same period.

What about a relationship between the use of airpower and artillery in South Vietnam and the garden variety war crimes that many of the books in this bibliography allege—the individual acts of torture and murder of prisoners and civilians by American soldiers, the burning of peasant huts in "Zippo raids," the looting and the rape? Did the conduct of the war as approved at the highest levels create an atmosphere in which the lives of the Vietnamese were so cheapened that they became subhumans in the eyes of the soldier? If so, did this atmosphere help to incite these individual war crimes, given the traditional racism of Americans towards Asians—the dinks, the gooks, the slopeheads—and the psychological stress upon the soldier of fighting in a country where much of the population is hostile, where women and children do set mines and boobytraps and shoot at you?

The two accounts of the My Lai massacre mentioned in this bibliography, Richard Hammer's "One Morning in the War" and Seymour Hersh's "My Lai 4," as well as the testimony that has emerged at the court martial of Lieutenant Calley, of practices like driving civilians ahead of the troops to detonate mines with their bodies suggest that the general conduct of the war did contribute to these individual atrocities.

The word Lieutenant Calley used to describe the act of slaughtering the 102 men, women and children for whose deaths he is being held responsible evokes this atmosphere in uncanny fashion. He told the prosecutor that he was ordered "to waste the Vietnamese... waste, waste them, Sir." Were this just Lieutenant Calley speaking the word would not carry much meaning, but the word is from the argot of the American soldier in Vietnam. Human beings are "wasted" there, they are "blown away." Soldiers have a unique ability to find words to describe the reality of their wars.

Given such an atmosphere, the massacre at My Lai would be a departure from the norm only in that it consisted of the direct murder by rifle and machine gun fire of several hundred Vietnamese civilians at one time. The soldiers in Lieutenant Calley's platoon, whose moral sense led them to disregard his orders and not participate in the killings, do not appear to have been shocked by the lesser, individual atrocities that occurred prior to My Lai. Looked at coldly, Lieutenant Calley and the soldiers who did join

him in the massacre were doing with their rifles what was done every day for reasons of strategy with bombs and artillery shells. There are Calleys in every army. What makes them dangerous is a set of circumstances in which their homicidal aberrations can run amok. The laws of war say that it is the responsibility of the highest leadership to do all in its power to prevent such circumstances from occurring.

Both the Army Field Manual and the Nuremberg Principles address this central issue in delineating when a claim of superior orders can constitute a defense against a charge of war crimes. "The fact that a person acted pursuant to order of his Government or of a superior does not relieve him from responsibility under international law, provided a moral choice was in fact possible for him" [italics added], the Nuremberg Principles say. The Army Field Manual is a bit more elaborate. "In considering the question whether a superior order constitutes a valid defense, the court shall take into consideration the fact that obedience to lawful military orders is the duty of every member of the Armed Forces; that the latter cannot be expected, in condition of war discipline, to weigh scrupulously the legal merits of the orders received; that certain rules of warfare may be controversial; or that an act otherwise amounting to a war crime may be done in obedience to orders conceived as a measure of reprisal," the Manual says.

Curiously, Lieutenant Calley's lawyers have claimed that he has a robot-like personality incapable of resisting any orders from his superior, Captain Ernest Medina, but they have not sought to defend Calley on the grounds that, given the general atmosphere in which the war was being conducted, and his interpretation of his orders that morning in My Lai, he may not have been capable of a moral choice. They may have hesitated to do so because they would have had to put the entire command structure from President Johnson on down in the witness chair. Telford Taylor notes in his book that a court martial at Fort Benning is too limited a forum for such a far-reaching inquiry.

Nevertheless, the question of higher responsibility hangs over My Lai. It hangs over the individual atrocities described in these books, it hangs over the use of airpower and artillery to lay waste the Vietnamese villages, if that, too, constitutes a war crime and the greatest one of all.

Many would contend, as Townsend Hoopes did in an exchange of articles with two reporters for the Village Voice who accused him and his colleagues of being war criminals, that raising the issue of war crimes in Vietnam is absurd and unwarranted in the context of a democracy like the United States. Worse, many would argue, it is vindictive, capable of perversion into a new McCarthyism. Hoopes was a Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force in the Johnson Administration. He wrote an admirable account of the inside events behind the March 31, 1968, decision to restrict the bombing of North Vietnam and open peace negotiations. His view is important because it appears to be widely held.

Hoopes argued that since the President is elected, since the war was prosecuted from well-meaning if mistaken motives, since Congress voted the funds and there was broad public support at the outset, no official should acquire criminal liability. Judgment, he said, should be confined to voting the Government out of office. Attacking this position in his introduction to the Russell Tribunal proceedings, Noam Chomsky of M.I.T. states that Hoopes is claiming an immunity for American leaders which this country denied to the leaders of Japan and Germany. Marcus Raskin, co-director of the Institute for Policy Studies in Washington, the think-tank of the New Left, asserts that Congress



cannot be held responsible as a body, because many Congressmen voted funds merely to ensure that American soldiers had the means to defend themselves. Telford Taylor, a mugwump Democrat, remarks that though good intentions may be mitigating circumstances, they do not negate the fact of a crime, if one occurred.

Taken to its logical end, the Hoopes argument also means that all Americans were responsible for the actual conduct of the war. If so, then the adult majorities of Japan and Germany should have been punished for war crimes. They applauded the beginning of World War II. And if everyone is responsible, of course no one is responsible. The Nuremberg and Tokyo tribunals rejected Hoopes' argument by making a distinction between those in the audience and those who held power, as do the laws of war. The Army Manual denies a collective copout: "The fact that a person who committed an act which constitutes a war crime acted as the head of a State or as a responsible government official does not relieve him from responsibility for his act."

(Hyperbole in describing what war crimes may have taken place in Vietnam seems just as unhelpful as the Hoopes argument. Chomsky in "At War With Asia," accuses the United States of intending genocide in Vietnam. So do Richard Falk, the international legal scholar, and Gabriel Kolko, the revisionary historian, both of whom have otherwise diamond-cutting minds, in "War Crimes and the American Conscience," the published proceedings of a Washington symposium on war crimes last year. Genocide does not appear to be an accurate characterization of American conduct in Vietnam. The story is more complicated and the facts do not support the charge. The population of the country has grown despite the war, from an estimated 15-million in 1962 to about 17-million now.)

But how is this country to determine whether war crimes were really committed in Vietnam and who is responsible for them?

Not even the wildest of anti-communist politicians has predicted the conquest of the United States by the Vietcong guerrillas and the North Vietnamese army. So it seems equally outlandish to imagine that a tribunal with the power of those at Tokyo and Nuremberg will ever sit in judgment on the leaders of this country.

The Army, the principal service involved in the Vietnam war, has shown that it will not enforce military law and judge itself. The dismissal of charges against Maj. Gen. Samuel W. Koster, the division commander of the troops at My Lai, demonstrated that the current leadership of the Army considers Lieutenant Calley and Captain Medina to be its only real war criminals. Barring unforeseen disclosure, no one more important than a few captains, a major and a colonel or two are likely to join Calley and Medina in the dock. For the Army had a good case against General Koster, who was in his helicopter over the My Lai area that morning. What the Army lacked was the will to prosecute.

Perhaps it is expecting too much of human nature to think that the Army would sit in judgment on its own conduct in Vietnam. A command structure so traumatized, so emotionally defensive because of its failure in Vietnam, is not, except under great outside duress, about to begin charging members of the inner circle with war crimes.

Indeed, the military services are in the greatest danger of becoming the scapegoats of a public witchhunt that could come from the left over the war crimes issue if responsible men do not prevail. Mark Lane's collection of purported eyewitness accounts of atrocities in Vietnam, "Conversations with Americans," is an example of the kind of scurrilous attack that is already being made.

The military have few defenders in the current climate. Much of the intellectual community and many of the students are almost childishly indiscriminate in their assaults. A number of the former senior civilian officials of the country, who have changed their minds about the war they helped to prosecute, are now all too eager to blame everything on the generals.

Professional soldiers, whose frame of reference is almost by nature circumscribed, are being criticized for not having displayed the kind of broad wisdom and judgment self-proclaimed statesmen did not exhibit. If the generals did commit war crimes in Vietnam, they did so with the knowledge and consent of the civilians. If seeking to pacify with the fire and the sword of the 20th-century, airplanes and howitzers, constituted a war crime, then the civilians helped to induce this crime by denying the generals sufficient troops to garrison the countryside.

