

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

EARTH WEEK, 1971

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, once again this year the Nation will focus its attention on the problems of environmental quality. The initial effort last year to bring environmental problems to the attention of the American people was a marvelous success which included participation by 3,000 colleges and universities, 10,000 high schools and grade schools, 2,000 communities, and vast numbers of individual citizens. For the first time last year, we as a nation paused to examine the deterioration of our environment which has been caused partially by our anxious efforts to advance technologically without considering the environmental consequences.

During the Earth Week in April this year we will review and assess the environmental progress which has been made in the last year and attempt to determine what further steps must be taken to protect and restore the quality of our fragile environment. I am pleased that this year we are going to celebrate not an Earth "Day," but an Earth "Week" which will provide us all with a greater opportunity to examine environmental problems in depth. Across this country, public and private organizations, business, labor, government, educational institutions and individuals will join one another in seeking solutions to environmental problems with one goal in mind—to provide the kind of clean, wholesome environment to which every citizen is entitled.

I am pleased to be a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 15, a joint resolution to designate the third week of April of each year as "Earth Week." Many Senators have joined me in cosponsoring this resolution, and I am hopeful that the upcoming Earth Week will establish a tradition to be followed in future years.

I am pleased to say that I have had the privilege of supporting a number of new laws which have passed Congress that set up safeguards to prevent the further contamination of our environment. I strongly supported the clean air bill, requiring substantial reductions of automotive air pollution by 1975 and providing for other strict air quality controls. The Water Quality Improvement Act establishes strict Federal standards and penalties against violators for water pollution and oil spills. In the area of solid waste management, the Resource Recovery Act has been enacted, which establishes a significant new Federal commitment to the principle of recycling solid wastes and provides for Federal financial assistance toward solving the problems of solid waste disposal. In addition, I voted against continued funding of the SST

program, partly because I felt that underlying environmental concerns have not been satisfactorily resolved.

President Nixon has submitted a special message on the environment to Congress, including a comprehensive program which includes proposals to increase Federal control of water pollution, improve pesticide controls, and tax emissions of sulfur oxides and tax lead in gasoline. In addition, these proposals also covered toxic substances, noise pollution and ocean dumpings. The President has also proposed measures to promote environmental quality in land use decisions involving a new procedure for the approval of powerplant sites, including nuclear powerplants, and regulation of the environmental effects of surface and underground mining.

The actions of Congress, and the proposals of the President, demonstrate a strong commitment to cleaning up and protecting our environment. I am pleased at the progress which we have made during the last year, but clearly we cannot rest on our laurels. Instead, we must reaffirm our commitment and desire to provide permanent solutions to our environmental problems. We must rid our Nation's cities of air pollution. We must clean up our waterways. We must remove the litter from our countrysides. As individuals, each of us must be willing to bear a portion of the burden—but with the recognition of the fact that our efforts now can help to provide this Nation with a clean, wholesome environment for years to come.

LEGISLATION TO PROHIBIT UNAUTHORIZED ENCAMPMENTS ON PUBLIC LANDS

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I realize that all of us have just returned from the recess, perhaps refreshed, but hopefully not unmindful of the siege on Washington by an assortment of antiwar groups beginning today with a group of some 3,000 to 5,000. As of last Friday, this group was denied a permit to set up an encampment on the Mall just below the Capitol grounds, and over the weekend, because the leaders of that group insisted their followers would camp out anyway, the Interior Department obtained an injunction to enjoin such activity. Then on April 24 and the following 2 weeks, a much larger group of up to 75,000 dissidents is expected to be urged by its militant leaders to use Rock Creek Park in the face of a similar denial of use for overnight camping. In other words, the Government is being challenged to make good on its word to keep these public areas open for all persons for lawful purposes.

Mr. Speaker, it was because of the blight on the landscape left by Resurrection City in 1968 adjacent to the Lincoln Memorial—not to mention the total disregard of the rights of the general public that feared for its safety by even going near the area after dark—that H.R. 1035 was initiated in the 91st Congress. As the report of the House Committee on Public Works stated:

Washington, as the Capital, epitomizes what this Nation stands for. It is here that the people of the United States have placed the monuments, parks and statues that identify our heritage and our purpose as a nation. It is here, too, that our Federal Government lives and functions. These grounds and buildings belong to all the people, and they should at all times be available to all our citizens . . . Clearly, access to these buildings and grounds cannot be limited, for any extended period, to any individual citizen or group of citizens, great or small, however lofty their aims may be or however idealistic their purpose.

Citing the cost to the taxpayer as a result of the ill-advised permission granted to the Resurrection City encampment, the committee report went on to note a cost in excess of \$1 million "covering all the side effects of the issuance of the permit," I would remind you that of these total costs, the sponsors of Resurrection City forfeited a \$5,000 bond and the Government recovered another \$5,500 from the salvage of the lumber.

According to the RECORD of June 11, 1969, H.R. 1035 went on to be approved by the overwhelming vote of 327 for and 51 against. It is only to be regretted that the other body failed to act on the legislation before adjournment.

Because of the very urgent need for legislation of this type, our colleague from Iowa, the Honorable WILLIAM J. SCHERLE, on April 7, 1971, introduced a bill identical to the measure passed by the House in the 91st Congress. Today, the gentleman from Ohio, the Honorable CHALMERS P. WYLIE, and I are introducing another identical bill for the purpose of emphasizing this urgency and to urge that the House Public Works Committee give all deliberate speed to reporting the bill again so that this House will be on record as to its position on the use of publicly owned lands in the District of Columbia for unauthorized and unlawful encampments. At the same time, I trust that the feelings of the majority of my colleagues here present will bolster the decision of the Interior Department officials not to yield to the demands of these dissident groups at the expense of all other citizens. Inasmuch as it is reported that Justice Department officials are giving a fresh look at a possible Rock Creek Park encampment, I would also strongly urge the administration to stand firmly behind the Interior Department in this matter which has already denied a permit for this purpose.

Mr. Speaker, the dissident, antiwar groups that will be in this city for the next few weeks exercising their rights

of speech and assembly must not be permitted to do so in a manner that will deny the rights of others who do not feel the same way. The only way to start is to absolutely prohibit these unlawful encampments. Should the law be violated, those responsible must be dealt with promptly and without bias. That is the only way the rights of all will be preserved.

REQUIEM FOR THE U.S.A.

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, a member of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives has just brought to my attention an inspiring editorial prepared by Mr. Fred Williams, of WAHT-radio in Lebanon, Pa. Representative Robert C. Rowe has been kind enough to send me a copy of the editorial broadcast on Memorial Day 1970.

Numerous comments of well-deserved gratitude and praise were sent to Mr. Williams by many inspired listeners. In my estimation, it is a fitting commentary not only for Memorial Day purposes, but a fitting message to be read and remembered all year around. I am sure that Senators will agree that Mr. Williams had a tremendous insight into a subject of considerable concern today.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the the RECORD.

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

"REQUIEM FOR THE U.S.A."

(By Fred Williams)

"Requiem for the U.S.A.," is a rather ominous and sinister sounding title that deserves a more definitive explanation. Its true and valid meaning is requiem for the unknown soldier of America. Shortly after World War One, the bodies of many American soldiers that were killed in battle could not be identified, and the United States wanted to honor in some special way, the memory of these brave men. In the year 1931 the final resting place of the unknown soldier of America was completed. A white marble tomb in Arlington National Cemetery. A simple phrase of edification adorns its walls; "Here rests in honored glory, an American soldier, known but to God." Many years before, during the Civil War, a small group of faithful Southern women chose May 30th to honor and decorate soldiers' graves. They prayed for the dead of both the Union and Confederate armies. It was indeed, a most solemn day for the entire nation. As time passed, this great day became known as Memorial Day. A patriotic holiday set aside to honor and pray for American servicemen and women who truly made the supreme sacrifice, giving of their lives for the cause of freedom and justice for all. It is now 1970, and many wars later. What does Memorial Day mean to the most powerful nation on earth? What does it mean to the millions of 20th century Americans on-the-go? Is Memorial Day thought of as no more than the first weekend of fun? The advent of summer? Picnics, laughter, a stroll in the park? Hot dogs and baseball games? Can it be that spiritual remembrance and patriotism are becoming a

dead issue? The apathy of man all too soon forgetting what Memorial Day is all about. For some, Memorial Day will be just another day. But thank God prayer and patriotism is very much alive. Alive and living in the hearts of every man and woman proud to shout loud and clear, "I am an American." Legions and legions of people, loyal dedicated Americans who know that Memorial Day is really Valley Forge, Gettysburg, the Spanish American War, World Wars One and Two, Korea. Memorial Day is Pearl Harbor, the steaming jungles of Guadalcanal, Bataan, Flanders Field, Iwo Jima, Corregidor, and the jagged hills of China. Memorial Day is the rolling plains of France, Normandy, Bizerte, Anzio, and the hot, dry deserts of North Africa. Memorial Day is the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, the Mediterranean Sea, everywhere and anywhere American servicemen and women spilled their blood and died for the cause of liberty and freedom. Memorial Day is South Vietnam, Danang, the Mekong Delta, and many other places in southeast Asia we never knew existed a few years ago. Memorial Day 1970 is but a few days away. Let us visualize for just a moment, that the unknown soldier could speak for himself. Will his plaintive cry be, "Why have you forsaken me?" Will his plea go unanswered? Some will turn a deaf ear, but the rest of us choose to stand up and be counted. Let us never forget that this beautiful country is God's gift to all of us. The chosen planet in all the universe, destined to be man's final salvation for suffering humanity, and a brilliant ray of hope for the persecuted and oppressed. On this Memorial Day, let us decide to rejuvenate in ourselves, and in our children the true spirit of the American way of life. True patriotism. That unyielding devotion to the basic principles and ideals upon which this country was established. The time is now America, to forget about the near veneration and admiration of material things, and return to a state of spiritual values and ethical standards which are far more valuable to all of us. On this Memorial Day, let us all pray, each of us in our own way, that the leaders of nations all over the world may resolve their differences once and for all, so that mankind everywhere may walk in the light of perpetual peace. Would the unknown soldier of America ask for less?

SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT ON TV PROGRAM "SAY GOODBYE"

HON. JAMES D. (MIKE) McKEVITT

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. McKEVITT. Mr. Speaker, I have continued to receive letters and verbal complaints from my constituents concerning a television program presented by the National Broadcasting Co. on January 8, 1971.

The complaints about the NBC-TV production entitled "Say Goodbye" center mainly over a program segment which depicted a man with a rifle, apparently hunting illegally from an aircraft, shooting down a mother polar bear. The camera showed a closeup of the bear, seemingly shot and writhing in pain as her two cubs looked on pathetically and helplessly. The conclusion one might reach from this particular program segment was that a heartless hunter, hunting illegally, had killed a mother polar

bear and that the two cubs had been left to die.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to attempt to set this matter straight for the record.

This segment was not what it seemed to be. The Alaska Department of Fish and Game stated that the portions of the film showing the polar bear sequence actually were taken by an employee of the department during an operation involving the tranquilizing of a female polar bear for tagging purposes. The Alaska Department of Fish and Game also pointed out that aircraft were not used to illegally herd or chase the polar bear and her cubs.

The bear was anesthetized with a drugged dart to allow inspection and data gathering after which it was tagged and released. The bear rejoined her cubs, which were unharmed.

I might also note that the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners vigorously protested this segment of the NBC-TV presentation.

Chester Phelps, president of the association, wrote NBC-TV stating that he had been advised by officials of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, U.S. Department of the Interior, and by fish and game authorities in Alaska that the female bear in the sequence, instead of undergoing a death agony as represented, was in fact succumbing to a tranquilizing drug administered by biologists employed in a scientific and humane project designed to improve knowledge of polar bears and thus protect the species.

NBC-TV has responded that

The program was independently produced by Wolper Productions, Inc., for an advertiser who then supplied the program to us for broadcast.

NBC-TV continued:

We have asked the producer for the details of the polar bear sequence and are informed by him that it was a composite creation from stock footage prepared for inclusion in this program and not, as it appeared, a record of an actual event. We are advised that the footage edited together was of the shooting of a male polar bear outside the territorial limits of the United States and of a female polar bear who had been anesthetized.

NBC-TV went on to say it is developing guidelines so that in future documentary-type programs dealing with nature, a viewer will not be misled.

I applaud NBC-TV's candor in this matter, and its stated intention to avoid such situations in the future.

However, in the case of "Say Goodbye" the damage has been done. Bill Clede, president of the Outdoor Writers Association of America, has stated:

The false depiction, although severely damaging the image of millions of sportsmen, involves a more basic problem for all Americans.

Clede asks:

Who has the responsibility for truth in documentaries—the network, the producer, or the sponsor?

It is a question that deserves consideration by all of us.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF DR. J. DUANE SQUIRES, NEW LONDON, N.H.

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, "Who's Who in America" carries a long and varied list of the accomplishments of Dr. J. Duane Squires, of New London, N.H.—educator, historian, writer, religious leader, worker for good government, and civic authority. Of special interest at this particular moment, however, is his authorship of various books and articles on our State of New Hampshire, for the knowledge and research which have produced such valuable and interesting historic works in the past have now resulted in another article which provides some fascinating facts for all of the millions of us who, to use Dr. Squires' words, like to know "when and how things began."

This most recent article by Dr. Squires is entitled "New Hampshire 'Firsts'—Notable Events in Granite State History." The article was published in the New Hampshire Echoes magazine, March-April 1971 issue. I ask unanimous consent that for the enjoyment and enlightenment of all who will take a few moments to enjoy the rewards of Dr. Squires' scholarship and research the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

NEW HAMPSHIRE "FIRSTS": NOTABLE EVENTS IN GRANITE STATE HISTORY

(By J. Duane Squires)

It is always interesting to know when and how things began. In my years of studying, teaching and writing history, I have found no greater common denominator of interest than answers to queries as to origins and beginnings.

In this article, therefore, let me mention ten "firsts" which have been a part of the history of New Hampshire, each one of which has been a credit to the people and the institutions of our State.

I

New Hampshire is the first state in the nation to have named one of its towns after George Washington. On December 13, 1776, one of our pioneer communities honored itself by incorporating under the proud name of the American commander-in-chief. Eight years later, in 1784, Dr. Manesseh Cutler gave the same proud name to the tallest mountain in the State.

While Washington has been subsequently honored in scores of place names throughout the United States, New Hampshire was the first so to act. It was an absolutely fitting thing to do. No American ever lived more worthy of respect and admiration. The qualities that set George Washington above all other men were his "... talents as an organizer, his adroitness in managing and coordinating large and complex enterprises, his ability to work with people, his patience and willingness to consider other views, to speak frankly, to accommodate and mediate but to be firm when necessary, and, finally, to act decisively, and to enforce his will."

II

In April 1780, Benjamin Randall founded the first Freewill Baptist Church in the

United States at New Durham, New Hampshire. The Rev. Mr. Randall, a former chaplain in the Continental Army, broke with orthodox Baptist faith and its tendency towards Calvinist dogmatism; he stressed the qualities of freedom of conscience for one's self and for others in the religious life.

His new denomination was legitimized by State legislative action in 1804, and for more than a century flourished in New England and in other parts of the nation. It is a matter of gratification to the contemporary religious thinker that this strain of ecumenism and toleration appeared this early in New Hampshire life.

III

In 1822, two noted New England women educators, Zilpah Grant and Mary Lyon, assisted in founding Adams Academy in Derry, New Hampshire, the first endowed seminary for girls in the United States. It antedated Miss Lyon's Mount Holyoke College in Massachusetts by 15 years.

These women educational pioneers were of the same dedicated breed of human being which had produced generations of New England ministers. As Mary Whitton has written, "... they were warmed through with the fire of faith that belonged to old New England. They were the spiritual sisters of the young men who left the plough for the pulpit."

IV

In 1831, the first Guernsey cows introduced into the United States arrived in New Hampshire. The gift of a sea captain out of Boston, these two animals—a bull and a heifer—were placed on a farm on an island in Lake Winnepesaukee. The Guernsey breed—in the early days often called "Alderneys"—had come from the Island of Guernsey in the English Channel, and proved to be one of the most useful dairy animals ever brought into the nation.

In 1833, the New Hampshire legislature officially renamed the Winnepesaukee habitat "Guernsey Island," and so it remains today. For many years the Guernsey breed headquarters for the pedigreed livestock of this species have been located in Peterborough.

V

No institution is more characteristic of modern life than the public library. In the early years of our State history, many communities organized "private libraries," established locally by interested persons for their own and their friends' use. The first of these was in Dover in 1792.

But in 1833, Peterborough made a major stride forward in the history of the American library movement. In that year the voters of Peterborough established a true "public library," supported by tax funds, and freely open to all people. It was the first true public library in the United States.

VI

Every year in June, the Harvard-Yale rowing contest on the Thames River in Connecticut takes columns in the sporting sections of our newspapers. Prestigious as this regatta is in our day, one may not always remember that Harvard-Yale water sports were first held in New Hampshire.

On August 3, 1852, on the waters of Lake Winnepesaukee, a Harvard crew raced a Yale crew. The spectators at Center Harbor included New Hampshire's political leader, Franklin Pierce, shortly to be elected President of the United States. The race was won by Harvard. Exactly a century later, on August 3, 1952, it was meticulously re-enacted. But the original contest was another "first" for the Granite State.

VII

While the first "Concord Coach" was built in 1827, the oldest one still preserved was constructed in 1848 and is now in the Smithsonian Institution in Washington.

The great days of the "Concord Coach" came after 1865 when the firm was renamed Abbott, Downing and Company, and went into large-scale production of its famous vehicle. Of the superlative merits of the "Concord Coach," Mrs. Alice M. Earle has written: "The story of the Concord is one of profound interest. . . . It has justly been pronounced the only perfect vehicle for travelling that has ever been built." Notice Mrs. Earle's use of "Concord" as a noun, a practice followed by scores of writers on the American West.

"Concords" were found on every Rocky Mountain highway until modern times; on the pioneer roads of Canada; on the wild stage lines of Australia, South Africa and South America. Truly a New Hampshire "first" of which all transportation buffs may be proud.

VIII

In 1969, the nation observed two historic railroad centennials. One was the completion of the first transcontinental railway at Promontory, Utah, on May 10. The other was the 100th anniversary of the Mt. Washington Railway on June 3. On that day in 1869 the first genuine cog-wheel mountain railroad in the world began operations from Base Station to Tip-Top House. It was a "dream come true" for Sylvester Marsh of Littleton and Walter Aiken of Franklin, New Hampshire.

As Mrs. Ellen C. Teague reminded us in her Newcomer paper, read in Whitefield in September 1969, this technical achievement marked a significant "first" in transportation history in the Western world. It was later imitated by a Swiss company which constructed a similar cog railroad up Mt. Rigi; and, of course, by many subsequent enterprises.

IX

The first organized summer camp for boys in the United States opened on Squam Lake in New Hampshire in 1881. It had been instituted by Ernest Balch, a noted American of his day in the bringing of greater opportunity to youth. The move proved to be almost instantly popular. Within a few years scores of rival boys' camps appeared, and, also, many intended for girls.

Today, the youth camping movement is one of New Hampshire's most characteristic features in the summer months, a vast and intricate industry that brings tens of thousands of people to the State each season.

X

New Hampshire is the only state in the nation that ever was host to a formal peace conference ending a foreign war. This occurred at Portsmouth in 1905, when the sanguinary Russo-Japanese War of that era was officially terminated.

At the invitation of President Theodore Roosevelt of the United States, the two belligerent nations sent their envoys to the New Hampshire seaport, and on September 5, 1905, the Treaty of Portsmouth was signed. In the annals of American diplomacy this incident is unique, and again is one of those "firsts" of which our people can be proud.

In his last book, that late, distinguished New Hampshire man of letters, Robb Sargent, wrote:

"Life holds more meaning for me somehow when the past ties into the present. When this happens, one gains the assurance the present will tie into the future. Without this hope preservation would hardly be worth while."

As we contemplate some of the "firsts" that have made New Hampshire notable in the past, we not only feel tied into the days of yesterday, but also in some sense to the days yet to be. For today, also, there are "firsts" in New Hampshire which will help to make tomorrow worth living.

BLUE RIBBON DEFENSE PANEL
SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the following study was prepared by seven members of the President's Blue Ribbon Defense Panel. During the year these men spent studying the workings of the Department of Defense they became so concerned with the drastic shift of the strategic balance in favor of the Soviet Union that they reserved the right to issue a supplemental report commenting on the trends they observed and their meaning for the people of the United States.

Although this report was submitted to the Department of Defense in early October 1970 it was not released until the middle of March 1971 and therefore some of the estimates of Soviet forces are low. Since our official intelligence projections of Soviet force levels have been on the low side for the last 5 years this is not entirely unexpected. The Soviets have over 1,440 ICBM's now deployed, rather than the 1,300 figure given in the report, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff projects 1,500 operational Soviet ICBM's in place by June 1971. This will give the Soviets 50 percent more ICBM's than the United States has—a sixfold increase of their land-based ICBM force since 1966.

In addition to these 1,500 ICBM's Senator HENRY JACKSON has recently revealed that the Soviets are beginning construction on a completely new offensive missile system featuring weapons equal and perhaps superior to the SS-9. The SS-9 is the Soviet 25-megaton counterforce weapon. According to Senator JACKSON the Soviets have the ability to deploy between 60 and 70 of these new missiles this year and if such a number is deployed the megatonnage—destructive power—of this new system alone will surpass the total megatonnage possessed by our entire Minuteman force.

The Soviets now have 17 Y-class ballistic nuclear submarines operational rather than the 10 mentioned in the report. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff projects 20 Soviet Y-class operational by June of 1971.

On the other hand the United States B-52 force, listed in the report at 550 aircraft, will be reduced to 450 by the end of fiscal year 1972.

With these facts in mind, facts which underline the thoughts contained in this study, I would highly recommend that all my colleagues read this report. It is a well-written, well-reasoned, incisive look at factors which are essential to the survival of the United States. It is impossible not to agree with the Panel members finding that if we do not respond adequately, and in time, to the rapidly expanding growth of the Soviet strategic offensive forces, "the United States will become a second-rate power incapable of assuring the future security and freedom of its people."

I have a very low confidence factor in the Soviets assuring our security and

freedom for us, should the choice be left to them.

The study follows:

SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENT TO REPORT OF BLUE RIBBON DEFENSE PANEL SUBMITTED TO THE PRESIDENT AND THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ON THE SHIFTING BALANCE OF MILITARY POWER

This Statement is respectfully submitted to The President and The Secretary of Defense as a supplement to the Report of the Blue Ribbon Defense Panel.

William Blackie, Peoria, Illinois; George Champion, New York, New York; William P. Clements, Jr., Dallas, Texas; John F. Fluke, Seattle, Washington; Hobart D. Lewis, Pleasantville, New York; Wilfred J. McNeil, New York, New York; Lewis F. Powell, Jr., Richmond, Virginia; Members of Blue Ribbon Defense Panel, September 30, 1970.

PREFACE

The Blue Ribbon Defense Panel, appointed by the President and the Secretary of Defense in July 1969, submitted its Report on July 1, 1970. Members of the Panel reserved the right to submit supplemental statements on areas not addressed by the Panel's Report. This is submitted, pursuant to that reservation, by the Panel members named below.

The statement which follows deals with the balance of strategic military power at a time when the convergence of a number of trends indicates a shifting of this balance against the United States. In the course of the Panel's study during the past year, it became increasingly clear to the undersigned that if these observable trends continue the United States will become a second-rate power incapable of assuring the future security and freedom of its people.

The President and the Secretary of Defense are fully aware of the trends which cause deep concern, and have brought these to the attention of the Congress and the public in formal reports and addresses. Yet much of the public remains uninformed and apathetic. This supplemental statement is submitted with the hope that it will contribute to public discussion and in the end to the informed public understanding which is essential in a democracy.

Now a word about the scope of this statement: It does not purport to be an exhaustive assessment of the comparative military capabilities of the U.S. and the Communist superpowers, as this can best be done by intelligence experts. Nor does it address directly the specific defense and foreign policy issues which must be resolved by the Administration and the Congress. Rather, the statement deals generally with the disquieting trends which affect adversely the strategic posture and influence of this country; with the continuing buildup of Soviet and Red Chinese nuclear capabilities, including an apparent Soviet preemptive strike capability; with the vital issue of technological supremacy; and with attitudes on the domestic front which tend to inhibit the needed public debate and thoughtful reexamination of defense policies and priorities.

It is hoped that this statement will help stimulate this debate and reexamination, with a resulting wider public understanding that the first duty of the national government is to "provide for the common defense" of our country.*

SUMMARY

The principal points in the accompanying Statement may be summarized as follows: *

The Converging Trends. The convergence of a number of trends indicates a significant shifting of the strategic military balance against the United States and in favor of the Soviet Union.** These trends include: (i) the growing Soviet superiority in ICBM's; (ii) the Soviet commitment of greater re-

sources than the U.S. to strategic offensive and defensive weapons, with the continued deployment thereof; (iii) the possibility that present U.S. technological superiority will be lost to the Soviet Union; (iv) the convincing evidence that the Soviet Union seeks a preemptive first-strike capability; (v) the rapidly expanding Soviet naval capability; and (vi) the mounting hostility of segments of the public towards the military, the defense establishment and "the military-industrial complex," without due recognition that sustained irresponsible criticism could undermine and weaken the only forces which provide security for the U.S.

A Second-Rate Power. If these observable trends continue the U.S. will become a second-rate power incapable of assuring the future security and freedom of its people. Neither the facts concerning these trends nor the ultimate danger is generally understood by the public, which for the most part remains uninformed and hence apathetic.

A Soviet World Order. Since World War II a degree of world order has been maintained by the dominance of U.S. strategic military strength. This American preserved world order is now disintegrating, as doubts arise as to our will and strength to preserve it. There is reason to believe that the Soviet Union envisions a new era which it will dominate, employing superior military power and the threat of its use to achieve long-cherished political, economic and even military objectives.

The End of U.S. Superiority. In a dramatic shift in the balance of power, largely unnoticed by the public, the quarter century of clear U.S. strategic superiority has ended. The Soviet Union has moved significantly ahead of the United States in ICBM's, the principal weapons system of the nuclear age. The U.S. retains, for the time being, a substantial edge in the smaller, short-range SLBM's launched from Polaris submarines. Yet, the Soviet Union has a major submarine construction program which by 1973-74 could nullify this advantage. The U.S. subsonic B-52 bomber force still outnumbered the Soviet strategic bombers by a three to one margin, but both nations recognize the relatively obsolete character of this weapons system.

There are, of course, other elements in the equation of strategic military power. In some of these—such as MIRV and Poseidon—the U.S. is ahead of the Soviet Union. In others—such as strategic defense against missiles (ABM's) and against bomber attack—the Soviets are significantly ahead.

But however one may view the balancing, no informed person now denies that the period of clear U.S. superiority has ended. The Soviet SS-9 ICBM force alone is capable of delivering a megatonnage of nuclear warheads several times greater than that of the entire U.S. force of ICBM's and SLBM's.

A Soviet First-Strike Capability. Our planners in the 60's assumed that if both superpowers had an adequate retaliatory capability neither would prepare for or risk a first strike. The evidence is now reasonably conclusive that the Soviet Union, rejecting this assumption, is deploying strategic weapons systems designed for a first-strike capability. This evidence includes: (i) the continued Soviet production and deployment of ICBM's after having attained a clear numerical and megatonnage advantage; (ii) the emphasis on SS-9's designed as counter-force weapons capable of destroying U.S. hardened missile silos; (iii) the development of MRV with warheads also designed as counter-force weapons, and of MIRV by 1971-72; (iv) the development of a fractional orbital missile which significantly minimizes warning time; (v) the construction of a Y-class atomic powered submarine SLBM launching fleet capable, with no effective warning, of destroying our national command centers and much of our B-52 bomber force; and (vi) the continued

*Footnotes at end of article.

Soviet emphasis on strategic defense systems against both missiles and bombers—an emphasis without parallel in this country.

The characteristics of these offensive and defensive weapons systems, which the Soviets continue to expand, are consistent only with a preemptive strike capability. Such a weapons mix and volume are not required for effective retaliation.

A Challenging Soviet Navy. The Soviet navy, modern and rapidly expanding, is now challenging U.S. naval superiority in every category except aircraft carriers. This Soviet naval buildup is a major element in the shifting balance of military power.

Retreat from the Threat of the 70's. The situation which our country faces is without precedent. As we enter the 70's, the strategy of American superiority has given way to the concept of deterrence by maintaining an assured retaliatory capability. But there is no longer any certainty that our nuclear deterrent will remain credible to a Soviet Union which apparently seeks a preemptive strike capability, and which is moving rapidly into the role of the world's dominant military power. Red China, bitterly hostile to the U.S., also is acquiring a significant ICBM capability. It is not too much to say that in the 70's neither the vital interests of the U.S. nor the lives and freedom of its citizens will be secure.

Yet, many of our most influential citizens respond to this unprecedented national peril, not by a renewed determination to assure an adequate national defense, but rather by demands for further curtailment of defense measures which can only increase the peril.

Outback in Defense Spending. Although the President has submitted for FY 1971 a "bare bones" defense budget, reflecting the largest single cutback since the Korean War, public and political pressures are mounting for even more drastic reductions. As U.S. defense spending goes down, the trend of spending by the Soviet Union continues steadily upward. Its total military funding about equals that of the U.S., although its gross national product is barely half that of this country. The mix of Soviet spending is especially meaningful. Without the drain of a Vietnam War or public pressures to curtail defense funding, Soviet expenditures in dollar equivalents on strategic offensive and defensive weapons significantly exceed those of the U.S.

Threat to Technological Superiority. U.S. qualitative superiority in weapons, due to its advanced technology, has afforded a decisive advantage over the past years. This advantage is now being eroded away, as the U.S. falls behind the Soviet Union in the support of R&D and in the training of scientists and engineers. There is an ever present risk of disastrous technological surprise in major weaponry where an open society is in competition with a closed Communist society. We are neglecting, by inadequate support and planning, to minimize this risk.

Negotiations—Trap or Opportunity? Since the end of World War II repeated attempts have been made by the U.S. to negotiate limitations on the "arms race." Negotiations for sound enforceable limitations should be continued and hopes are now high for the success of the current SALT talks. But the total experience of negotiating with Communist nations suggests the utmost caution and the need for the most critical analysis of the possible consequences of any proposed terms. Not only is the security of this country at stake, but it is possible that a limitations agreement as to strategic weapons could have the effect of neutralizing the U.S. as a strategic power, leaving the Soviet Union and Red China relatively free to employ their superior tactical capabilities wherever their seems advantageous.

Hostility Towards the Military. At this critical time, when the balance of military power is shifting, it is uniquely unfortunate

that public hostility toward national defense and the military is at an unprecedented level. This attitude reflects a broad spectrum of opinion from honest pacifists and dissenters over Southeast Asia to New Leftist revolutionaries. But the base is sufficiently broad, and the voices supporting various aspects of it sufficiently powerful, to have a profoundly adverse effect upon almost every aspect of national defense. In a democracy, national defense suffers when there is inadequate public understanding and support. It may be fatally undermined when a significant segment of public opinion is not merely negative but irresponsibly hostile.

A viable National Strategy. Unless the American people wish to accept irrevocably the status of a second-rate power—with all of the probable consequences—the only viable national strategy is to regain and retain a clearly superior strategic capability. This can be accomplished by reversing the trends identified above, and by eschewing agreements which freeze the U.S. into a second-rate status. The margin of our overall strategic strength must be sufficient to convince the most reckless aggressor that, even after a surprise first strike, the capability to retaliate will in fact survive and be adequate to impose unacceptable destruction on the aggressor nation. This course of action is not incompatible with continued negotiations for arms limitations. Indeed, it will significantly enhance the chances of negotiations being genuinely fruitful without constituting a trap.

The Consequences of Second-Rate Status. Basic Communist dogma contemplates the employment—over such time spans as may be necessary—of the entire arsenal of pressures against the U.S. as the strongest democratic power. Despite discord among Communist states, there has been no amelioration of this doctrinal goal. Throughout the past quarter century, when the Soviet Union was relatively weak strategically, it precipitated or supported crisis upon crisis—directly or through puppets and satellites—designed to extend its influence and to create disarray within the U.S. and the Free World.

It is irrational to think, with the balance of military power shifting in its favor, that the policies of the Soviet Union will be less hostile, disruptive and imperialistic.

The consequences of being second rate, even if national survival is not threatened, could be seriously detrimental to the most vital diplomatic and economic interests of this country.

Weakness—The Gravest Threat to Peace. The road to peace has never been through appeasement, unilateral disarmament or negotiation from weakness. The entire recorded history of mankind is precisely the contrary. Among the great nations, only the strong survive. Weakness of the U.S.—of its military capability and its will—could be the gravest threat to the peace of the world.

The Blue Ribbon Defense Panel's assigned mission, though broadly defined, was related primarily to the organization and functioning of the Department of Defense and the Armed Services. The Panel was not requested to consider matters of national policy such as strategic posture, force levels, weapons systems and defense spending.

But one cannot spend a year studying the defense structure of this country without considering the vital questions of national defense policy. In the course of this study, it became increasingly clear that the balance of strategic military power is continuing to shift against the U.S.

In his Foreign Policy Report, Presid. at Nixon said:

"The overriding purpose of our strategic posture is political and defensive: to deny other countries the ability to impose their will on the United States and its allies under the weight of strategic military superiority. We must insure that all potential aggressors

see unacceptable risks in contemplating nuclear attack, or nuclear blackmail, or acts which could escalate to strategic nuclear war, such as a Soviet conventional attack on Europe."¹

If observable trends continue—in this country and abroad—there is grave doubt whether this purpose can be attained for the 1970's and beyond. The warning by Secretary Laird that the U.S. could be "in a second-rate strategic position . . . by the mid-1970's" appears to be fully justified.² Indeed, if these trends continue, the U.S. will become a second-rate power incapable of assuring the future security and freedom of its people.