President Johnson and his closest advisers, Robert S. McNamara, Walt W. Rostow, and Dean Rusk, directed the unfolding of the conflict just as President Nixon and his senior advisers now do. The military almost always played a subordinate role. Mr. McNamara, for example, supervised the planning and the execution of the war for the President as the chief of a European General Staff would have done. In 1965 he often said: "We're going to trade firepower for men." He had no criminal intent, of course. What he meant was that he planned to expend ten bombs to kill five North Vietnamese soldiers, instead of trading the lives of five American infantrymen for the same job. But when the bombs were targeted on civilians, Mr. McNamara did not cry halt. This is not to say that the generals would be absolved of responsibility, only that the highest, and therefore the greatest, responsibility does not rest with them.

For precisely this reason, one cannot expect the Nixon Administration, of its own accord, to institute any meaningful inquiry into war crimes. Mr. Nixon is using the same airpower tactics in Laos and Cambodia that his predecessor employed in South Vietnam. His strategy of Vietnamization is even more dependent upon the unrestricted use of airpower than was Mr. Johnson's. Mr. Nixon has also sensed even more keenly the political convenience of this weapon. He has calculated correctly that the public will not worry much about the dead, or about their age or sex, so long as the bodies are far enough away that the photographers and the television crews can't get to them too often and so long as they are, most important of all, not American.

The Kennedy Subcommittee estimates that civilian casualties in Laos, which has a population of only three million, are now exceeding 30,000 a year, including more than 10,000 dead. Many of these casualties are attributable to American bombs. Classified military documents specifically talk about bombing villages in Communist-held areas "to deprive the enemy of the population resource." No one knows what the civilian casualty toll is in Cambodia, where the same kind of air attacks are taking place. The Kennedy Subcommittee guesses there are now about a million and a half refugees in Cambodia out of a population of 6.5 million and that civilian casualties are running in the tens of thousands a year.

When I asked a responsible official at the State Department about the refugees he said he didn't have an estimate. Why? I asked. "The Cambodians haven't really asked us for any assistance with refugees and until they do it's not our concern. Our staff in the Embassy is pretty small and they have a lot of other fish to fry." What about the civilian casualties? "The Cambodians haven't been compiling them," he said. "We're de-

pendent on their statistics and they don't keep careful statistics on anything." Really, that's what he said. The new American aid program for Cambodia contains no funds specifically marked for civilian medical relief.

Yet the cleansing of the nation's conscience and the future conduct of the most powerful country in the world towards the weaker peoples of the globe, demand a national inquiry into the war crimes question. What is needed is not prison sentences and executions, but social judgments soberly arrived at, so that if these acts are war crimes, future American leaders will not dare to repeat them.

The sole hope for such a national inquiry would appear to rest with the Congress or a commission of responsible men, with military and judicial experience, appointed by Congress and empowered to subpoena witnesses and examine documents. They might try to answer one fundamental question that I have not attempted to deal with here because the arguments are still so tangled—whether the United States intervention in Vietnam was itself a violation of the Nuremberg Principles forbidding wars of aggression. There does not seem to be the stomach for such an inquiry in Congress now, but attitudes may change as the full import of the issue becomes known.

If Congress fails to undertake an inquiry that carries the authority of the nation, then hypocrisy will be added to our sins. The Nuremberg judgments upon such diabolical Nazi crimes as the extermination of the Jews will still stand as a monument to international justice. Even under the most critical scrutiny, nothing the United States has perpetrated approaches the satanic evil of Hitler and his followers. The Nazis were in a class by themselves.

But the other, lesser judgments at Nuremberg, and the verdicts at the Tokyo Tribunal, will become what many said they were at the time—the pronouncements of victors over vanquished. We ought to remember that at the Tokyo Tribunal, the United States went so far as to establish the legal precedent that any member of a Cabinet who learns of war crimes, and subsequently remains in that Government acquires responsibility for those crimes. Under our own criteria, therefore, Orville Freeman, the Secretary of Agriculture under President Johnson, could acquire responsibility for war crimes in Vietnam.

Recently, when I discussed with a Japanese friend the condemnation of General Yamashita for the death of more than 25,000 noncombatants in the Philippines, he remarked: "We Japanese have a saying. The victor is always right."

History shows that men who decide for war, as the Japanese militarists did, cannot demand mercy for themselves. The resort to force is the ultimate act. It is playing God. Those who try force cannot afford to fail. I do not mean to suggest that men should be free to attempt anything in war to ensure victory. Quite the opposite. The laws of war seek to mitigate the evil of war, to save what lives can be saved in the midst of great killing. War nonetheless remains an evil that imposes a unique burden upon those responsible. This will sound cynical to many, but if the Johnson Administration had won the war in Vietnam, few would be searching for war crimes among the physical and human ruins of Indochina. Evidence of murder and brutality on a grand scale would have been hushed in the shouts of success. The resort to force has failed, however, and that failure has helped to make the issue of war crimes in Vietnam a very real and a very fair one to be dealt with. Our failure presents an opportunity for humanity that should not be lost.

## A CRITIQUE OF "ROTC, MYLAI, AND THE VOLUNTEER ARMY"

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on March 15 I placed in the RECORD a series of articles on the issue of the citizen soldier and the career soldier. A critique of the Foreign Policy article I included has been brought to my attention. I introduce it for the benefit of those who read my previous insertion:

(From the Friends Committee on National Legislation)

AN UNPERSUASIVE CASE FOR DRAFT EXTENSION  
(By Holmes Brown)

The recent article "ROTC, Mylai, and the Voluntary Army," in the Spring 1971 issue of *Foreign Policy* reprinted in the March 15,

1971 *Congressional Record*, p. 6536, raises a number of challenging questions but fails to prove the proposition that an end to the draft would have a deleterious effect upon the quality and attitudes of America's career officer corps. A careful examination of the concerns raised in the article, compared with data cited in the Gates Commission Report suggests rather that a volunteer army is a more satisfactory response to these questions than either extension of the current system or draft reform.

The authors of "ROTC, Mylai, and the Voluntary Army" begin by observing that ROTC is under attack on a number of campuses, and they express the fear that the reduction or dismantling of ROTC could result in a dramatic increase in the number of officers drawn from the service academies and the enlisted ranks whose attitudes would have an unsettling effect on both domestic and world policies. There follows a series of tables which indicate varying differences of opinion among academy, ROTC, and non-ROTC respondents. The difficulty with this opening section is that the fears expressed concerning ROTC are groundless and much of the

data relating to student attitudes are inconclusive or irrelevant.

As to whether attacks on ROTC will result in its demise, Senator Cranston in the March 14 edition of the *Washington Post* observes that "there are today more students and colleges desiring scholarship ROTC programs than there are spaces or units available." He further notes that while more than 50 colleges and universities are now actively interested in initiating their own ROTC program, some of the 12 colleges which recently dropped ROTC are inquiring about reestablishing their units.

The related concern that ROTC might be officially terminated is equally unfounded. No Congressional sponsors of the volunteer army favor abolition of ROTC, rather they support its expansion. And the Gates Commission contends that instead of causing a constantly diminishing supply of college trained officers (whose more liberal and circumspect outlook the authors admire in comparison with service academy alumni) the volunteer army promises a steadily increasing number of college graduates in both the ROTC and OCS programs.

TABLE 6-11.—ARMY COMMISSIONED OFFICER REQUIREMENTS AND POTENTIAL SUPPLY IN AN ALL-VOLUNTEER FORCE

(2,500,000-man force level)

Fiscal year	Potential supply						Total	Required accessions	Estimated surplus or shortage
	ROTC			OCS					
	Academy <sup>1</sup>	Scholarship <sup>2</sup>	Nonscholarship <sup>3</sup>	College graduates <sup>4</sup>	Noncollege graduates <sup>5</sup>	Others <sup>6</sup>			
1971.....	900	1,400	11,200	200	1,000	1,400	16,100	16,800	-700
1972.....	900	1,500	8,000	300	1,000	500	12,200	5,300	+6,900
1973.....	1,000	2,000	5,700	300	1,000	600	10,600	7,100	+3,500
1974.....	1,000	2,500	3,200	400	1,000	1,000	9,100	11,400	-2,300
1975.....	1,000	2,500	3,100	500	1,000	700	8,800	8,700	+100
1976.....	1,000	2,500	4,100	500	1,000	700	9,800	8,500	+1,300
1977.....	1,000	2,500	5,100	500	1,000	800	10,900	9,900	+1,000
1978.....	1,000	2,500	6,000	600	1,000	800	11,900	9,500	+2,400
1979.....	1,000	2,500	6,800	600	1,000	800	12,700	9,000	+3,700
1980.....	1,000	2,500	7,300	600	1,000	800	13,200	9,400	+3,800

<sup>1</sup> Based on current Army plans.

<sup>2</sup> Assumes an increase in current Army plans of 500 in 1973 and 1,000 thereafter.

<sup>3</sup> Assumes the additional 1,000 ROTC scholarships are given to new applicants and are not included in ROTC projections (original 1,500 were assumed to be included).

<sup>4</sup> Assumes growth in 1964 proportion of college graduates entering OCS in line with estimated growth in male college population adjusted for the war-induced decline in the rate estimated from ROTC. Estimated proportion of draft-induced volunteers among 1964 entrants equals 60 percent.

<sup>5</sup> Assumes approximately 10 percent of officer entrants will be noncollege graduates.

<sup>6</sup> Includes mostly direct appointments and entrants from special commissioning programs. Ratio of such officer to total requirements instituted at prewar level.

Note: Numbers rounded to nearest 100.

If these projections are correct, the differences in attitude noted between academy personnel and ROTC graduates become mere tabulated facts rather than arguments for continued conscription, since on the one hand, a positive correlation between the draft and the number and quality of ROTC applicants has not been established, and on the other hand, the Gates Commission figures indicate that the ROTC program will be retained as the major source of officers entering the armed services.

It may be argued that the Gates Commission figures obtain only during peacetime with an army of 2.6 million, but Pentagon figures indicate that the presence of the draft did not result in a significant increase in the number of college students joining ROTC during the escalation of the war in Indochina. For as the demand for officers accelerated, the percentage of officers supplied by ROTC to the army fell from 60.5% in 1965 to 28.1% in 1968. The actual number of program graduates between the two years was a minuscule increase of 290. In contrast, the percentage of officers provided by non-college graduate programs grew from 4.6% in 1965 to 37.9% in 1968. The numerical increase in this category between 1965 and 1968 was nearly 13,000. Thus the contention that the draft provides a "leavening" effect on the doctrinaire officers of academy and OCS origin by inducing college graduates to enter ROTC is disproven. For during the war, when one suspects the preference for being an officer as opposed to a draftee would be greatest, a

minimal increase in that number of ROTC candidates occurred.

The polls conducted by the authors do demonstrate a vast difference of attitude between the college liberal arts major and his military counterpart. By quoting one senior officer as complaining: "Lieut. Calley never would have become an officer if we were not so short-handed. Why are we short-handed? Because the bastards at Harvard wouldn't... step up to their responsibilities." The authors suggest that one way to allay their fears of a militaristic officer corps would be to implement a highly selective draft of humanities majors charged with the duty of "leavening" and "surveilling" the military. But this alternative is not likely to appeal to those who currently oppose the draft as an inequitable infringement of personal liberties, nor to the military who would express some reluctance at accepting a draftee who had been selected for his incompatibility rather than his efficiency, and finally it would appeal least of all to the liberal arts graduate who might define "stepping up to his responsibilities" as working to end the war altogether, rather than making it more "humane" or palatable to either the Asian or American public.

In conclusion, the article fails to make the convincing correlations between conscription and a dangerous change in officers' attitudes which would provide one reason for retaining the draft.

There are many career officers who are revolted by the atrocities committed in this war, and who have been active in bringing

these issues to public attention. Col. Anthony B. Herbert brought charges against fellow officers "out of a sense of duty, the dictates of his conscience, love of country—and in the best interests of the Army" according to a *Washington Post*, March 15 story by Philip D. Carter.

Ultimately, if the American military establishment endangers the Republic, it is not going to be the draft motivated volunteers, of whom only 16% re-enlist, who control the threat, but rather it must be a concerned and vigilant Congress and public.

## ESSAY ON SOUTHERN AFRICA

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, one of our Nation's most distinguished and respected diplomats, George Kennan, has published a thoughtful essay on Southern Africa in the January issue of *Foreign Affairs*.

Although I do not necessarily agree with some of Mr. Kennan's conclusions, I believe he has provided in this article a useful and exhaustive survey of the current situation in that area. In view



of my longstanding interest in Portugal and the interest of many thousands of Portuguese Americans in my district, I would call particular attention to Mr. Kennan's treatment of the situation in Angola and Mozambique. In sharp contrast to the racist policies of South Africa, Kennan asserts, these Portuguese colonies are marked by a near total lack of discrimination.

He also notes the rapid change and development taking place in these territories. The number of primary school students in Angola, for example, has increased by some 500 percent in the last 15 years, and the secondary school population by as much as 850 percent. And, within the last 10 years, a university has been established in each of these territories.

In sum, although the Portuguese were late in instituting such reforms, considerable progress is now being made. Presumably, by the time the native peoples' aspirations for independence have reached full tide, a well-educated and relatively prosperous base for governing the new nations will have been established.

Mr. Speaker, I include the full text of Mr. Kennan's essay at this point in the Record:

**HAZARDOUS COURSES IN SOUTHERN AFRICA**  
(By George F. Kennan)

Stretching southward from the two great river systems of the Congo and the Zambesi to the confluence of the Atlantic and Indian Oceans, and thus comprising roughly the southern third of the African continent, there lies a vast area, about two-thirds the size of the United States, which constitutes in its entirety one of the principal problem-children of the world community. Consisting largely of an arid central plateau, with lower coastal strips only partially suitable for human habitation, this region harbors a population of some 41,000,000, of whom, in approximate terms, 34,000,000 might be of black African origin, 4,500,000 of European, and the remainder of mixed or other blood. It is made up of a number of highly disparate political entities; the great Portuguese dependencies of Angola and Mozambique, the highly controversial territories of Rhodesia and South West Africa, the Republic of South Africa, and the three former British High Commission territories, now independent: Lesotho, Swaziland and Botswana.

With the exception of these last-named entities, which make up only a small portion of the whole, there is no part of this area which has not been in recent years the subject of violent discontent, debate, protest and conflict in the United Nations and in world opinion generally. Controversy has centered, of course, on the political relations existing there between people of European origin and the black Africans who constitute everywhere the majority. This is scarcely surprising. The area contains at least 90 percent of the entire white population of Africa, as against 11 percent of its Blacks. Of the white inhabitants, furthermore, a considerable proportion have been settled in Africa for many generations, having even in some instances come no later than did the Blacks to the settlement of the regions in which they are now residing. In these circumstances racial problems were bound to be of a different order—greater in scale, emotionally more acute—than elsewhere in Africa. It could scarcely have been otherwise. This distinction notwithstanding, the demands of the international community, particularly as formulated by the senior bodies

of the United Nations, have tended to be no different than those previously raised with relation to the African countries farther north: i.e. immediate decolonization, in the case of the Portuguese territories, and the establishment everywhere of régimes drawn, whether by democratic means or otherwise, from the black African majorities.

Elsewhere in Africa these demands have been generally accepted. In southern Africa, aside from the three former High Commission territories, the controlling powers have resolutely refused to accept them, alleging them to be demagogically inspired, historically unjust, economically unrealistic and detrimental even to the interests of the black African populations involved. The resulting political conflict, massive and tragic, has now weighed heavily, over a period of several years, on the stability of international life: preempting larger sections of U.N. debate, complicating relations among outside powers, interfering with normal cultural and commercial as well as political contacts throughout the region, reducing greatly the contribution this region, itself the seat of most of the industrial strength of Africa, could make to the life of the remainder of the continent and indeed to world affairs generally.

II

It may be best, in tackling the bundle of problems that southern Africa presents, to go first to the one that is the most difficult and recalcitrant of all as well as being the one that involves the largest number of people, namely, South Africa itself.

It should perhaps be made clear at the outset that the present examination does not rest on any disposition to minimize the evils of South African apartheid. These are real, ubiquitous, shocking and depressing. It is idle to argue whether the fault proceeds from the nature of the theories these policies are designed to serve or from the manner in which the theories are put into execution. No merits of theory could justify, and no deficiencies of execution excuse, the inequities and inhumanities which the present system obviously produces. This is a painful indictment to make for one who has many South African friends whose goodwill he credits and whose feelings he respects. Candor, unfortunately, permits no other judgment.