TRENDS WHICH ENDANGER U.S. SECURITY

The trends which are combining to shift the strategic balance of power in favor of the Soviet Union include:

1. The Soviet deployment of types and numbers of offensive and defensive nuclear strategic weapons which threaten the security of this country.

2. The Soviet commitment of greater resources than the U.S. to strategic offensive and defensive weapons and weapons systems.

3. The Soviet commitment of greater manpower and resources than the U.S. to military-related research and development (R&D), thus threatening to end U.S. technological superiority.

4. The evidence that the Soviet Union seeks a preemptive first-strike capability.

5. The Soviet deployment of a fleet capable of challenging the U.S. fleet.

6. The abandonment by the U.S. of its former policy of maintaining strategic superiority.

7. The state of mind of much of the U.S. public which tends to inhibit necessary defense measures and even the full and rational discussion of the need for such measures.

8. The tendency of many to attack and criticize, whether justified or not, the military, the defense establishment, and "the military-industrial complex," without due recognition that sustained irresponsible criticism could undermine and weaken—at a critical time in history—the only forces which provide security for the U.S. and the free world.

It is appreciated, of course, that opinions differ as to the extent and significance of these trends. Some will think these views do not appropriately weigh such counter trends as may exist. But national defense policies in the nuclear age should be formulated conservatively, based on the most realistic assessment of potential enemy capabilities.³ It is imprudent, indeed even reckless, to formulate such policies on the basis of subjective judgments as to Soviet and Red Chinese intentions rather than their known military and technological capabilities.⁴

Where the issues are the security of our country, the preservation of the values of a free society, and possibly the life or death of tens of millions of our people, responsible government cannot afford to run the risk of miscalculation on the optimistic side. The lessons of history abundantly teach that nations do not survive by trusting other nations to be rational or by setting examples of unilateral restraint in self defense.

THE GENERAL WORLD POSTURE

Genuine peace, the professed goal of all mankind, is as remote today as at any time since World War II.

The Asian Continent

On the Asian continent, the war in Southeast Asia drags on. Communist aggression continues in South Vietnam and Laos, and now threatens the national existence of Cambodia. With Red China building a military road across northern Laos directed toward

Footnotes at end of article.

Thailand, apprehension mounts in that ancient kingdom.

North Korea, reckless and arrogant, attacked an American ship and plane with impunity and constitutes a threat so serious that some 60,000 American troops remain in South Korea 17 years after the tenuous armistice there.⁸

Despite internal convulsions, Red China maintains the world's largest ground forces and is acquiring a significant nuclear capability. Its despotic regime harbors and promotes the most virulent hatred of America.⁹ Its ambitions within Asia—beyond Taiwan—remain obscure, although already it has conquered Tibet, conducted border incursions against India, and indicated a continuing covetousness toward Southeast Asia.

Some think the greatest threat to peace in Asia lies along the Soviet-Chinese border where ancient hostilities have been exacerbated. However this may be, Asia is a continent of discord and unrest with military strength mounting in the four Communist powers. There is no peace or prospect of it.

The Middle East

The situation in the Middle East, in terms of possible escalation into major confrontation, appears to be even more serious. A state of undeclared but active war existed between Israel and its Arab neighbors until the August 1970 cease fire. Although the Arab states have an implacable hatred of Israel they are incapable of waging modern war without the weapons, technicians and economic support provided by the Soviet Union.

The strategic significance of the Middle East is profound. The petroleum resources there are vital to the economic well being of much of the Free World. Effective control of these resources—at least to the extent of being able to deny them to the Free World—is an obvious Soviet strategic objective. Perhaps a less obvious objective is the reopening and control of the Suez Canal. This waterway, as important to the Soviet Union as the Panama Canal has been to the U.S., would provide the cheapest and most effective transportation route between the Soviet heartland in Europe and the Soviet Far East. The critical importance of this sea link is evident in relation to a possible U.S.S.R. confrontation with Red China.⁷ These strategic considerations explain the willingness of the Soviet Union to incur the gravest risks of escalation. In addition to building up United Arab Republic and Syrian capabilities, the Soviet Union has deployed in the UAR some 100 Mig 21-J's and a substantial number of SAM-3 sites, all operated by Soviet personnel.⁸

The cease-fire plan appeared initially to afford an opportunity for negotiations. But this hope was dashed, perhaps irretrievably, by Soviet and UAR duplicity in deploying SAM's within the agreed truce zones.⁹

In view of Israeli-Arab hostility and Soviet ambitions in the Middle East, including its desire to out-flank NATO in the Mediterranean, there is no prospect of genuine peace in this explosive area.

Western Europe

The situation in Western Europe, the area of our most vital interest, remains relatively precarious beneath the superficial aura of peace. The Berlin Wall and the Iron Curtain still stand. NATO forces, including some 300,000 Americans, are confronted by a larger and better equipped Soviet force. This cold-war type confrontation, without precedent in history in terms of duration and scale, has lasted more than two decades with no end foreseeable.¹⁰ One has to visit Allied bases in West Germany to comprehend even dimly the tenseness and tragedy of hundreds of thousands of armed men facing each other night and day, with air crews alert, ground units

in position, command posts staffed, and the flight of every aircraft monitored.

Berlin, that indefensible symbol of freedom which we nevertheless are committed to defend, remains surrounded by Communist forces which periodically block or harass access routes by land and air. Berlin has assumed crisis proportions a number of times in the past. No one can be sure that the future will be different.

Other areas

The foregoing are the more visible and active danger areas in a troubled world, but ruptures of peace could come anywhere. A war was concluded in Africa earlier this year with heavy loss of life and infinite human suffering. There are a few stable governments in either Africa or South America, where plots and revolutions and terrorist activities are commonplace. Cuba, now an armed and erratic Communist power, is a major base for subversion, the export of revolution and possibly for Soviet naval operations.

Communists have common objective

It is true that the solidarity of the international Communist movement has been fractured. The friendship between the Soviet Union and Red China has dissolved. Even the boasted unity of the Warsaw Pact members depends nakedly upon the military might of the Soviet Union and its openly avowed "right" to employ this might against any recalcitrant member.¹¹

But this disunity among Communist powers does not necessarily enhance the chances of peace for the Free World. The hate propaganda of both the Soviet Union and Red China against the United States exceeds that leveled against each other. Each has always proclaimed that the principal enemy is "imperialistic America." The Marxist dream of unity among Communist countries may have faded, but the Marxist purpose of communizing the world remains the goal of every Communist party.

This, in briefest summary, is the disordered state of the world at the beginning of the 1970's. Rational persons, familiar with the lessons of history, would hardly choose this time to undermine our own military forces either by irresponsible criticism or unilateral reductions in defense capabilities.

World order maintained by United States

Since World War II a degree of world order has been maintained almost solely by the dominance of U.S. strategic military strength. But for this strength and our will to assert it to preserve freedom, few doubt that the Soviet Union would have imposed Communist regimes on a number of other countries. It had the ambition to subjugate Greece and much of Western Europe just as it did the Eastern European satellites. But for American military strength there also would have been Communist incursions and aggressions—beyond those we have experienced—in Asia, Africa and even in this hemisphere.¹²

This world order which we have attempted to preserve has been precarious and far from effective in many instances. But at least the principal objectives have been attained. The freedom and independence of Western Europe and the opportunity of the countries there to restructure themselves economically were assured. Many nations around the world, including the emerging new nations in Africa, were encouraged to pursue courses of nonalignment. The prospect of worldwide Communist domination—a likely one in the absence of American deterrence—was not a realizable goal. But most important of all, a fragile peace was preserved between the great powers and there was no employment of nuclear weapons.

A new era—communist world order?

This American preserved world order is now disintegrating. We no longer have the power to preserve it. Nor do we appear to

have the will, as a new neo-isolationist fever dims the perception of our people. The Communists everywhere applaud this end of an era, and even many in our country seem to welcome it.¹³

Whatever one's views on this point may be, the critical question now is what sort of world order will exist in the years ahead. There is every reason to believe that the Soviet Union envisions the new era as one which it will dominate, employing its military power and the threat of its use to promote and attain its own imperialistic objectives.

Second best in a troubled world

Thus, as we enter the 1970's America is confronted with an inherently unstable world situation in which "little wars and revolutions" can escalate and major wars develop on short notice. We face a world in which the military balance of power is shifting from the West to the East, and the world order sustained by dominant American power is fading away. In the most optimistic view, a precarious order will continue as the two superpowers maintain an uncertain balance of deterrence. A less optimistic view, and one supported by the weight of the evidence, is that the United States will become a "second rate" power subordinate to manifest Soviet military superiority. In that case, the world order of the future will bear a Soviet trademark, with all peoples upon whom it is imprinted suffering Communist repressions.¹⁴

THE END OF U.S. MILITARY SUPERIORITY

The facts set forth in the Reports of the President and the Secretary of Defense, mentioned above, clearly foreshadow the end of U.S. military superiority.¹⁵ This was predetermined by decisions made in the 1960's, which resulted in the reduction, postponement and abandonment of strategic defense measures and weapons systems. These decisions reflected the budgetary priorities of the Vietnamese war as well as a desire to de-escalate the strategic arms race by an example of self-imposed restraint.

In any event, the U.S. is now face-to-face with the fruits of this unilateral strategic arms slowdown.

Soviet missile superiority

The Soviet Union has attained for the first time a superior strategic capability—where it counts the most—in ICBM's. The U.S. froze its ICBM's at 1,054 in the mid-60's when the Soviets had less than 250 ICBM's. While we imposed a limitation on additional strategic weapons, the Soviets pressed forward to overtake and pass us. Intelligence estimates indicate that they now have over 1,250 operational ICBM's, and will have about 1,300 by the end of 1970.¹⁶

More than 275 of the operational Soviet ICBM's are SS-9's, each capable of delivering 25 megatons as compared to the one megaton payload of the U.S. Minuteman.¹⁷ The major portion of the remainder of the Soviet ICBM's are SS-11's and SS-13's, each capable of a payload as large as that of Minuteman.¹⁸

More serious than the numerical superiority is the substantial megatonnage advantage enjoyed by the Soviet Union. The enormous payloads of the SS-9's have a destructive capacity incomparably greater than any U.S. missile; they have a wider margin of error; they are effective against hardened missile silos as well as population and industrial centers; and their launch vehicle is capable of far more extensive MIRV systems than any U.S. missile.

Although the U.S. has frozen the number of its ICBM's at 1,054, we have commenced to deploy Minuteman III with MIRV warheads. This is a significant qualitative advance in missile technology. The Soviets are believed already to have deployed MRV's in some SS-9's,¹⁹ and they have recently tested what appears to be a MIRV system for the SS-

Footnotes at end of article.

11 missile, indicating an early capability comparable to Minuteman III.²⁰

The qualitative lead of the U.S. in MIRV's and guidance systems may prove to be short lived in view of Soviet success and the scale of its effort. The Soviet Union's advantage in numbers and megatonnage of missiles also seems certain to increase, as it continues to construct and deploy ICBM's at a rate that could result in a force more than double that of the U.S. by the Mid-70's.²¹ At that level of superiority, the Soviet Union would have the capability of effectively destroying both the U.S. ICBM and bomber forces as well as our cities.²²

Polaris—A vital but limited response

The U.S. is fortunate to have its Polaris force, consisting of 41 atomic powered submarines capable of launching a total of 656 missiles (SLBM's). As in the case of ICBM's, we froze the number of Polaris submarines in the mid-60's and no new ones are authorized.

We have commenced the conversion from Polaris to the Poseidon configuration, increasing the size and range of the SLBM warheads. The Defense Department projects the ultimate conversions of 31 submarines, although only eight have been authorized by the Congress.

The U.S. superiority in this category of strategic weapons is also being challenged. The Soviet Union is now engaged in a priority construction program for its Y-class atomic powered submarine which is superior in some respects to Polaris. Ten of these submarines are believed to be operational, each with 16 SLBM's, and the Soviet Union is producing as many as eight to ten new vessels per year in two shipyards. By 1974-75, if this program continues, the Soviet Union will have some 50 Y-class subs with a missile capability greater than our present Polaris force.

Y-class submarines are already patrolling the U.S. coast. Their deployment constitutes an ever-present threat to the survivability of our national command headquarters, to most of our major cities, and increasingly to the bomber element of our deterrent.²³

Balancing the two SLBM forces against each other is not meaningful without considering the relationship of other strategic weapons systems and their survivability following a preemptive strike. If, as indicated above, the Soviet ICBM force attains the capability of destroying or neutralizing our ICBM and bomber forces, the only remaining retaliatory strategic weapons system would be Polaris.

But is it prudent, by tolerating an increasing Soviet ICBM superiority together with a rapidly expanding SLBM capability, to risk the security of the U.S. on a single retaliatory system which we do not plan to enlarge (except qualitatively) and which has definite limitations? Of our 41 Polaris submarines, a significant number are always in port and nonoperational. This means that at any given time our Polaris "assured retaliation" is considerably less than the specified total capability. Soviet strategists may conclude, as their ABM system is extended and improved, that—following a massive preemptive first strike—the damage potential of our SLBM response would be an acceptable risk.

Moreover, there can be no assurance that the presently assumed invulnerability of Polaris will continue.²⁴ As the Senate Armed Services Committee has said: "We cannot assume that our Polaris system will be the first weapon in history to remain invulnerable."

Strategic bombers

The third element of the U.S. strategic force consists of about 550 B-52 bombers, as compared with some 20 Soviet strategic bombers. Although a vital weapons system for many years, the subsonic and obsolescing B-52's are approaching the end of their effectiveness

as a major strategic system. Both the U.S. and the Soviet Union are gradually minimizing their reliance upon existing strategic bombers. In assessing the strategic balance of power for the 70's, one must discount the role and significance of these aircraft.²⁵

The misleading "numbers game"

There is a pervasive public misunderstanding as to the comparative strategic capabilities of the U.S. and the Soviet Union. This may well result in major part from the widespread practice—among some of the media and among others who minimize the need for national defense measures—of treating nuclear warheads as if they were fungible. This has sometimes been referred to as the "numbers game," namely, the mere counting of warheads without analysis of megatonnage, range, accuracy, survivability and reliability of delivery.

The typical presentation of comparative strength simply totals "the number of warheads deliverable by the U.S. and Soviet strategic systems." An example, which made first-page news, was a tabulation taken from The Strategic Survey showing the U.S. capable of delivering 4,235 nuclear warheads as against only 1,880 by the Soviet Union. The tabulation apparently added together all ICBM's, SLBM's and each warhead which U.S. and Soviet bombers are capable of carrying. Thus, a single bomb or one air-to-ground missile on a B-52 was equated with a Soviet 25-megaton ICBM. This simplistic type of comparison creates the illusion of abundant security, if not U.S. over-kill capability.

It would be difficult to conceive of a better way to mislead the public than to present—without precise definition and analysis—comparative figures of this kind. Those who present such distortions contribute to the confusion rather than enlightenment of our people.

If one wished to make a dramatic comparison indicating precisely the opposite result, the basis could be deliverable megatonnage rather than numbers of warheads. The 300 Soviet SS-9's, expected to be operational by the end of this year, will be capable of delivering 7,500 megatons with a destructive capability several times greater than the total warhead capacity of our entire ICBM and SLBM forces. While such a comparison would be far more meaningful than the "numbers game," it also would be an oversimplified presentation of vastly complex relationships and components of strategic military power.

Other weapons systems

There are, of course, aircraft carriers and other tactical means (by fighter bomber aircraft and short-range missiles) of delivering nuclear warheads. This is not the place to discuss or balance these out in detail.²⁶ But analysis of the comparative numbers, types and probable employability of these weapons in a time of national or international peril is not reassuring.

The available tactical means of delivery do significantly augment the U.S. strategic forces. It must be remembered, however, that the Soviet and Warsaw Pact tactical forces deployed against NATO possess overall capabilities superior to those of NATO.²⁷

This tactical superiority is fortified by the rarely mentioned Soviet intermediate range ballistic missile force (IRBM), a type of weapons system we no longer possess. The Soviet Union has deployed more than 700 IRBM's targeted against Allied and U.S. military forces and the cities of Western Europe. Following a preemptive first strike, with these and shorter range missiles, there would be little American or Allied retaliatory capability remaining there. Indeed, in view of the threat of certain destruction of much of Western Europe posed by Soviet IRBM's, one may question whether NATO would be willing to employ tactical nuclear weapons even against a Soviet attempt to overrun Western Europe with conventional forces.

In short, if the U.S. no longer possesses the strategic superiority which has been the ultimate "shield" protecting the European democracies, the tactical imbalance against the West could result in profound new military and political problems.

A Soviet first-strike capability

Our planners in the 60's assumed that if both super-powers had an adequate survivable retaliatory capability neither would risk a first strike. They further assumed that the Soviet leadership would be content with this "balance of deterrence," especially if—by freezing our own program—we permitted the Soviet Union to attain a rough parity of strength. Little consideration appears to have been given to the possibility that the Soviets would not "buy" such a rational program, but rather would seek a capability to neutralize the effectiveness of our retaliatory response.

It now appears that the Soviet Union is developing just such a capability. It is producing and deploying offensive nuclear weapons with the capability, when sufficient are deployed, to destroy the ICBM and bomber elements of our retaliatory forces. At the same time, the Soviet Union is pressing ahead with an anti-ballistic missile system designed to provide a strategic defense against such U.S. retaliatory missiles as might survive a first strike.

It is to be remembered that, with the possible exception of our obsolete B-52 force, our strategic weapons are designed primarily for retaliation against enemy centers of population. They are not designed as counter-force weapons and with their limited warheads are not an effective weapon for destroying Soviet ICBM's in hardened silos. This is in accord with America's irreversible commitment never to make a first strike, and to rely—as a deterrent—on having enough operational missiles after an enemy strike to destroy its population centers.

This entire theory becomes untenable if the enemy develops (i) an offensive first-strike capability against our means of delivering retaliatory missiles and (ii) a defensive capability of protecting much of its heartland from such U.S. missiles (e.g. Polaris) as survive the preemptive strike.

The evidence is reasonably conclusive that the Soviet Union is planning precisely these capabilities. This is not to say that a preemptive first strike is intended, but rather that weapons systems which are needed only for such a purpose are being deployed:

SS-9 missiles. These missiles, with 25-megaton warheads capable of destroying American ICBM's in hardened silos, are designed as a counter-force, preemptive strike weapon. Warheads of this size are not needed for retaliation against even the largest city. The Soviets are continuing to produce and deploy these monster missiles.

SS-9 with MRV. This multiple reentry vehicle contains a cluster of three warheads each capable of delivering five megatons. Our MIRV warheads for Minuteman III are pigmies by comparison, deliver only 200 kilotons, and are designed—not as counter-force weapons—but to penetrate ABM defenses of enemy cities.²⁸

SS-11's buildup. The Soviets also are continuing to produce and deploy SS-11's, despite having attained missile superiority over the static U.S. force. They have now tested what appears to be a MIRV system for their SS-11's, which—when deployed—will escalate the ratio of superiority.

Soviet ABM deployment. The Soviet Union is committing large resources to strategic defense systems, both against missiles and bombers.²⁹ The Moscow population and industrial area are already protected by the Galosh system, with 67 launchers for multi-stage missiles with megaton warheads.³⁰ The Soviets are also deploying at about half-a-dozen points around the Soviet Union giant "Henhouse" radars for ballistic missile defense acquisition and tracking. As the radar

Footnotes at end of article.

installation is the long lead time component. It is possible that the Soviets are extending their Galosh ABM system to protect many other areas. They are some five years ahead of the United States in this vital element of strategic power.³³ To the extent that Soviet cities and industrial areas are protected (while ours remain unprotected), the credibility of our retaliatory threat diminishes.

FOBS. The Soviets are developing a fractional orbital nuclear weapons system designed to minimize warning time.³⁴ This weapon is consistent with a first-strike strategy, as it virtually precludes the possibility of enough warning to fire our missiles or get our bombers off the ground.

Soviet SLBM's. The Y-class submarines described above will have the capability of eliminating most of our B-52 bomber force.³⁵ Also these SLBM's will constitute a grave threat to Washington, D.C., and to our national command centers.

It is clear from the foregoing and other evidence that the Soviets never have accepted the assumption upon which American strategic planning has been based. The structures of both their offensive and defensive forces strongly indicate that they have planned—and are moving to achieve—a first-strike capability of destroying our urban centers and neutralizing our retaliatory weapons except such Polaris submarines as happen to be on station.³⁶

In contemplating what risks responsible officials and members of Congress are willing to assume on behalf of the American people, it is well to remember that we have no defense whatever against Soviet ICBM's and SLBM's which now have the capability of killing perhaps half of our population—more than 100 million people—by a surprise first strike.

Soviet "Blue Water" Navy

The weapons described above relate to the Soviet Union's strategic nuclear capability. The growing Soviet Navy is a threat of a different kind, and yet it confirms Soviet intentions to be the world's dominant military power.

For centuries, both under the Czars and more recently under Communist rule, Russia was a land power with limited capability at sea. Virtually landlocked, it was not a maritime power in a "blue water" sense. This has changed strikingly in recent years, as the Soviet Union has now achieved a challenging naval capability. It has the largest conventional submarine fleet; it is moving rapidly to overtake the U.S. in ballistic missile submarines; it has by far the strongest force of surface-to-surface missile-launching ships; and it leads the U.S. in numbers of cruisers, destroyer escorts and patrol boats. Only in aircraft carriers—presumably considered by the Soviets to be vulnerable to missile-launching vessels and aircraft—has the Soviet navy failed to challenge the U.S.

More important than numbers is the quality of the vessels. Although our carrier force is formidable indeed, the U.S. has failed to maintain a balanced navy of modern surface ships. The majority of our fleet vessels are more than 20 years old, many with obsolescing weapons and equipment. By contrast, most of the Soviet fleet is relatively new and modern,³⁷ often with vessels of greater speed, fire power and more advanced electronics than comparable vessels in the U.S. fleet.³⁸

The Soviet naval buildup, like its strategic missile deployment, is a major element in the shifting balance of military power. Although not itself a direct threat to the continental United States (except the submarines), the new and growing Soviet naval strength affects adversely the diplomatic and economic position of the United States throughout much of the world. It also threatens an historic American policy, namely, freedom of the seas.

The U.S., traditionally a sea power, has extensive worldwide commitments. These range from the defense of U.S. states (Hawaii and Alaska), and its territories and bases, to the protection of American citizens and investments in scores of countries. These commitments also include treaty obligations to our allies, and the supplying of U.S. Armed Forces abroad. Our extensive international trade is essential to the continued prosperity of our people. U.S. commitments in all of these respects can be fulfilled only by maintaining control of the seas, now being increasingly challenged by Soviet naval power.

For some three centuries the British navy preserved freedom of the seas and fostered international trade. There were also other naval powers, including the U.S., Japan, Germany, France and Italy. All of this has changed beyond recognition in a dramatic shift of sea power. All of these navies (except that of the U.S.) have ceased to exist as blue water fleets. England has dismantled its great bases around the world, and the vacuum thus created is being filled by the Soviet Union. The Indian Ocean and the Mediterranean east of Malta are already dominated by Soviet naval power. There are no limits to the seas in which the Soviet navy now operates, as demonstrated by its naval maneuvers.³⁹

In the new era—in which a Soviet world order is envisioned by its Communist rulers—this navy will increasingly endanger the most vital diplomatic, military and economic interests of the U.S.

Retreat from the threat

The situation which our country faces is without precedent. For a few years following World War II our national security was complete and unchallenged. In the early 50's the Soviet Union became a nuclear power and, with gradual but increasing momentum, it undertook to challenge American superiority. But we enjoyed marked advantages in our industrial base, our technology, and in the sheer number and quality of strategic weapons. In the 60's our complacency in this respect became so great, and our preoccupation with the Vietnam war so distracting, that we neglected our strategic posture.

As a result, we enter the 70's confronted by (i) a superior Soviet offensive missile capability, (ii) a marked Soviet advantage in defensive missile capability, (iii) a menacing Soviet fleet, and (iv) with respect to all of these, a Soviet commitment and momentum which is quite unmatched in this country. We are also confronted, as Red China orbits its first satellite, with the certainty of a new and growing ICBM capability from that irrationally hostile nation.

Within a span of less than two decades we have moved from complete security to perilous insecurity.

Yet, the response of the public generally, much of the media and many political leaders ranges from apathy and complacency to affirmative hostility—not against the potential enemies which threaten us—but toward our own military establishment and the very concept of providing defense capabilities adequate to protect this country and its vital interests. The state of public opinion is such that some responsible leaders, fully familiar with the threat, believe it is futile to seek adequate defense funding. Thus, we respond as a nation—not by appropriate measures to strengthen our defenses, but by significant curtailments which widen the gap.

In short, the mood of the people and much of the Congress is almost one of precipitous retreat from the challenge. This paradox in response to possible national peril is without precedent in the history of this country.

THE CUTBACK IN DEFENSE SPENDING

It is in this mixed climate of euphoria and retreat that a major retrenchment in America's defense effort has been deemed necessary. The defense budget proposed for FY 1971, totaling \$71.8 billion in proposed

expenditures, reflects the largest single cutback in defense spending since the Korean War.⁴⁰ Yet a significant portion of our political and intellectual leadership is demanding even more drastic reduction.

Difficult budgetary decisions

In addition to the public malaise, it must be recognized that the Administration and the Congress are confronted with extremely difficult budgetary decisions. The problems include (i) pressing and escalating domestic needs, (ii) inflationary costs (iii) the continued drain of the Vietnamese war, and (iv) the imperative necessity of a budget more nearly in balance after years of deficits.

Quite apart from public and political pressures, there is an obvious need for some restructuring of national priorities as well as the effecting of all possible economies. The impact of all of these pressures centered on the defense budget, which the Secretary of Defense describes as a "bare bones" one. It is also recognized as "transitional," pending to some extent the outcome of the SALT talks and affording time for a more penetrating analysis by the new administration of defense needs, options and priorities.

Inadequate funding

As understandable as the resulting budget may be, it entails the assumption of defense risks which seem unjustified.⁴¹ The \$71.8 billion dollars proposed for FY 1971 is \$9.8 billion below the Johnson administration budget proposal for FY 1970, and constitutes 7% of estimated gross national product—the lowest percentage since FY 1951. This proposed funding would constitute 34.6% of the total federal budget, the lowest commitment to defense since FY 1950.⁴²

Greater Soviet effort

There has been no comparable restraint exercised by the Soviet Union either with respect to overall defense spending or the funding of its strategic programs. On the contrary, the trend of Soviet defense spending continues steadily upward. Its total military funding about equals that of the U.S., although its gross national product (GNP) is barely half that of this country. If expenditures on the Vietnam war are excluded, the total Soviet effort substantially exceeds that of the U.S. But the mix of the spending is especially meaningful in view of its effect upon the strategic balance of power. The Soviet Union is spending significantly more than the U.S. in the buildup of its strategic offensive and defensive weapons.⁴³

The results of this greater Soviet effort are now reflected in their dramatic gains in ICBM's, SLBM's and other advanced weapons systems. If we continue to permit the Soviet Union to outdistance the U.S. in defense effort, it is inevitable that the security of this country will be endangered. As Secretary Laird has warned:

"Time and again in our past history our nation has paid a heavy price for allowing its armed forces to dwindle to levels that proved to be too low to discourage or to counter aggression."⁴⁴

In view of the crescendo of demands for further reductions in defense spending, we may be well along the road to reliving this past history.

THE THREAT TO TECHNOLOGICAL SUPERIORITY

There are three disturbing trends in defense funding: (i) the magnitude of the overall reduction, (ii) the unfavorable balance between Soviet spending on strategic forces as compared to our effort, and (iii) a similar unfavorable balance in the critical area of research and development (R&D). Of these, perhaps the last is the cause for greatest concern.

Soviet challenge to U.S. technology

The U.S. has enjoyed a clear technological superiority over the Soviet Union and all other countries until recently. It has been this qualitative superiority, rather than the

Footnotes at end of article.

size of forces or numbers of weapons, which has enabled America to deter major war and protect the Free World during the past quarter of a century. This superiority is today being successfully challenged by the Soviet Union.⁴⁵

In addition to talented leadership and the necessary industrial base, the essential ingredients of a vital and competitive technology are skilled manpower and adequate R&D funding.⁴⁶ The U.S. is falling behind the Soviet Union in both of these respects.

More graduate engineers

As of 1969, the Soviet Union was believed to have about 550,000 full-time R&D scientists and engineers, as compared with about 540,000 in the U.S. But the Soviet Union is graduating annually a substantially greater number of engineers than the U.S., and its technically trained manpower base is projected steadily to outdistance that of the U.S.⁴⁷

Greater funding of R&D

Comparative funding data for military-related R&D (including space/atomic energy) in the Soviet Union and the U.S. reflects a similar disparity. Soviet annual funding for this purpose is now estimated at about \$16 to \$17 billion as compared with U.S. funding of about \$13 to \$15 billion. Again, the trend is also adverse as the Soviet military R&D effort during the 1960's increased by about 60% while that of the U.S. increased 30%.⁴⁸

Secretary Laird has pointed out that "the Soviet Union is devoting more effort to military-related R&D than is the U.S.," with its rate of such expenditures increasing "about 10-13% annually" while comparable U.S. expenditures "remain relatively constant."⁴⁹

Threat to Minuteman

In relating our need for the most advanced technology to the Soviet threat, Dr. Foster has testified that by early 1974 the Soviet Union, if it continues its ICBM production and deployment, will be able "completely to overwhelm the present Minuteman portion of our deterrent."⁵⁰ He stated that the Safeguard program (ABM) should improve the survivability of a significant fraction of the U.S. land-based missiles. But the long-range survivability of an adequate number of our ICBMs cannot be assured without a more extensive and effective ABM system than has been proposed. The critical necessity of providing alternative measures is now a priority task of R&D.⁵¹ Dr. Foster cited this problem as one example of the frightening way in which advancing technology obsolesces both offensive and defensive weapons and even entire weapons systems. Indeed, he states a "major restructuring of our strategic forces may be necessary to insure survivability."⁵²

Lead time—A free society handicap

The problem of "lead time" in weapons development is particularly acute in competition between an open and a closed society. The time span between initial R&D and deployment may range from five to fifteen years, depending upon complexity and rapidity of new developments requiring changes or re-designing. In a Communist state, where secrecy is both an obsession and a way of life, the development of a new weapon may be concealed—even from our most intensive intelligence efforts—until testing begins or often until the completed weapon is displayed in Red Square. This gives the Soviet Union and Red China at least a five-year time advantage in developing new weapons systems. If a major technological breakthrough should catch us by surprise the results could be catastrophic.⁵³

Hope of survival—Technology superiority

There is no way completely to guard against the possibility of some dramatic and

concealed technological advance in weaponry. But this risk is minimized directly in proportion to the extent we maintain an overall superior technological base and a more effective R&D effort than any other nation.

It is precisely here that recent trends create serious doubts as to the future security of this country. The United States can never match its potential enemies in land armies or in numbers of tactical weapons. Our only hope of survival is to maintain clear weapons superiority. This simply cannot be achieved by permitting our industrial and technological manpower bases to erode and by inadequate emphasis on R&D.

No subject in the entire spectrum of defense problems deserves a higher priority of thoughtful and urgent attention.⁵⁴

NEGOTIATIONS—TRAP OR OPPORTUNITY

One of the reasons assigned for the "transitional" budget proposed for FY 1971 is the hope that the present Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) will be fruitful. Some political leaders have urged even greater restraint than that reflected in the reduced budget, arguing—despite all experience to the contrary—that the Soviets might be influenced favorably by our example.

The object of SALT

There are obvious reasons for seeking to halt the escalation of nuclear weapons. The logic of the situation—at least on the surface—calls for a "freeze," which seems such a facile and popular solution. In simplest terms, the object of SALT is to agree upon a limitation—and perhaps a gradual reduction—of strategic nuclear weapons. An effective agreement to this end which does not leave either side at the mercy of the other, which does not in itself alter the balance of power, and with procedures to assure compliance, would be welcomed by most of the world. SALT therefore deserves the most careful attention, as all avenues toward a more peaceful world must be explored.

Disarmament talks—Record of failure

But whatever the hopes and opportunities of SALT may be, there is no precedent in history of effective disarmament being accomplished by agreement between major powers with divergent national interests. Nor has U.S. experience been reassuring. There is nothing new about our seeking disarmament through negotiation. This has been the most consistent element in American foreign policy since the beginning of the nuclear age. Few seem now to remember the U.S. offer to prevent an atomic arms race by delivering its stockpile to the United Nations—an offer rejected by the USSR. Periodically since then various efforts to slow or halt the arms race by negotiation have been frustrated in every instance by the intransigency of the Soviet Union.

It is true that three negotiations have been successful in the sense that limited agreements were reached on important issues. Yet none of these agreements has slowed the pace of the Soviet armaments or its manifest quest for superiority. Indeed, we may have magnified and perhaps even misconstrued the significance of such agreements.⁵⁵

Communist concept of negotiation

All Americans would like to think—despite the absence of convincing evidence—that the Cold War is over and that we have indeed entered a new era of negotiation. Our desire for peace is so strong and our national inclination to assume reciprocal friendliness and rationality so genuine, there is danger that we may assume without justification a similar spirit on the part of the Soviet leaders.⁵⁶

But it is prudent to remember that the Communist concept of negotiation is radically different from ours. They view it as a component of conflict, with the objective of gaining an advantage without conceding

anything. The classic description of the Soviet approach is as follows:

"Soviet officials do not converse with foreigners: they compete. There is no searching for understanding in conversation as we understand it in the West, no effort at accommodation of the mind, not even the slightest hint or suggestion that the Soviet Union has ever done anything that was in anyway wrong or even unwise, imprudent or intolerable. Their idea of give and take in a talk is simple: You give, they take."⁵⁷

Few American diplomats have had greater experience in attempting to negotiate with Communists than Dean Acheson. Writing his autobiography with the sober perspective of time, he said:

"What one must learn (from our experiences) is that the Soviet authorities are not moved to agreement by negotiation—that is, by a series of mutual concessions calculated to move parties desiring an agreement closer to an acceptable one."⁵⁸

Humiliation and futility

The dreary and frustrating record of negotiating with Communists abundantly documents the foregoing views.⁵⁹ One need not go back to the disillusionments of Yalta and Potsdam, to the exasperating negotiations over Berlin, or to the recurrent disarmament talks which have foundered on the Soviet determination to take all and give nothing. The past failures are legion and recent experience affords little basis to expect anything different. Seventeen years of humiliating effort have failed to produce a negotiated settlement of the Korean War, and the mockery in Paris has now continued for nearly two and one-half years. It will be said that the Soviet Union has not been a direct party to the Panmunjon and Paris talks. Yet no one familiar with the realities of world power and politics doubts that the Soviets could make these discussions meaningful whenever they so desire.⁶⁰ Rather, they continue to support the aggression in Southeast Asia and the threat of aggression in Korea, while the "peace" talks are exploited for Communist propaganda.