One can accept, and even sympathize with, the theory that in a country which is a veritable jumble of cultures and races each of the cultural or racial groups should enjoy the privilege of retaining its traditional identity and developing its life in its own way. But none of this would seem to necessitate or to justify either the general condition of denial to the majority of the population of any effective voice in the shaping of the larger aspects of its own condition or a whole series of specific anomalies, injustices and hardships which the laws and practices of the South African regime now impose. Among these latter might be mentioned: the viciousness of the pass laws and their enforcement; the absurdities and extremisms of petty apartheid; the multitudinous hardships inflicted on the urban Bantu by the régime's insistence on clinging to the absurd theory of the temporary nature of their residence in the urban areas; the power and disposition of the police to ignore, almost at will, the protection afforded to the individual by an otherwise excellent judicial system; the magnitude of the disparities in wages and in public expenditure on education as between Whites and non-Whites; and the hardships worked by the recent inclusion under the strictures of apartheid of the Asians and the Cape Coloureds—the latter, in particular, a people, largely Afrikaners-speaking, who have no culture, no tongue and no remembered past other than those of the Whites who in-

flict these strictures upon them. (This listing is only illustrative, not inclusive.)

There are, on the other hand, a number of circumstances relative to this indictment, often ignored in Western opinion, which, while they do not excuse the conditions in question, go far to explain them and to make clear why suitable alternatives are not always easy to discover.

It should be recognized, first of all, that the South African Whites, and the Afrikaners in particular, are confronted with a very real problem when it comes to maintaining, in the face of a large black African majority, their own historical and cultural identity. It is a remarkable identity, forged and affirmed over the course of centuries, at times in struggle and adversity, and against a background of circumstances in some respects different from that which any other people has ever had to face. It is an identity in which, as in the case of the Israeli, national components are mixed, for better or for worse, with religious ones; and the Afrikaners are no more inclined to jeopardize it, by placing themselves entirely in the power of a surrounding foreign majority, than are their Middle Eastern counterparts. They would die rather than do so; and it is simply useless to come at them with demands which suggest that it is this that is expected of them.

Secondly, slight as may seem the prospects for any early change in the political situation of the non-Whites in South Africa, it cannot be said that their situation in other respects is unchanging or that its development does not have hopeful aspects. The Nationalists, when reproached over the evils of apartheid, often say in reply: "Give us time. The native will have, ultimately, no complaint. But we will do things in our own time and our own way." Whether the Nationalist concept of the end to be ultimately achieved is the same as that of the many foreign critics may be doubted; but the point made here is not entirely without substance. Real incomes among the urban Bantu, even allowing for inflationary tendencies, are increasing by about four percent per annum. Bantu are being brought into the labor market at a rate of about 2½ percent per annum. Educational opportunities, already in some respects far ahead of those existing in the black-ruled countries to the north, are showing steady improvement, particularly at the primary and trade school levels. The wage disparities, as between Whites and Blacks, are of course excessive and onerous and deserve prompt correction. But one must not forget that there are severe limits to the pace at which this correction could safely be effected. A sudden and complete removal of these disparities would unquestionably undermine the competitive viability of great sections of the South African mining and industrial establishment, which now give employment to hundreds of thousands of black Africans, and would in many instances force the closing of the enterprises, with consequences disastrous to black African living standards.

In judging South African conditions much depends, invariably, on the perspective of the viewer. It will thus be pointed out, in rebuttal of what has just been said, that if living standards among the Blacks are improving, those of the Whites are improving even faster; and a similar point will be made with respect to educational advancement. All this is true. But it would be wrong to ignore the extent to which the rapid economic development of the country is beginning to exert upon the white leadership an effective discipline in the direction of rethinking some of the extremisms of apartheid. The severe shortage of white labor is compelling, in ever-increasing degree, the admission of Blacks into positions within the industrial structure which, under a strict interpretation of the apartheid concepts and

regulations, they would not have been expected or permitted to occupy. The realization is steadily spreading, furthermore, among white businessmen and political leaders, that a great modern economy such as that of South Africa cannot continue to thrive or even to achieve a proper balance unless and until the majority of the population comes to command a strong purchasing power and to give proper dimensions to the consumers' market. In general, it may be said that there is a basic conflict between the concepts of separate development that now constitute the official ideology of the régime, on the one hand, and the needs of a successful and rapidly expanding industrial economy, on the other; and if the stormy pace of economic growth is continued, this conflict is bound to produce changes, and favorable ones, in the position of the non-white portions of the population.

Thirdly, it should be recognized that any sound and fair criticism of racial conditions in South Africa must bear in mind the position and interests not just of Whites and black Africans but also of the other racial groups, notably the Indians and the Cape Coloureds. It is by no means certain that their interests would be served by the sweeping, simplistic solutions to which the more emotional of the foreign critics are prone.

Finally, the foreign observer has to bear in mind that while a relaxation or removal of the present racial régime would presumably solve some of the problems of the native black South African, it would solve by no means all of them. Those that would remain would be problems of great seriousness, and ones that could not conceivably be solved except in intimate collaboration with the white community. There could be many illustrations of this; but a particularly vivid one might be found in the problem of the native "homelands"—the rural areas in which, ideally under the concepts of apartheid, the native Africans are eventually to find their permanent homes and to achieve complete autonomy and, in some instances, even independence.

It is true that these areas (and notably the greatest and most important of them—the Transkei), over-grazed, poor in resources, poor in capital, and overpopulated as they now are, would be quite incapable, in any foreseeable circumstances, of harboring successfully anything like the totality of the tribal groups theoretically assigned to them, many of whose members now reside in the large urban and industrial centers of the "white" area. To this extent the theory of apartheid is unrealistic as well as unjust. But it would be wrong to assume that the abolition of apartheid would produce anything resembling a solution of this problem.

The basic problem here is, as in other African countries that have no racial difficulty at all, sheer overpopulation. Present estimates are that instead of the expected 19,000,000 black Africans by the year 2,000, the figure on which governmental policies with respect to the homelands have heretofore been based, the actual figure will be closer to 35 to 40 million. The most optimistic estimates of the economic development of the homelands afford no reason to hope that these regions will be able to cope even with the existing black population, let alone anything resembling this increase. The existing program for construction of "border industries" just outside the homelands, to which the inhabitants of the latter could commute on a daily basis, will solve only a small part of the problem. The only other visible alternative is the continued residence of great masses of these people in the major urban areas, where the birth rate among them is only about one-half what it is in the rural areas, and where, theoretically at least, one might hope for a relative stabilization of their numbers.

But there are limits, as can easily be observed even in places remote from South Africa, to the rate at which any great city can successfully absorb immigrants from a primitive rural culture. And it is hard to conceive that any political régime could achieve much more in this respect than the present South African régime is achieving. One has to remember that the municipality of Johannesburg, South Africa's greatest city, has contrived to build on its own outskirts, just in the past two decades, a complete new city of individual homes, nearly 75,000 of them, complete with amenities such as schools, sport facilities and the greatest hospital in the Southern Hemisphere, to house over a half-million black Africans, many of whom previously resided in the most wretched sort of shantytowns. The position of the inhabitants of this vast native "township" leaves much to be desired in a number of respects, particularly as regards policing and transportation; but it would be unfair to the South African authorities not to recognize the magnitude of the effort they have put forward. A glance at the comparable records of great cities elsewhere should suffice to show that it is not likely that this sort of progress in the absorbing of a rural native population into urban areas could be much accelerated under any other conceivable régime.

The foreign critic, therefore, in weighing South Africa's problems, has to remember that the question of racial discrimination represents by no means the totality of them, and that there are some, including a few of the most profound and bitter ones, that could not possibly be mastered without the continued enthusiastic commitment—and this means in many respects the leadership—of the white South African community on whose shoulders the responsibilities of government now rest. The two communities are mutually dependent in a way that whites and Blacks farther north in Africa never were; and the problems of neither can be solved by the destruction or permanent frustration of the other.

### III

There is a sharp division of opinion among foreign observers and among well-informed South Africans themselves as to the present underlying trends and possibilities in the political life of the Republic. Some feel that the results of the recent election, repudiating the right wing of the Nationalist party and strengthening somewhat the position of its more moderate opponents, is the beginning of a trend in the direction of greater liberality and maturity of official policy—a trend bound to become strengthened as more young people come into the picture as voters. Others, seared perhaps too often by past disappointments, are skeptical. They see the Nationalist leaders as unshakable in their political monopoly, implacable in their commitment to the most unfeeling promulgation of apartheid, deaf to both outside and inside criticism.