The most recent example of the unwisdom of relying upon USSR assurances is its role in sabotaging the Middle East cease fire by supporting, if not participating in, the violation thereof by the UAR.⁶¹

Trap for the unwary?

This is the historical framework in which all negotiations with Communist powers should be viewed. We must continue to hope and to strive for a genuine change of attitude and for some constructive results. In the nuclear age, every opportunity to negotiate and to improve channels of communications must be pursued. But there is always the danger of fatal concessions or even of a deliberate trap.

The Soviet Union has been an unpredictable and aggressive power, certainly for the past 30 years.⁶² It has acted with stealth, surprise, and ruthlessness—when it attacked Poland in concert with Nazi Germany; when it subjugated its allies, Hungary and Czechoslovakia; and when it moved to deploy missiles in Cuba.

The Soviet Union has been making a massive effort, out of all proportion to its own resources or any external threat, to acquire and extend strategic nuclear superiority over the U.S. Its record of feverish military preparation is unequalled since Hitler—determined upon conquest—structured his Wehrmacht for World War II. The Soviet Union has shown an almost paranoid hostility toward America and "capitalist imperialism," as evidenced by its consistently hostile conduct in every arena of international affairs and by its pervasive anti-American propaganda for a quarter of a century.

Only the reckless or the naive would negotiate with such an adversary except with the greatest caution and skepticism. Likewise,

Footnotes at end of article.

we would indeed risk the security of our country if defense planning and funding are predicated on assumptions or hopes as to the willingness of the Soviet Union to agree to mutually fair and enforceable disarmament.

As President Nixon well said, "we cannot trust our future to the self-restraint of countries that have not hesitated to use their power even against their allies."⁶⁵

Strategic implications of a "freeze"

It is possible that the Soviet Union sees SALT as an opportunity to assure indefinitely for itself, by agreement, a position of military superiority. This would be accomplished if we were foolhardy enough to agree to an arms limitation which left the U.S. vulnerable to a Soviet first-strike capability or which otherwise undermines the credibility of our capacity effectively to retaliate. But one may assume that U.S. negotiators will not commit such egregious folly.

There may be a less visible danger. The Soviet Union could strengthen its overall military and political position by an agreement which freezes strategic capabilities at some level of specified parity. Even if it be assumed that the result would be genuine strategic parity⁶⁶—rather than the freezing of the present Soviet advantages—the consequences could still be profound in terms of total military power and diplomatic influence.

The Soviet Union is appreciably stronger than the U.S. in tactical forces and weapons. Moreover, the Soviet Union has some 700 IRBM's deployed within convenient range of defenseless Western European cities and NATO forces. The Soviet tactical forces—capable of overrunning much of the land mass of Europe, Asia and Asia Minor—have been restrained for the past quarter century by the "shield" of the U.S. superior strategic nuclear forces. If this shield is neutralized by agreement, what restraints will then exist against Communist non-nuclear aggressions?

If such a neutralization occurs, the implications are disturbing and far reaching. Will the Soviet Union be emboldened to employ its superior tactical capabilities, secure in the knowledge of an agreed strategic standoff? Will the posture of NATO forces thereby become so untenable that the countries of Western Europe deem it prudent to move into the orbit of Soviet influence? Or, to forestall such an unwelcome move, will the U.S. find it necessary substantially to augment our NATO tactical forces? What will be the effect upon U.S. influence and interests in other friendly countries around the world?

These and related questions bring the SALT negotiations into sobering perspective. One may doubt, without in any way degenerating the importance of SALT, whether such questions have received the public discussion and scrutiny which they so manifestly deserve.

THE HOSTILITY TOWARD THE MILITARY

One of the trends in this country—perhaps the most fundamental one—which causes concern is the increasing public hostility toward "the military." This is not the place for a full discussion of this gravely disquieting problem. Some aspects of it are alluded to in the body of the Panel Report, and a brief reference is made above to the effect on defense funding. But the consequences of a largely hostile or even an apathetic public are not limited to reduced military spending. The entire structure of our defense edifice suffers when there is inadequate public understanding and support. It may be fatally undermined where public opinion is not merely negative but aggressively hostile.

Revolution on the campus

Already this level of hostility exists on the college campus and the virus is spreading. There is a widespread revulsion to the Vietnamese war and resentment of the draft,

with its disruption of life plans. It is understandable, and in accord with our best traditions, that the young people who are asked to serve in the military forces should be concerned and skeptical. They have every right to ask why, to debate the assumptions and judgments with respect to defense needs, and to disagree with them. This right is acknowledged and should be zealously defended.

But there are militant and revolutionary minorities on many campuses who abuse this and other rights in their desire to destroy American institutions. A favorite tactic is forcibly to deny free speech to all who entertain different views, relying not on reason and rational discussion but on coercion and violence. Examples of this fascist-minded conduct are legion. They have demeaned the life and quality of education on some of the most prestigious campuses of this country.⁶⁷

The hostility gains support

The greatest cause for concern is not that a few thousand New Leftist revolutionaries are on the move. Rather, it is that they—and their lawless conduct—are tolerated and often supported by a broad base of otherwise responsible students, faculty and even college administrators and trustees.⁶⁸ Many of the tactical "causes" of the New Left have acquired a broad appeal. Foremost among these is the crusade against the Armed Services, the Defense Department and—the favorite whipping boy of all—the "military-industrial complex."⁶⁹

We have witnessed all too frequently the disheartening spectacle of avowed revolutionaries being accorded respectability by many fellow students and faculty members as well as by the national publicity so generously provided by the media. Among the most popular campus speakers are these leftists whose goal—in accord with Communist objectives—is to disarm America.

A movement of this magnitude does not remain confined to the campus. It has widened rapidly to engulf a significant segment of opinion makers in this country. Most of those who now participate in the criticism certainly do not go as far as the leftist extremists. Many remain well within the limits of legitimate comment and criticism. But the outcry against "the military" is now orchestrated with frightening unanimity—not only on the campus but by much of the media, in the theater and arts, and widely among some politicians. We may have reached what amounts to a subtle form of censorship by consensus. Few are willing to speak out in defense of the military, and even fewer in support of increased defense funding. The public figures who have the courage to present a "different" viewpoint are predictably assailed as "warmongers" and "jingoists."

One has to go back to the days of McCarthyism to find such intolerance and repression of rational discussion of issues of the gravest national import.⁷⁰

The consequences

The short-range consequences already are becoming apparent. Marked success has been attained in slandering the ROTC, in driving military recruiters from the campus, in denying recruiting opportunities to defense-related industries, and in some curtailment of university-based military-related research and development. The number of draft dodgers and deserters, encouraged not merely by revolutionaries but by many who consider themselves respectable citizens, is a cause for increasing concern.⁷¹

Other predictable consequences of this hostility include the adverse effect (i) on the general recruiting and retention of military personnel; (ii) the number and quality of applicants for the service academies; and (iii) on the morale and esprit of the Armed Services of our country, both at home and abroad.

There also will be an inevitable weakening of the American concept of civilian orientation of the military. Some of the institutions and practices which are prime targets of the New Leftists tend significantly to perpetuate educated civilian influence on our military affairs and establishment. One would have thought that those who distrust "the military" would be zealous to strengthen—rather than undermine—this wholesome influence.

In its broadest scope, the result of the widening public alienation from the military will be the weakening of the defense of our country and freedom everywhere. This is precisely the end desired by the revolutionaries.

The role of responsible dissent

It should be made clear at this point that no thoughtful person suggests that the military, or any aspect of national defense, is above criticism. The role of responsible criticism and dissent is vital to the health of a democracy, and for the reasons pointed out by President Eisenhower there must ever be a vigilant public overseeing of the defense establishment. This is necessary to assure the civilian control prescribed by law. It is also necessary because, in a troubled world with nuclear weapons and huge defense requirements, national security is too important to leave to the military, to Congress, to the Executive Branch or indeed to any single segment of our society. An appropriate national defense posture, adequate but not excessive, is a matter of the most urgent national concern, and every aspect of it should be subjected to the widest and most thoughtful scrutiny and inquiry.

But it is one thing to exercise responsibly these attributes of democracy. It is quite something else—by resort to irrational abuse and indiscriminate criticism—to destroy the effectiveness of the only instrumentality which protects from foreign aggression the freedoms we all cherish.

A VIABLE NATIONAL STRATEGY

Unless the American people wish to accept the status of a second-rate power—with all of the probable consequences—the only viable national strategy is to regain and retain a clearly superior strategic capability. This can be accomplished by reversing the trends identified above, and by eschewing agreements which freeze the U.S. into a second-rate status. The margin of our overall strategic strength must be sufficient to convince the most reckless aggressor that, even after a surprise first strike, the capability to retaliate will in fact survive and be adequate to impose unacceptable destruction on the aggressor nation. This course of action is not incompatible with continued negotiations for arms limitations. Indeed, it will significantly enhance the chances of negotiations being genuinely fruitful without constituting a trap.

The requisite resources

It will be said that domestic needs should have priority and that we cannot afford to continue an "arms race" with the Soviet Union. The truth is that this country can and must meet both its domestic and defense requirements. If we fail in either, there is little future for America as we know it or for our cherished freedoms.⁷²

The U.S. has all of the requisite resources, except perhaps the will. The Soviet Union has a gross national product only half that of this country. It lacks a comparable industrial and technological base, and it has a backlog of domestic demands which—suppressed as they may be—vastly exceed those of this country. Indeed, in terms of consumer goods and standard of living the Soviet Union is at least a half century behind the U.S. In any contest to establish and maintain a superior military capability, we have an overwhelming advantage in the necessary resources.

Footnotes at end of article.

Need for public understanding

But in our free democracy, as contrasted with a totalitarian regime, the ultimate defense posture is determined by the will of the people. It is here we suffer a serious disadvantage, especially at a time of disillusionment with international responsibilities and a greater concern with pressing domestic needs. The only hope of minimizing this disadvantage is to assure a wider public knowledge of the facts and an understanding of the probable consequences of second-rate military status.

THE CONSEQUENCES OF SECOND-RATE STATUS

The American people must be reminded that basic Communist dogma contemplates the employment—over such time span as may be necessary—of the entire arsenal of pressures against the U.S. as the strongest democratic power. Despite discord among Communist states, there has been no amelioration of this doctrinal goal. Throughout the past quarter century, when the Soviet Union was relatively weak strategically, it precipitated or supported crisis after crisis—directly or through puppets and satellites—designed to extend its influence and to create disarray within the U.S. and the Free World. Throughout this time it waged, as did Red China, massive political warfare against the United States, including subversion and propaganda as well as economic and diplomatic pressures. Nor did the Soviet Union hesitate to employ techniques of military blackmail.

It is irrational to think, with the balance of military power now shifting dramatically in its favor, that the policies of the Soviet hierarchy will be less hostile, disruptive and imperialistic.

A recent study of Kremlin policy noted the Soviet effort to achieve nuclear superiority, and commented:

"Presenting the world with a clear cut superiority in numbers of nuclear weapons may appear to some leaders in the Kremlin a feasible political means of consolidating its own alliances and disintegrating the opposing forces. Such a major shift in the worldwide balance of power may also heighten the risk of confrontation, with vast costs in the present and unforeseeable dangers in the future."¹

As our country ponders its future course, drifting as we are into a position of inferiority or possibly even freezing that status by agreement, our people—as well as responsible officials—should consider the capability of the U.S. to respond in the types of situations which are likely to arise in the 70's and beyond, and which may include: (i) a Soviet-inspired and supported war against Israel; (ii) some other form of Soviet takeover of the Middle East, with its coveted oil reserves; (iii) a new confrontation over the status of Berlin; (iv) extension of the Brezhnev doctrine to selected non-Communist countries; (v) another Cuban-type crisis, perhaps in Latin or South America if not again in Cuba; (vi) nuclear blackmail over issues affecting our vital interests; (vii) the disruption, by force or other sanctions, of the international trade upon which the economic well being of our people depend; (viii) intensified levels of subversion to the point of threatening our internal security; and (ix) outright aggression against allies—in Western Europe or elsewhere—whom we are committed to defend.

It is difficult to believe that the proud and responsible people of this country would knowingly tolerate a national strategy which could invite these types of situations, leaving us virtually helpless to respond effectively. Certainly there would be no conscious toleration by a majority of our people of defense weakness which threatens national security and freedom itself.

WEAKNESS—THE GRAVEST THREAT TO PEACE

The most ominous danger of being second rate in the nuclear age is that it multiplies

the chances—not of peace—but of nuclear war. Soviet or Red Chinese overconfidence or miscalculation in the employment of, or threat to use, their power may trigger such a war inadvertently or place the United States in a posture from which there could be no retreat.

The road to peace has never been through appeasement, unilateral disarmament or negotiation from weakness. The entire recorded history of mankind is precisely to the contrary. Among the great nations, only the strong survive.

Weakness of the U.S.—of its military capability and its will—would be the gravest threat to the peace of the world.

SEPTEMBER 30, 1970.

FOOTNOTES

* This Summary is necessarily incomplete and reference should be made to the full Statement for the views of the authors.

** The principal threat to U.S. security for the 70's is the Soviet Union, and this paper is addressed primarily to that threat. By the late 70's and beyond, the most menacing country in the world may be Red China.

¹ U.S. Foreign Policy for the 1970's, Report to the Congress by President Nixon, Feb. 18, 1970, p. 122. (Referred to herein as the President's Report.)

² Defense Report for Fiscal Year 1971, by Secretary Laird before the House Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, Feb. 25, 1970, p. 1. (Referred to herein as the Laird Report.)

³ It should be remembered here that in recent years intelligence projections frequently have understated these capabilities. Laird Report, *supra*, pp. 34, 101.

⁴ The folly of relying on assumptions as to intentions, rather than upon known capabilities, is documented by countless military surprises down through history. Pearl Harbor is a classic example. More recent examples involving the Soviet Union include the Cuban Missile Crisis and Czechoslovakia. See Senator Henry M. Jackson, Senate Speech, July 9, 1969.

⁵ Plans to withdraw 20,000 American troops are opposed by the South Korean government. As indicated in a recent on the scene report "there is no real peace in Korea today." N.Y. Times, article by Philip Shabecoff, June 24, 1970.

⁶ Mao Tse-tung recently issued a fresh indictment against the U.S., calling for a "protracted peoples' war" against American "imperialism," and concluding: "People of the world, unite and defeat the U.S. aggressors and all of their running dogs!" N.Y. Times, May 21, 1970.

⁷ The Suez Canal has other strategic significance. The Soviet Union continues to supply North Vietnam by sea. Soviet ships from Black Sea ports now require nearly 40 days to reach Vietnam by sailing around Africa.

⁸ See the Military Balance 1970-71 for Strategic Studies, London, p. 45.

⁹ See editorial comment, The New York Times, September 20, 1970. The Soviet Union also shared responsibility for Syria's brief but dangerous intervention in Jordan's September 1970 civil war.

¹⁰ The recent Soviet-West German nonaggression pact may result in some surface lessening of tension, but as long as Soviet ground, air and missile forces are maintained in Eastern Europe, with the capability of overrunning and destroying Western Europe, there can be no assurance of peace and freedom.

¹¹ The Brezhnev doctrine, announced as justification of the invasion of Czechoslovakia. In commenting on this proclaimed right of aggression, the New York Times said: "This reliance on force and contempt for law must raise fears that some day Moscow will decide that the sovereignty and territorial integrity of non-Communist nations is also being interpreted" in a way

which justifies Soviet intervention. New York Times editorial, Sept. 28, 1968.

¹² Only U.S. superior military strength frustrated the Soviet plan to install strategic missiles in Cuba, although history may record that U.S. concessions assured an unmolsted Communist regime and base in Cuba.

¹³ C. L. Sulzberger, foreign correspondent of The New York Times, recently commented on the "neo-isolationism" in this country, and noted that "U.S. influence is being slowly squeezed out" of Western Europe, the Middle East and Southeast Asia. New York Times Service, Richmond Times-Dispatch, July 24, 1970.

¹⁴ This paper addresses primarily the Soviet threat which is clearly paramount for the 1970's. There is no thought of minimizing the threat of Red China, the leadership of which is so implacably hostile to the U.S. and to a lesser extent the Soviet Union. It is possible that in the long run Red China is more likely to rupture peace than any other nation.

¹⁵ See also Mr. Laird's address of April 20, 1970, at the Annual Luncheon of the Associated Press, N.Y. Times, April 21, 1970; and data reported in *The Military Balance 1970-1971*, published by The Institute for Strategic Studies, London, 1970.

¹⁶ President's Report, p. 120 and Secretary Laird's Report, p. 35. See *The Military Balance, supra*, p. 6, which reports about 1300 operational ICBM's in July 1970. Intelligence estimates of the number of ICBM's actually deployed are extremely accurate. But estimates of production rates (and hence future operational strength) have consistently erred on the low side. See Laird Report, p. 34.

¹⁷ Secretary Laird's Report, p. 35. The Soviets are continuing to produce SS-9's at a rate of about 50 per year, and will have some 300 by the end of this year. See Laird, Address of April 20, 1970, *supra*. The Institute for Strategic Studies, based in London, publishes annually *The Military Balance* (cited *supra*) and a complementary publication entitled *The Strategic Survey*. Although there are variations in detail as to types and numbers of weapons, the data published by The Institute for Strategic Studies generally corroborates the unclassified information of the U.S. Defense Department.

¹⁸ See *The Military Balance, supra*, p. 6, which credits the Soviet Union with 800 SS-11's, with deployment continuing.

¹⁹ The distinction between MRV and MIRV is that in the former the multiple separate warheads are not independently guided to targets.

²⁰ Secretary Laird estimated last February that if the Soviets follow a "High Force-High Technology" approach they will probably have their first "MIRV's by mid-1971 and a very formidable hard target kill capability (by MIRV's) by the mid-1970's." Laird Report, p. 104. The recent Pacific testing of multiple reentry vehicles on improved SS-11 missiles indicates the Soviets are significantly ahead of this schedule.

²¹ See Laird Report, p. 103. Secretary Laird recognized that this cannot be a firm estimate at this time.

²² See Dr. John S. Foster, Director of Defense Research and Engineering, Statement before Subcommittee of House Armed Services Committee, March 9, 1970, p. 9 *et seq.*; Laird Report, pp. 48, 49, 103, 104. See also *The Strategic Survey of 1969, supra*, pp. 30, 31 where the "new and more accurate guidance systems" are discussed, and the conclusion reached: "The whole future of land-based ICBM's has been called into question (by this improved accuracy), since it begins to seem possible that no amount of protection for ICBM silos can compensate for the improvements in accuracy now in prospect." This judgment by *The Strategic Survey* applies primarily to the vulnerability of U.S. missiles.

²³ See Secretary Laird's Report, pp. 39, 40 and 50.

²⁴ A technological breakthrough in the underwater detection and tracking of submarines could give the first nation to achieve it a decisive advantage. See Interview with Dr. John S. Foster, Jr., Air Force/Space Digest, July 1970, pp. 31, 35. It has been suggested that such a technological breakthrough may be achieved by "sensing devices that could reveal every submarine in the oceans to detection." See news report on a Pre-Pugwash Conference on New Technology and the Arms Race, Racine, Wisconsin. The Washington Post, Sept. 9, 1970, p. A-3.

²⁵ The U.S. has plans for a test model of a new supersonic bomber (B-1). A force of such bombers capable of long distance air-to-ground launches would add flexibility and diversity to our deterrent capability, and also would be useful in limited, non-nuclear confrontations. Such bombers must be designed, however, to operate from numerous smaller and dispersed airfields to minimize vulnerability from ICBM's and SLBM's.

²⁶ The Strategic Survey of 1969, *supra*, p. 28. It is not suggested that the Survey itself was misleading. The tabulation which received the wide press publicity was *only one* of many tables in the Survey, which also included a great deal of relevant data on megatonnage, accuracy and survivability.

²⁷ Of the total warheads assigned to the U.S. 1,853 represent the optimum load of our B-52 force, while 450 were assigned to Soviet strategic bombers. A similar distortion of SLBM's apparently was included in the tabulation, assigning 1,328 warheads to Polaris submarines.

²⁸ This Statement addresses broadly the strategic balance of power and does not discuss comparative tactical or general force capabilities. Secretary Laird's Report, and especially the appendices, indicate the superiority of the Communist powers in non-nuclear military power. See also the publications of The Institute of Strategic Studies, *supra*.

²⁹ Gen. Andrew J. Goodpaster, Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, has warned that "the balance of security there is shifting in favor of the Soviet bloc." He stated that the Warsaw Pact forces "form a concentration of military power that exceeds anything the world has previously seen. These Soviet forces far exceed anything that is required solely for defense." Richmond Times-Dispatch, September 16, 1970.

³⁰ William Beecher, writing in the N.Y. Times, Oct. 28, 1969, assumes a 100 kiloton warhead on our MIRV, and states that the Soviet MIRV warhead is 50 times more powerful than our MIRV. The Strategic Survey for 1969, *supra*, p. 29, assumes a 200 kiloton warhead on MIRV's. See also Laird Report, p. 102, as to Soviet MIRV.

³¹ As a part of this protection, the USSR has deployed the most elaborate radar warning and counter-measure systems. It also has devoted a greater effort than the U.S. to advanced fighter interceptor aircraft (the Foxbat, for example) and to ground-to-air missiles, with larger defense forces in these categories than the U.S.

³² *The Military Balance 1970-71, supra*, p. 7.

³³ Although critics in this country doubt the feasibility of an ABM system, one must assume the Soviets would not be spending billions on such a system unless they had full confidence in its effectiveness. Dr. John S. Foster, Jr., and many qualified U.S. scientists, have no doubt that an effective ABM system is within the competency of existing technology. See interview with Dr. Foster, published in Air Force/Space Digest, July 1970, p. 31 *et seq.* See evidence marshalled by Sen. Henry M. Jackson in his ABM debate speeches to the Senate on Aug. 6 and 11, 1970. A major component of the ABM system, the Spartan missile, successfully intercepted an ICBM over the Pacific in a test on August 28, 1970.

³⁴ President Nixon's Report, *supra*, p. 125.

³⁵ Secretary Laird has stated that by the mid-70's the Soviets will probably have "a submarine force capable of destroying most of our alert bomber and tanker force before it can be airborne." Secretary Laird's Statement, pp. 50, 105. The Defense Department confirmed for the first time on April 23, 1970 that Y-class Soviet submarines, with 16 nuclear missiles are patrolling our Atlantic Seaboard. N.Y. Times, April 24, 1970. Secretary Laird reports that as of April 1970 the Soviets had over 200 operational launchers on nuclear submarines for submerged launch SLBM's, plus 70 launchers on diesel submarines. Laird's address, *supra*, p. 11.

³⁶ Senator Jackson recently informed the Senate that "there is no doubt that their (the Soviet's) program, if continued, will produce a first-strike capability unless the U.S. takes appropriate counter measures." Senate Speech, Aug. 5, 1970.

³⁷ The Soviets have been more innovative than the U.S., having pioneered in gas turbine propulsion, in developing a variety of surface-to-surface missile-launching ships, and possibly in new techniques of ASW.

³⁸ Nor have the Soviets neglected the support elements for world-wide naval operations. They have tankers, supply and maintenance vessels, supported by an impressive merchant marine fleet. They also have emphasized, more than any other nation, oceanographic studies and surveys. Their trawlers—used extensively for intelligence purposes—regularly patrol our coasts.

³⁹ In April 1970 Soviet maneuvers, described by U.S. Navy spokesmen as the "biggest in history," involved some 200 warships. Associated Press story, April 23, 1970.

⁴⁰ Laird Report, *supra*, p. 21.

⁴¹ Secretary Laird warned that in defense funding and in the deferral of decisions on vital defense measures "we are literally at the edge of prudent risk." Address of April 20, *supra*, p. 5.

⁴² Laird Report, *supra*, p. 22. The detailed facts and figures are set forth in the Reports of the President and the Secretary of Defense mentioned above. These include a comparison which indicates the neglect of strategic funding (after adjusting for inflation) since the beginning of the Vietnamese war. The FY 1971 defense funding is only \$3.8 billion, or 7% above the 1964 level of defense spending prior to the Vietnamese war. As the cost of that war has been running at more than \$25 billion per annum, it is evident that strategic spending—for the defense of the country—has been curtailed sharply.

⁴³ It is difficult to know exactly what the Soviet Union is spending on defense. The statements above reflect estimates published by various sources. See Department of Defense Posture Statement, Jan. 15, 1969; Library of Congress studies; and Stanford Research Institute Studies. Mr. Laird has said that "the Soviet Union, as far as offensive strategic weapons systems, is outspending the U.S. in the ratio of three to two converted to dollars." Press conference, Feb. 18, 1969. See also address of Sen. Henry Jackson, U.S. Senate, Aug. 6, 1970.

⁴⁴ Laird Report, *supra*, p. 33.

⁴⁵ Testimony of Dr. John S. Foster, Jr., Director of Defense Research and Engineering, before a subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee, 91st Congress, March 9, 1970. See also the Reports of the President and the Secretary of Defense, *supra*.

⁴⁶ Other essentials to the development and deployment of advanced weapons systems relate to procurement and defense planning, contracting and testing. These and related matters are discussed in the body of the Panel's Report.

⁴⁷ See Foster, *supra*, p. 28.

⁴⁸ See Foster, *supra*, p. 30 *et seq.* Dr. Foster points out that total R&D spending, both

civilian and military is still greater in the United States, but the trend is unfavorable even with the addition of our non-military-related effort.

⁴⁹ See Laird's Report, *supra*, p. 66.

⁵⁰ Foster, *supra*, pp. 9, 10.

⁵¹ Alternative systems under consideration include (i) the mobile basing of Minuteman-type missiles, and (ii) an undersea long-range missile system (ULMS's) with submarines capable of launching missiles of ICBM range. Dr. Foster, *supra*, p. 12. Secretary Laird's Statement, pp. 48, 49. The Soviets may already be well ahead of the U.S. in developing a mobile ICBM. The Strategic Survey for 1969, *supra*, at p. 29, states: "A mobile ICBM has certainly been under development for some time, and the Soviet Union has claimed that it is already operational."

⁵² Foster, *supra*, p. 14; Laird Report, *supra*, p. 49.

⁵³ Science and Technology, Tools for Progress, report of the President's Task Force on Science Policy, April 1970, p. 38: "Technology will not stand still; on the contrary it will likely move more rapidly. The penalty for technological surprise can be enormous."

⁵⁴ Other problems related to technology and R&D have been identified in the main body of the Panel's Report.

⁵⁵ The first of these, the Test Ban Treaty of 1963, halted nuclear testing in the atmosphere. The Soviets only agreed to this at a time when their test program, involving high-yield weapons with both offensive and defensive (ABM) capabilities, was well ahead of America's. We had previously been duped during the late 50's into the cessation of testing similar weapons on the specious theory that the Soviets might follow a good example. The second agreement was the United Nations' ban on the use of outer space for military purposes, an agreement which the Soviet Union appears already to have violated in spirit. The third of these limited agreements is the Nonproliferation Treaty, recently approved, which leaves a number of non-signing nations free to develop nuclear weapons.

⁵⁶ One may recall the disillusionment after the hopes engendered by the "spirit of Geneva" and "the spirit of Camp David" were dashed by Soviet duplicity.

⁵⁷ James Reston, New York Times, Dec. 8, 1960, p. 46.

⁵⁸ Acheson, *Present at the Creation*, W. W. Norton & Co., N.Y., 1969, p. 729.

⁵⁹ Past negotiations have occurred when the overwhelming weight of bargaining power lay on our side of the table. Now, when the U.S. is relatively weaker, and when the issue is the future security of our country, it is prudent to be skeptical as to the genuine mutuality of any agreement acceptable to the Soviet Union.

⁶⁰ The competition between the Soviet Union and Red China for dominant influence in smaller Communist countries does complicate the situation, making it less likely that either will take the lead in exercising an ameliorating influence.

⁶¹ Although the full extent of Soviet participation in this violation may not yet be known, press reports and commentators indicate that "the Kremlin broke its word, lied to the United States and double crossed the developing peace." See, for example, Roscoe and Geoffrey Drummond, Richmond Times-Dispatch, Sept. 10, 1970; Joseph Alsop, The Washington Post, Sept. 21, 1970; and Evans and Novak, The Washington Post, Sept. 21, 1970.

⁶² In addressing the Senate on July 9, 1969, Sen. Henry M. Jackson said that "an increasing number of informed western analysts assess the Soviet Union (today) as a dangerous and unpredictable opponent."

⁶³ The President's Report, p. 111.

⁶⁴ "Parity" is inherently a theoretical—not a realistic—concept, as there are too many

variables both as to the quality and characteristics of various weapons and the circumstances under which they might be employed.

⁶⁵ The New York Times described the New Leftist revolutionaries as "the new Fascists of our generation." Editorial, Dec. 17, 1969. See also New York Times editorial of June 10, 1970. Stewart Alsop has observed that the campus "is in danger of becoming intellectually a closed society." Newsweek, May 18, 1970.

⁶⁶ Alexander M. Bickel, *The Toleration of Violence on the Campus*, The New Republic, June 13, 1970, p. 15 *et seq.* Fred M. Hechinger, Education Editor of the New York Times has stated that: "The politicizing of the campus . . . has moved the universities to the brink of disaster." N.Y. Times, July 19, 1970. See also Dr. Nathan Pusey, *infra*.

⁶⁷ As indicated in the Panel's Report, corporations which depend in major part on defense contracts are among the least profitable of all corporations. Indeed, many corporations deliberately refuse or avoid defense business. See George E. Berkley, *The Myth of War Profiteering*, The New Republic, Dec. 20, 1969.

⁶⁸ President Nathan Pusey, Baccalaureate address at Harvard University, New York Times, June 10, 1970. See also Dr. Pusey's Annual Report for 1968-69.

⁶⁹ It is estimated that some 25,000 to 30,000 draft dodgers have sanctuary in Canada, with an elaborate organization for getting them there. Stewart Alsop, Newsweek, July 20, 1970. Already some politicians and advocates of "peace at any price" are urging amnesty for these draft dodgers.

⁷⁰ President Nixon has said: "If we are less strong than necessary . . . there will be no domestic society to look after." The President's Report, Feb. 18, 1970, p. 10.

⁷¹ *New Trends in Kremlin Policy*, Center for Strategic and International Studies, Georgetown University, Aug. 1970, p. vi.

THE STERLING BALL

HON. PHILIP A. HART

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), I ask unanimous consent that a statement by him with respect to a charitable event called the Sterling Ball be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR HART

Mr. President. Education is the cornerstone of a free people, and it must be freely accessible to all, regardless of race, creed or national origin or financial status. Recently, a news story appeared in the Detroit Free Press and in other news media across the nation which told of a unique charitable event called the Sterling Ball.

The ball is part of a magnificent effort by a prominent black family to provide educational opportunities to inner city high school graduates who want to continue their education. The annual gala was conceived by Berry Gordy, president of the Motown Record Corporation, and his sister Mrs. Esther Edwards, also an officer of Motown. It was created as a living memorial to their sister, the late Mrs. Loucye Gordy Wakefield, who was the first vice president of Motown, a

Whereas, increasing demands upon state with such popular talent as Diana Ross, the Jackson Five, the Supremes, Smoky Robin-

son and the Miracles, Marvin Gaye, Gladys Knight and the Pips, the Temptations, the Four Tops, Stevie Wonder and many others.

This charity function has taken its place among the best-attended fashion and social events of the year, and for a vital cause. To date, this event has made it possible for fifty-two young men and women—black and white—to attend college. Mrs. Edwards, general chairman of the Sterling Ball Committee, reports that this year's event at the Gordy Manor in Detroit, Saturday, April 24, will again be attended by top educators, public officials, writers and entertainers.

Berry Gordy is a modern day Horatio Alger. A former prizefighter and assembly line worker, this gifted 40-year-old started Motown ten years ago with \$700 and a dream. He now heads the biggest independent record firm in the world and the only black company in the entertainment industry. Now with the annual Sterling Ball, Gordy is making it possible for many young men and women to see their own dreams come true. Berry Gordy and his family have earned our thanks, and I welcome making this expression a part of the Record.

FAVORABLE RESPONSE TO REVENUE SHARING IS GROWING

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, despite the smokescreen of misinformation that has been created around the revenue sharing program by many persons inside and outside of Government, it is very heartening to report that the truth about this proposal is finally filtering through to the people. And their favorable response is growing in overwhelming proportions.

I am very pleased to report to my colleagues that this response has been reflected in a joint memorial passed by the New Mexico State Legislature last month. The memorial states that:

It is a matter of vital importance to the federal system of this nation to support and enact an acceptable revenue sharing plan.

In submitting this memorial for your consideration, I want to add my sincere hope that the distinguished Members of the United States House of Representatives and Senate will act as firmly and decisively on this important legislation as have the far-seeing members of the New Mexico State Legislature. The memorial reads as follows:

THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 9

(Introduced by Senator Junio Lopez)

A Joint Memorial to the President and the Congress of the United States relating to revenue sharing

Whereas, the resolution of our nation's myriad and diverse problems is contingent upon a viable partnership between the federal government and strengthened state governments; and

Whereas, increasing demands upon state and local governments for essential public services have compelled the states to rely heavily on highly regressive and inelastic consumer taxes and property taxes; and

Whereas, federal revenues based predominantly on income taxes increased significantly faster than economic growth, while

state and local revenues based heavily on sales and property taxes do not keep pace with economic growth; and

Whereas, the recurring fiscal crises at state and local levels has become the overriding problem of intergovernmental relations and of continuing a vibrant and workable federal system; and

Whereas, the evident solution to this problem is a meaningful sharing of federal income tax resources; and

Whereas, there will be placed before the present United States Congress one or more proposals for the enactment of revenue sharing legislation; and

Whereas, under one of these plans the counties and cities of New Mexico would receive approximately eight million dollars (\$8,000,000) of general revenue sharing to be distributed as follows:

Bernalillo 67,522; Catron 5,870; Chaves 189,566; Colfax 21,344; Curry 48,959; De Baca 19,210; Dona Ana 91,381; Eddy 97,117; Grant 152,880; Gaudalupe 37,886; Harding 3,068; Hidalgo 18,009; Lea 343,913; Lincoln 34,952; Los Alamos 43,809; Luna 78,307; McKinley 45,357; Mora 6,270; Otero 38,153; Quay 78,174; Rio Arriba 21,878; Roosevelt 61,632; Sandoval 10,806; San Juan 58,030; San Miguel 24,813; Santa Fe 66,168 Sierra 12,940; Socorro 50,026; Taos 20,811; Torrance 14,674; Union 13,340; Valencia 55,496.

Albuquerque 3,025,844; Roswell 232,921; Raton 35,352; Clovis 339,110; Las Cruces 494,391; Artesia 148,878; Carlsbad 138,205; Silver City 78,441; Lordsburg 14,007; Eurice 15,341; Hobbs 162,351; Jal 16,409; Lovington 49,492; Deming 46,958; Tularosa 10,806; Tucumcari 68,169; Portales 135,404; Bernalillo 9,338; Aztec City 7,476; Farmington 75,425; Las Vegas City 52,294; Las Vegas Town 31,350; Santa Fe 353,518; Truth or Consequences 20,544; Socorro 31,350; Clayton 22,945; Belen 35,485; Grants 59,097; Milan 20,677; All other cities 346,447. Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States be urged as a matter of vital importance to the federal system of this nation to support and enact an acceptable revenue sharing plan that would make a portion of the taxes on income levied by Congress pursuant to the Sixteenth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States available each year to state governments and the political subdivisions thereof, by means of direct allocation, tax credits, or both, without limiting directly or indirectly the use of such moneys for any purpose not inconsistent with any other provision of the Constitution of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the President of the United States Senate and to each member of the New Mexico delegation in the United States Congress.

Signed and sealed at The Capitol, in the City of Santa Fe.

ROBERT A. MONDRAGON,
President, New Mexico Senate.
WALTER K. MARTINEZ,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

"THE SELLING OF THE PENTAGON"

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, as you know CBS gave me one of its "starring roles" in its now discredited program, "The Selling of the Pentagon."

The film clip of me interviewing Maj. James Rowe, a former prisoner of war, was obtained by CBS representatives from my press secretary, Lou Gehrig Burnett, with my permission, under the pretense it would be used for a POW documentary.

I said it had been obtained under false pretenses in an interview with WTOP-TV and with CBS News. Additionally, I explained the situation in press releases and in an insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 3, 1971.

I also discussed a Washington Post story which said an unidentified CBS spokesman termed my charges untrue.

I want to expand on this particular aspect of my involvement in "The Selling of the Pentagon," and offer additional proof that CBS misrepresented their intent to me and other Members of Congress as well.

To set the stage, I want to quote from the transcript of a program entitled "All About TV," which was aired over WNYC-TV in New York on March 17, 1971. The host for the show was Steven Scheuer, and the guests were three representatives from CBS:

SCHUEER. One of the allegations that's been raised and the flak that's created about the show (The Selling of the Pentagon) was that Congressman Hébert has indicated that he was led to believe that the program "The Selling of the Pentagon" was originally about POW's. Is there any—what's CBS's response to that?

DAVIS. (Peter Davis, producer of "Selling") Well, he's mistaken.

SCHUEER. Because one of his assistants indicated that that was their reaction and otherwise the film would not have been given to them. Was there any such representation by CBS ever made?

WOLFF. (Perry Wolff, a producer for CBS) No. I don't think we want to go further with that.

SCHUEER. Okay. I just wanted to clarify that because there hasn't been. . .

WOLFF. I think Peter can explain that better.

DAVIS. There was never—it's not all that interesting to go into. We had a number of contacts with Chairman Hébert's office. There was never any suggestion that our broadcast was on anything except military public relations, and indeed, it would have been, Steve, in our own worst interest to have made any such misrepresentation to the Chairman's office, because dozens, literally dozens of people, not only in the Pentagon, but on Capitol Hill, very close associates of Chairman Hébert knew of our broadcast on military public relations, and have indeed furnished us material. So it would be little short of absurd for us to have gone to one office. We have the same tape we used of Chairman Hébert talking to the Green Beret major. We had similar tapes from a number of other Congressmen. All of them knew what our broadcast was about. (End of quotes from transcript)

I want you to keep in mind what Mr. Davis said—that other Congressmen who had interviewed Major Rowe were asked for their film clips and they knew that CBS was doing a documentary on Pentagon public relations.

As you may recall, CBS rebroadcast its program on March 23. It was followed by a severely edited interview which I had done with CBS about the show as well as edited remarks from Vice President AGNEW and Secretary of Defense Mel Laird. I sent telegrams to Dr. Frank

Stanton, president of CBS and told him I did not want my comments edited. Nevertheless, CBS did a superb job of cutting out my comments which would have answered CBS News President Richard Salant's remarks about me in his comments which closed the broadcast. I later read a news story where CBS said it had not received my telegrams.

I discussed the editing of my interview by CBS in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 25.

I now quote a portion of Salant's comments from the March 23 broadcast:

Representative Hébert says he gave us the film under the assumption that our broadcast had to do with prisoners of war. He states it; we deny it. His own documents support our denial. In the course of preparing "The Selling of the Pentagon" we talked to dozens of people on Capitol Hill and, as you've seen, in the Pentagon. They all knew we were doing a broadcast on military public relations—because we told them. (End of quoted comments)

So here we have Peter Davis, producer of the program, and Richard Salant, president of CBS News, telling the people that other Congressmen knew what kind of program CBS was doing.

All I can say is that there is a breakdown in communications at CBS because the documents I have prove that Davis and Salant either do not know what their representatives did or they do know and refuse to admit it and deliberately falsified the facts.

I am going to insert at this point five statements which I received from other congressional offices. Four state that CBS representatives called and asked for film clips of the Congressman concerned with Major Rowe because the network was doing a documentary on "Prisoners of War." Two of the memos are signed by the Congressmen themselves, the others by assistants who talked with CBS representatives.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 5, 1971.

To: Hon. F. EDWARD HÉBERT, Chairman, House Armed Services Committee

From: John Kimbrough Johnson, press assistant to Congressman WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

Re: Columbia Broadcasting System (CBS) request for "Dickinson-Rowe" interview

This is to verify that several months ago a representative of the Columbia Broadcasting System in New York City, Bernie Seabrooks, did on more than one occasion contact this office in order to obtain a video taped interview. The purpose, as explained by Mr. Seabrooks, was the preparation by CBS of a television documentary on the plight of our Prisoners of War.

The film was sent on loan to CBS in New York. It was later returned after a telephone conversation with another CBS representative, Jim Branon—Mr. Branon called to request help in obtaining the names of other Congressmen who might have taped similar interviews.

At that time it was, and still is, our opinion that this interview between Congressman Dickinson and U.S. Army Major James N. Rowe, a former prisoner of the Viet Cong, was to be used for a documentary on prisoners of war and those listed as missing in action. If any other use has been, or is being made of this film, then it is being done totally without permission and is a complete misrepresentation of facts.

JOHN KIMBROUGH JOHNSON.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 12, 1971.

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT,
Chairman, Armed Services Committee,
Rayburn Building.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is to confirm conversations with your office concerning CBS.

I do recall that sometime last year, probably in the late summer, CBS contacted this office to obtain a film strip of an interview that I had with Major Rowe, who had escaped from a North Vietnam prison camp. The man from CBS sought the strip because he said the network was intending to do a documentary on POW's.

Sincerely,

SAM STEIGER, M.C.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 18, 1971.

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ED: In response to a request from Mr. Lou Burnett of your office, I did receive a telephone call sometime last summer from a Bernie Seabrooks of CBS, New York, requesting the use of my taped interview with Major Rowe.

We had taped a program, but we were unable to lend it because it had been erased. At the time, I tried to return Mr. Seabrooks' long distance call; but we were never able to reach him.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

PAGE BELCHER,
Member of Congress.

MARCH 5, 1971.

To: Congressman EDWARD F. HÉBERT,
From: Larry L. Morgan.

During the period of February 1969 to December 1970, I was Press Secretary to Congressman Ed Foreman of New Mexico. In November of 1969, Congressman Foreman interviewed in the House Recording studio Major James Rowe, a member of the U.S. Army Special Forces and a prisoner of war of the Viet Cong for five years. This television and radio program was distributed to news-media in New Mexico. Several months later I was contacted by an individual who identified himself as an employee of CBS. He said that the network was preparing a program on the prisoners of war and would like to borrow a copy of Congressman Foreman's interview with Major Rowe. I informed the gentleman that we had given our only copy of the program to an organization called "United We Stand" headed by H. Ross Perot of Dallas, Texas. I further told the man that I had allowed the Pentagon to make a copy of the video tape recording. I heard nothing further from CBS.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 15, 1971.

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT,
Rayburn House Office Building,

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HÉBERT: This will verify a conversation with a member of your staff. Several months ago, Congressman Downing received a telephone call from someone identifying himself as an employee of CBS. I handled the call for the Congressman and learned that the caller was interested in a video tape of an interview which Congressman Downing and Congressman G. William Whitehurst had with a Major Nick Rowe of the United States Army who was formerly a prisoner in Vietnam. I informed the caller that the video tape was the property of WAVY-TV in Portsmouth, Virginia which is the NBC affiliate in that area. The caller explained the CBS interest in the video tape

as relating to a television program on prisoners of war they were considering.

Sincerely,

E. M. HUTTON,
Administrative Assistant.

I know you will agree that this is indisputable proof that Davis and Salant were not being factual in their comments for reasons of their own. I cannot read what is in an individual's mind.

Nevertheless, I did want to give Mr. Salant the benefit of the doubt because I thought it was possible he did not know what his men had done. So I wrote him a letter on March 25. I insert the letter here:

March 25, 1971.

RICHARD S. SALANT,
President, CBS News,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. SALANT: After viewing your reply on CBS Tuesday night, I can't help but feel you have been done in by your own people.

While I can understand an executive defending his subordinates, I can't understand how those subordinates could lead their chief into such a trap as you fell into on your broadcast.

I have a feeling you never had the facts. Therefore, I am enclosing a press release which I issued on March 22 which contains five memos from congressional offices. These memos indicate that these offices were called at about the same time my office was last year by the same CBS representatives. It further indicates that these offices were asked for film clips of the congressmen and Major Rowe for a documentary on prisoners of war. The press release explains the matter in detail.

I would deeply appreciate receiving your reaction to these undisputable facts.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely yours,

F. EDWARD HÉBERT.

I received a reply from Mr. Salant dated April 1, 1971, and I insert his letter at this point:

CBS NEWS,
New York, N.Y., April 1, 1971.

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HÉBERT: I have your letter of March 25 by which you enclose your March 22 press release and five memoranda from Congressional offices which, you write, "indicate that these offices were called at about the same time my office was last year by the same CBS representatives" and which indicate "that these offices were asked for film clips of the congressmen and Major Rowe for a documentary on prisoners of war." You ask for my reaction "to these indisputable facts."

The basic issue is, as you indicate, whether any CBS News people misrepresented to any Congressman or his staff members the nature of the documentary which was then in preparation and which ultimately became "The Selling of the Pentagon."

It is clear that a square conflict, at worst, or a clear misunderstanding, at best, exists. This, of course, is a matter of serious concern to us and we shall make every effort to resolve the matter.

Yours sincerely,

RICHARD SALANT,
President.

As you can see, Mr. Salant admits that "a square conflict, at worst, or a clear misunderstanding, at best, exists."

I say that CBS clearly misrepresented its intentions for a documentary to me and other Members of Congress, and I believe I have documented that fact beyond a doubt.

"FEDERAL LEGISLATION THROUGH 50 YEARS" FROM THE FEDERAL BAR JOURNAL

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

MR. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, when the wise framers of our Constitution drafted and adopted this basic charter of our national existence, they decided that the very first article and its first section shall declare that—

All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

This, in itself, is proof positive of the importance of the legislative branch of our Government which consists of three equal and coordinate branches.

Our great Constitution, is a venerable and historic document that is as valid today as it was on the date of its adoption by the original 13 States of our country. As Members of the Congress and concerned as we are with legislative matters, it may be of special interest to review Federal legislation through the past one-half century.

In this connection, I wish to invite the attention of my colleagues and others interested in a learned article which appeared in the fall 1970 issue of the Federal Bar Journal, a publication of the Federal Bar Association. It was written by an erudite professor of law, Dr. Charles B. Nutting of the George Washington University on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the association.

As president of the Capitol Hill Chapter of the Federal Bar Association, I was particularly impressed by this excellent article and I wish to share it with those concerned about Federal legislation.

Due to its importance and general interest, I now insert it in the pages of the RECORD:

FEDERAL LEGISLATION THROUGH 50 YEARS

(By Charles B. Nutting*)

In order to sense the moods and problems of a country, one should examine its legislation. This paper represents an attempt through the use of selective materials¹ to prove the point. Naturally, in view of problems of space and time, the process must be somewhat arbitrary. But what follows, apart from a brief examination of the enactments of half a century ago, will reveal the reaction of the Congress to significant events in American history.

POST WORLD WAR I LEGISLATION

The Sixty-sixth Congress of the United States commenced its second session only a little more than a year after the close of World War I. One might have expected to see more evidence of that fact than is apparent in the statutes. Perhaps the most significant example of war's aftermath is the Transportation Act of 1920.² It was concerned in part with the termination of Federal control over railroads. In addition, however, it overhauled the whole area of railroad regulation and substantially expanded the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

This, perhaps, was the most substantial piece of legislation enacted by that session. However, the Federal Power Commission was established at that time.³ An act which was

to have its impact during the Teapot Dome scandals and related episodes announced a policy to promote mining and similar activities on the public domain and gave the Secretary of the Interior extensive powers to grant leases to private operators.⁴

Beyond these matters, the Congress seems to have been preoccupied with what, to an unsympathetic observer, might be regarded as *trivia*. Drainage districts affecting public lands,⁵ the loan of Army rifles to the American Legion⁶ and local provisions regarding roads and bridges⁷ are examples. In short, the laws tended to be limited in scope, for the most part to involve relatively simple situations and not to represent any incursions by the Federal government into the states' domains. And so it was until the Great Depression.

NEW DEAL LEGISLATION

At that time paralysis gripped the nation. As Robert L. Stern has pointed out:⁸

"The depression which began in the Fall of 1929 has, by 1933, produced an economic crisis probably unequalled in the history of the United States. At least thirteen million persons were unemployed; the average wages of those still employed in twenty-five selected industries has dropped to \$16.13 per week in February, 1933; wages received in mining, manufacturing, construction and transportation had declined from 17 to 6.8 billion dollars. Prices had fallen 37 per cent and industrial production had been cut almost in half. Insolvencies were mounting, and the banks were closed. The amount of revenue freight carried by Class I railroads, a fair measure of the quantity of interstate commerce, had declined 51 per cent."

It is against this background that the country witnessed what might fairly be called a revolution in terms of traditional concepts of federal-state relations and of the role of the national government in regulating the economy. For the most part the vehicle was the commerce clause. The historic battle between the courts and the Congress regarding the revolution will not be described in detail here,⁹ although passing reference will be made to it. But at the end of the battle, bloody as it was,¹⁰ the forces of the New Deal emerged as substantial victors.¹¹

The problem, as has been indicated, was whether or not the Federal Government under the commerce clause could, in effect, regulate such matters as labor relations, agricultural production, the sale of securities and wages and hours, as well as provide a system of social security. There had been intimations that the power of Congress was not plenary,¹² although Mr. Stern, who was most intimately concerned with the matter from a vantage point in the Department of Justice, concluded that "... there could be little doubt as to the power of Congress to use the Commerce Clause in regulating all the interrelated elements of the great interstate industries."¹³

Be this as it may, the Congress under the goad of the newly elected administration reacted rapidly and broadly. Although not the earliest, probably the most significant legislation was, in effect, the assertion of federal power over the whole economy. The National Industrial Recovery Act¹⁴ declared a state of national emergency which was productive of widespread unemployment and disorganization of industry which, in turn, burdened interstate commerce and affected the public welfare. It further stated that the national policy was to remove obstructions to the free flow of commerce by promoting the organization of industry for the purpose of cooperative action among trade groups.

The enactment of this historic measure marked the hatching of the Blue Eagle, an extraordinary fowl which, for about two years in its original incarnation, spread its wings over vast areas of the economy. The act provided that the President might establish "codes of fair competition" and as a result

Footnotes at end of article.

hundreds if not thousands of such codes were adopted. They purported to regulate such matters as trade practices, prices, wages and hours, and, in fact, almost every aspect of business.

Although this statute was directed toward the control of business as a whole, it, and subsidiary legislation, also attacked problems in specific areas. Section 9(c) of the Act²⁵ authorized the President "... to prohibit the transportation in interstate and foreign commerce of petroleum and the products thereof produced or withdrawn from storage in excess of the amount prohibited to be produced or withdrawn from storage by any state law. . . ." The legislation was the result of the virtual collapse of the oil producing industry because of excess production. This production was often in violation of state laws attempting to eliminate it, ostensibly to prevent physical waste of a natural resource but actually to preserve a price structure.

Another early concern of the New Deal was agriculture, where depressed prices and overproduction again had a substantial and adverse effect on the economy. The vehicle chosen to deal with this matter was the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933.²⁶ Here it was declared to be the policy of Congress "to establish and maintain such balance between the production and consumption of agricultural commodities, and such marketing conditions therefor, as will re-establish prices to farmers at a level that will give agricultural commodities a purchasing power with respect to what farmers buy, equivalent to the purchasing power of agricultural commodities in the base period." Thus was born the concept of parity, the determination of which involves occult processes too complicated to be described here.

The coal industry was another specific target. Here, in the Bituminous Coal Conservation Act of 1935²⁷ the Congress found that the distribution of bituminous coal is in the national interest and directly affects interstate commerce and that therefore regulation of the industry is necessary. Although the constitutional basis for regulation was probably interstate commerce, the sanction imposed here, as in the Agricultural Adjustment Act, was the imposition of a tax. In this case, there was a drawback provision available to producers who accepted a code to be formulated by the Bituminous Coal Commission.

Regulation of securities was another problem to which the New Deal addressed itself in the early days. The Securities Act of 1933,²⁸ the Securities Exchange Act of 1934²⁹ and the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935³⁰ in sum constitute a pervasive exercise of federal control over the operations of the securities market. Again, the commerce clause was the asserted basis for congressional action.

Other examples of the assumption of federal authority under the commerce clause dating from these years might be cited, but those that have been mentioned are sufficient to set the stage. The judicial attitude toward these assertions and the legislative response remain to be considered.

The judicial attitude was catastrophic. Although as Mr. Stern suggested³¹ precedents under the commerce clause might well have justified congressional action, the Supreme Court took a dim view of the matter. The first cases, however, involved not so much the commerce clause as the matter of delegation of legislative power. In *Panama Refining Company v. Ryan*³² the Court invalidated Section 9(c) of the National Industrial Recovery Act³³ on the basis that the statute constituted an invalid delegation of power to the chief executive since no

standard was to be found which limited his discretion or indicated the circumstances in which he was to act.

This case was followed by *A. L. A. Schechter Poultry Corporation v. United States*³⁴ in which a unanimous court struck down a provision in the National Industrial Recovery Act³⁵ authorizing the President to establish "codes of fair competition." Again it was held that the delegation was invalid since it imposed no limits on the Executive's discretion.

To say that these cases created consternation in the Department of Justice is to put it mildly. Government counsel in the *Panama* case had asserted flatly that "the extent to which Congress is permitted to delegate authority must be determined essentially by the necessities of practical administration."³⁶ This, indeed, was not an unreasonable assumption since, prior to the *Panama* and *Schechter* cases, no federal legislation had been held invalid because of improper delegation.

But the end was not yet. In *Carter v. Carter Coal Co.*,³⁷ the Bituminous Coal Conservation Act of 1935³⁸ was invalidated in part because it contained an unlawful delegation of authority to private groups.

Meanwhile, back at the farm, a divided court, in an opinion of monumental confusion,³⁹ partially invalidated the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933.⁴⁰ The law was labeled an unconstitutional interference with reserved powers of the states. It was also declared that the provisions for benefit payments to producers were inextricably bound up with exactions in the form of taxes.

These were the principal but not the only cases in which congressional legislation was invalidated during this period.⁴¹ It was no wonder that some saw the New Deal lying in ruins. However, this was not to be. The administration fell back, regrouped and marched on to ultimate victory.

No attempt was made to revive the National Industrial Recovery Act as such. Perhaps on the theory that the Court, which had refused to swallow a camel, might not strain at several gnats, various aspects of regulation were dealt with by acts much more confined in scope. Many of the provisions regarding labor relations were embodied in the National Labor Relations Act,⁴² sustained in *National Labor Relations Board v. Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.*⁴³ and the Fair Labor Standards Act,⁴⁴ sustained in *United States v. Darby*.⁴⁵ Price fixing in the coal industry was made possible by the device of having prices proposed rather than prescribed by industry committees.⁴⁶ This was accepted by the Supreme Court in *Sunshine Anthracite Coal Co. v. Adkins*.⁴⁷ Federal control over the marketing of agricultural commodities was attained through a redrafting of the Agricultural Adjustment Act and was approved in several cases.⁴⁸ The various acts regulating securities were not regarded adversely by the courts.⁴⁹

The legislation enacted in the early thirties, which was later reframed, was followed by other laws which had a significant impact on the economy. The Congress adopted the Social Security Act of 1935⁵⁰ which was later upheld by the Supreme Court.⁵¹ The provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act dealing with wages and hours were, as has been noted,⁵² sustained.

Two observations regarding the technical aspects of the New Deal legislation may be made. The first is that the problem of delegation, which seemed so important in view of the *Panama* and *Schechter* cases, was resolved by a process of what I have called illusory detailed delegation.⁵³ This consists in listing all the factors that an administrative agency may possibly take into account and then directing it to consider these factors "to the extent practicable."

Secondly, in later legislation, the Congress was careful to focus the regulation on the

commerce power more clearly than had been done in earlier provisions. This made it easier for the courts to uphold the statutes.

It cannot be denied, however, that the result of the whole body of legislation was greatly to enlarge the scope of federal control over the economy and to permit the national government to occupy areas which had previously been regarded as reserved to the states. Probably this was due to a realization that the country had become an economic unit and that national intervention was necessary if problems in this area were to be effectively resolved.⁵⁴ In any case, the legislation produced a basic reorientation in attitudes toward national power.

WORLD WAR II ENACTMENTS

World War II marked the next significant period in the history of Federal legislation. The military aspects of the matter will not be considered here since they are not in the main stream of our discussion. War, however, not only affects personal lives in the sense of military service. It also profoundly affects the economy. This is largely because of a conflict between claims for goods involving military requirements and those involving ordinary civilian use. There is never enough to go around and therefore some means of allocation must be found.

This was true in the first World War and was even more so in the second. As to the former, the basic statutory authority was Section 120 of the National Defense Act of 1916.⁵⁵ It authorized the President, through the head of any department of government, to impose a system of priorities for the procurement of needed materials.⁵⁶ Shortly after the outbreak of World War II in Europe, Congress enacted the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940⁵⁷ and An Act to Expedite National Defense and for Other Purposes⁵⁸ each of which had provisions dealing with priorities.

With the entrance of the United States into the conflict other basic and far reaching legislation was adopted. One of the most important was the Second War Powers Act of 1942.⁵⁹ Section 2(a)(2) of Title III⁶⁰ provided:

"Whenever the President is satisfied that the fulfillment of requirements for the defense of the United States will result in a shortage in the supply of any material or of any facilities for defense or for private account or for export, the President may allocate such material or facilities in such manner, upon such conditions and to such extent as he shall deem necessary or appropriate in the public interest and to promote the national defense."

Section 2(a)(8) of the same Act gave the President broad powers of subdelegation.

The other most important Act for our purposes was the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942⁶¹ as amended by the Inflation Control Act of 1942.⁶² This Act created the Office of Price Administration. In substance, it declared the Act to be necessary in the effective prosecution of the war and stated a policy to stabilize prices and rents. The Administrator was authorized to establish prices, after consultation with members of the affected industries so far as practicable, to fix prices which "in his judgment will be generally fair and equitable and will effectuate the purposes of this act." The Administrator was also directed to give "due" consideration to prices prevailing during a designated base period.

After the passage of these laws, there followed a spate of executive orders and administrative regulations that rivaled the "begats" in the First Book of Chronicles. In addition to the Office of Price Administration, there was the War Production Board and the War Food Administration, to mention only three. The latter agency was said to have control over the "food" program, which, to the surprise of some, included cotton and

Footnotes at end of article.

tobacco.⁵³ The various orders were so confusing in their seemingly contradictory delegations of authority that many bureaucratic man hours were spent in trying to resolve conflicts.⁵⁴

But, in contrast to the New Deal legislation, the exercise of war powers met a friendly reception in the courts. In *Yakus v. United States*,⁵⁵ the price control act was upheld. The power of Congress to control prices as a war emergency measure was not questioned. As to the delegation problem, the court had no difficulty, even though the scope of the delegation seems nearly as broad as that involved in *NIRA*. "The Constitution," said the court, "as a continuously operative charter of government does not demand the impossible or the impracticable."⁵⁶

Similarly, the court had no problem with the Second War Powers Act when it held in *L. P. Steuart & Bro., Inc., v. Bowles, Prices Administrator*⁵⁷ that the power of the President to allocate materials includes the power to withhold rationed materials from persons violating the ration regulations.

The war power also authorizes Congress to "unwind" and extends to acts passed after the cessation of hostilities. This was established by *Woods v. Miller Co.*⁵⁸ in which the Supreme Court upheld Title II of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947.⁵⁹

Much of the war legislation has now expired by its own terms. But what has been said indicates clearly that in a war situation⁶⁰ the federal government has almost absolute power to regulate the economy through rationing and price control. Further, it seems that the broadest possible delegations and subdelegations will be permitted.

POST WORLD WAR II LEGISLATION

Although the country continued its involvement in international affairs after World War II, it also emphasized its concern with domestic problems. Perhaps the clearest example had to do with housing and urban development.

Some approaches to the housing problem had occurred as early as 1934, when the Federal Housing Administration was created.⁶¹ It was established for the purpose of providing a system of mutual mortgage insurance, to exert a stabilizing influence on the mortgage market and to encourage improvement in housing standards.⁶² Since that time it has had what has been described as a turbulent history illustrating "... the problems arising where government attempts to influence, by a mixture of carrots and sticks, the marketing and operation of property it neither owns nor manages."⁶³

The original Act has undergone substantial modifications which will not be considered in detail here. Recent changes are found in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968.⁶⁴ Today, the Administration (now a part of the Department of Housing and Urban Development) not only insures regular home ownership housing but also administers programs involving home improvement loans, rental housing, mobile home courts, cooperative housing and many others. It also administers the rent supplement program which subsidizes part of the cost of rental housing occupied by certain low income families and individuals.⁶⁵

The controversial aspects of the housing program will not be discussed here. However, its impact on the national economy is epitomized in the following quotation:⁶⁶

"Since its creation in 1934, the Federal Housing Administration has insured close to \$130 billion in mortgages and loans; has assisted more than 1½ million American families to become home owners, has helped builders finance about 1.4 million rental apartment units, and has insured more than 29 million home improvement loans.

"In addition, FHA has made the low payment, long term mortgage universally ac-

cepted as the most feasible and economic way for home ownership to be achieved by the greater number of families. FHA mortgage insurance has become the standard for virtually all home financing throughout the United States."

Urban renewal is a related and equally important aspect of post war legislation. The basic Act was passed in 1949.⁶⁷ Again, the complexities of the matter are too great to make detailed consideration possible.⁶⁸ Basically, urban renewal is said to be a local problem. The Federal role is primarily one of providing financial assistance, leadership and general program direction.⁶⁹ The local agency must present a workable program, which, after hearing, may be approved for execution. Generally speaking, when a program is approved, land in blighted areas is acquired, demolition of existing structures takes place and the land is transferred to a developer who builds new structures in accordance with the plans. The land and buildings are then sold or leased to private enterprises.

The Housing Act of 1949 itself seemed to raise few, if any, constitutional problems but basic issues were involved in the actual implementation of the program through local redevelopment authorities. In general, as has been said, redevelopment took place through the acquisition of land, its development and transfer to private enterprise. When the land was acquired by eminent domain, the question arose as to whether, if it were later so transferred, the "taking" could be constitutionally justified. Doubts as to this were resolved in the landmark case of *Berman v. Parker*,⁷⁰ which directly involved the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945.⁷¹ In essence the Court decided that the police power extended to the elimination of slums and that, this being the case, the right to realize the objective permitted the use of eminent domain. In one way or another state courts have reached the same result.⁷² Since Federal financing is the core of the program, another example of Congressional legislation affecting the local economy is apparent.

However, the pervasive character of Federal involvement is not made evident by the legislation itself. As of March 31, 1969, 1,573 urban renewal projects had been approved in 760 localities.⁷³ Furthermore, incidental and subsidiary programs involve intimate Federal relationships with many aspects of community life.⁷⁴

The interstate highway program is still another instance of Federal participation in domestic affairs. In 1956 Congress declared that "the prompt and early completion to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways . . . is essential to the national interests . . ." ⁷⁵ The Federal Aid Highway Act, from which this statement is taken, provided for 90 percent Federal assistance for interstate highways and 50 percent for other roads. The interstate system is now about 70 percent completed. About 29,000 miles have been finished and another 13,000 miles are in prospect. The cost thus far has been \$38.8 billion.⁷⁶ Although routes are originally selected by the states, they are subject to approval by Federal authorities. Recently the program has been under heavy attack by citizen groups, largely because of displacements suffered as a result of highway construction.⁷⁷

Still another example of Federal involvement is found in the area of environmental control. Again, the stick and carrot approach is evident. The problem of water pollution was considered by the Congress as early as 1948.⁷⁸ However, the statute has been substantially amended⁷⁹ and the latest version will be considered here. The purpose of Congress is declared to be ". . . to enhance the quality and value of our water resources and to establish a national policy for the prevention, control and abatement of water pollution."⁸⁰ The primary responsibilities of the

states to attain these ends is recognized. The Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare is directed, after appropriate consultation, to develop comprehensive programs to eliminate or reduce water pollution in interstate streams and their tributaries. Grants for planning, research, experiments, demonstrations and studies are authorized. Interstate cooperation is encouraged. A Federal Water Pollution Control Administration is created, as is a Water Pollution Control Advisory Board. State plans are subject to the approval of the Federal agency and funds may be withheld if the states are not in compliance with the approved plan. The states are invited to adopt water quality standards. In the event that water pollution is said to occur, the law provides for conferences among the affected governmental agencies. Reports may be required from persons who are alleged to cause pollution and, for failure to report, a forfeiture may be imposed which may be recovered in a civil action in a United States court.

Almost the same pattern is found in statutes dealing with air pollution control. Again, an earlier statute⁸¹ has been substantially amended.⁸² The policy statement in this instance is directed toward problems of urbanization and the purposes of the statute are declared to be the protection and enhancement of the quality of the Nation's air resources so as to promote the public health and welfare and the productive capacity of its population. To these ends, although the primary responsibility rests on the states and local governments, Federal financial assistance and leadership are regarded as essential. Once more, interstate arrangements are encouraged and provision is made for conferences regarding potential air pollution problems. Grants for the support of air pollution planning and control programs are authorized and provision is made for the establishment of air quality standards.

A significant provision of the statute is one for judicial proceedings to secure the abatement of pollution. Where the pollution endangers the health or welfare of persons in another state or foreign country, the Attorney General of the United States may institute suit in the appropriate district court to abate the nuisance, and, in cases of imminent and substantial endangerment, to secure an injunction. This procedure has been judicially tested and the constitutionality of the statute has been sustained.⁸³

The most recent example of Federal interest in the environment is found in the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, approved on January 1, 1970.⁸⁴ This goes much further than the acts previously cited in that it sets a policy regarding all aspects of the relationships between man and his environment. It provides for the cooperation of all concerned agencies and for the sharing of information among them. It also provides for a Council on Environmental Quality to gather information, review and appraise the various programs of the Federal government and to make policy recommendations to the President. Consultation with the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality and with various other groups is also required. Whether this measure will create a bureaucratic heaven, or the reverse, remains to be discovered.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND CRIME

The matters to be discussed here—civil rights and crime—do not fit neatly into a time frame. However, in each area, developments have occurred which deserve mention.