The author, believing that no country in South Africa's position can live for long without change, and that change, in this instance, can hardly fail to be for the better, is himself inclined to the more optimistic of these analyses. But he is free to admit that there is, as yet, no adequate proof, one way or the other. It is entirely possible that he is wrong.

However this may be, the main determinants of change will be and must be, as in any other great country, internal. Over the long run no outside force can ever make great, lasting and beneficial changes in another country's life. This does not mean, however, that foreign reaction and opinion have, in the case of South Africa, no influence at all. They have some. There are few South African Whites who are not aware that not all things are as they should be in South Africa and who are not in some way sensi-

tive to outside opinion with relation to these conditions. The manner in which such people react to foreign opinion may vary greatly, however, from positive response to the most violent and determined resistance, depending upon the tenor and spirit of the criticism to which they find themselves subjected. If white South Africans are given to feel that they are viewed with implacable hatred by the outside world, and that the demands made upon them are ones that could be satisfied only by their punishment and humiliation or by some sort of mass emigration, this will only get people's backs up, produce a feeling that safety lies only in a deeper commitment to the principles of white supremacy, and cause otherwise moderate and well-disposed elements to rally in despair around the most intractable nationalist leadership. If, on the other hand, they are confronted with a foreign reaction that takes some account of the measure, the reality and the uniqueness of their problems, they may be importantly aided, as well as stimulated, to find better solutions.

Neither Blacks nor white liberals nor any other South Africans are aided, for example, by demands for Western policies designed to damage the South African economy. Aside from the fact that no outside efforts in this direction are likely to have any appreciable success, they are conceptually wrong in the first place. The black man would be the first to suffer from any serious failure in the process of economic growth. His best chances for a relaxation of apartheid lie, on the contrary, precisely in the continuation of the present rapid economic development of the country. No thoughtful and informed friend of the black African population of South Africa could logically wish for the obstruction and failure of the country's economy.

Similarly, efforts to bring about the isolation of South Africa from the remainder of the world community are simply counter-productive. The country, separated as it is by thousands of miles from the remainder of the Western world, already suffers from an excess of isolation. Apartheid is to some extent the reflection of this isolation. The reactionary and racist tendencies within South African society positively thrive on it. Nothing, on the other hand, with the exception of the economic development, places a greater strain on those tendencies than does extensive personal contact between South Africans and reasonable people in other countries. Apartheid is simply one manifestation of a great national introversion, and why any opponent of that system would wish to intensify the very condition it feeds upon is difficult to image.

Finally, the well-meaning outside critic will do well to avoid specific advice to the South Africans as to the manner in which their problems might best be solved. It is all right for him to record, and to emphasize, his disbelief that better, more humane and more hopeful approaches could not be found to South Africa's problems than those that dominate official policy today. It is all right for him to use his influence, in a friendly but earnest way, to bring the white South Africans to a reexamination of their own situation in a spirit larger and more compassionate, less dominated by petty anxieties and more cognizant of the community of fate that links them to their non-white fellow citizens, than the present inspiration of their policies. But the outsider will do well to avoid the responsibility he would incur by recommending specific courses of action.

The real state of mind of the South African native remains, so far as many of us can see, a book with seven seals. No one knows how this native would react to specific alternatives in the future course of South African policy. The hour is late. It may be too late.



A relaxation of the present iron hand might open the way to a brighter period in South African life. But it might conceivably, on the other hand, set in motion uncontrollable forces whose play could end only in violence and disaster. The writer does not believe this last to be the case. He is inclined to think that the white establishment in South Africa still has options more hopeful than that. But he cannot know for sure; and there is no reason for him to make assumptions. No changes in official South African policy will ever be successful unless they spring in the main from the workings of the country's own public opinion and political process. It is inadvisable and unproductive for outsiders to relieve the South African authorities of even the smallest degree of their own responsibility by forcing their hand and trying to tell them what to do. Let the friends of the various South African peoples hold the white rulers of that country to the recognition that to the outside world the present pattern of South African apartheid is abhorrent in aspect and unconvincing in rationale; but beyond that let it be the task of those rulers, who know their own situation better than any outsider can, to find the conceivable alternatives.

## IV

Nowhere is the conflict between the United Nations and the present ruling power in southern Africa so formal, so acute and so complete as in the case of South West Africa. Not just the General Assembly but in this case the Security Council as well has flatly demanded that South Africa withdraw immediately its administration of the territory and hand it over to the authority of the United Nations, and has threatened South Africa with "effective measures in accordance with the appropriate provisions . . . of the United Nations Charter" in the event of noncompliance. The South African rejection of these demands has been no less determined and categorical. The impasse is now complete. It is all the more dangerous because positions have been so formalized on both sides.

Bearing in mind that in international affairs all legal distinctions rest on infirm foundations, one can follow the legal arguments advanced by the United Nations in favor of the termination of the mandate and the establishment of its own authority in South West Africa. It is more difficult to see what the world organization would do with the territory if it had it. This vast arid region, as large as France and the German Federal Republic combined, is inhabited by only 610,000 people. Of these, approximately 96,000 are white South Africans—Afrikaners for the most part—of whom nearly 90 percent live in the administrative center of Windhoek, in the west-central part of the territory. The remaining population is made up of indigenous peoples comprising about half-a-dozen distinct ethnic groups. Of these, nearly 65 percent reside in the northern region of the territory, near the Portuguese border, some 500 miles north of Windhoek, where they are very little troubled by the proximity or competition of Whites. The majority of these northern natives (the majority, in fact, of the entire indigenous population of South West Africa), in the number of some 300,000, to be exact, are known as the Ovambos. They live in a native homeland—Ovamboland by name—which now enjoys fairly extensive rights of local autonomy. This is perhaps the only native "homeland" under South African control which would seem to have reasonably favorable prospects for progress under the existing concepts of "separate development." Much better watered than most of the rest of the territory, it is relatively ample in area and provides a home for at least 95 percent of the Ovambos. The South African official presence is neither numerous nor bur-

densome. (Of the territory's 102 policemen, for example, only 50—or about one to each 6,000 inhabitants—are white.) No Whites other than officials are permitted to reside or even normally to travel in the territory. Educational standards at the primary and secondary level compare with the best in Africa. Health and medical services are exemplary. Taxation of the natives, except locally and by their own administration, is negligible.

The overwhelming portion of the expense of maintaining and developing the territory is supplied by the South Africans. Their present contributions of \$4,350,000 annually for budgetary expenditures and \$12,420,000 in developmental capital run, together, to about \$55.00 per capita, as compared with \$6.10 in aid from all sources as the average for the black African countries farther north. This is in addition to a bevy of other services—water development, soil research, pest control, public health, meteorological service, etc.—which are extended automatically by virtual inclusion of the territory in the South African state, and could hardly be effectively provided by any other than a highly advanced, and preferably contiguous, country.

Things are not ideal for the Ovambos, and particularly not for those who aspire to higher education or who would like to play a role in public affairs outside their own territory. These, however, are a small minority. As for the remainder: it is difficult to believe that their material condition could be improved, or their capacities for self-government given more extensive scope for development, by any sort of U.N. administration.

This narrows the problem, essentially, to that of the remaining 200,000 non-Whites in the territory. These, for the most part, do not reside in the homelands tentatively marked out for them; most of them probably never will. They suffer indeed from all the restrictions of apartheid, although the atmosphere is perhaps somewhat less tense and cramped than in the Republic proper. If all that was involved in a South African withdrawal and a U.N. takeover was an alleviation of their situation in these respects, there might be much to be said for it, although the effect on the more fortunate Ovambos would still have to be considered. But one is obliged, regrettably, to consider not just the likely positive but also the predictable negative consequences of such a turn of events.

In the event of a forced South African withdrawal, the overwhelming majority of the existing white population of the territory could be expected to withdraw together with the South African authorities. All existing administrative and social services would simply cease to exist. The railways are South African. Their rolling-stock, in its entirety the property of the South African State Railways, would assuredly be removed. Without the railways, the great non-ferrous and diamond mines, employment in which provides a large part of the income of the native population, would close down. In the case of the non-ferrous ones, their pumps would at once cease to function; it would be months before they could be reopened. Agriculture, too, would be largely paralyzed. The territory's only significant port, Walvis Bay, the status of which as a complete South African coastal enclave has never been questioned, would remain under South African administration.