Congress, of course, has been concerned with civil rights since the war between the states, as is evidenced by a long series of statutes which need not be dealt with at this point. Recently, however, there has been intensive consideration of certain aspects of the problem. One instance is found in the Voting Rights Act of 1965.⁸⁵ The measure was

passed "to enforce the Fifteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States and for other purposes." After declaring that no voting standard or other device shall be imposed to deny or abridge the right to vote on account of race or color, the law creates a mechanism for policing elections in order to make sure that the congressional mandate is carried out. The mechanism is triggered by the Attorney General who may institute suits if he believes that violations of the statute are taking place. Where it is determined that forbidden tests or devices are being used, the court in which the suit has been brought shall suspend them and the court retains jurisdiction until it finds that the tests and devices will not have the effect of denying the right to vote. Among the tests and devices which are forbidden, if wrongfully used, are literacy tests, demonstrations of knowledge in any particular subject and the requirement of good moral character.

Perhaps the most significant aspect of the law has to do with the appointment of federal examiners who are authorized to investigate alleged violations on the spot. They may, among other things, issue certificates evidencing eligibility to vote. In this manner, Federal supervision of state elections is assured through the judicial and administrative processes.

A final portion of the statute declares that the constitutional right of citizens to vote is abridged by the poll tax and directs the attorney general to bring actions against the enforcement of the tax. Of course, the Twenty-Fourth Amendment, which became operative on February 5, 1964, prevents the imposition of the tax with respect to Federal offices.

The most recent revision of general civil rights legislation is found in the Civil Rights Act of 1968.⁸⁴ For our purposes, the most important provisions deal with interference with federally protected rights and with housing. As to the former, it is said that whoever, whether or not acting under color of law interferes with such federally protected activities as voting, enjoying employment, serving on juries and gaining access to hotels and restaurants is subject to fine or imprisonment or both. As to housing, the Act prohibits discrimination in the sale, rental or financing of housing where Federal financing or insurance is involved. Educational and conciliatory activities are provided for and enforcement procedures are prescribed. Again, penalties are imposed on violators whether or not they are acting under color of law.

It is impossible within the limitations of this discussion to examine in depth the tremendous amount of case material which the Civil Rights Acts have engendered. Probably the most significant recent case is *Jones v. Alfred H. Mayer Co.*⁸⁵ The opinion by Mr. Justice Stewart contains an elaborate review of civil rights legislation and a comparison between the 1964 Civil Rights Act and that of 1968. The most important element of the decision for our purposes is that Congress, under the Thirteenth Amendment, has power to forbid racial discrimination in housing whether private or public. Thus, when legislation is based on that amendment, rather than on the Fourteenth, state action need not be found and congressional legislation can reach the individual directly. It may be noted that the Thirteenth Amendment in its terms simply outlaws slavery and involuntary servitude but the court was able to find that this protected a person from discrimination in the purchase of housing on racial grounds. Thus, it appears that in situations involving discrimination in voting⁸⁶ and other types of racial discrimination, the Fifteenth and Thirteenth Amendments permit direct Federal intervention.

Federal interest in local crime is, again, a

matter which has existed for some time but, again too, that interest has been intensified in recent years. Here, however, Federal intervention has not been direct but rather, as in the areas of housing, renewal and environmental control, has taken the form of aid to the states with Federal control over expenditures. The Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968⁸⁷ contains a finding that the high incidence of crime in the United States threatens the public peace and that law enforcement efforts must be better coordinated, intensified and made more effective at all levels of government. It is recognized, however, that crime is essentially a local problem and that it must be dealt with by state and local governments if it is to be controlled effectively.

Consequently, a Law Enforcement Assistance Administration is created in the Federal government which is empowered to make planning grants to states for the establishment of state planning agencies and grants for law enforcement purposes. States are required to submit comprehensive plans. The law also provides for training, education, research and demonstration grants. These are made by the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice which is also established by the Act.

Another title of the Act grants authority to both Federal and state officials to conduct wire taps under the supervision of the appropriate courts. These provisions are elaborate and, probably with constitutional problems in mind, appear to be most carefully drawn. Still another title has to do with state firearms control assistance, which basically provides for Federal control and licensing of importers of firearms, but also contains a provision to the effect that there is no intention to occupy the field to the exclusion of state law unless there is a positive conflict.

SUMMARY

This brief summation of significant legislative events since 1920 has given some indication of congressional reaction to depression and war. It has shown the nation's concern with blighted cities and other problems of urbanization as well as its involvement with environmental control, with civil rights and with crime. It has demonstrated the fact that the Congress does react to great social problems, whether in timely fashion, or wisely, or not.

It is difficult to find valid generalizations apart from these. Certainly the overshadowing presence of the Federal government has been demonstrated. That presence has been made known in several ways; through the commerce and war powers, through taxation and now, perhaps most significantly, through spending. In some areas the Federal government has assumed complete control. In others, it has shown sensitivity to the interests of the states and, in the case of urban renewal, even more to those of municipalities. Indeed patterns of Federal assistance in this area have raised questions as to the position of the states in our scheme of government.⁸⁸

No one can tell what the next half century will bring. One might conjecture that there will be increasing involvement with social problems and that in one way or another the influence of the Congress may reach such areas as zoning and other forms of land use control. Congress may attempt to exercise some influence over population movements. Regional arrangements for dealing with conditions created by urbanization may be expected. The financial plight of states and municipalities may receive more attention. All of this presupposes that international affairs will be stable enough to permit more concern with domestic problems.

But, no matter what situations arise, the Congress will continue to write history through the legislative process.

FOOTNOTES

* Professor of Law, The George Washington University.

¹ For a much more extensive treatment of the general subject, see *THE STATUTORY HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES*, B. Schwartz Ed., 1969.

² 41 STAT. 456 (1920). Federal control was established as of March 21, 1918. 40 STAT. 451 (1918). Note: In this and in many subsequent footnotes, the United States Code is not cited. This is because the statute referred to is no longer operative and no comparable provision is contained in the Code.

³ 41 STAT. 1063 (1920).

⁴ 41 STAT. 437 (1920).

⁵ 41 STAT. 392 (1920).

⁶ 41 STAT. 403 (1920).

⁷ 42 STAT. 4 (1921).

⁸ Stern, *The Commerce Clause and the National Economy, 1933-36*, 59 HARV. L. REV. 645, 653 (1946). I am deeply indebted to Mr. Stern for his highly informative account of the legislation and litigation of this period. Mr. Stern's footnotes are omitted from this quotation.

⁹ See Stern, *supra* note 8.

¹⁰ One of the battles involved the so-called court packing plan. On February 5, 1937, President Franklin D. Roosevelt sent a message to Congress containing a plan for the reorganization. It proposed the appointment of additional judges in federal courts where there were sitting judges who had reached retirement age and who had not retired or resigned. It also extended these provisions to the Supreme Court. After a bitter controversy the proposal was defeated. The matter is summarized in FREUND, SUTHERLAND, HOWE AND BROWN, *CONSTITUTIONAL LAW: CASES AND OTHER PROBLEMS*, pp. 243-245 (2nd Ed. 1961).

¹¹ See Nutting, *Constitutional Delegations Since the Schechter case*, 14 MISS. L. J. 350 (1942).

¹² See, e.g., Stern, *supra* note 8, p. 649 and footnotes.

¹³ *Id.*, p. 652.

¹⁴ Act of June 16, 1933, 48 STAT. 195 (1933).

¹⁵ 48 STAT. 195, 200 (1933).

¹⁶ 48 STAT. 31 (1933).

¹⁷ 49 STAT. 991 (1935).

¹⁸ 48 STAT. 74 (1933).

¹⁹ 48 STAT. 881 (1934).

²⁰ 49 STAT. 803 (1935).

²¹ Stern, *supra* note 8, p. 652.

²² 293 U.S. 388 (1935).

²³ *Supra*, note 14.

²⁴ 295 U.S. 495 (1935).

²⁵ 48 STAT. 195, 196 (1933).

²⁶ 293 U.S. 388, 403 (1935).

²⁷ 293 U.S. 238 (1936).

²⁸ *Supra*, note 16.

²⁹ 297 U.S. 1 (1936).

³⁰ *Supra*, note 15.

³¹ They are collected in FREUND, *etc.*, *supra*, note 10, p. 243.

³² 49 STAT. 449 (1935).

³³ 301 U.S. 1 (1937).

³⁴ 52 STAT. 1060 (1938).

³⁵ 312 U.S. 100 (1941).

³⁶ 50 STAT. 77 (1937).

³⁷ 310 U.S. 381 (1940).

³⁸ E.g., *Mulford v. Smith*, 307 U.S. 38 (1930); *United States v. Rock Royal Co-operative, Inc.*, 307 U.S. 533 (1939).

³⁹ See *Jones v. Securities and Exchange Commission*, 298 U.S. 1 (1936); *Wright v. Securities and Exchange Commission*, 112 F.2d. 89 (C.C.A. 2d 1940); *Electric Bond and Share Co. v. Securities and Exchange Commission*, 303 U.S. 419 (1938).

⁴⁰ 49 STAT. 620 (1935).

⁴¹ *Steward Machine Co. v. Davis*, 301 U.S. 548 (1937).

⁴² *Supra*, note 34.

⁴³ Nutting, *supra* note 11, p. 355.

⁴⁴ See Nutting, *Are States Still Legislative Laboratories?*, 52 A.B.A.J. 877 (1966).

⁴⁵ 39 STAT. 213 (1916).

⁴⁶ See Pearlman, *Wartime Priority Control Over Food*, 29 IOWA L. REV. 430 (1944).

⁴⁷ 54 STAT. 892 (1940).

⁴⁸ 54 STAT. 676 (1940).

⁴⁹ 56 STAT. 178 (1942).

⁵⁰ *Id.*

⁵¹ 56 STAT. 23 (1942).

⁵² 56 STAT. 765 (1942).

⁵³ Exec. Order 9280, 7 Fed. Reg. 10179, paragraph 10 (1942).

⁵⁴ See, *passim*, Nutting and Baskette, *Food Distribution in War Time*, 23 NEB. L. REV. 131 (1944).

⁵⁵ 321 U.S. 414 (1944).

⁵⁶ *Id.*, at p. 424.

⁵⁷ 322 U.S. 398 (1944).

⁵⁸ 333 U.S. 138 (1948).

⁵⁹ 61 STAT. 193 (1947).

⁶⁰ No opinion is expressed here as to Federal power in a situation of "undeclared war."

⁶¹ National Housing Act of 1934, 48 STAT. 1246 (1934).

⁶² 1 CCH Federal Banking Law Reporter 10,-031 (1966) as quoted in LEFCOE, *LAND FINANCE LAW* 186 (1969).

⁶³ HAAR, *LAND USE PLANNING* 650-51 (1959).

⁶⁴ Act of Aug. 1, 1968, 82 STAT. 476, 12 USC 1701.

⁶⁵ PROGRESS REPORT ON FEDERAL HOUSING AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS. Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs, Committee on Banking and Currency, United States Senate, 91st Cong., 1st Sess., pp. 11-25 (1969).

⁶⁶ *Id.*, at p. 11.

⁶⁷ Housing Act of 1949, 63 STAT. 380, 42 USC 1460 *et seq.*

⁶⁸ It is almost literally true that writings on this subject would fill a library. In addition to a vast amount of other literature, there are the following casebooks, each of which contains extensive material on the problem: HAAR, *LAND-USE PLANNING* (1959); MANDELKER *MANAGING OUR URBAN ENVIRONMENT* (1966); LEFCOE, *LAND DEVELOPMENT LAW* (1966); BEUSCHER AND WRIGHT, *LAND USE* (1969); KRASNOWIECKI, *HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT* (1969); MICHELMAN AND SANDALOW, *GOVERNMENT IN URBAN AREAS* (1970).

⁶⁹ The description in this paragraph is derived from a statement by William Slayton, then Commissioner of the Urban Renewal Administration, before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Banking and Currency in 1963, as quoted in MANDELKER *MANAGING OUR URBAN ENVIRONMENT*, pp. 133 *et seq.* (1966).

⁷⁰ 348 U.S. 26 (1959).

⁷¹ 60 STAT. 790 (1945); D.C. Code sec. 5-701 to 5-719.

⁷² See Mandelker, *Public Purposes in Urban Development*, 28 TUL. L. * * * 96 (1953).

⁷³ Progress Report, *supra*, note 65, p. 110.

⁷⁴ *Id.*, pp. 111-116.

⁷⁵ 72 STAT. 885 (1958); 23 USC 101 *et seq.*

⁷⁶ Campagna, *In the Path of the Interstates*, City, June-July 1970, p. 25.

⁷⁷ *Id.*

⁷⁸ 70 STAT. 507 (1948).

⁷⁹ 79 STAT. 903 (1970); 33 USC 466 *et seq.*

⁸⁰ *Id.*, sec. 466.

⁸¹ 69 STAT. 322 (1955).

⁸² 81 STAT. 485 (1967); 42 USC 1857(a) through (1).

⁸³ *United States v. Bishop Processing Co.*, 287 F. Supp. 624 (D.C.Md. 1968); *affd.*, 423 F.2d 469 (4th Cir. 1970); *cert. den.*—U.S.—(1970).

⁸⁴ 83 STAT. 852 (1970); 42 USC 4321 *et seq.*

⁸⁵ 49 STAT. 437 (1965); —USC—

⁸⁶ 82 STAT. 73 (1968); 18 USC 2101-2102. This was extended by Congress in June 1970, with an added provision extending voting privileges to eighteen year olds.

⁸⁷ 392 U.S. 409 (1968). The position in this case was reaffirmed in *Sullivan v. Little Hunting Park, Inc.*—U.S.—; 90 S. Ct. 400 (1969).

⁸⁸ *Supra*, p. 262.

⁸⁹ 82 STAT. 197 (1968). The Act has been codified under numerous titles of the United States Code. They may be identified by consulting the Popular Name Table under the title of the Act as given in the text.

⁹⁰ See De Grove, *Help or Hindrance to Station Action? The National Government, in the States and the Urban Crisis*, The American Assembly, 1970.

EARTH WEEK: AN OPPORTUNITY TO REVIEW THE PROGRESS AND FUTURE CHALLENGE OF PRESERVING THE ENVIRONMENT

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, nearly a year ago, on April 22, 1970, millions of persons throughout the United States actively participated in the observance of Earth Day. Citizens everywhere recognized the importance of preserving and enhancing our environment.

This week, April 18 to 24, has been designated as Earth Week. It is appropriate at this time to add up our ecological scorecard—to check our environmental record and establish what has been accomplished in the last year and what still remains to be tackled. There were some last year who were worried that environmental awareness was just a passing fad, and that concern about making real progress in enhancing the quality of life would become a forgotten issue. There are, of course, a multitude of other pressing concerns confronting Congress and the man in the street. But I am glad to say that we are moving ahead on the environmental front. We are making solid advances in ending the deterioration of our water, our air and our entire ecosystem. The record shows that the issue of the environment is not a passing fad and not an issue that can be shunted aside. Indeed, it is a concern that may well represent the most important long-term issue we have ever confronted.

Nearly a year ago I discussed the environmental legislation Congress had approved previously. Both the quantity and scope of that legislation was extensive. Since last April a number of new bills have been passed.

The Clean Air Act, which authorized \$1.1 billion over three years for air pollution and aid to the States, includes one of the toughest antipollution provisions ever passed. The act stipulates that by January 1, 1976, the auto industry must produce a virtually pollution-free engine.

This measure was opposed by Detroit, but it is necessary if we are to control the No. 1 source of air pollution. I have confidence in American technology—I believe we can produce a clean automobile engine by applying the full force of our knowledge and ingenuity. If we really invest our time and energy, we can have progress without pollution. We can produce an engine, as this Act calls for, that will reduce carbon monoxide and hydrocarbon emissions by 90 percent.

Other provisions of the Clean Air Act require the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare—HEW—to formulate national air pollution standards and complete the designation of air quality control regions across the Nation. Within 3 to 5 years the States must establish and enforce clean air programs meeting the national standards. If a State fails to act the U.S. Attorney General can bring suit to stop pollution, with penalties up to \$10,000 per day. In addition, the act permits citizen suits to compel enforcement of existing pollution controls, including suits against lax administrators. First-time violators face up to \$25,000 in fines or 1 year imprisonment.

Another important act passed since Earth Day 1970 is the Resource Recovery Act. This legislation authorized \$463 million over 3 years for a variety of efforts designed to promote the recovery of energy or resources and recycle useful material.

This legislation is limited and preliminary because it involves the almost untouched technology of recycling. But it is an important beginning. As a Nation which has only 6 percent of the world's population, but which accounts for more than half of the world's annual consumption of raw materials, the United States has a responsibility to use the earth's finite energy and resources as efficiently and wisely as possible. Our technological society must learn to use its resources as intelligently as the old Indians of the Great Plains used their resource, the buffalo. The Indians did not hunt the buffalo for its meat alone—they used and often reused almost every part of its body. We too, in similar fashion, must make the most of our natural wealth. We must recycle our resources.

Under the Resource Recover Act, HEW is conducting studies of economical means of recovering useful materials from solid waste. In addition, planning grants and experimental grants to State and local governments are available for projects that lessen the environmental impact of solid waste disposal and promote resource recovery and recycling.

Numerous other acts established and funded programs relating to the environment, including the Environmental Quality Education Act, a \$45 million program to increase ecological literacy. Through other legislation, Congress set aside 23 new wilderness areas, a national seashore, two national lakeshores, a national park, and a national historic park.

These bills will not bring us to the ecological millenium, and neither will the hundreds of environmental bills introduced in the new 92d Congress. The environmental problem is large and complex. But progress is being made.

This year I have introduced several pieces of legislation which would help improve our environment. H.R. 5076, which I joined Representative MORRIS K. UDALL and others in sponsoring, would provide the citizen with new and stronger legal tools to combat pollution more effectively. Citizens' suits and class action suits could be filed in U.S. district courts against personal or corporate polluters.

This bill would allow citizens to file for damage done to the total environment. At present, they can recover damages only if a narrow and specific economic harm from pollution can be proven. In addition, relief often comes in the form of a financial award rather than a judicial directive to the polluter to stop violating the law.

Another bill I have sponsored, H.R. 6486, would deal specifically with the problem of lake pollution. This legislation also introduced by Representative CLARENCE D. LONG, calls for a \$900 million, 40-year grant program to aid State and local governments in developing water plants and cleaning up existing pollution. Particular attention would be given to improving the quality of small community lakes.

Within 18 months after the passage of this bill, participating State and local governments would be required to adopt enforceable laws to control effluents discharged into lakes. In addition, land developers in areas near or adjacent to lakes or their tributaries would be required to control soil erosion, a major cause of water pollution. Violators of this legislation could be fined up to \$10,000 and/or imprisoned for a year.

Water quality would also be enhanced under a bill sponsored by the House Interior Committee, Chairman WAYNE ASPINALL and myself. H.R. 5334, the saline water bill, would continue the program of research, development, and demonstration of processes for converting salt water and chemically contaminated water into fresh water. Through this bill, we may soon be able to economically convert brackish water into clean water and improve the quality of natural waters.

H.R. 6087, sponsored by Representative ROBERT L. F. SIKES, myself and others, would provide for an important program of urban environmental forestry. This legislation would promote the development of vital green spaces and parklands near our urban and suburban areas.

Two House joint resolutions I have sponsored include House Joint Resolution 5 to establish a Joint Committee on the Environment and House Joint Resolution 280 to permanently designate this, the third week of April, as Earth Week.

Thank you.

THE SEAL PROTECTION ACT OF
1971

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the Seal Protection Act, a bill which would protect seals from being exterminated.

The wanton slaughter of wildlife for no other purpose than to adorn clothing, or place before a hearth, is obnoxious and one of the greatest obscenities of our society. Yet, for the sake of the dollar, seals are subjected to massive brutality

and slaughter at the hands of man. It is time to realize that this destruction—coupled with the pollution of the oceans—may result in an upset in the balance of nature.

The preservation of animals is not an economic issue.

For no other reason than humanics in a civilized society, we should do everything in our power to preserve and protect wildlife. The preservation of animals is our duty as trustees of this planet. We have an obligation to future generations to leave this earth and her flora and fauna in a better condition than when we entered.

Mr. Speaker, to prohibit the barbaric treatment of seals at the hands of fur hunters, this bill would make it unlawful to harass, hunt, or kill seals that are in the United States. Further, this measure would prohibit the sale or importation of seal skins into the United States.

However, there are exceptions to this standard. The Eskimos, who have traditionally hunted seals for their own use, will be allowed to continue this practice, but will not be allowed to offer them for sale. In addition, municipal zoos will be allowed to replace deceased seals in their zoos.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time that we stop the wanton slaughter of helpless animals that harm no one. Instead, we should adopt a policy of enhancing our environment and preserving the precious resources that we have very nearly decimated.

ART INSTITUTE OF PITTSBURGH
ESTABLISHES JOHN DENT SCHOLARSHIP

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, we all know the great work that JOHN DENT has performed on behalf of the working man. Currently his committee is seeking legislation that will protect the pensions of workers and a second bill to raise the minimum wage and put 7 million more workers under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

With a track record like this, it is not difficult to see why homage is paid to JOHN DENT for his efforts.

But the gentleman from Pennsylvania is renowned for his work with another important group, America's students, the greatest hope our Nation has.

Most recently, the Art Institute of Pittsburgh, a school with whose good work I am very familiar and an institution which happens to be in my district, established a John Dent Scholarship to be presented every 2 years to a deserving high school senior.

I believe that this is an excellent tribute to one of this body's more energetic Members.

In establishing the John Dent Scholarship, John Johns, President of the Art Institute, said:

We consider it a great privilege to set up a scholarship in honor of Congressman DENT,

as only a small token of the tremendous work he has been doing to help the cause of education. Every student owes a debt to Mr. DENT's diligence and enthusiasm. I am just happy to be able to say "thank you" in a way that will help even more students.

Helping people seems to be a habit with JOHN DENT and a habit with the Art Institute of Pittsburgh which has provided my city of Pittsburgh with hundreds of competent art and design specialists.

A John Dent Scholarship at the Art Institute of Pittsburgh, I could not think of a better union of interests and concerns.

I just want to congratulate both JOHN DENT and the Art Institute and bring to the attention of the House this great honor, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

LAOS ATTACK SUCCESSFUL

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, there has been some confusion about the results of the recent action in Laos. This subject was discussed in a recent article written by Ira C. Eaker, who served with great distinction in the Air Force during World War II. He retired as a lieutenant general. He is known for his accuracy and dependability. A copy of the article follows:

RESULTS SHOW: LAOS ATTACK SUCCESSFUL

President Nixon said, about the middle of the Laotian operation, "The jury is still out on Laos."

Now that the ground-force phase of the Laotian operation has ended, it is possible to assess the results with considerable accuracy.

It is estimated that the enemy lost about 15,000 killed and 30,000 wounded. His losses of equipment, weapons and supplies include 5,000 trucks—500 to ARVN (Army, Republic of South Vietnam), artillery and the remainder to U.S. gunships—106 tanks and armored vehicles, 600 million rounds of small arms ammunition, 2,000 machine guns, 5,000 rifles, 216,000 gallons of gasoline, and 2.5 million lbs. of rice (the rations for 100,000 soldiers for a month).

The ARVN lost 1,300 killed and about 3,000 wounded. There were 37 U.S. airmen lost in air support of the Laotian campaign.

The disparity in losses between the Reds and the ARVN was due to the fact that the enemy made massed attacks against fortified positions on high ground, defended by artillery and automatic weapons and under continual strafing and bombing from U.S. air support.

Some dispatches from Vietnam claimed that the United States suffered heavy helicopter losses. Forty thousand helicopter sorties were flown to support the Laotian operation. Total helicopter losses were 87. This is about 2 per cent. In World War II, British bomber losses (night operations) were 2 per cent while U.S. bomber losses (daylight missions) were 4 per cent.

The Reds have succeeded in moving South of the DMZ no more than 25 per cent of the supplies they have been moving in a dry season in past years.

The Laotian operation cut up and severely mauled three of the best Red divisions, greatly decreasing the threat to Cambodia,

Laos and South Vietnam, improving the prospects for Vietnamization and reducing the hazard to our dwindling forces.

The Laotian tactical plan called for two ARVN divisions to advance on a narrow corridor to Tchepone where all supply trails south converge.

As the South Vietnamese divisions advanced westward to successive phase lines, four or five miles apart, they established fire bases on either flank. Ultimately six such bases were occupied on the north flank and four on the south.

A fire base was made by dropping several 15,000-pound bombs on a hilltop, thus clearing an area out of the jungle adequate for helicopter pads, a battalion of 400 men with their artillery and automatic weapons and a cleared field of fire several thousand yards in extent in all directions.

As the high command had guessed, the Reds elected to attack massively. They hit the westernmost fire base with a regiment of 1,800 men. They lost 1,400 killed. For the first time they did not remove the dead, counted by low-level reconnaissance and photographs. Subsequent similar attacks on other fire bases suffered additional heavy Red casualties.

When the ARVN divisions began to withdraw (it was never planned that two divisions would hold indefinitely when outnumbered), a Pentagon senior officer was asked if this nullified the success of the operation. He replied, "It was better that the enemy chose to fight. They have now lost half of their best troops in three divisions, and they have expended their scarce ammunition and weapons at a greatly accelerated rate." He then concluded, "We also have discovered the quality of the South Vietnamese troops. They performed well, there was never any rout or panic at any time. We are much more confident that our allies can manage after we leave."

Red defectors (several hundred crossed over during the Laotian operation) report that morale in the regular North Vietnamese divisions has depreciated markedly as a result of their heavy losses. This has now been confirmed from other intelligence sources.

Another significant result of the Cambodian and Laotian operations is the fact that the enemy has now lost the initiative. No longer can he rely upon secure sanctuaries or elect his own time and place of attack.

IN SUPPORT OF J. EDGAR HOOVER

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover and the Federal Bureau of Investigation which he has moulded certainly need not defend themselves. Their respect is international and their credibility is far deeper than mere politics.

As an indication of the admiration and respect with which Mr. Hoover is venerated, I have even received a letter from a prisoner in a State penitentiary commending Mr. Hoover for his efforts to make our country a better and safer place in which to live.

I insert the letter at this point:

RICHMOND, Va.,
April 14, 1971.

HON. JOHN R. RARICK,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SIR: I am writing this letter to you to commend you on your recent support of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the F.B.I.

It may sound strange to you, that I, a convicted felon of 26, would be in support of one of the finest law enforcement officers in this country. However, I say, is it really so strange. Does my being a convicted felon mean that I cannot respect a man, who in my opinion is doing one fine job? I respect Mr. Hoover for the type of man that he is. Men of his character and virtue are rare these days. This man has done so much for the American people in trying to make this a better and safer place in which to live. He has built one of the finest crime fighting organizations in this country; or, for that matter, in the world. I truly believe that the F.B.I. has become more famous than either Interpol or Scotland Yard.

These recent attacks on him, in my judgment, are in ill taste. Have the dissenters in this country created such a stir that they have made men in higher offices turn on our living symbol of Law and Order? Have these men forgotten what Mr. Hoover has done to protect society not only from the criminal element of society but its enemies as well? Thank you once again for supporting this truly fine American.

Yours very truly,

HUGH L. ERWIN, Jr.

REX MARTIN II TOPS BRADDOCK HEIGHTS OPTIMIST ORATORICAL CONTEST

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, the Optimist Club of Braddock Heights, Md., held its annual oratorical contest April 6 at the Braddock Heights Fire Hall. Rex R. Martin II won first prize; Mark D. Lederman won second; and Albert L. Nagy, Jr. placed third.

I would like to extend my personal congratulations to the contest winners. Rex Martin's winning speech was a convincing appeal to America to continue the struggle to maintain its freedom:

THIS I BELIEVE

I believe in Americanism, and freedom is Americanism at its best.

Three hundred and fifty years ago our forefathers had the American dream, and came to this country for one main reason, freedom. Since then, freedom or the American way of life has been our heritage.

In 1775 the American Revolution began and was fought, under the leadership of George Washington, for one main purpose, freedom, again Americanism. The Declaration of Independence was written by Thomas Jefferson, outlining the principles of our country. Then came the Constitution of the United States, which remains the law of our land, striving for liberty and justice for all. All people are free to strive and to succeed. Mark Twain once said "An Englishman is a man who does something because it has been done before, but an American is a person who does something because it has not been done before". Freedom and Americanism are what permitted our great leaders such as Washington and Lincoln to succeed. The free atmosphere likewise, permitted Benjamin Franklin to discover electricity, Alexander Bell the telephone, and allowed Daniel Webster to become one of our greatest orators of all times. Our country has always needed more Daniel Websters, and better communication to spread the American word of freedom both at home and abroad.

In 1861 the Civil War began and was fought for freedom and to abolish slavery, again Americanism.

In 1941 World War II began and was fought to keep America free and to protect the free world. Sir Winston Churchill once said "A democracy is a terrible form of government, but I know of none better". I believe most Americans feel the same way.

Today, we find ourselves at war in Vietnam, and again fighting for freedom or Americanism to protect our interests and to uphold our treaties, and to contain Communist oppression. Under Red Rule, the freedoms of travel, speech, religion, and the many other freedoms which we Americans today all take for granted, do not exist. Today our high standard of living, and our great accomplishments including putting men on the moon, have been possible because of our great heritage, freedom.

Our generation today is enjoying greater freedom than any other in the history of man. This I believe, but we should never take it for granted. Freedom is not free, it can and has been extremely costly. You hear the question: "What type of a nut is he? He wants to run his own business. He wants to select his own doctor. He wants to select his own friends. He wants to make his own bargains. He wants to grow on his own efforts. What kind of a nut is he?" He is an American who understands and believes in the Declaration of Independence, that's what kind. Aren't you glad you are too? And don't you wonder why so many of our fellow Americans are trying so hard to destroy the kind of life that has made us the aim and the envy of every other person on earth. The question is what kind of nuts are they? When our United States Capitol building in Washington is bombed, it is time for all red blooded Americans to wake up.

Today, we American youths are well educated, filled with energy and enthusiasm and foresight, and are eager to accept and protect our heritage. To us it will always be, America, first, last, and always. This I believe. In final analysis, it matters little whether our national anthem is The Star Spangled Banner, or America the Beautiful, but what really matters is, when our flag, Old Glory, goes passing by, stand up, take off your hat, put your hand over your heart and say "Thank God, I am an American". This I believe.

CROATIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, April 10, marked the 30th anniversary of independence by the people of Croatia. In April 1941, the people of that ancient and culturally well endowed land were finally able to assert their right to pursue their own destiny. Although entangled in the tragedy of World War II, the Croats were able to make good on their determination to become an independent state.

The people of Croatia have a long and honorable history and have steadfastly maintained their great national traditions. The American public should remember the Croats' courageous struggle for postwar freedom.

However, World War II's end saw the demise of Croatian independence and now she has become a part of Communist Yugoslavia. But for those countrymen who lived through that period of resurgence, the freedom they tasted shall never be forgotten.

On this anniversary of Croatian in-

dependence, we should all remember those patriots who solemnly recall that joyous April. On this occasion we should join with all those of Croatian heritage as they recount the glory and justifiable pride of those few years of independence.

THE GUILTY MEN

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, Nguyen Khoa, said in Washington Star, April 1, 1971:

We had Communists in the village then. They fight against the Americans. That's why it happened . . . if we didn't have Communists in the hamlet it would not have happened.

Nguyen Khoa is a militia leader in the Vietnamese hamlet of Tu Cung located about a half mile from My Lai 4—the subhamlet where the incident for which Lieutenant Calley has been sentenced to life imprisonment took place. Nguyen Khoa's 5-year-old son was killed during the encounter at My Lai 4. Yet Nguyen Khoa understands why it happened. He understands where the basic guilt lies. It does not rest basically with Lieutenant Calley.

Neither does it rest with the American people. Although some commentators who can find little to recommend our Nation at any time have seized upon this incident as conclusive proof that Americans are an unworthy and degenerate people, their assessment just does not square with the facts.

The men responsible for My Lai 4, the men responsible for the loss of well over three quarters of a million lives in Southeast Asia since 1957, reside in Hanoi. They and their program of action furnish the moral justification for our participation in the war. They are hardened and ruthless Communist despots who are attempting to subjugate the people of Indochina no matter what the cost in human life.

While U.S. forces have waged their campaign in defense of South Vietnam with the greatest possible precautions to preclude civilian casualties, the Communists have conducted a systematic campaign of terror against the people of South Vietnam. In order to bring this massive organized liquidation effort to the attention of my colleagues and the American people I have been inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from time to time, reports of terrorist activities which are compiled by the National Police of South Vietnam.

This series, entitled "The Pulping of a People," brings forth most vividly the nature and scope of the Communist terrorist activities directed against civilians. Men, women, and young adults were assassinated, maimed, and abducted at the rate of approximately 290 per week during 1970.

The most vicious single attack on the civilian population of South Vietnam took place during the 1968 Tet offensive. Between January 31, 1968, and March 15, 1968, approximately 7,400 civilians were killed. Over 5,000 civilians in the city of Hue were systematically executed. It was in response to this ruthless extermination campaign that the South Vietnamese Government requested that U.S. forces be sent to the Son My area which served as headquarters for the 48th Vietcong battalion. This is the area where the My Lai incident took place.

As the House Armed Services Investigating Subcommittee, headed by Congressman F. EDWARD HÉBERT, stated in its investigative report of the My Lai incident:

The village of Son My, of which the hamlet of My Lai 4 was a part, was a hard core Viet Cong area and had been so for more than 20 years. The hamlets were fortified by camouflaged fighting bunkers and used as a base and supply camp for the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese Army units. It was from this area that the 48th Viet Cong Battalion launched this attack on the city of Quan Ngai during the January 1968 Tet offensive.

The subcommittee report also commented on the civilians in the area:

Based upon events which took place in the weeks preceding March 16, 1968 (the date of the incident), it is reasonable to conclude that those 'civilians' present in the hamlet of My Lai 4, except those too young to do so, were there to aid the enemy or his cause. They had been previously removed from that village to the safety of a refugee camp but subsequently returned.

The subcommittee report also sets the incident into the only perspective from which the occurrence at My Lai 4 can be understood.