Worst of all, while it is possible to imagine certain of the remaining tribal elements, notably the Ovambos, administering themselves (albeit largely without money), it is not possible to imagine any of these elements collaborating in the administration of any of the others. These tribal entities live, in many instances, hundreds of miles apart; there is no intimacy and little affection among them; none, one suspects, would respond favorably to the appearance in its

midst, as would-be administrators, of officials of another tribal affiliation. The United Nations would, in other words, have to create a new administration, largely foreign, to take the place of the South African one. It is easy to believe that such an administration would follow more liberal policies with respect to the status of the native than does the existing one. It is not easy to believe that it would be as efficient, or as well provided with funds; and it would almost certainly be years before it could expect to restore to this vast territory even a semblance of such good order and prosperity as it has now achieved.

One can understand the desire in U.N. circles to remove from South African control at least this one area which was once, and can still be construed to be, an international responsibility. But one wonders whether the practical consequences of such a step have been really thought through. Very few foreigners have visited South West Africa in recent years. Senior American officials do not, as a matter of policy, go there. An exchange in 1968 between the South African government and the U.N. Secretary-General about the possibility of the latter's sending a U.N. representative to the territory ended in misunderstanding, confusion and recrimination.

Would it not be better, one must ask, instead of continuing to press the South Africans to take a step which they will not take and cannot be compelled to take, and which, if taken, would only be likely to have unfortunate consequences for the people of the territory anyway—would it not be better for the United Nations to inform itself at first hand on conditions there and then to enter into normal contact with the South African authorities with a view to seeing whether some accommodation could not be found which would relieve the situation of that minority of black African inhabitants of the territory who live outside the homelands, and would at the same time relieve the South Africans of the continued burden of a grievous and dangerous conflict with most of the rest of the international community? This might bring at least limited benefits to the non-white portion of the South West African population; a continuation of the present threats and pressures will bring none at all. That support of the members of the Afro-Asian bloc, not to mention the communists, would not be easily had for such an approach is obvious; but this is no reason why, if it really represents the most hopeful line of possible solution, the Western powers should not support it.

## V

The situation in the great Portuguese territories of Angola and Mozambique differs fundamentally from that prevailing in South and South West Africa in that the central issue here is not that of race. Members of the insurgent movement now operating against the Portuguese administrations like to insinuate that Portuguese rule is really a concealed form of white supremacy; and such allegations find ready credence in Western liberal, not to mention Afro-Asian, circles. Neither the personal observations of a detached visitor nor the literature of unbiased scholars who have addressed themselves to Portuguese African affairs afford much confirmation for such allegations. There have no doubt been periods of racial prejudice in the past; and there are no doubt individual manifestations of it here and there today; there always are some such manifestations when great numbers of people of different racial origin reside side by side. But there is no legal discrimination in residence, education or employment; and there is ample evidence that the absence of such discrimination is not just a formality. The tenor of everyday life in these Portuguese territories reflects less racial tension than can at times be observed in certain of the independent black African countries. It is useful to reflect

that if one were able to have today in South Africa not only the legal basis but the living reality of what now exists in the Portuguese territories in the sense of interracial relationships, even the most sanguine liberal would surely feel that at least 95 percent of the problem of South African apartheid had been solved.

To say that the racial factor is not the issue is not to say that there are not other disparities and deficiencies in the Portuguese administration which have not been, and could not be today, the objects of more serious and legitimate challenge. It is also not to say that the material and social situation of the African portion of the population is equal, or anywhere near equal, to that of the European and the mixed elements. The differences that exist in this respect are primarily the reflection of educational and economic, not racial, disparities. The average black African Angolan or Mozambican, starting as he does from a lower economic and social level, tends to get off the educational ladder—with a view to beginning to earn his living—at a lower point than does the average youngster of European-Portuguese origin; and this finds its reflection in position and income. But this is a problem not peculiar to Angola and Mozambique.

This disparity in living standards and social position is the real focal point of much of the criticism of the Portuguese administrations. The demand is, in reality, for a greater degree of social egalitarianism—for a curtailment of the privileges and prerogatives of the rich, most of whom happen to be European-Portuguese, and for a more rapid elevation of the poor, most of whom are still black.

But this situation is now in a state of rapid evolution and change. This is not generally realized abroad. Members of the Portuguese administration in these territories make no bones of the fact that the armed challenge with which they have been confronted in recent years has stirred them, and, more importantly, has stirred the Lisbon authorities, to reforms and improvements that might otherwise have taken decades to complete. Nowhere have the changes been greater than in the educational field. The number of persons embraced in the primary school system in Angola has increased by some 500 percent in the last 15 years, and in the secondary school system by as much as 850 percent. In 1963, a university was established in Angola, where none existed before. The proportion of black Africans among the university students in Angola was, by 1970, up to 30 percent and growing. In a country where education, rather than race, is truly the key to position and prosperity, this represents no insignificant change.

It is difficult, furthermore, to believe that a triumph of the present insurgent pressures would produce any more rapid progress in educational opportunities and living standards for the African. In both of these respects the Portuguese territories are already well ahead of most of the black-ruled countries of Africa. The existence of privileged élites, after all, is not a peculiarity just of the white-ruled countries of Africa.

The reproach most commonly leveled against the Portuguese administrations of Angola and Mozambique is that they represent a colonial relationship. For those—and their number is not few—to whom the term "colonialism" is a negative semantic absolute, there can be no defense against this charge. The same will be true of those whose criteria are more than just semantic but who view as uniquely iniquitous any relationship of dependence that operates across a body of water or any in which a West European country, or the United States, figures as the metropolitan power. But these are subjective distinctions. They have no sanction, as yet, in any formal international

determinations. In the absence of such determinations, the well-meaning foreign observer has no choice but to focus his judgment not on semantic distinctions but on the real interests of the peoples most immediately involved.

To what extent there is genuine popular discontent with Portuguese rule, as distinct from the restlessness of individual intellectuals ambitious to replace the Portuguese in the seats of power, is hard to judge. Even a plebiscite would not throw much light on this question. Self-determination, as the present Portuguese premier has pointed out, is not a matter of thrusting square pieces of paper into the hands of the man in the bush. Prior to the insurgent attack in 1961 (in which, incidentally, far more black Africans than Portuguese were killed), the vast territory of Angola, larger than Texas, Oklahoma and New Mexico combined, was garrisoned by no more than two regimental combat units of 1,000 men each. This does not suggest great discontent with Portuguese rule. Militant insurgency, provoking as it always does punitive measures, making its own martyrs and causing people to hedge their statements as well as their bets, has a tendency of course to evoke discontent, or at least the semblance of it, even where there was none before. But this is something else again.

However that may be, it is hard to picture a happier future for the people of these territories being brought about by the further successful pursuit of those military pressures that have been brought to bear against the Portuguese since 1961. One has only to consider the likely consequences. The white population, in Angola in particular, is the greatest, proportionately, of any country in Africa after South Africa. Its numbers are heightened, in effect, by the fact that tens of thousands of people of mixed blood consider themselves, and are accepted as, Portuguese. This strong and vigorous element would not bow out of the picture. In addition to that, the insurgent forces operating against the régime in Angola are split into three competing factions, the differences running in some instances along tribal lines.

Finally, one must reckon with the South Africans. They have a keen interest in what takes place in the southern part of Angola where some of the border tribes are related to their neighbors, the Ovambos, not to mention in the southern part of Mozambique, which is important to South Africa from a number of standpoints. In the event of a disruption of the authority of the present Portuguese administrations, all of these various elements could be expected to compete for the heritage. The likelihood would be for a partition of both territories, certain portions falling to the South Africans, and the strong European factions, whose roots of residence and experience go back for hundreds of years, digging in for one form or another of a "Rhodesian" solution. It is possible to imagine that one or another of the insurgent leaders might find a partial satisfaction of his ambitions in such a state of affairs, though even this is not certain. It is harder to see how the mass of the African population would be benefited.

As things now stand, these two Portuguese territories serve—with their relatively tolerant racial policies—to break the bipolarity between the north and south of the African continent. In the event of a removal of Portuguese authority and the triumph, even on limited portions of their territory, of the existing guerrilla-insurgent elements, the territories would cease to play this role. Quite the contrary. Bitterness, fear, and violence of feeling would be heightened on both sides. The area of South African control—the area of real racism, that is—would almost certainly be geographically increased. Not only that but the fires of racial discrimination in South Africa itself would be impor-

tantly fed. The reactionaries there would say: "You see what comes of the attempt to pursue moderate racial policies. The Portuguese pursued such policies. Did that save them? Is it not evident from their experience that the real motive behind the guerrilla pressures in southern Africa generally is not race at all—that this is merely the pretext? What reason is there to suppose that more moderate and tolerant racial policies on our part would have any effect in preserving us from the same sort of attack?" It is in this spirit, and under the influence of such arguments, that the South Africans would move to secure, if forced to, such areas in the countries north and east of them as they consider essential to the security of their own territory.