In a war such as that in Vietnam, our forces in the field must live for extended periods of time in the shadow of violent death and in constant fear of being crippled or maimed by booby traps and mines. And added to this is the fact that this is not war in the conventional sense. The enemy is often not in uniform. A farmer or a housewife or a child by day may well be the enemy by night, fashioning or setting mines and booby traps, or giving aid, comfort and assistance to the uniformed enemy troops. Under such circumstances, one can understand how it might become increasingly difficult for our troops to accept the idea that many of those who kill them by night somehow become "innocent civilians" by day.

The President's review of Lieutenant Calley's case, conducted with an understanding that, in the murky half-light of indecisive action against an elusive enemy, our soldiers are many times in the position of being damned if they do or dead if they do not, will hopefully produce a finding within the spirit as well as the letter of the law. But more importantly, we must let the firsthand experience and obvious commonsense of Nguyen Khoa help guide us to the roots of the problem.

Justice for the people of South Vietnam can only be achieved by directing our state apparatus of compulsion and coercion against the real criminals. These men are in Hanoi, not Georgia.

ECTOR MUNN: ADVOCATE OF PLANNED PARENTHOOD

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, welfare costs and solutions to the problems of welfare in the United States have been the subject of countless newspaper and magazine articles, research papers, studies, reports, and debate and is presently under consideration by the House Ways and Means Committee.

Inextricably related to the problem of rising welfare costs in America is the size of the welfare family, and planned parenthood is likewise an essential part of any meaningful solution to the problem.

Mr. Ector Munn of Palm Beach, Fla., has recognized the need for effective planned parenthood programs to curb welfare costs, and I am enclosing, for the benefit of my colleagues, an article which appeared recently in the Palm Beach Daily News which describes Mr. Munn's contributions to this program.

ECTOR MUNN: BIRTH CONTROL BONUS COULD CUT RELIEF COSTS

(By Jane Skinner)

Welfare problems abound in the U.S., the "population explosion" has been picked up, carried down the field of social significance as a menace to man's survival, and all along, Palm Beach winter resident Ector Munn has been trying to do something about both conditions.

Retired from active business life 10 years ago, Munn has spent most of his time bringing the planned parenthood concept to the attention of state and county health departments throughout the southeastern U.S.

In 1964, Munn, with the assistance of famed cartoonist George McManus, creator of "Bringing Up Father," with Maggie and Jiggs, began furnishing, free of charge, posters designed to educate masses of people living in a poverty environment to the advantages of limiting family size.

The response was immediate . . . letters poured in to Munn from health educators, obstetric consultants, nursing consultants, directors of public health education and bureaus of maternal and child care in Georgia, North and South Carolina, Mississippi and Florida, asking for more posters.

In 1969, the Director of Maternal Health Service for the Georgia State Department of Health wrote, "We have a need to provide all of our 159 county health departments with one of these posters and to use others in the department of family and child services, who often refer patients to us."

But before the Planned Parenthood posters became so successful he had trouble keeping his supply commensurate with the demand. Ector Munn, in 1966, offered financial support to the first family planning clinic in Palm Beach County . . . in Pahokee.

Dr. C. L. Brumback, director of the Palm Beach County Health Dept., said Munn provided the department with funds, \$6,108, to operate the glades area clinic for a period of one year.

"Mr. Munn's help has been invaluable to us," said Dr. Brumback.

Munn's efforts have taken on new energy in the past year, because he believes an in-

centive program could be more successful in family planning than the ever growing need for more welfare dollars.

"Only one out of four potential mothers of welfare babies try birth control, and of these, so many drop out only about one in five is protected," he said.

"An incentive plan to practice family planning should be employed."

Dr. Brumback said the family planning clinics in the county offer various means of achieving this end, and education in practicing the methods, none of which can be offensive to individuals with personal and varying religious beliefs.

Munn takes issue with providing underprivileged people with "information," referring to a large sum of money recently allocated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to improve contraceptives.

"Certainly the poor do not need information. What they lack is motivation and the best use HEW could make of its money would be to supply motivation," he said.

Munn had small surveys made in Palm Beach and Sarasota counties to determine what constitutes the biggest stumbling blocks to successful family planning.

The women screened included "afraid of side effects (from the pill), too far to go to a clinic, too tired, and no baby sitter," among the reasons for not availing themselves of the free help.

"Fatalism" and "apathy" were not mentioned, said Munn, "but I am sure they play a large part."

Munn believes hope of turning the tide in the future does not lie with the pill, but in a new, miniature intra-uterine device (IUD). It can be inserted by specially trained visiting nurses.

Within a very few years, he said, a tiny capsule now in experimental use, will also be available, for injection under the skin.

The capsule contains hormones which pass through its membrane and protect against pregnancy for several months.

Munn suggests compensation for the mother for her time in having the IUD inserted. "A small cash remuneration . . . such as a day's wages, and perhaps a day off from work."

"The cost of an incentive reward compared to the cost of a relief-baby is nothing. From birth until 14 years old, cash cost to public authorities is about \$7,000 and that is only the beginning.

"The child's home of one and two rooms is often so overcrowded and noisy that on reaching school age they cannot do homework, get discouraged and drop out.

"Without the education to get a job, they may turn to crime and drugs. The cost to the community in police, insurance, courts and prisons is beyond calculation."

Munn said "if HEW can be persuaded to experiment with incentives perhaps it can break the vicious chain of relief babies which grow up and produce other relief babies in mathematic progression like a cancer."

POTSDAM MIDGETS—NEW YORK STATE CHAMPIONS

HON. ROBERT C. McEWEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that a team from Potsdam, N.Y., in my congressional district, the Potsdam Midgets, won the New York State Midget Hockey Team championship in March and earlier this month participated in

the National Championships in Detroit, Mich.

While they did not emerge as the national champions, northern New York can well be proud of the team's tournament record of one win, one loss and two ties. At the National Championships, the Potsdam team tied the Partridge, Ill., team in double overtime; tied the Erie, Pa., team; defeated the Southfield, Mich., team and were defeated by the Seattle, Wash., team.

The Midgets, winners of the New York State Tournament, are made up of boys of up to 16 years of age, and traveled from Potsdam to Detroit after more than \$2,000 was donated by local businessmen and area residents. I know that northern New York is proud of the Potsdam Midgets as they wear the crown of champions of New York State and for the excellent hockey and sportsmanship they displayed.

RID-LITTER DAY IN BOYNTON BEACH, FLA.

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, we need not look too far to realize we are becoming surrounded by trash and litter on our streets, our sidewalks and with increasing frequency, in our parks and recreation areas.

Americans like to throw things away, but regrettably, too many Americans don't care where they throw their trash, and too often our public lands become our garbage cans. In two generations, we Americans have managed to discard enough solid waste to cover an area seven times the size of the State of Rhode Island.

During the last Congress, I was pleased to have been the author of the Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1970, now Public Law 91-512, and this new law will provide incentive for finding new ways of coping with our solid waste problems.

But, in large measure, citizen concern will be the key to improving the situation, and action at the local level is all important.

I am pleased that the city of Boynton Beach, Fla., has taken such action at the local level. The city, on April 3, held its second annual "Rid-Litter Day" from 9 a.m. to 12 noon.

I insert at this point in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues, a letter from Councilwoman Emily M. Jackson describing the activities of "Rid-Litter Day" as well as the formal report of the day's success.

CITY OF BOYNTON BEACH,
Boynton Beach, Fla., April 8, 1971.

The Hon. PAUL G. ROGERS,
Rayburn Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ROGERS: Knowing of your interest in what is happening in your district, I am enclosing a report of our second annual Clean-up day which we call "Rid-Litter Day."

As you can see the City of Boynton Beach has taken an active part in fighting pollu-

tion by having one massive event when all residents of all ages were invited to help rid our city of litter.

From 9:00 A.M. until Noon the City of Boynton Beach looked like an anthill of ants working industriously. Everywhere you looked you saw groups of residents (from 2 years up) filling yellow plastic garbage liners with cans, bottles, paper, etc., or else you saw piles of filled yellow bags heaped in piles waiting for the garbage truck to pick them up.

There were many unusual sights: people filling one bag with more bags hanging from belts, pockets or even one tied around their waists to be used when the first bag was filled.

One woman had her baby strapped to her back, while the mother gathered litter.

It was a heart-warming sight to see people, working together for the good of the community, and taking pride in doing so.

I wish more cities would try this. One of the first solutions to pollution is civic pride.

Boynton Beach is proud of its efforts and results.

Yours truly,

EMILY M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Rid-Litter Day.

REPORT OF "RID LITTER DAY"

Time: April 3, 1971—9:00 A.M. to Noon.
Councilwoman Emily M. Jackson, Chairman.

Jody Hamilton, Co-Chairman (9th Grade).
The purpose of this event was to have a community concerted effort to become aware of the need for Civic Pride, by keeping our City clean.

Participating: 5 organizations donated money, 9 individuals donated money.

Planning committee was made up of representatives (adult and students) from Rolling Green School Boynton Beach Elementary School, Boynton Beach Junior High School, Forest Park School, Wilson Youth Association, St. Marks School, Boynton Youth Association, also representatives from Junior Women's Club, Women's Club, Chamber of Commerce, Leisureville, Sorosis, Recreation Department, High Point, Swim Club.

The above organizations and schools took part in the actual cleanup on "Rid Litter Day". In addition, the following also participated in the pickup: Sterling Village, Pack 322 Den 1 Cub Scouts, Pack 322 Den 6 Cub Scouts, Troop 311 Girl Scouts, Day Care Center, Troop 100 Girl Scouts, Sigma Alpha Chi Fraternity (from Florida Atlantic University) Ridgewood Hills, Little League, Brownie Troop 233, Junior Optimists, Hampshire Gardens, plus two neighborhood groups organized by parents.

795 certificates to be distributed to those who participated and contributed to the Clean-Up (From age 2 years, upwards) at Council meeting, by Co-Chairman Jody Hamilton.

127 Posters were made by students and placed in stores and schools.

197 "Badges" were made by students advertising "Rid Litter Day".

4 Supermarkets and 3 Banks distributed notices of "Rid Litter Day" a week before April 3rd.

The City furnished 3000 litter bags (garbage can size).

Grummons Printers contributed some of the certificates and an anonymous donor donated the remainder.

Thanks are due the news media: WDBF-Radio, WEAT-TV, Palm Beach Post, Palm Beach Times, Sun Sentinel, Boynton Beach News Journal, Miami Herald.

Special thanks is due to Harold Hopkins and his Sanitation Department for their cooperation.

RESULTS

15,000 pounds of litter taken to City dump, plus the aluminum cans that some people

sorted from the rest of the litter and took to the Chamber of Commerce to be used for re-cycling.

The money donated (\$96) will be used to purchase more Litter Barrels to be placed in strategic places.

FINAL RESULT

Boynton Beach at Noon on April 3rd was probably the cleanest city in Florida and residents have become more aware of the need to keep our City clean. EVERY DAY should be "Rid Litter Day". Use litter bags and litter barrels.

POLLY CHACE HONORED BY ALPHA GAMMA DELTA

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Alpha Gamma Delta sorority recently honored one of its members, Mrs. Pauline Brown Chace, with its Distinguished Citizen Award for her work with handicapped children.

I have known Polly Chace and her husband, Los Angeles County Supervisor Burton Chace, of Long Beach, for many years and know of her fine work with the exceptional children of our area.

Polly recently wrote an article for Alpha Gamma Delta's quarterly magazine concerning the needs of these children and the opportunities for her sorority sisters to help. I am pleased to insert her article in the RECORD and commend a great lady for her outstanding contribution to society in making life a little easier for these children:

THESE, TOO, ARE YOUR CHILDREN

(By Pauline Brown Chace)

If you lived in Los Angeles County, you would have approximately 52,000 children identified as needing and enrolled in, "special" education programs. This sounds like a very big family of handicapped boys and girls. But you, like we are, would be uneasily conscious of this fact. Based on required reports made by school districts to the County Superintendent of Schools, Los Angeles County probably has 110,000 handicapped children who need "special" programs.

In California, all physically handicapped children may start to school at three years of age. But if the state and the school districts do not provide the money for school environments and for teachers' salaries, their being able to go to school is not a reality. I feel it is imperative that trainable and educable mentally retarded children be admitted to a school environment at three years of age just like the other handicapped children. The chance of their rehabilitation is greater the younger they are placed under the guidance of specially trained teachers. Dr. Richard Clowes, Superintendent of Los Angeles County Schools, is knowledgeable, personable, with vision and leadership abilities. He has vowed to make California's "special schools" and "special education" the finest in the country. Our seven-member Board of Education is one hundred per cent behind him.

But you say, "I live in a small town. We have so few exceptional children. We cannot afford special classes or specially trained teachers. Our school board, our taxpayers and our legislators cannot and will not spend the necessary money." But, can you afford not to train and educate these children? The

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

annual cost of maintaining a child in an institution is between \$5,500 and \$6,500. The average cost for adequate special education is between \$2,500 and \$3,000 per pupil. If these children are not educated, they will become illiterates. By 1980, an illiterate will have no opportunity for employment. By the next decade, the societal cost for an illiterate will rise to between \$160,000 and \$240,000 per individual.

I wish that everyone of my sisters in Alpha Gamma Delta would ask herself, "Am I, as an individual or as a member of an Alpha Gamma Delta alumnae chapter or club, really concerned about "exceptional or special" children? Do I care whether or not they are discarded on Life's human scrap heap? What can I do to make special education and special schools available to all children everywhere, so that these children may become more fulfilled, happier and hopefully, a contributor in life?"

Everyone of you has "exceptional children." But I am using "exceptional" here, to identify any child who deviates from the normal either physically, mentally, emotionally, educationally or neurologically. Do you know what the schools in your town or city are doing to meet the needs of your blind or partially sighted child; of the deaf or hard of hearing child; of the cerebral paised child; of the emotionally disturbed child; of the mentally retarded child; of the most unfortunate of all, the multiple handicapped child? Are your special schools inadequately financed? Most of them are. Then you must work for legislation with adequate, realistic, excess-cost reimbursement from the state to your local school districts. Are you adequately teacher staffed? If so, you are the exception.

You must sell special education to young men and women going into the teaching profession. You must encourage organizations and clubs to give adequate scholarships to those who will prepare themselves to teach handicapped children. We should work to have a Doctoral program in Special Education established in at least one of each state's institutions of higher learning. All student teachers should be required to spend some time in "special" classes. A course on exceptional children should be one of the curriculum requirements for regular teachers.

Do your pediatricians and other medical personnel examining children recognize the less obviously handicapped child—the child with brain damage from a birth injury? We should encourage institutions training physicians, social workers, psychologists, nurses and teachers to require courses on the etiology and diagnosis of mental retardation and the needs and problems of the mentally retarded so that they can accurately diagnose these children at the earliest possible time. Physically, mentally, emotionally and educationally handicapped children should be admitted to school at three years of age. The sooner they are under the guidance of competently trained and understanding teachers, the better their chance of rehabilitation.

If you become knowledgeable about the problems and needs of your "special" children, you can work cooperatively with your schools, with your public and with your legislators to bring about an understanding climate for your exceptional children, and wholehearted, adequate financial support. Volunteer as an aid to your special education classes. Work with your recreation department for beach or park recreational programs for your handicapped children.

Norman Johnson, Director of Los Angeles County Parks, has a varied and stimulating program for all types of handicapped children. Richard Fitzgerald, Director of Los Angeles County Beaches, has specially selected and trained lifeguards who give our County's mentally retarded children a water safety and marine life educational program. This last summer 3,000 children from the minority

and inner city groups, were given five days at the beach. Many of these boys and girls had never before been to the beach. Having this program was my suggestion. You can motivate similar "life-enriching" programs in your city, county or state.

I am the mother of two daughters with nerve deafness. Both are college graduates, are married, have families and do substitute teaching for "special" education. I have a nine-year old, trainable, mentally retarded grandson. I am knowledgeable about the needs of both the physically and mentally handicapped. I am dedicating my time and experience to bring about ever-better educational, recreational and work-experience environments for the handicapped child. Won't all of you, my sisters, in Alpha Gamma Delta, join me?

FILEMON GARZA

HON. ELIGIO de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, recently an article from the May 1969 edition of the Texas Highways magazine about Mr. Filemon Garza of Rio Grande City, Tex., was called to my attention by his daughter, Mrs. Felicia Garza. The article, written by Mr. Frank Lively, editor of the Texas Highways magazine pays tribute to Mr. Garza, who, on the salary of a maintenance foreman with the Texas Highway Department, reared and educated eight fine children. I feel the pride and dedication of this man to his family refreshing and inspiring enough to share with my fellow colleagues.

The article follows:

FILEMON GARZA

The small town of Rio Grande City lies on US 83 about halfway between the lush citrus groves of Mission and the sparkling green waters of Falcon Reservoir. Except for an occasional hurricane or cloudburst, it is hot and dusty most of the year. Cacti and mesquite cover the rolling hills. It is a tough country.

It is only natural that Filemon Garza reflects the toughness of his surroundings. Garza, maintenance foreman in Rio Grande City since 1944, has to be counted as one of the tough ones, a man for the long haul.

His wife Guadalupe also knows something of self sacrifice and the toughness it takes to get the job done. Between the two of them they have reared eight children on a Highway Department maintenance man's salary. Quite an accomplishment in itself. But that's only part of it. Not only did all the children graduate from high school, but six have graduated from college and the last two are in college now!

District 21 employees look upon the Garzas' accomplishments with amazement.

"Filemon can teach us all a lesson in citizenship," says District Engineer Raymond Stotzer, who believes that many of today's social problems could be solved if parents followed the Garzas' example of strong family ties and an insistence in getting a good education. "And Filemon is so well thought of in his community that he can't help but be an asset to the Highway Department."

Garza's boss, District Maintenance Engineer Sam Cox, agrees.

"He knows practically everybody in Rio Grande City and he has the respect of the community," adds Cox. "And I'll tell you another thing. He's Highway Department

through and through. It's not a job with him. It's a way of life."

But Garza always reserved at least a part of his life for his family. As Traffic Engineer Ross Fitzpatrick put it, "I think his primary goal in life has always been to educate his children."

Why this persistence for an education from a man who only finished the ninth grade?

"I knew a little bit to get this job. And I knew it was important that my children get an education," says Filemon Garza.

There was never any question about school. After the first daughter graduated from college, the rest of the children knew they had to go—and help the next one go to college.

Garza credits the long, hard pull to his wife and the Highway Department. He said his wife had to be "very economical" with his salary so they could send the children to school.

"It also helped to have a good credit rating at the bank," he added.

Garza began working for the Highway Department in Rio Grande City 38 years ago this month. He was working with an automobile dealer there in 1931 when he decided he needed a better paying job because his wife was expecting their first child. Garza asked the Highway Department maintenance foreman for a job one morning, quit his job at the auto dealer's at noon, and began working for the Department at 1 p.m. for 28 cents an hour!

It was the day of hand labor. Garza used a pick and shovel nine hours a day for six days a week. When it rained, the men pulled cars out of the mud with a team of mules. When they worked out on the roads far from town, they camped out at night. There was no per diem.

A crew of 15 to 18 men with hand tools had to maintain about 100 miles of dirt roads, Garza recalls. Today his crew of 28 maintains some 253 miles of paved highways with the latest maintenance equipment. The transition from hand labor to machinery came after World War II.

"Today a man has to work more with his head than his hands. I don't think the machinery makes people lazy. If they're lazy, they're lazy."

Garza said several of the men in those days could not read or write. But today he feels a man must be educated to handle the complicated machinery, fill out the maintenance records, estimate the cost of jobs, and handle the hundred other tasks necessary to keep a mechanized maintenance section running smoothly.

Sam Cox is proud of his maintenance foremen. He says they are aggressive and competitive and dedicated. It must rub off. Garza says almost the same things about his men.

"I'm lucky to have had good, reliable, efficient men working with me," explains Garza. "I have only four men with less than 10 years experience, and one man has been with us for 40 years."

What's the reason for such longevity? Garza thinks perhaps it is the regular hours.

"Of course, we have a better sick leave policy now, too. Highway Department wages are as good as any in this area."

What Garza calls "regular hours" may seem a little strange to those of us who are used to eight-hour days. His men still work nine hours a day—and many more when there are floods and other natural disasters, such as the 1967 hurricane.

Garza just shrugs and says he never thinks about the long hours. His day seldom ends before sundown. He drives every road in his county once a week in the daytime, and once a month at night. The night drive is to make sure signs reflect properly and that they can be read easily. If the weather is bad, he'll drive the roads more often.

Garza's eyes light up when he talks about his years with the Department.

"I've enjoyed every bit of it. I've worked with some fine men over the years. The Highway Department has a system of working that you enjoy. You know you're working for the future. My only regret is that I have to get out at 65."

When he had an operation in January, Garza was afraid he might have to take disability retirement, but he was soon able to return to work. As Sam Cox said, Filemon is a proud man who wants to complete his career with the Department and retire at 65.

There will be more time for working in church and community activities when he retires, says Garza. His wife is looking forward to the time, also, "so we can travel to see our children and our 14 grandchildren."

When he retires in the fall of 1970, the Garzas last child will be in her final year at college. That will mean they have had children in school for the last 32 years—long years of self-sacrifice.

"It's been pretty tough," says Garza, "but you can do it if you want to do it."

McCaffrey Warns of Campaign to Intimidate Press

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, Joseph McCaffrey of the WMAL stations in Washington is widely recognized as an astute commentator on Congress and its work. Few newsmen know their subject better than Joe, a familiar figure in these halls and a confidant of many Members, of varying ideological persuasions, and from both sides of the aisle.

Yesterday, Mr. McCaffrey drew on his many years of experience as a working newsman in a thoughtful address to the annual Writing Awards luncheon of the Virginia Press Women, at Culpeper, Va.

His topic: The escalating campaign of certain Government officials to discredit those who gather and report news.

As most of our colleagues are well aware, Mr. McCaffrey has no partisan ax to grind. He speaks from the informed and objective standpoint of one who has been a professional observer of the Washington scene for more than a quarter of a century.

Says Mr. McCaffrey:

I have found during that time that reporters are not infallible, nor are men in public life infallible. However, I have found more men in public life who claimed infallibility than reporters.

As one who spent two decades as a newsman before coming to Congress, I fully subscribe to Mr. McCaffrey's conclusion: Reporters help keep the political game honest, regardless of who is in power.

His speech should be of general interest, and I am pleased to include it at this point with my remarks:

REMARKS BY JOSEPH McCAFFREY

I'd like to talk today about what appears to be a concentrated campaign of intimidation against reporters, not just in the media I work in, television, but against all men and women who are reporting news.

When the criticism is directed by the second highest ranking elected official in the nation's government there is a fine, if not in-

discernible line between criticism and censorship.

It is no happenstance that this official criticism comes at a time when reporters, and especially those who work in Washington, are dealing in a land of make believe. The people of the country are either not being told all that is going on, or they are told that what they read is really not so.

It is a sleight of hand routine which boils down to this: "things-are-not-what-they-appear,-but-what-we-tell-you-they-are."

The cost of living goes up again, but we are told this is a good sign because it didn't go up as far as it did the month before, yet we are denied briefings by the Bureau of Labor Statistics experts who can, if they are allowed to, honestly interpret what the latest figures mean.

The current criticism, taken along with this "it's-not-what-it-is-but-what-we-say-it-is," adds up to an attempt to shake the belief of the people in what they read in the press, and in their weeklies, and what they hear on radio and television.

The criticism is aimed at smudging over the real differences between the facts as they are available and what those in positions of power seek to claim those facts mean or do not mean.

There is grave doubt that the present criticism of the media is spontaneous. It may be recalled a key member of the present administration once accused the press corps of unfairly trying to get him, and told reporters they would not have him to "kick around any more".

Even the former White House resident intellectual, Daniel Moynihan, has joined the hounds. He is disturbed not only by reporters but by the bureaucrats who leak stories to them. However, he fails to explain why it is that the release of information about the government poses such a threat to the welfare of the Republic.

To categorize the bureaucrats and the reporters to whom they gave information as anti-Nixon malcontents is to foster an incorrect and even dangerous view of what this country is all about. The government, even that part of it known as the Executive Branch, does not belong to any sitting President. It belongs to the people. And news about pending changes in its composition should be disseminated widely and well. Our government functions best only in the bright glare of public discussion, however painful it may be to string pullers in the executive offices.

The role of men in government is to defend themselves against too great a glare. They are, quite naturally, protective of themselves and what they are doing. The men responsible for presenting the President's image, for example, are basically not free information people but propagandists. They are drawn from advertising and the editorial-page side of newspapers, and in the case of the present administration, these are conservative newspapers. Therefore, these men think of the media as devices for selling something—whether its soap or ideas, and their concern of course, is with ideas or perhaps, even non-ideas. Combine this with a President who is convinced that reporters are not his friends but his enemies as he indicated in his "last press conference" back in 1962—and we set today's stage.

Despite lip service to the contrary, in Washington today you sense no faith on the part of the government in the free-wheeling public discourse which has built this country. Instead you have:

Army Intelligence agents maintaining dossiers on ordinary citizens and political leaders . . .

The Attorney General asserting his right to tap almost anyone's telephone in the cause of national security . . .

Presidential policy advisers refusing to testify before Congressional committees . . .

The FBI punishing its own agents for daring to suggest that J. Edgar Hoover may possess human flaws . . .

A Congressional committee issuing a subpoena for the materials not even used in producing a television documentary . . .

This is a grim mosaic . . . one that hardly contributes to a robust discussion of public issues. And I think the current attacks on the media must be seen as a part of this general environment.

Putting the press on the defensive is a political ploy. And it is the natural, logical ploy if you have convinced yourself of three things:

1. That political considerations are ultimate considerations . . .
2. That large segments of the press are against you . . .
3. That the country will be well-served by an un-critical, un-questioning acceptance of government policies.

Washington seems well on the way to accepting all three.

All presidents have fought their battles with the news media and expressed concern over its "balance" or lack of same. George Washington was the first president and the first president to feel that way. Lyndon Johnson is still press shy, and John Kennedy, who probably got the best treatment of any recent President, told his aides not to trust reporters.

But never has an Administration mustered such a frontal assault as we see today. This may be because the art of merchandizing and image making has developed so much more during recent years, and the present Administration has become wrapped up in its image and the effect that image will have on public opinion.

Public policy is constantly being approached in terms of its impact on this or that voting block, how it will be treated in the press, and what, in turn, the result will be in the opinion polls.

The image has become more important than the substance, and so, perhaps, it is only natural that the "image presenters" are held responsible when all is not going well. South Vietnamese defeats aren't the fault of the South Vietnamese or the Americans who planned the battles, they are the fault of the Saigon press corps and the columnists and commentators in the United States. If we exalt government by public relations, this is only a natural conclusion.

Individual stories, individual newspapers, broadcast stations and networks may have presented unfair reports, even erroneous reports. But that is not the point. The point was best made by Walter Lippmann: "The theory of a free press is that the truth will emerge from free reporting and free discussions, not that it will be presented perfectly and instantly in any one account."

Does anyone really believe that there can be a free and unrestricted flow of information if radio and television broadcasters can be haled before Congressional committees every time they touch a sensitive nerve with their news programs?

The integrity and courage of radio and television are fragile commodities . . . the men who run the industry know they face government licensing inquiries every three years. The mechanics of this has become more difficult each year.

The possibility that broadcasters will be required to come to Washington and explain their actions in producing specific programs will drive off the air the small amount of investigative reporting that is now being done.

Vice President Agnew is demanding that the free press enter the political arena, that it behave as a third political party or as a lobby group. He even proposes that network correspondents be put on a panel and inter-

rogated, with himself as one of the interrogators, a kind of "BEAT the press" idea.

What kind of a free press is it that must appear before a panel of politicians and explain and apologize for its reporting? How much freedom is there in such an idea?

Why does the Executive branch, which spends millions of dollars on public relations men to spread the party line, (and the government is loaded with public relations men), need such extraordinary measures to answer its critics?

How can reporters, who spend their professional lives striving for objectivity be expected to survive in the political arena, where only the skilled polemicists survive?

Once you have made the news media just another branch of politics you have destroyed its value. It is easy to destroy because it is a fragile institution.

Its power is held in check by public acceptance in the market place.

As I read the First Amendment that is the only test which may be applied.

It is the only test which I, as a free American, am ready to accept.

There are troublesome problems facing this country, at home and abroad. Men in government are not going to solve them by carping about the way reporters report or do not report. The job ahead of them, and this country is much more important than that. We have to face up to the problems honestly and not try to confuse and diffuse them by the use of mirrors.

I have observed the workings of Washington, and of reporters, for more than a quarter of a century. I have found during that time that reporters are not infallible, nor are men in public life infallible. However, I have found more men in public life who claimed infallibility than reporters.

It is reporters who best serve to keep the game honest regardless of who is in power or who is out of power in Washington, and that goes, too, for Richmond, and on down to a county seat such as Culpeper.

During my years as a Washington correspondent I have found that despite the razzle-dazzle of the Executive department or of the committees of Congress, or of individuals from either federal branch, the truth, by a process of osmosis, seeps through, sometimes only drop by drop, and sometimes a little late, but almost always, I would point out, because of the curiosity, the insistence, and the dedication of some reporter or many reporters.

This is a time in our history when we need, more than anything else, faith; faith in ourselves, faith in each other, and above all else, faith in this great country of ours.

PAN AMERICAN DAY

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, the Organization of American States, which celebrated its 81st anniversary last week, is the oldest and most enduring of the U.S. multilateral international commitments. From the earliest days of our Nation, we have realized the importance of Latin America.

The dedication of the Latin American Republics to achieving the goals of the Alliance for Progress, including the principle of self-help, is essential to political, economic, and social progress in the hemisphere.

In honor of the founding of the Pan American Union, we should extend to the other republics of the Western Hemisphere, and their citizens, our sincere best wishes and hopes that the year ahead will mark a new period of growth, prosperity, social progress, and justice for all.

MRS. ANNA PERRY THOMAS, A DELEGATE TO WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CHILDREN

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. McCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege and pleasure to name Mrs. Anna Perry Thomas of Waukegan, Ill., as delegate from the 12th Congressional District of Illinois to the White House Conference on Children, that was held in Washington, December 13 through 18, 1970.

Mrs. Thomas operates the Happy Day Nursery School and Children's Educational Center in Waukegan, and is an inspiration to those who know her for the dedication, enthusiasm and insight she brings to her work and to those children entrusted to her care.

Mrs. Thomas has graciously provided me with a copy of her report on the White House Conference, including some personal comments, which I wish to share with my colleagues in the Congress. Thus, I am having them inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In a foreword to her personal remarks, Mrs. Thomas stated:

I was encouraged to see the reaching out for ideas that would help us to find the instruments with which we can work. I looked with interest at the children who took part in the skits. I enjoyed the music and felt the heart beat of a troubled people—the Indians, the Spanish-speaking, the mountain people, the Afro-American, the middle-class, the affluent society and the people of influence, all fermenting—as it were—a great force of projective effort centered in their concern for the very young child of every level. The haves and have-nots, the sick and the well, both physically and mentally. But I felt a lack of moral and spiritual concern. I felt the need for recognition of our Great Educator, Great Physician, Great Father of all men, Who—because of His love for us—made the supreme sacrifice of His Son, just as some of the people all over the world are doing today. We are sending our sons to be sacrificed in Vietnam and other wars, but we are failing to plan for the good life that will make wars impossible. Understanding destroys hate, destroys graft, destroys bigotry and degeneration and creates a sense of well-wishing that is the beginning of well-being.

When we can take this firm step toward the good life, the need for the dole will be no more. Jobs will take the place of alms. When the people of America or of any other nation provide—all the way from the administration to the recipient of relief—these dependent families with understanding of their need for self-respect and self-reliance "freedom from want" will be a reality. Then and not until then will this nation or any nation prosper in the finest sense of the word.

These were the thoughts racing through my mind as I felt the resentment in many of the sentiments expressing the need of our children which poured forth from other delegates. "Oh, that men would praise the Lord for His goodness and His wonderful gifts to the children of Men!" . . . But there was no prayer.

Mrs. Thomas is one who has not forgotten that our Founding Fathers prayed as they convened, and established our Republic. I am happy and grateful that this august body continues in this practice.

Mr. Speaker, it was gratifying to learn that a recommendation submitted by my constituent at the Conference was one of the few chosen for official inclusion. Mrs. Thomas' recommendation reads as follows:

RECOMMENDATION

Due to the miscarriage of purpose that has been prevalent in many licensed and federally funded programs for the young child, there is a need for well informed leadership. Teachers, their assistants and aides, must continue to grow in educational skills.

I recommend that requirements in educational qualifications shall be specifically stated and that these qualifications shall be met by all administrators, supervisors, directors, teachers, and/or any other persons holding official positions as leaders of programs for young children.

Orientation training should be required of all persons assisting the teacher before entering into the regular program.

Workshops and periodical in-service training for teachers and teacher assistants should be a part of every program planned for the young child and participation in such training should be required of every member of the teaching staff.

PURPOSE

The child needs an atmosphere in which he can grow and develop, knowing that he is not expected to perform beyond his capacity. The young child needs time to grow and guidelines to follow which will give him a chance to know and respect himself and the dignity and rights of all people. He should have a feeling of "belonging," and of being a part of a constructive program that meets his needs and the needs of others, one where he can make his contribution and appreciate the contributions of those about him.

The child needs to know the adult as a friend, who provides interesting experiences which take him from where he is, starting with what he knows, to new knowledge—at his own speed—through his own creativeness. Here, because of quality training and the sensitivity of his needs his teacher can help him to learn to meet difficult situations; to work with problems at his own level of understanding as well as to enjoy the wonders of God's good earth; knowing full well that this child for whom she is placing guidelines must, in his time of responsibility, take the best from the past and the best from the present and build his own future.

These, we feel, are not only needs but rights—of every child that lives upon the face of the earth.

I, therefore, recommend that all programs shall provide adequate background of academic education, sensitivity to the needs of the young child, and the ability to raise the educational standards of the program to quality teaching through workshops, in-service training and continuous growth and development in knowledge and understanding of the young child—keeping in mind that the individuality of every child is of great importance.

WALL STREET JOURNAL ARTICLE POINTS OUT EFFECTIVENESS OF DAYTON'S MODEL CITIES AND LAW ENFORCEMENT EFFORTS

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday's edition of the Wall Street Journal, one of the most highly regarded newspapers in the country, carried a comprehensive story regarding two federally supported programs presently in operation in Dayton, Ohio, which lies within my congressional district.

The article examined in detail the operation of the model cities program and the law enforcement efforts now underway. The conclusion reached by the writer was that those projects are among the best in the Nation, no small accolade from so estimable a publication.

The journalist's account speaks for itself, Mr. Speaker, but I thought I would add a few observations of my own about some of the other effective initiatives that have been undertaken in the Greater Dayton area with Federal support.

One effort that certainly stands out is a scatteration housing plan developed by the Miami Valley, Ohio, Regional Planning Commission. Now under review by the Housing and Urban Development Department, this proposal seeks to provide low- and middle-income housing availabilities within the five-county suburban area surrounding the city of Dayton. The concept was originated locally and has been coordinated carefully with the political jurisdictions involved. Once implemented, it will strengthen the central city by dispersing one of the more significant burdens placed upon it.

Another program of note is the city of Dayton's effort at neighborhood conservation and stabilization which is aimed at preventing the needless deterioration of metropolitan areas.

There are several other commendable urban programs being effected in the Greater Dayton area which reflect the determination of the citizens and local government to avoid the blight and other problems that today besiege so many of our cities. Such efforts are in keeping with the innovative, can-do history of the Dayton area which produced such great men as the Wright brothers, Col. E. A. Deeds, Charles Kittering, and John H. Patterson.

Mr. Speaker, for the information of my colleagues, I insert in the RECORD the referenced article from the Wall Street Journal.

DAYTON: LEARNING TO LISTEN WELL

(By William Wong)

DAYTON, OHIO.—The Department of Housing and Urban Development calls the Dayton Model Cities program one of the best in

the country. Another federal official gushes that Dayton is the "most successful law enforcement city" in the U.S.

At first glance one might wonder why. This medium-sized city (population 247,000) situated in the agriculturally rich Miami Valley is so low-key it almost yawns. There seems to be little movement, not even a rush-hour downtown traffic jam. Sidewalks roll up at 6 p.m. As one visitor from the San Francisco area recently said, "Dayton is really small-town Middle America."

That may be so, but in talking with its residents and civic leaders, a visitor begins to understand why Dayton has won raves. With comparative success, it's coming to grips with tough problems—the same kinds that New York, Chicago and Los Angeles have. But what sets Dayton apart is the fact that, in the words of Edward T. Crutcher, local Model Cities administrator, "The government here has the sense to listen."

The mayor, the city commission, the city manager, the police chief—they're all listening these days to a variety of Dayton residents, poor, middle class, rich, black and white. Listening and hearing. Indeed, "citizen participation" here isn't just an urbanologist's textbook phrase; it has become a reality.

DAYTON'S SYSTEM

In a way, Dayton needs all the "citizen participation" it can get. Its mayor, after all, is only a part-timer who's paid \$1,800 a year. The four other city commissioners are also part-timers, paid \$1,200 a year. The day-to-day taskmaster then is the city manager, a professional appointed by the commission and paid \$35,000 a year.

Daytonians want the system kept that way. In 1963 they voted down an attempt to change to a full-time, well-paid mayor system, and prospects are slim for any such change in the near future.

"This is the cleanest type of government you can have," asserts Mayor James H. McGee, who happens to be black and an attorney. "There's hardly any politics in it."

With the personal stakes so low, it's little wonder that elected officials can turn their attention to governing and problem-solving. The federal government is offering a helping hand in many areas—a practice that grew immensely under the Johnson Administration—but perhaps the two most important are in upgrading impoverished areas and in law enforcement.

The Model Cities program, started in 1966, offers federal grants to cities for improving social and physical conditions of blighted (usually black) areas. The 1968 Safe Streets Act provides federal grants to local law enforcement agencies to fight crime and improve community relations. Both programs require some degree of citizen involvement in planning and implementation. In this regard, federal authorities say, Dayton has become a showcase city for using federal funds wisely.

The Model Cities program here is concentrated in the black slum in West Dayton. The 40,000 blacks there constitute about 95% of the area's population. In 1960, some 30% of the West Dayton slum families (who at that time made up less than 15% of the city's families) had annual incomes under \$3,000. The slum infant-mortality rate was twice that of the entire city, as were the unemployment and substandard housing rates. There's little indication that things have improved in 10 years. If anything, they've worsened as more poor blacks live there now than did in 1960. The biggest gain, perhaps, is a sense of hope for the future.

The backbone of the Dayton Model Cities program—funded at about \$10 million with various types of grants—is "citizen participa-

tion." Slum residents were cranked into the planning process for a comprehensive program. Through the Model Cities Planning Council, a body of 27 elected representatives of various sections of the slums, they share policy-making powers with the City Commission on matters that affect their neighborhood. The "equal partnership agreement" informally negotiated between the two bodies is considered extraordinary by federal authorities.

Slum residents also sit on the boards of four "satellite" nonprofit corporations that have been established to carry out the Model Cities program and policies set by the Planning Council and City Commission.

In the monthly joint meetings of the Model Cities Planning Council and the City Commission, slum residents are finding out just how boring and tedious government can be. "We find (government bureaucracy) distasteful," says George Washington, chairman of the Planning Council and a cement contractor. "We don't pay much attention to Robert's Rules of Order. But the Model Cities program has allowed us to exhibit that poor people can run a government. It has made people here think; it has produced leaders in our neighborhood."

Indeed, many residents here say this is the first time they have had a voice in making decisions that directly affect their lives and their living conditions, and by and large, they're taking their responsibilities seriously.

"They're still poor and deprived," says one city official, "but they've become very knowledgeable about the processes of government."

As the implementation arm of the Model Cities program, the four "satellite" corporations—social services, housing, health and job-training—coordinate existing federal, state and local programs as well as institute new ones. Rather than beef up existing agencies with Model Cities funds to expand services to slum residents—which is one possible way of bettering conditions—the City Commission and Planning Council decided to establish the four corporations. Thus, as members of the boards that govern these corporations, slum residents have some degree of control.

One or two of the corporations have had faster starts than the others and already show impressive results. The health corporation has established a part-time outpatient clinic, the neighborhood's first. A health center, now being built exclusively by black contractors inside the shell of an old supermarket, will offer comprehensive health care to some 1,000 to 1,500 neighborhood families. The social-services corporation has surveyed more than 2,000 families and is making sure the neediest get the services for which they're eligible, such as welfare, child care, medicaid or manpower training.

JOBS AND HOPE

The Model Cities program has also provided new or better jobs to some 500 slum residents, a figure that's considered "fantastic" by one administrator. "Some girls are now working as secretaries instead of being maids," says Mr. Crutcher, the Model Cities administrator.

Poverty, joblessness, unequal opportunities and shabby housing are still facts of life for slum blacks here, but the Model Cities program is offering a glimmer of hope. As Robert Owens, a partner in Dessel Inc., a black contractor responsible for the plumbing, heating and air-conditioning of the health center, its biggest job ever, says, "Well, it's a start, and it's better than nothing."

Another problem area, related to race and poverty, is crime and police credibility. Like other cities, Dayton hasn't been immune to a

rise in crime or tensions between the police and its citizens, particularly blacks. Federal programs are helping the Dayton police combat crime and improve community relations, but again the key is "citizen participation."

Some 100 ordinary citizens—mechanics, engineers, housewives—from two neighborhoods where crime is rising have volunteered as unarmed "Neighborhood Assistance Officers," or NAOs. Nightly they patrol their own neighborhoods in their own cars as "the eyes and ears" for the police. Equipped only with powder blue blazers, first aid kits and portable police radios, they hail regular policemen if they spot potential trouble, and they handle minor public-service calls, such as traffic control and locating lost pets. "We're trying to take the load off the police," says John Prikkel, one citizen involved in the NAO program.

Federal programs are also teaching policemen to cool potential confrontations with words rather than clubs. The programs are also bringing into the police force (which has 425 officers, only 25 of whom are black) young and otherwise unqualified blacks as office workers while they climb toward regular patrolman status. In other areas, the programs are helping establish a modern regional crime laboratory and treating and rehabilitating alcoholics and drug addicts who otherwise might be jailed and largely forgotten.

Indeed, there's a spirited sense of change around police headquarters these days, and the man most responsible is Robert Igleburger, the 61-year-old chief of police. A good listener, he has brought in civilian assistants. Chief Igleburger, a policeman for 32 years, says, "I've reached down into our department and reached outside, and there's been cross fertilization. We're listening to some new voices now."

PRAISE FOR POLICE CHIEF

One of these voices belongs to Tyree S. Broomfield, a tall dynamic 32-year-old black man who administers two federal police programs, and who calls the chief "a beautiful cat." Says Mr. Broomfield: "We can't operate at 1955 levels any longer. Our town's changed—it's younger, it's got more black people. We've got to become the people's advocate." Naturally, that sentiment, of course, isn't universally accepted within the police force, especially among old-line cops, but, says one 10-year veteran who's convinced of the new wave, "The movement's growing."

There are, of course, reasons for the "movement," not only in the police department, but all over Dayton. For one thing, Dayton's still a "manageable size"—247,000 in the city, 900,000 or so in the metropolitan area.

The weak-mayor and strong-city manager system of government helps also. "We don't have a lot of partisan political hang-ups and petty bickering," avers City Manager James Kunde, a slender, soft-spoken 33-year-old. As a result "we're a very responsive place."

The city government has also been an example-setter, increasing the number of non-whites on the city payroll to 25% in 1970 from 15% in 1967. Dayton's 90,000 blacks make up some 35% of the city's population.

Despite positive indications, no one here is being excessively Pollyannish or optimistic about progress. Squabbles still mark meetings between city officials and citizens. Says City Manager Kunde: "The city government still has some credibility problems with West Dayton, but now they're willing to give us a chance." Adds Police Chief Igleburger, "We've got a long way to go, but we're achieving some credibility among blacks and the young. We're adding community input, showing some responsibility to the community we serve."

BERRY GORDY, JR.: STILL PAYING HIS DUES

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago a Detroit assemblyline worker, who had formerly been a prizefighter, saved \$700 and started his own business. Like so many before him, he had ideas of what he could do and wanted to try them in a business of his own. His name was Berry Gordy, Jr., and the company he created was the Motown Record Corp.

Starting from their own home, the Gordy family has built Motown into the largest independent record firm in the world, and the only major black company in the entertainment business. Motown has given America the artistic talents of innumerable celebrities and the names of Diana Ross, The Jackson Five, The Supremes, Smokey Robinson and the Miracles, Marvin Gaye, Stevie Wonder, Gladys Knight and the Pips, and The Temptations are well known in countless American households. His organization has now moved into an even wider range of activities in the entertainment world, including the production of network television programs and full-length motion pictures.

Berry Gordy is an immensely successful businessman but he has not forgotten his past and whence he came. He has paid his dues. Paying dues is a show business phrase used to describe the trials and tribulations that must be overcome to make it to the top. Like all truly outstanding individuals, however, Berry Gordy has really never stopped paying his dues. He has never forgotten that the racial discrimination and economic roadblocks which he confronted still exist for most who would attempt to follow in his steps.

Berry Gordy realizes that even in America factory workers cannot all become successful businessmen. Therefore, he believes that it is essential that each and every young person receive the maximum education possible. He knows that education is the passport to the future and that tomorrow belongs to the people who prepare for it today.

One of the many ways Gordy puts his belief to work is through the Sterling Ball, a benefit which directly provides assistance in the form of scholarships to inner-city high school graduates who wish to continue their education but are financially unable to do so. This annual charitable event has, to date, helped scores of young men and women, black and white, reach an otherwise impossible goal—a college education. Mrs. Esther Edwards, general chairman of the Sterling Ball Committee, reports that this year's event at the Gordy Manor in Detroit, Mich., on April 24 will provide even greater opportunities for many more young people. Public officials, educators, and entertainers from across the country will attend the affair as well as many

hundreds of citizens from all walks of life.

The benefit was originally conceived by Mr. Gordy and his sister, Mrs. Esther Edwards, vice president in the corporation, as a continuing and meaningful memorial to their late sister, Mrs. Loucye Gordy Wakefield, who had been the first vice president of Motown and a personal inspiration to all who knew her.

In the annals of American business, there are few, black or white, who can compare with Berry Gordy's meteoric success. But unlike the heroes of Horatio Alger's novels, Gordy has reached out to those less fortunate to give them a hand up toward dignity and success. I proudly salute Berry Gordy, his family, and his organization for the many ways in which they make their community a better place for all of us. I am certain that many of my colleagues join me in commending their worthy example, which serves as the best proof of what a man can do against the odds.

MORE TAXPAYERS SEEK HELP IN PREPARING TAX RETURNS

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in ever larger numbers American taxpayers are turning to outside firms for help in preparing their annual income tax returns. Last year almost half of the 75 million filed were prepared by someone other than the taxpayer himself, in many cases by computer-based nationwide organizations. For a fee rarely higher than \$20 these services spare the taxpaying citizen both the time and the bother of filling out the incredibly complicated Federal forms required by law.

But the practice is not without its dangers. The raw financial data accumulated and computerized by the tax preparation firms has found a ready market in the form of mutual funds, banks, insurance companies and credit bureaus. The taxpayer who has sought assistance from one or another of the thousands of tax preparation services across the country may find himself receiving, along with his finished return, unsolicited offers of investment counseling, insurance, loans and other financial services, tailored to his personal economic needs. In other words, he will find his name on one more mailing list and the details of his financial situation in one more computerized memory bank.

In my view, this practice seriously compromises the citizens' right to privacy. After all, we require the Internal Revenue Service to observe the strictest confidentiality with regard to the individual tax return, yet we allow these private firms to sell highly personal information without the taxpayer's consent. One of the bills I have introduced today would end this practice.

It requires the written consent of the client before information used to prepare his return could be disclosed. The bill defines a valid consent form as a separate document, signed by the taxpayer, which specifies the information that may be used or made available, and the purposes for which it may be made available.

Of course, this legislation does not deal with the real source of the problem: the fact that tax returns are simply too complicated to be prepared without the help of an expert. My second bill would create a citizens' commission to study ways of simplifying the tax form. I doubt that anyone here would object to that proposition.

Both these bills, Mr. Speaker, are of great importance, if we are to preserve the traditional right of Americans to personal privacy. I urge that they be most carefully considered.

UNITED STATES AT MERCY OF RUSSIA FOR VITAL DEFENSE ORE

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to find editorial support for a position taken by a Member of Congress. The Muskegon Chronicle in my district supports legislation I have introduced concerning chromium ore. I am pleased to insert the Chronicle editorial at this point in the RECORD:

UNITED STATES AT MERCY OF RUSSIA FOR VITAL DEFENSE ORE—LIFT THE EMBARGO!

This newspaper carries no brief for the African nation of Rhodesia. Its government discriminates cruelly against its predominantly black population, and we supported then President Johnson's 1967 executive order barring American trade with that country.

The order was the result of a decree by the United Nations Security Council calling for a worldwide embargo against Rhodesian goods based on the charge Rhodesia had illegally declared its independence from Great Britain and that its government policies were racist.

Well and good—as matters stood at that time.

Developments since make mandatory a re-examination of the policy in terms of its impact on the security of this nation.

As 9th District Rep. Guy Vander Jagt points out in a recent statement on the embargo, the United States for years before issuance of the executive order had imported a very substantial share of its metallurgical grade chromium ore requirements from Rhodesia. This country must import virtually all the chromium it uses, and is heavily reliant on the strategic ore, since it is essential in the production of stainless steel used in industry and in defense and consumer goods.

The world's other major high grade chrome ore producer is the Soviet Union, which entered the market in the early 1960s, and by 1967 had grabbed off a substantial share of the American market by underselling its competition.

When the Rhodesian sanctions took effect, the Soviet Union pushed its share of the U.S. market close to the 50 per cent mark

and then—with Rhodesia muscled out of the competition—abruptly increased its prices. High grade chromium ore costs \$75 per ton today compared with the preembargo price of \$25.

Rhodesia, with few shedding tears over her fate, strove frantically to find other markets and ultimately was able to sell some of its ore in Europe and Japan at distress prices. The natural result of this was the manufacture in those parts of the world of chrome-ore-based products priced on the world markets at levels well below our own.

The effect of being priced out of a part of the market is damaging enough to a sagging industrial economy—particularly since we were levered out of the picture by Russian price-gouging—but a situation which leaves the United States for the most part dependent on the Soviet Union for a raw material critical to our manufacturing processes and defense industry is absolutely intolerable.

High grade chromium ore is a top priority strategic mineral. An assured supply is essential to the nation's security, and surely there are enough Congressmen with sufficient common sense to see the necessity to avoid dependence on the Soviet Union for a mineral which might well be essential to national survival.

How critical the lack of chrome ore can be is underscored in the book "Inside the Third Reich," by Albert Speer, the architect of Hitler's industrial empire, who stated that Germany would have lost the war anyway by Jan. 1, 1946, since it was running out of its supply of chrome ore.

The situation is dangerous in the extreme, and we welcome word from Congressman Vander Jagt that he intends to support legislation which would prevent banning imports to the United States of important commodities from non-Communist countries if those commodities are being imported from Communist countries.

We think that makes eminent good sense, considering the potentially disastrous consequences of inaction, and we urge concerned readers to inform the congressman of their support by letter. The address: Rep. Guy M. Vander Jagt, 9th District, 1133 Longworth Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

EDITORIALS AND COLUMNS IN OPPOSITION TO TREASURY'S PROPOSED DEPRECIATION RULING

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on May 3d, public hearings will begin at the Department of the Treasury on its proposed new ruling on Asset Depreciation Range—ADR.

There is a rising chorus of opposition to this move which bypasses the Congress, costs the Treasury billions upon billions of dollars which could be used more efficiently, and exceeds Treasury's authority under the Internal Revenue Code.

I would like to print at this point in the RECORD several editorials which have questioned the ADR ruling. Following is an editorial from the April 11, 1971, New York Times, the April 17, 1971, Christian Science Monitor, the April 18, 1971, Cleveland Plain Dealer, and a column

by Don Oberdorfer from the Washington Post of April 1, 1971.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 11, 1971]

\$36-BILLION TAX BREAK

Changed depreciation rules proposed by the Administration would represent a huge tax gift to business. By the Treasury's own estimate, the liberalized write-off of capital assets, coupled with special allowances for "repair, maintenance, rehabilitation, and improvement" of eligible property, would result in a revenue loss of \$3 billion in fiscal 1972 alone. Between now and fiscal 1980, the total tax break to business would amount to an estimated \$36 billion.

Despite the Administration's claim that it has a clear legal right to change depreciation "tolerances," Boris I. Bittker, Sterling Professor of Law at Yale University, has filed a statement with the Internal Revenue Service challenging the Treasury's statutory authority to let taxpayers depreciate assets over so wide a range. He contends that the Treasury requires explicit Congressional authority, and that the changes amount to setting new tax rates.

The Administration's rationale for the tax give-away is that it would stimulate business spending on new plant and equipment and thus speed up the sluggish economy. But the Administration has published no estimates of how big an investment bang it expects from all those lost tax bucks. Private economists forecast that the impact on investment will be far less than the tax losses. It is foolhardy, in any event, to justify a tax give-away stretching many years into the future on the ground that the economy needs an immediate shot in the arm.

If the economy does need extra stimulation to reduce unemployment, there are better ways to achieve that objective, such as increased expenditures on manpower, education, health, basic research and other programs of high social priority. If temporary stimulus through tax reduction is needed, it would be better to move up to this year the personal income tax cuts slated to take effect in 1972 and 1973.

The Internal Revenue Service has said it will hold hearings on the proposed changes before the new depreciation system is formally put into effect. There is still time for Congress to stop this outrageous tax gimmickry.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Apr. 17, 1971]

WHO WRITES THE TAX LAWS?

The United States Treasury is moving perilously close to violating the spirit and the letter of the tax law, as written by Congress, in a proposed new business depreciation schedule, known officially as the Asset Depreciation Range (ADR).

Briefly, the situation is this: the power to tax resides with Congress, which in Section 167 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, provided that business may deduct from the corporate income tax "a reasonable allowance" for wear, tear, and obsolescence of capital assets, such as machinery. Last January President Nixon issued a statement announcing the new ADR system. He described it as "essentially a change in timing" that would allow business "to reduce tax payments now, when additional purchasing power is needed, and to make up these payments in later years."

But Robert J. Domrese, editor of the Harvard Law Review, terms the ADR system "a conceptually distinct system of capital cost recovery" that bears no relation to depreciation accounting as Congress provided for in the tax law. He argues that the ADR is inequitable because it confers a special bonus on business.

Secretary of Treasury Connally acknowledges that the liberalized tax credit will

cost the Treasury \$2.7 billion in fiscal year 1972. Mr. Domrese estimates that figure will reach \$5 billion a year by 1976.

Other independent tax experts contend that the Treasury's ostensible reason for the ADR—as a fiscal tool to boost the lagging economy—is a phony argument. Prof. Robert Eisner of Northwestern University doubts the ADR "will have much effect on investment" in the long run, and "certainly almost no effect over the short period."

A public hearing is scheduled for May 3, but a Treasury spokesman is quoted in news reports to the effect that whatever the testimony, the Treasury plans to go ahead with the ADR. The opposition will certainly be represented in force at the hearing. Just as certainly, the Treasury should be on hand, displaying a more sensitive ear than it has to date.

But if the Treasury persists in its over-concern toward business via the tax laws, some public interest law group will have a strong case to carry into the courts for argument on constitutional grounds.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Apr. 18, 1971]

DEBATE TAX CUT

A change in Internal Revenue Service rules which would allow business to accelerate depreciation of assets reportedly would cost the U.S. Treasury an estimated \$36.8 billion in 10 years.

The change, proposed by the Nixon administration to stimulate the economy, has run into opposition from some economists and some congressmen.

The critics question the legality of the scheme and some also question its efficacy in lifting business out of the current recession.

It is reasonable to suggest that a tax cut of such magnitude should be debated in Congress and enacted into law, if it is deemed just, rather than being put into effect by administrative fiat. Rep. Charles A. Vanik, D-22, and Sen. Birch Bayh, D-Ind., point out that Congress alone has authority to change tax law.

It will may be good policy to grant business a tax break to stimulate the economy but such a policy first should have a thorough public airing.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 1, 1971]

A CURIOUS TAX BREAK

(By Don Oberdorfer)

January 11 was a dreary morning in Laguna Beach, Calif., and it was not brightened by the word from the White House press staff that the daily news briefing would be held that afternoon instead of the customary 11 a.m.

Noon on the West Coast is 3 p.m. on the East Coast—the closing hour for the New York Stock Exchange—and thus the common expectation among the reporters was that some sort of economic news was in the making, timed for release after the closing of the Big Board.

The guess was correct. At 12:20 Presidential Press Secretary Ron Ziegler turned up with Under Secretary of the Treasury Charis Walker, Deputy Assistant Secretary John Nolan and a two-page presidential statement which began, "Today I have approved three important changes in the administration of the depreciation provisions of the tax laws . . ."

The news release and the briefing by the Treasury officials was dry-as-dust, and most reporters found themselves scratching their heads and wondering what the story was all about. Now, more than two months later, more information and perspective is available. It is quite a story.

As calculated by the Treasury Department, the new depreciation rules for taxing equipment will permit corporations to "defer" pay-

ing \$3 billion in U.S. taxes in the coming fiscal year and even larger sums in years to come. Since millions and billions and trillions sound pretty much alike to most of us, it is difficult to grasp what an enormous sum this is. By comparison with the \$3 billion corporate tax break:

The President's welfare reform proposal to bring every family of four in America up to a minimum income level of \$1,600 a year would cost \$2.1 billion. This has set off a big battle in Congress and the country.

Total U.S. aid to preschool, elementary and secondary education in the coming year is budgeted at \$3.6 billion.

Last year, Mr. Nixon vetoed the education bill because Congress exceeded his request by \$453 million and the housing bill because it exceeded his request by \$514 million.

Another surprising thing about the "depreciation" tax change is that congressional action was not requested. Assistant Treasury Secretary Nolan said in an interview last week that since Congress had authorized a "reasonable" tax rebate for the obsolescence of machinery, the costly change did not need further legislation.

There is doubt about the legal authority. A 1968 Treasury study quoted "leading experts" as indicating that legislation would be required for further changes in the depreciation rules. Moreover, President Nixon's Task Force on Business Taxation, headed by a partner of Mr. Nixon's former Wall Street law firm, "strongly" recommended last fall that depreciation changes be made by legislation.

A 26-year-old 1970 law school graduate named Tom Stanton, now working for Ralph Nader's Public Interest Research Group, filed suit in federal court to force the Treasury to at least hold a public hearing before making the \$3 billion-per-year tax change. The Treasury replied that it had planned to hold a hearing all along though the Jan. 11 announcement said nothing about hearings and presented the tax changes as presidential "actions."

The public hearing is scheduled for May 3, based on written opinions from the public, which are due April 12. Assistant Secretary Nolan told me "we will listen to everybody who has something to say—I will add that it is highly unlikely we will change the concept of what we recommended."

As the Treasury sees it, the \$3 billion change in tax rules is necessary to encourage the modernization of American industry to compete with other nations. According to Nolan, it was not up to the Treasury to weigh this need against the possible use of \$3 billion for school aid, family assistance, anti-pollution efforts or other purposes.

"An expenditure decision is up to Congress," Nolan said—but in a world of limited resources, revenue decisions are crucial to expenditure decisions.

Despite the traditional jealousy about the power of the purse, hardly a voice has been raised in Congress about the substance, procedure or impact of the Treasury-White House decision of Jan. 11. Maybe the lawmakers agree with it. Then again, maybe they don't understand it either.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—
HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks:

"How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

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

How long?

THE HEAVY RESPONSIBILITY OF THOSE WHO RUN THE MEDIA

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the continuing responsibility of those who publish, edit and control the reporting of facts to the public is a heavy one in these times of vocal extremism. Just as an automobile engine can stand only so many pounds of pressure per square inch in its cylinder head without exploding, so our American society can stand only a measured amount of misrepresentation, engendering of hatred, or incitation to mobocracy without the destruction of society itself.

In this light, just why Tom Wicker, who is the New York Times' Washington bureau chief, should publicly state "We got rid of one President. Maybe we can get rid of another one" beats me, unless Wicker has got a thing about Vietnam that so distorts his prospective as to materially undermine his ability to be objective.

A similar thing on President Nixon or Vice President AGNEW seems to obsess a great number of those members of the fourth estate whose duty it is to report to America the news as fact and to confine their editorial opinion to comments so entitled.

In this connection, a recent address by Al Capp, delivered to the National Association of Broadcasters in Chicago on March 30, 1971, is significant. At the conclusion of this speech Mr. Capp received a standing ovation from more than 3,000 NAB members present.

The address follows:

TV HAS DELUSIONS OF INFALLIBILITY

(By Al Capp)

Anyone who shows any civility to the most despised minority group in this country—the President and his Cabinet—on any of our network night-time talk shows gets the same treatment as the only novice in a nursery with a case of VD.

One night, on the Griffin Show, there were four Hollywood liberals on—and me. It was evenly balanced.

Hell, it was more evenly balanced than most. Mostly there are four Hollywood liberals and no me.

Well, we were discussing the usual subject—the repression of liberals on TV—and as it went on, it became clear they were outnumbered. So they brought another liberal on . . . a Broadway liberal.

I've forgotten his name, but I remember he was wearing Leon Trotsky's old beard and the suit they found Ché Guevara dead in. He was the director of a flop Broadway show he'd transformed into a smash hit by having the cast perform it stark naked and it became the most popular public hair pageant on Broadway.

Merv asked him a question. The guy replied with a misleading statement.

Now, I've studied tact under Spiro Agnew and I learned from him that there's nothing CBS reacts more graciously to than having a misleading statement on one of its shows corrected publicly. So I corrected the guy.

The guy said, "What's your source for the information?"

I said *Life* magazine.

He said everybody knows that's a fanatic, fascist filth-sheet. Next you'll be quoting Li'l Abner.

I said . . . Don't knock it. I *invented* you 30 years ago in Li'l Abner, only I never thought you'd come to *Life*.

Anyone who tells a bunch like this we're the most influential individuals in America is conning us. Anyone of us who believes it is naive.

It's the *hardware* we use . . . the radio and TV hardware that's influential. We, as individuals, are influential *only* as long as we have the use of it . . . but no longer.

Edward Morgan . . . remember him? He once had the use of the radio hardware. With it he shaped the opinions of millions. Morgan is still alive and well, but without the use of the hardware he has about as much influence on shaping opinions as Phyllis Diller has on shaping bras.

Jack Paar once had the use of the TV hardware.

He became a household word. Every word he spoke became a household word.

Well, he gave up the use of the hardware for a couple of years. Then he returned one night as a guest on a talk show. He asked the audience to ask him questions. Nobody did. You could see they were asking *themselves* a question. Who was he?

It's the hardware that's influential and those of us who, for this moment, have the use of it can influence the nation in many ways.

When Sander Vanocur uses it, the public gets his version of the truth. When Doug Edwards uses it, the public gets the truth.

Abraham Lincoln once said: "He who molds public sentiment goes much deeper than he who pronounces decisions. He makes those decisions possible or impossible."

What sentiment have those of us who are, for the moment, using the hardware molder for those the nation elected to make its decisions?

Walter Cronkite tries to be fair. Frequently he succeeds.

Eric Sevareid is too high-minded . . . or, possibly, too exhausted . . . to *revile* the President, but it's clear that he *regrets* him.

David Brinkley and Frank McGee try to conceal their contempt for the President, but not very hard. John Chancellor makes no effort to conceal his—not even in the President's presence. And, as you all saw the other night, vice versa.

Harry Reasoner doesn't *always* snarl at the President. Sometimes he merely sneers. And their staffs, the Kalbs, the Kaplows, the Wallaces, the Agronskys, the Rathers, are honest men, too. They are honestly biased against the President and they make an honest effort to conceal it, but they can't. Too honest, I guess.

Although millions of Americans respected the President enough to give him the highest office in the land, the networks have been able to come up with only one man—Howard K. Smith—who respects the presidency enough to give us a dispassionate picture of it.

Most of us who, for the moment, control the radio and TV hardware—we who Lincoln called the sentiment molders—we can't forgive Richard Nixon, can we, for his past. His campaigning against people we loved . . . Stevenson and Kennedy . . . with toughness and smartness. It was legal to run against

them, we admit that, but it wasn't in good taste.

So many of us are still campaigning against *him*—so savagely, so ceaselessly—that we haven't noticed that all that toughness and smartness is now in the *nation's* service, and what's more tragic, we haven't let up on him long enough to let the nation notice.

So many of us use the sentiment-molding hardware night after night, month after month, year after year, to mold such suspicion, distrust and distaste for the men in the White House that the President's occasional attempts to use it himself to clarify his policies, or the Vice President's attempts to clarify CBS's, aren't, as so many of us claim, divisive or repressive. They're *hopeless* as we damn well know from the ratings.

Sure, the President or the Vice President can borrow the hardware to defend themselves a few nights during the year. But the Chancellors, the Brinkleys, the Vanocurs have it *every* night in the year—to *saturation bomb* them!

But our use of the hardware to demolish their efforts has given us delusions of infallibility that may demolish *our* ability to think straight.

For example, two crusaders in the last few weeks have warned the nation about flaws in products offered to them.

Ralph Nader warned us about the flaws in cars. We made a national hero of him.

The Vice President warned us about the flaws in another type of product manufactured by equally big companies—TV documentaries. We made a national whipping boy of him.

Although we honor Ralph Nader and dishonor Spiro Agnew, they are both precisely the same sort of crusaders. Only in my opinion, Agnew has more guts.

What do the sentiment molders accomplish by so savagely, so relentlessly molding sentiment against the President? Are we destroying merely *this* President as we did the last one? Or are we destroying the presidency itself?

Now I live in Cambridge, Mass., a stone's throw from Harvard. A couple of weeks ago, Tom Wicker spoke there. He said to a wildly cheering mob—including some of those who a night or two later firebombed a dean's office at nearby Tufts—he said: "We got rid of one President. Maybe we can get rid of another one."

When Tom Wicker isn't being cheered by the SDS, he's the New York Times Washington bureau chief and a frequent commentator for educational TV on Washington affairs.

And so we can all sleep peacefully at night knowing that in the morning we'll get as unbiased a view of the presidency from Washington as we would get from any other national capital—such as Hanoi, Peking or Moscow.

If a mob can be inflamed enough by our sentiment molders to gather in Washington to get rid of a President of the United States, can it be inflamed enough to gather in New York to get rid of the president of NBC, CBS or ABC?

If the networks' sentiment molders use their hardware to give the nation a sympathetic picture of a mob that took over private property in California and declared it a "People's Park"—will the networks be equally sympathetic when a mob takes over NBC, CBS or ABC and declares them "People's Networks"—or will they scream for the National Guard to protect them with *their* hardware, as they did at Kent State?

Tom Wicker must know Dick Cavett, who has used ABC's hardware to make a national political figure of Jane Fonda. I remember when she was simply a national figure. Even Dick Cavett must know that if a mob can blow up a police station it can blow up a radio or TV station.

Lincoln was right. We who have, for the moment, the use of the sentiment-molding hardware must not use it only to spread the sentiments of a special group of men. We must not use it to mold the public into their image. They may be wrong.

We must have enough faith in the balance and the fairness of the American people to give them a fairly balanced interpretation of the news. An unpoisoned picture of the men they've elected.