Whether the Portuguese will be able to hold out indefinitely against the military attacks now being pressed against them is, again, simply impossible to predict. For the moment, the situation has all the earmarks of a standoff. The Portuguese military would appear to have the capability of holding on indefinitely in the central districts of the country. The insurgents, on the other hand, would seem to have, presupposing a continuation of the present level of external support, an equally indefinite capability of continuing to infiltrate and to make trouble. The conflict, meanwhile, is consuming nearly half of both metropolitan and provincial budgets. It is devouring resources at least a good portion of which might be expected to be otherwise available for economic development. Never, surely, was there less reason for continuing a conflict, and more reason for attempting to compose it by negotiation and compromise. And never, surely, was there a conflict which it was less in the interests of the major Western powers, in particular, to exacerbate and to press to a violent conclusion.

The Portuguese position in Africa rests, in contrast to the recent colonial positions of the other European powers, on several centuries of involvement and experience. In the depth of its roots as well as in the nature of relationships between European and African to which it has led it is unique. To try to liquidate it in exactly the same way, and under exactly the same assumptions, as in the case of other colonial relationships in that continent, is neither logical nor politically promising. Here, if anywhere, new ideas and new approaches are in order.

#### VI

Space does not permit a similar review of the situation in Rhodesia; nor do the Western powers have, in this instance, the same latitude of choice that they have with relation to the countries already discussed. It will suffice to note that here, too, a successful prosecution of the insurgent military pressures—of the attempt, that is, to solve the problem by external violence—would almost certainly lead to a greater involvement of the South Africans and to an expansion, rather than retraction, of the effective area of South African apartheid.

But there is another reason, too, why one's heart sinks at the prospect of a continuation of the attempt to solve the problems of this part of the world by violence. This is the situation of the three former High Commission territories of Lesotho, Swaziland and Botswana. These new countries are in many respects the most hopeful places in southern Africa. Here, too, as in the Portuguese territories (but without the attendant issues of colonialism), efforts are being made to solve problems on a basis of racial amity and willing collaboration. Again, like the Portuguese territories, these countries stand as useful buffers between the black African countries of the north and the countries of white supremacy in the south.

Not only this, but they stand as symbolic tests of the principle that there can be ways



of doing things in that part of the world which do not involve racial discrimination yet present no danger to any racial element or to any neighboring state. That they have found it possible in recent years to pursue an independent existence on the basis of this principle in intimate proximity to—in one instance even totally surrounded by—South Africa is one of the really encouraging features of the whole South African situation. It is of greatest importance that they not fail in their undertaking.

Their example is of importance, in particular, for those of the South African homelands that are moving, at least in theory, toward independence. In many respects the physical and social problems of these two categories of regions are similar. The example of the successful cultivation of an independent national life, in these three countries, in a manner that poses no danger to South African interests, can have a significant effect on future South African attitudes and policies both in the homelands and elsewhere.

Yet there can be no doubt that the relentless pursuit of efforts to overthrow by military means all the so-called "white-ruled régimes" of the remainder of southern Africa will grievously complicate the relations of these countries to their neighbors and will jeopardize in many ways the achievements they already have to their credit. In a situation of gradual change, they have good prospects for establishing themselves and developing their independence. In a situation of extreme military tension and political polarization these prospects will inevitably suffer.

## VII

The United States government and to some extent the other Western governments have wisely recognized the danger and sterility of the movements that purport to solve the problems of South Africa by military violence. Yet the political positions these governments have taken are in a number of instances ones that could conceivably be satisfied only by the very violence they profess to oppose. These positions have been conceived, no doubt, primarily as gestures of goodwill and solidarity addressed to the peoples and régimes of the remainder of the African continent. But if this was the point, it may be considered now as having been amply made; and there is nothing to suggest that the further belaboring of it is going to produce much more in the way of appreciation and confidence than has been forthcoming to date. The time has surely come for a reexamination of Western policy toward this region from the primary standpoint of the interests of the peoples most immediately concerned, with a view to finding approaches which, while not endorsing or encouraging any form of racial discrimination or oppression, would hold out for those peoples prospects more favorable than those implicit in the present precarious deadlock.

## NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

## HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to the current Calendar of Events, National Gallery of Art for the month of April. It is of particular interest that on April 25, 1971, one of the world's finest exhibits of the great artist Dürer opens. This showing which features his graphic work and will mark the 300th anniversary of the good artist's birth. In addition

to the display, a major scholarly work on the German artist will be published by National Gallery. This fine publication was edited by Mr. Charles Talbot, an assistant professor at Yale University who received outstanding assistance from Gaillard F. Ravenel, a curator from our own National Gallery of Art and Jay Levenson, an affiliated of the Institute of Fine Arts of New York University. It will certainly be an exciting month at the Gallery during the exhibition and I encourage all my colleagues to avail themselves of this opportunity.

I include the article as follows:

## CALENDAR OF EVENTS, APRIL 1971

## DÜRER IN AMERICA: HIS GRAPHIC WORK

The largest Dürer graphics exhibition ever held in the United States will open at the National Gallery on April 25, to remain on view through June 6. Marking the 500th anniversary of the artist's birth, the exhibition will consist of 36 Dürer drawings from public and private American and Canadian collections, and a selection of 207 of the finest prints from public collections in the United States. It will bring together for the first time all but two of the Dürer drawings in America. Ten books with woodcut illustrations and six bound volumes of prints will also be on exhibition.

Among the drawings are the *Self-Portrait* of 1493, one of Dürer's most important early drawings; *Adam and Eve*, a study for the well-known engraving; and *Kneeling Donor*, a study for the *Feast of the Rose Garlands* altarpiece, commissioned by the German merchants in Venice and now in Prague.

Prints in the exhibition, chiefly engravings and woodcuts, will include *Melencolia I* (see illustration). This work has been described by the late Erwin Panofsky, professor at the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, as "in a sense a spiritual self-portrait of Dürer." In addition to its symbols of Melancholy as one of the four humors and Geometry as one of the seven liberal arts, the engraving reflects Dürer's mental state of frustration not only with the limitations of his beloved disciplines of art and geometry, but with the fitness of his own powers.

The exhibition spans Dürer's entire career, and is organized to show his development as a graphic artist. A technical section developed by Richard Field, Assistant Curator of Prints, Philadelphia Museum of Art, will contain 50 Dürer prints with texts and labels and will deal with problems of connoisseurship.

The exhibition was organized by Gaillard F. Ravenel, a curator at the National Gallery of Art, with the collaboration of Charles Talbot, an assistant professor at Yale University; Jay Levenson, affiliated with the Institute of Fine Arts of New York University; and Mr. Field.

## GALLERY AND CAFETERIA HOURS

The Gallery is open weekdays and Saturdays, 10:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., and Sundays, 12 noon to 9:00 p.m. The Cafeteria is open weekdays, 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.; luncheon service 11:00 a.m. to 2:30 p.m.; and Sundays, dinner service 1:00 to 7:00 p.m.

## DÜRER CATALOG

The catalog *Dürer in America: His Graphic Work*, published by the National Gallery, will be a major scholarly publication on the artist and his work, with extensive treatments of all drawings in the exhibition, summaries of major points on the prints, and reference material. A hard-cover edition will be distributed in this country and abroad by the Macmillan Company of New York and London. The 362-page catalog will be available at the Gallery. All works in the exhibition will be illustrated. In addition to 253 illustrations of exhibited works, there will be 35

supplementary illustrations of paintings and drawings relating to works on view. Four illustrations will be in color.

The catalog was edited by Charles Talbot, assistant professor at Yale University, who has written the introduction. Entries were prepared by Charles Talbot, Gaillard Ravenel, and Jay Levenson. J. Carter Brown, Director of the National Gallery of Art, has written the foreword. A special sixteen-page illustrated essay based on Professor Wolfgang Stechow's lecture "Dürer and America," which inaugurates the opening of the exhibition, will also be available with the catalog.

## LECTURES AND TOURS ON DÜRER EXHIBITION

In connection with the Dürer exhibition, a series of four Sunday lectures by distinguished scholars will begin the opening day of the exhibition. Wolfgang Stechow, the 1971 Kress Professor in Residence at the National Gallery of Art, will speak on April 25 on "Dürer and America." He has also been invited to deliver the opening remarks on the Dürer exhibition in Nuremberg, the artist's native city, in May.

On May 2 Julius Held, Professor of Art History, Barnard College, Columbia University, will discuss "Dürer's Personality." Gerald Strauss, Professor in the Department of History, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, will speak May 9 on "Dürer—The Artist and His Society." On May 16 Eleanor A. Sayre, Curator, Department of Prints and Drawings, the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, will discuss "Dürer, Master Printmaker." Each lecture will be at 4:00 p.m. in the National Gallery auditorium.

The Education Department staff lecturers will give guided tours of the exhibition, beginning on April 27. An acoustiguide tour of the exhibition will also be available.

## MONDAY, MARCH 29, THROUGH SUNDAY, APRIL 4

Painting of the week: <sup>1</sup> Jordaens. *Portrait of a Man* (Ailsa Mellon Bruce Fund), Gallery 44, Tues. through Sat. 12:00 & 2:00; Sun. 3:30 & 6:00.

Tour of the week: 19th-Century French Masters: Toulouse-Lautrec. Rotunda, Tues. through Sat. 1:00; Sun. 2:30.

Tour: *Introduction to the Collection*. Rotunda, Mon. through Sat. 11:00 & 3:00; Sun. 5:00.

Sunday lecture: *Canaletto and the Venetian View Painters*. Guest Speakers: Claus Virch, Former Curator of European Paintings, The Metropolitan Museum, New York, Auditorium 4:00.

Sunday concert: National Gallery Orchestra, Richard Bales, Conductor, East Garden Court, 7:00.

## MONDAY, APRIL 5, THROUGH SUNDAY, APRIL 11

Painting of the week: <sup>1</sup> Jacques-Louis David. *Madame Hamelin* (Chester Dale Collection), Gallery 93, Tues. through Sat. 12:00 & 2:00; Sun. 3:30 & 6:00.

Tour of the week: 19th-Century French Masters: Cézanne. Rotunda, Tues. through Sat. 1:00; Sun. 2:30.

Tour: *Introduction to the Collection*. Rotunda, Mon. through Sat. 11:00 & 3:00; Sun. 5:00.

<sup>1</sup> 11" x 14" reproductions with texts for sale this week—15¢ each. If mailed, 25¢ each.

For reproductions and slides of the collection, books, and other related publications, self-service rooms are open daily near the Constitution Avenue Entrance.

All concerts, with intermission talks by members of the National Gallery Staff, are broadcast by Station WGMS-AM (507) and FM (103.5).

Inquiries concerning the Gallery's educational services should be addressed to the Educational Office or telephoned to (202) 737-2415, ext. 272.

Sunday lecture: *Archetypal and Personal Elements in Leonardo's "Last Supper."* Guest Speaker, Raymond S. Stiles, Former Curator in Charge of Education, National Gallery of Art, Auditorium 4:00.

Sunday concert: National Gallery Orchestra, Richard Bales, Conductor, East Garden Court, 7:00.

MONDAY, APRIL 12, THROUGH SUNDAY, APRIL 18

Painting of the week: Botticelli, *Portrait of a Youth* (Andrew Mellon Collection) Gallery 8, Tues. through Sat. 12:00 & 2:00; Sun. 3:30 & 6:00.

Tour of the week: *19th-Century French*

*Masters: Manet.* Rotunda, Tues. through Sat. 1:00; Sun. 2:30.

Tour: *Introduction to the Collection.* Rotunda, Mon. through Sat. 11:00 & 3:00; Sun. 5:00.

Sunday lecture: *Hogarth's London.* Guest Speaker: W. R. Dalzell, Author, Lecturer, and Radio Commentator, Bedford, England. Auditorium 4:00.

Sunday concert: Thomas Beveridge, Bass. Martin Katz, Piano. (28th American Music Festival). East Garden Court, 7:00.

MONDAY, APRIL 19, THROUGH SUNDAY, APRIL 25

Painting of the week: Byzantine, XIII Century. *Enthroned Madonna and Child.*

(Andrew Mellon Collection) Gallery 1, Tues. through Sat. 12:00 & 2:00; Sun. 3:30 & 6:00.

Tour of the week: *19th-Century French Masters: Degas.* Rotunda, Tues. through Sat. 1:00; Sun. 2:30.

Tour: *Introduction to the Collection.* Rotunda, Mon. through Sat. 11:00 & 3:00; Sun. 5:00.

Sunday lecture: *Dürer and America.* Guest Speaker: Wolfgang Stechow, Kress Professor in Residence, National Gallery of Art, Auditorium 4:00.

Sunday concert: Helen Boatwright, Soprano. Stuart Raleigh, Piano. (28th American Music Festival). East Garden Court, 7:00.

## SENATE—Tuesday, March 30, 1971

The Senate met at 9:45 a.m., and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*My voice shalt Thou hear in the morning, O Lord; in the morning will I direct my prayer unto Thee, and will look up—*  
Psalms 5: 3

And now as we return to the vexing problems of state we beseech Thee, O Lord, to empower Thy servants with hearts aflame for Thee and minds illumined by Thy wisdom. Give them eyes to see the distant scene and a faith in the things that abide all our earthly years. We pray that Thou wilt direct and control all that they design or do or say. And when evening comes give them a good conscience, a quiet mind, and peace at the last.

In the name of Him who gave Himself for others. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 29, 1971, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 55) to provide a temporary extension of certain provisions of law relating to interest rates and cost-of-living stabilization.

### ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S.J. Res. 55) to provide a temporary extension of certain provisions of law relating to interest rates and cost-of-living stabilization, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

### ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 30, 1971, he pre-

sented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S.J. Res. 55) to provide a temporary extension of certain provisions of law relating to interest rates and cost-of-living stabilization.

### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on March 25, we recognized the courageous and nationalistic spirit of the Byelorussian people on their 53d observance of Byelorussian Independence Day. The free world should take note of these people who every day pray and hope for freedom from the constant terror of communism. The short term of Byelorussian freedom from 1918 to 1921 has since been followed by a long and bitter Communist rule. This lunge for liberty has not been forgotten by the Byelorussians and will not be ignored by the United States.

Byelorussia emerged as an independent nation during the turmoil of the Bolshevik Revolution. An example of Byelorussia's desire for self-determination was powerfully stated in an excerpt from the Second Constitutional Decree of March 9, 1918:

After three and one-half centuries of slavery, the Byelorussian people proclaim to the entire world that they are living and will live.

This statement certainly has survived within the hearts of the Byelorussian people at this hour. They will never give up hope, and the United States will never let that hope down.

Every possible means of assistance will be furnished by the United States, as well as the United Nations, to work toward a lasting era of freedom in the future for this captive nation. The short term of Byelorussian independence beginning on March 25, 53 years ago, will be a symbol revealing what these captive people are struggling for. Freedom is waiting to be

unleashed in Byelorussia. The thirst for freedom is living and will continue to live in Byelorussia.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, under the previous order, I ask that the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE) be recognized.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE) is recognized for 15 minutes.

(The remarks of Mr. MUSKIE when he introduced S. 1408 are printed in the RECORD under Bills and Joint Resolutions Introduced.)

### SILENT VIETNAM

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the United States has paid a heavy price for its involvement in the war in Indochina. Thousands of lives have been lost, priceless resources have been squandered, and public morale has suffered a crushing blow.

Yet the toll which this war has exacted on the countries of South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia has been far more savage, infinitely most costly.

Our obsession with the body count method of measuring the progress of this war has led us to the indiscriminate bombing of the countryside and the wasteful destruction of its people and resources.

The number of people driven from their homes has soared. The number of bodies maimed by bombings and the use of chemical weapons reaches into the many thousands.

And the countryside itself has been stripped of its vegetation and wildlife. The chances are great that the delicate ecological balance has been irreparably upset, and that the social structure built upon this balance has been destroyed.

In the March 6 issue of Look magazine, Orville Schell, codirector of the Bay Area Institute, has provided a detailed examination of the horrors of the "ecocide" which the war has brought to Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent that this article, entitled "Silent Vietnam," be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

### SILENT VIETNAM

(By Orville Schell, Jr.)

The gradual dismemberment of Indochinese society has become a fact of life. Learned at first with disbelief and horror, and then integrated into the routines of our everyday