We are, with all our faults, a truly generous people. Let's be generous enough with the truth, the truth from *all* sides, to give the American people the chance to make the nation, and the world, a better place to live in.

SEEING CLEARLY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the Near East Report and the Washington Post have each published perceptive articles during the recess about the real interests of the United States in the Middle East crisis. Both depart from a recent speech by the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas (Mr. Fulbright). In press accounts of that speech—which appears in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 14, 1971 on page 10355—Senator Fulbright seemed to raise some serious questions (and provide some confused answers) about the views in Israel of the role of the Soviet Union in the Middle East. He also suggested that Israel plays a role similar to South Vietnam in relying on a fear of communism to draw assistance from the United States.

These dubious views are answered well in the following articles:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 9, 1971]

SENATOR FULBRIGHT'S LAPSE OF JUDGMENT:
AN OFFENSIVE VIEW OF ISRAEL'S RELATIONS
WITH THE UNITED STATES

(By Stephen S. Rosenfeld)

"Recent visitors to the Middle East assure me," Senator Fulbright told Yale students last Sunday, "that the Israelis are quite sincere in their fear of being 'thrown into the sea' and in their conception of the Soviet Union as an insatiable imperialist power, bent, presumably, upon the conquest and communication of the Middle East. Nonetheless, I perceive in this some of the same old Communist-baiting humbuggery that certain other small countries have used to manipulate the United States for their own purposes."

"When it comes to anticommunism, as we have noted in Vietnam and elsewhere, the United States is highly susceptible, rather like a drug addict, and the world is full of ideological 'pushers' . . . Because of our continuing obsession with communism we permit client states like Israel and South Vietnam to manipulate American policy toward purposes contrary to our interests, and probably to theirs as well."

Two things need to be said about the Foreign Relations Committee chairman's remarks, and the first is that they are outrageous. To insinuate that Israel's fears for its security are contrived is mischievous, if not downright mean. To go on and attribute

to Israel the palpably ridiculous view that Moscow wants to "conquer and communize the Mideast" is no less disturbing.

As for Fulbright's lumping together of Israel and South Vietnam as clients which manipulate American policy against American interests, the most charitable reading is that he got swept away by the grandeur of his thesis and did not realize the import of what he was saying. Another possible reading is that he believes American Jews who would like to have the United States continue its friendship for Israel are being disloyal. This is an ugly—and false—charge.

If one can separate from Fulbright's remarks their aspect of gratuitous innuendo, however, then it is possible to acknowledge that there is a germ of truth in his argument. It is that the cause of anticommunism which contributed to the American involvement in Vietnam is also one of the sources of official American involvement in the Middle East. That it was a factor in respect to Vietnam hardly needs to be demonstrated. That it is a factor in respect to Israel has been clear at least since President Nixon's declaration last summer that Israel commands the Mediterranean-African "gateway" and stands at the "hinge of NATO" and keeps the "radical" Arabs off the "moderate" oil Arabs' backs. Moscow's entry into a direct combat role against Israel seemingly sealed the anti-Communist component—or, to make an essential distinction, the anti-Soviet component—in administration policy.

This is, of course, a troubling matter for those many Americans, Jews and others, who have criticized the anti-Communist rationale which successive Presidents have used to support American engagement in Vietnam. They have been open to the reproach that the cause they denied in one place is the cause they accepted in other.

Fulbright's own response to this "dilemma of the doves" has unquestionably had the virtue of consistency. He does not believe that anticommunism provides sufficient basis for American involvement in either Vietnam or Israel and he has recommended policies designed to restrict the American role in both countries. He would do that in Israel, he explained Sunday, by having the United Nations impose and enforce a solution—by applying sanctions to Israel, if necessary. "It makes no sense at all for us to shrink in horror at the very notion of an 'imposed' solution," he said, "not only because we are legally bound by the United Nations Charter to accept certain kinds of 'imposed' solutions, but because the absolute sovereignty of nations is an outmoded principle . . ."

Well, Fulbright has earned high marks for consistency. So in their opposite way have the likes of Senator Jackson. But must the rest of us accept their common framework in which the available choice lies between sustaining longer than necessary a wasting involvement in Vietnam, and submitting Israel to the political experimentation of the United Nations? (Fulbright: Mideast matters "go beyond the fears and ambitions of Israel and the Arab states and their great power mentors. I perceive here an opportunity to breathe life and force into the U.N. . .").

My answer would be no. No single cause or measure can be blindly applied to guide the disposition of American power. Rather, the constant effort should be to identify the nature of a given foreign situation, to judge the particular interests which Americans have in it, and to apply American resources in proportion to those interests.

There is a huge difference between combating communism in Vietnam and coping with Soviet power applied against Israel. There is a huge difference between Vietnam, a country with which Americans have never had strong ties of any kind, and Israel, a country of deep meaning to many Americans,

particularly, of course, to Jews. There is a huge difference between expending billions of dollars and thousands of lives in Vietnam and suffering the immense social costs of that war; and supporting Israel with supplies, credits and political means but with no troops, and with negligible domestic costs. There is a huge difference between engaging in war in the one place and trying by diplomacy—on the whole intelligently—to facilitate a settlement in the other.

It is astonishing, almost embarrassing, to find that Mr. Fulbright needs to have these elementary points spelled out for him.

[From the Near East Report, Apr. 7, 1971]

FULBRIGHT'S COMPLAINT

Sen. J. William Fulbright (D-Ark.) mounted a major attack on Israel's position in a speech at Yale University last Sunday. Fulbright charged that Israel is trying to manipulate the United States by dreaming up the threat of Soviet expansionism in the Middle East and arguing that it is in America's national interest to help her block it.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations said:

"Recent visitors to the Middle East assure me that the Israelis are quite sincere in their fears of being 'thrown into the sea' and in their conception of the Soviet Union as an insatiable imperialist power, bent, presumably, upon the conquest and communization of the Middle East.

"Nonetheless, I perceive in this some of the same old Communist-baiting humbuggery that certain other small countries have used to manipulate the United States for their own purposes. When it comes to anti-communism, as we have noted in Vietnam and elsewhere, the United States is highly susceptible, rather like a drug addict, and the world is full of ideological 'pushers.'

"It is a fine thing to respect a small country's independence and to abstain from interference in its internal affairs. It is quite another matter when, in the name of these worthy principles—but really because of our continuing obsession with communism—we permit client states like Israel and South Vietnam to manipulate American policy toward purposes contrary to our interests, and probably to theirs as well."

DISTORTIONS AND INCONSISTENCIES

There are many distortions and inconsistencies in Fulbright's position.

On the one hand, Fulbright speaks contemptuously of "client states," among which he counts Israel. He is worried lest Israel involve us in her defense. But Israel's determination to defend herself irks Fulbright. For he perversely turns around and derides what he calls Israel's policy of "antiquated—and to a great degree delusional—self-reliance."

No analogy can be drawn between Viet Nam and Israel. Israel is not a client state of the United States. Israel does not want Great Power Intervention in the Middle East. Indeed, Israel is urging that the Great Powers get out of the Middle East.

Fulbright argues that Israel has been heavily dependent on the United States for arms and economic assistance.

Here again there is no analogy between Viet Nam and Israel, for, if we have poured our soldiers and billions of dollars of material into Viet Nam, we have *not granted* Israel any military aid. We have *sold* her weapons and our economic assistance has consisted, to a large extent, of loans rather than grants.

Israel has not been appealing for American soldiers. She does not invoke the U.S.-Soviet cold war. Israel is not, and does not claim to be, in the forefront of the so-called free world struggle against so-called international communism. What Israel is up against is raw Soviet power—not simple Soviet ideology.

Fulbright equates Soviet and American policy and makes it appear that the United States is as culpable as the Soviet Union in the Middle East. Thus, he airily dismisses Soviet presence there as "the sailing of warships around the Mediterranean."

But he does not mention the grim threat which alarms Israel. That is the massive concentration of sophisticated Soviet weapons—planes, missiles and tanks, as well as Soviet soldiers and technicians—on her doorstep. Israel is a target. She has had to face Soviet pilots in actual combat.

Fulbright overlooks the fact that every escalation in the Arab-Israeli arms race has begun with the Soviet Union, while the United States has often withheld arms from Israel in the never-ending hope that there might be some indication of Soviet restraint—which never came.

Even as Fulbright spoke, there were reports from Beirut that for the last three weeks there have been new shipments of Soviet missiles and radar-directed cannons—an airlift designed to establish a missile system covering the entire Nile Valley.

Instead of proposing Soviet withdrawal, Fulbright is insisting that Israel withdraw as the Russians and Egyptians demand and that we participate with the Soviet Union in "peacekeeping" arrangements.

MISPLACED FAITH

Fulbright's faith in the Soviet Union has no historical basis. Fulbright probably will recall that on May 24, 1967, on the eve of the six-day war, he rose in the Senate to urge that we turn to the UN and to the Russians, in particular, to avert a conflict.

During the course of that 1967 speech, he spoke wistfully of the potential role of the Soviet Union:

"Among the members of the United Nations, none has a greater opportunity to exercise leadership in the current crisis than the Soviet Union. Alone among the great powers, the Soviet Union has great influence with the Arab countries. . . . It would seem to be a singular opportunity for the Soviet Union, working within the framework of the United Nations, to take a position of leadership in support of peace. . . ."

But the Soviet Union did not live up to Fulbright's high expectations, for it was the leading actor in a farcical debate in the Security Council. And in the Middle East itself, it egged Egypt on to a fateful mobilization which led to war and defeat.

And now Fulbright is ready to let the Soviet Union and Egypt dictate the terms of the settlement.

DEMANDS ISRAEL'S WITHDRAWAL

Fulbright said that "the Soviet position now is that Israel should return to the borders of 1967; that is substantially our position as well, and it is consistent with the Security Council resolution of November 1967. . . ."

The Department of State has repeatedly denied that this was the intent of the 1967 resolutions. It is unfortunate that Fulbright interprets that resolution and the American position precisely the way the Russians have been trying to interpret it.

YOST CONCURS

Fulbright can draw support from an article in the current issue of *Life* magazine, in which the former head of the U.S. delegation, Charles Yost, writes:

"There is an argument as to whether the UN Security Council resolution of Nov. 22, 1967 called for Israeli withdrawal from all occupied territories or only from some occupied territories to 'secure and recognized boundaries' to be negotiated between the parties." And then he goes on to say:

"Which interpretation one chooses is immaterial."

In other words, what the United Nations

had to say about the frontiers—so important to Israel's struggle for defensive lines—becomes completely "immaterial" if the Great Powers agree to impose their own map.

No wonder the Russians and the Egyptians are able to take a rigid and inflexible line. If the diplomat who was supposed to represent the United States all these weary months is now ready to declare that the language of a major UN resolution does not really matter, how can anyone place any reliance on UN resolutions, and how can anyone depend on the United States to continue firmly to support them?

This is exceedingly relevant to the major issue today. There is now, as in 1957, great pressure on Israel to rely on UN forces and UN guarantees. The vagueness of UN resolutions and resolutions back in 1957 enabled Nasser to ride roughshod over UNEF ten years later.

If UN resolutions can be misinterpreted, mistranslated and misrepresented with such utter diplomatic abandon to suit the panic of the moment, who can be expected to depend upon them?

BUT OTHERS DISAGREE

It is true that many of Israel's supporters believe that Israel's role in the Middle East does thwart Soviet expansionism. And it is also true that many of the critics of U.S. policy in Viet Nam do not share Fulbright's view that America can be complacent about the Soviet thrust in the Middle East.

Prof. Hans J. Morgenthau writes in the April 1971 issue of *Foreign Affairs* that "we have been hypnotized by the ideological aspects of the Indochina war. . . . We have been too busy with trying to save Indochina from communism to pay much attention to what the USSR was doing in the rest of the world and to compete with it or oppose it as our interests require."

The eminent political scientist and historian points out that Soviet expansionism is an important basis for the "uncertainty" of the future of Soviet-American relations.

Ideological pretensions are unimportant in the constant pattern of expansionism: "Russia has moved into the spaces left by the liquidation of the British and French Empires, thereby bringing close to consummation the Tsarist aspirations which during the better part of the nineteenth century had pitted Russia against Great Britain over the 'Eastern Question.'"

It is the Middle East, he writes, "which appears the most obvious point at which the interests . . . of the United States and the Soviet Union appear to collide."

Testifying before the Senate Subcommittee on National and International Operations, Prof. Bernard Lewis of London University argued that Soviet decisions are made in reaction to American policy. He elaborated on the theme that the Russians move when the United States retreats or is immobile.

He recalled the missile crisis of 1970, when the Soviet Union and Egypt violated the cease-fire stand-still agreement by putting missiles into the Suez zone.

He told the Committee that the Russian assumption that the United States was "no longer capable of pursuing any kind of foreign policy was reflected in the brazen and contemptuous violation of the standstill agreement . . . and received apparent confirmation in the agitated attempts by some Washington spokesmen to look the other way."

ONE-WAY CRITICISM

It is pertinent to note that during this period Fulbright's committee did not think it necessary to inquire into the circumstances of the Soviet violation. There was no indication from Fulbright at that time that he was at all concerned about the Soviet buildup.

Fulbright has reserved his criticism in his

Middle East analyses for Israel. Perhaps if, on occasion, he had criticized Soviet-Egyptian policy there might have been greater flexibility in Moscow and Cairo. Perhaps he might have stimulated the Russians themselves to rethink their own position.

Fulbright would do well to consider the fact that there is considerable dissent in Eastern Europe over the escalating Soviet involvement in Egypt. The argument that Russia has found her Viet Nam in Egypt has often been made and loyal Communists have decried the vast amounts of military aid given to Egypt as a misplacement of priorities.

Taking the Fulbright speech and the Yost article together, we must conclude that there is a campaign to stampede the Israelis into a now-or-never peace-at-any-price surrender to the Soviet-Egyptian ultimatum.

SANCTIONS!

Indeed, there was a threat of sanctions in the Fulbright speech:

"I would not shrink from applying certain sanctions as a last resort for the preservation of peace. . . . It makes no sense at all for us to shrink in horror at the very notion of an imposed solution, not only because we are legally bound by the Charter to accept certain kinds of 'imposed' solutions, but because the absolute sovereignty of nations is an outmoded principle. . . ."

[*Ed. note:* Especially for little "clients."] Israel has always maintained that if she can have the weapons she needs she will be able to handle the Arab threat by herself, and for 23 years she has done just that.

But Israel cannot be expected to handle the Soviet Union alone. Only a firm stand by the United States can neutralize the Soviet threat.

FOR WHOM THE BELL TOLLS

We cannot retreat to the isolationist belief that the United States need be concerned about nothing beyond its shores; that Soviet expansion over large chunks of the Third World and the seas and skies around it does not really pose any threat to the independence and survival of other peoples.

HARD HIT BY UNEMPLOYMENT

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, my congressional district is among those which have been most hard hit by unemployment resulting from cutbacks in aerospace activities and, needless to say, many highly skilled individuals living in the bay area of San Francisco have suffered considerably.

I recently received a copy of a letter to Governor Reagan from the wife of one of these unemployed engineers which dramatically illustrates the difficulties faced by her family. I believe this communication is worthy of note and am submitting it for inclusion in the Record.

Frankly I have been frustrated in my own efforts to bring about some Federal action which would ease the crisis confronting unemployed scientists and engineers. I have encountered nothing but bureaucratic negativism from various Federal agencies which should be concerned with the problem, and hope the letter which follows will be read and heeded by those who are in a position to carry out some much needed action:

LOS ALTOS, CALIF.,
March 18, 1971.

Governor RONALD REAGAN,
The State Capitol,
Sacramento, Calif.

DEAR GOVERNOR REAGAN: I have put off writing this letter, hoping something good would happen to us and that it would be unnecessary to write. However, I now find that we are *desperately in need of help and there is nowhere else to turn*. It is fervently hoped that you will read this letter personally in order that you might have a *true* picture of our seemingly hopeless situation. There must be many others in our shoes, but some of them, at least, have someone to whom they can turn for help, and we don't.

My husband worked for aerospace companies as a Systems Engineer (he has two degrees; one in Civil Engineering and one in Statistics) and along with others, was laid off in July, 1969. We hobbled along and he was able to land a *temporary* position with a small, struggling consulting firm which lasted from November, 1969 to February, 1970. Until now, March, 1971, there has been no other job in spite of hundreds of resumes sent out and many interviews. My husband, E. M. Abreu, has applied for every possible job in and out of his field in California and outside California. Almost without exception, any job available requests or requires *experience* in that particular field. Employers are entirely reluctant to hire former engineers for fear they won't stay on the job, especially if they might later have a better opportunity. He is willing to do *any* type work, but being *willing* doesn't seem to be enough. I, too, have applied for many jobs but prospective employers seem invariably to frown upon that fact that I haven't worked for 9 years and everywhere I go I am up against hundreds of applicants, most of whom have had *recent* experience. We are both registered with the Human Resources Dept. and private employment agencies, and we constantly follow the advertisements. On one job my husband called about, the employer said he had had 120 calls about that *one* position and the same thing has happened to me. We have both applied for full time, part time or temporary jobs to no avail. I have also called many stores thinking I could do sales work, but they tell me they are laying off and not even taking applications.

We sold our former home at a profit and used this to live on for awhile and when gradually we used up *all our resources*, including a bank loan. We never wanted to go on welfare and even though we were eligible long ago, we waited until late December, 1970 to apply after we had absolutely no recourse. We applied for food stamps at the same time, and although it is a tight squeeze, we manage to eat solely from these stamps. Our teenager son eats more than an adult, but there is just no money left monthly to supplement the food budget. We were foolish, I suppose, as we probably should have applied for welfare and food stamps much sooner, but we had been hoping against hope that we wouldn't have to ask anyone for help. Our unemployment benefits were long since used up.

Governor Reagan, I wouldn't know anything about people who supposedly cheat or take advantage of welfare. I only know we never wanted it, and would give it back if we could. This is our first time and I pray to God it will be our last, if we ever get on our feet again. However, as long as I live, I shall always feel sorry for those who *want* to earn a living and can't seem to be able to, and for the desperately poor and destitute.

We are apparently only eligible for aid under the aid to Dependent Children program and with any deductions or whatever figured in, we are only eligible for \$166 per month. Food stamps, of course, do not cover

paper goods, toiletries, etc. nor dog food. Some of that \$166 goes for these things (only *necessary* ones), as well as gas, electric, water, garbage, telephone and newspaper (the latter two items are necessary to look for a job). Months ago we had to turn in our Pontiac because we could no longer keep up the payments. We still have a T-Bird (1963) which uses a lot of gasoline and much of that \$166 goes toward this item because of so much job hunting. Unfortunately, we are in no position to trade in this car for a compact car which would get better mileage. I should explain that the reason we are only qualified for \$166 per month (\$83 every two weeks) is because we only have one child living at home. Our other son is 20, married, living in another state, going to school part time and working part time, and has his own financial problems.

We kept up our rent as long as possible and now are 2 months behind, *on the verge of being evicted (for the first time in our lives) and have no place to go, nor any money to do it with*. Out of the \$166, we have made some token payments on our rent these past two months, but it's not enough. We were told by the Welfare Dept. that out of a Special Monthly Fund they might possibly be able to help with our moving expense, *but not rent*. We can't even possibly save enough out of that \$83 every two weeks to pay rent elsewhere, and they (landlords) often require first and last months' rent or the first month plus a substantial security deposit. In addition, we are in a *high rent area*, unfortunately, and we don't have the money to move out of the state or to relocate, on our own. We thought of low rent housing and talked to Mr. R. R. Davis, Chief, Housing Authority of Santa Clara County, 770 Kleiy Blvd., Santa Clara, California. He informed us that the Housing Authority has not received any money for additional housing in 1½ years, and the office has long ago stopped even taking applications, but they do allow you to get on a waiting list. *When they are authorized to have more housing available, the old applicants (before cut-off point) will first be eligible and then the people on the waiting list and there are 1500 of them!* We are on that waiting list but have no hope in this world of getting housing through them. At present, they are only authorized to help *if possible* people whose houses have been condemned or burned down. As of now, they only have 600 units in Santa Clara County, all occupied.

In the name of heaven, *WHAT are we going to do? We just can't sleep on the street*. We have no relatives living in this state, and my husband's parents are dead. My parents live in a state across the country, are in their 70's and living on a small retirement income. They are in *no position* to help us but I know they would if they possibly could. You know, if we had three or four or more children at the moment, we would be better off rent-wise. Some of them, I suppose, are eligible for \$300, \$400, \$500 or more a month, but I really don't know. *At least* they can pay rent and their food stamps help them out.

In addition to the threat of being evicted, a bank where we have a loan is threatening to take all our furniture because it was given as collateral (we had no choice). *The bank knows we have no job and no income, but this has been turned over to an adjustment company in San Jose by them anyway*. We have been married almost 22 years and all our things are a sentimental collection of those 22 years. To make things worse, we finally could not keep up the payments on our 1963 T-Bird and we are in danger of losing that. Need I tell you that in this area it would be impossible to shop for food or look for a job without any car?

Things could not *possibly* be worse for us except that we have our health. My husband does have a heart condition which he had previously, but it never interfered with his

profession. I will say that this terribly unhappy, frustrating situation has gone on for *so long* now that we have become enormously tense, worried and "tied up in knots". You cannot imagine what this has done to our marriage—constant worry and *never* any money for recreation. For a long time, we were brave and tried to "hold our chins up". Finally, I just want to cry and cry and feel like I am just going to jump out of my skin. Between interviews, my husband paces the floor. There *must* be an answer *somewhere*. We, and many other engineers, are not in a recession. We are in the worst *depression* possible. Unless one of us has a heart attack, a stroke or a nervous breakdown, what *more* could go wrong for us?

Governor Reagan, we never wanted hand-outs, and we don't *like* having to receive welfare. I thank God and the U.S. Government for the food stamps, but I want to cry every time I use them, because I would so much prefer it to be otherwise.

My husband is presently under consideration by several companies here as well as out of state, only to the extent that they haven't sent what we call a "No" letter after receiving his resumé. This has happened before and then didn't materialize, but we will keep our fingers crossed.

As for Medi-Cal, we have been eligible since late December, but haven't used it. Actually, we have never been given much information on it as far as who to go to and who will accept it, etc. My glasses have needed changing for a year, and I am getting headaches now and also get dizzy off and on. I have no money for this and yet am told Medi-Cal will not cover expense for glasses. Of course, due to raw nerves, my blood pressure could have gone up, accounting for the dizziness.

Governor, you will note below that I am sending copies of this letter to President Nixon, and some senators and congressmen in Washington, as well as Sacramento (listed in alphabetical order). We feel that we simply must explore every avenue possible open to us before another day passes. I hope and pray that you or one of these distinguished men can help us or give us some guidelines to follow, especially as far as aid in *housing*, etc. is concerned. We will drive to Sacramento if you think it necessary and can help us. May I ask, PLEASE, THAT YOU PRETEND YOU ARE IN OUR SHOES FOR ONE MINUTE. Pretend that all your resources are gone, that you have not had a job for a long time and that you do not have enough money for rent, utilities, gasoline for car, etc., and you will soon lose the roof over your head.

I wanted this letter to be *much* shorter, but it seemed impossible to keep it brief. If information in my letter can be used to help us or someone else, please feel free to do so. However, I *urge you not to use our name* because of our 13 yr. old son (an 8th grader) as he would be embarrassed. He is an honor student in Jr. High, on Student Council and a leader in his school. Since the age of 10, his one big ambition in life has been to go to Annapolis and I just wouldn't do *anything* to embarrass him. School is a challenge to him and he loves every minute of it. We think of *his* security always before our own and I just hope and pray somehow that we can leave him in this school until June, only 2½ months away. It means *so much* to him and would almost be *tarumatic* to him, I believe, to take him out now, when he graduates from Jr. High shortly. We fervently believe in God, and I *still* pray for a miracle.

In case anyone wants to call us, our telephone no. in Los Altos is (415) 965-0869. I shall look forward to hearing from you.

Enclosed is a copy of an article from the Palo Alto Times, dated March 16, 1971. Please read *all* of it. I think you will indeed find it heartbreaking, as we did.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. R. M. ABREU.

CANNOT GET JOB, DEPRESSED ENGINEER KILLS HIMSELF

Charles Mallinckrodt Jr., 35, a Palo Alto computer engineer, seemed to have everything going in his direction—until the electronics and aerospace industry in California nearly collapsed last year.

Mallinckrodt, the father of three young children, decided that despite the lack of jobs, he would enter business for himself.

The venture failed, as most others begun since the depression struck the industry, and Mallinckrodt started last December to seek a job.

Monday, his body was discovered beneath a tree near the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center. A coroner's spokesman termed the death an apparent suicide.

A white plastic bag was pulled over his head and an almost-empty bottle containing an unknown toxic liquid, possibly cleaning fluid, was found alongside.

In his hands, investigators found a blue cardboard folder containing about a dozen printed résumé forms, detailing the young engineer's background and qualifications.

Also tucked into the folder were replies to letters of inquiry he had sent to various firms in search of a job.

There were ten reply letters in all, dated in January and February, each acknowledging interest but explaining that there were no job openings.

Mallinckrodt had been reported missing from his home at 1900 Barbara Drive by his wife, Claudine, according to San Mateo County Coroner Paul B. Jensen.

Mrs. Mallinckrodt identified the body today, telling Jensen that he had been dependent because of his inability to get a job.

"This is one of the saddest cases I've had to handle," said Coroner Jensen.

"A few years ago, they were literally crying for engineers. They were begging kids to train for jobs in the field," Jensen said.

"Now you've got thousands upon thousands of these guys laid off. They can't find a job—no matter what their qualifications."

This is tragic and should not be. He escaped his problems here on earth, but not those of his wife and children. He must have felt it was just *hopeless*.

**IMMIGRATION REFORM
LEGISLATION**

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a comprehensive bill to establish a worldwide ceiling on immigration with a fair and rational system for the selection of immigrants.

The time has come to recognize the practicality and necessity of a uniform world wide ceiling on the number of immigrants who come to the United States each year.

My bill proposes a new preference system which will offer flexibility and assure fair distribution among all nations. The bill also provides for the admission of refugees who satisfy the Attorney General that they are qualified as such under the terms of the Protocol Relating to Refugees of which the United States is a signatory.

The section-by-section analysis of the bill follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

SECTION 1

The "special immigrant" category, not included within numerical limitations, is amended to include those aliens who were previously classified as "immediate relatives" and unmarried sons or daughters are included as special immigrants.

Natives of countries contiguous to the United States are classified as special immigrants and, except for close relatives and other special immigrant classes, each contiguous country (Mexico and Canada) is limited to no more than 35,000 immigrants a year.

SECTION 2

There is established a worldwide ceiling on immigration of 260,000 immigrants per year, exclusive of defined special immigrants.

SECTION 3

Except for those countries contiguous to the United States, the number of immigrant visas available to any other country shall not exceed 25,000 in any fiscal year.

SECTION 4

The number of immigrant visas available to any subquota or dependent area of a foreign country is increased from 200 a year to 1,000 a year.

SECTION 5

A new preference system for selecting immigrants is established:

First preference—25 percent of the worldwide ceiling, or 65,000 immigrant visas are made available to the spouse, unmarried son or daughter, or parent of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence (in the case of a parent such lawful resident alien must be at least 21 years of age (and to the married son or daughter or the unmarried brother or sister of a citizen of the United States).

Second preference—25 percent of the worldwide ceiling, or 65,000 immigrant visas for the highly skilled immigrants—members of the professions and those with exceptional ability in the sciences or arts. However, no more than 10 percent of the total number of visas available under this preference shall be available to any one country per year. Furthermore, an alien who qualified for a second preference is precluded from any other preference except by reason of relationship to a United States citizen or permanent resident alien or as a nonpreference immigrant.

Third preference—25 percent of the worldwide ceiling, or 65,000 immigrant visas, plus any visas not required for preferences 1 and 2, shall be available to qualified immigrants capable of performing skilled labor not of a temporary or seasonal nature for which a shortage of employable and willing persons exists in the United States.

Fourth preference—15 percent of the worldwide ceiling, or 39,000 immigrant visas, plus visas not required for preferences 1, 2, and 3, shall be available for aliens principally engaged in religious duties, aliens who will not seek employment in the United States and investors.

Nonpreference—10 percent of the worldwide ceiling, or 26,000 immigrant visas, plus unused numbers from the four preferences, shall be available to nonpreference qualified immigrants in the order in which they qualify. There is a further proviso that within this category 25 percent of the numbers available to qualified immigrants who are under 25 years of age.

SECTION 6

The petition procedure to accord preference status and special immigrant status is amended to conform with amendments in this bill.

SECTION 7

The Attorney General is given discretion to admit an alien to the United States who, through no fault on his part, arrives at a port of entry with an erroneous visa classification.

SECTION 8

The labor certification requirement which became effective December 1, 1965, by the Act of October 3, 1965, is repealed and the law existing prior to that time reinstated. This, in effect, relieves the prospective immigrant from the burden of securing a labor certification that his admission to the United States will not displace an American citizen nor adversely affect labor conditions. This change in law would place the burden of proceeding back on the Government to make an availability determination and then exclude an alien who might take a job from a citizen or adversely affect labor conditions.

SECTION 9

A new refugee system is created without a numerical limitation, but which can be discontinued by a resolution of either body of Congress. The Attorney General, after consultation with the Secretary of State and in order to promote United States interests, is authorized to parole certain defined refugees into the United States. After two years, the amendment provides for retroactive adjustment of status to that of a permanent resident. Applicability of the section is directed at refugees from Communism, refugees from persecution, and those victims of natural calamity or military operations. The definition of "refugee" conforms with the definition contained in the "Protocol Relating to Refugees" to which the United States is a signatory. Furthermore, the Attorney General must report to the Congress semi-annually on the progress of this authority.

SECTION 10

Present law provides a waiver of exclusion for mental retardation if the alien is the spouse, unmarried son or daughter, minor unmarried adopted child of a United States citizen or lawfully admitted permanent resident. This amendment includes aliens who have a mental defect within the waiver possibility.

SECTION 11

Section 245 is amended to permit adjustment of status in the United States for all qualified aliens except aliens from countries contiguous to the United States and from adjacent islands.

SECTION 12

Obsolete sections of the Act of October 3, 1965 are repealed.

SECTION 13

Any alien eligible for fifth preference status on the basis of a petition filed prior to July 1, 1971, and who has retained the status accorded by the petition, and the spouse and children of such alien, shall be documented as special immigrants.

THE BICYCLE ERA

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, it has occurred to me that the following study conducted at Davis, Calif., would be of value and great interest to all as we seek to develop new methods of intracity

transportation. Not only have traffic congestion problems been solved, but in my mind a healthy form of exercise is being carried on. Through the cooperative efforts of community leaders a program of multiple value is being implemented. I commend this study to my colleagues and to the public:

BIKEWAYS IN ACTION: THE DAVIS EXPERIENCE
(By Robert Sommer and Dale F. Lott)

Leaving the freeway and entering Davis the motorist sees a large sign telling him that this California city has 18,000 bicycles. Considering that its population is only 24,000, probably no other city in the United States has as high a proportion of its citizens owning bicycles and using them as a regular means of transportation. A number of factors produced this situation—the presence of many young people attending the Davis campus of the University of California, the flat terrain, the mild weather, and the many wide streets. When the campus expanded greatly and the population in the area grew rapidly in the early 1960's, the streets became much busier. About the time the first stop light was installed, people riding bicycles began to feel crowded. At the local bicycle shop, it was common to see bikes appearing with damaged front wheels when riders were forced into the curb by passing cars. Competition, both for space on the streets and opportunities to cross at intersections, grew between bicycles and automobiles. It was a lopsided competition at best—bicycles are small and frail, automobiles large and sturdy. It became clear to a number of concerned Davis citizens that if bicycles were to remain a viable part of the city transportation system they would have to be given a place of their own in city traffic planning.

What was needed was some way to separate bicycles from automobiles and the plan adopted was the bicycle path or bikeway—a strip of pavement or concrete from which automobiles would be excluded. At first this suggestion was rejected by the city council; it was considered to be visionary, impractical, and potentially dangerous and its proponents were regarded as cranks. Letters to the editor proclaimed that the day of the horse was past and the day of the bicycle was passing. It was time to build more and larger parking lots and shopping centers. Citizens were urged to welcome the 20th Century to their city, and forget the gay nineties and all its trappings. However as the debate continued, it became apparent that there was widespread support for bicycle paths. A citizen group circulated a petition asking the city council to establish bicycle paths along principal streets and rights of way of an integral part of the city's transportation system. This petition was signed by 90% of the several hundred voters approached. *Bike paths became the central issue in a city election of 1966 and the pro-bikeway candidates won.* Soon after that the first bike paths were established along the sides of existing wide streets.

Since that time, Davis has been developing a bicycle path network that is probably unique in the United States. New housing tracts in the city are required to set aside space for bicycle lanes separated from traffic and a special act was passed by the California Assembly to enable the city to formulate traffic regulations for bicycles. It is important to realize that the bicycles are not merely owned, stored, or used for recreational purposes; they are an important part of the transportation system. On one heavily trafficked street, traffic counts during the summer (with few University students in town) show that bicycles represented 40% of all traffic. During the rush hour, 90% of all riders are adults. The emblem of the city shown on many municipal vehicles is a gay nineties two-wheeler. Many business leaders

in the community are strong proponents of bike riding and admit that this is a matter of self-interest. The use of bicycles has meant that there are no parking meters in the city and the traffic situation at rush hours is tolerable. The bicycle has also helped to preserve the central city core as a viable shopping district, since parking is not a serious obstacle to shopping downtown. The University and high schools have been able to set aside less space for parking lots than they would ordinarily. The acceptance of the bicycle as a viable means of transportation by virtually all segments of the community provides the unique opportunity to learn the structural and social requirements of safe, efficient, and pleasurable bike riding.

The potential of bicycle transportation cannot be realized without the necessary environmental support system. Just as one cannot have a railroad without tracks, or a bus system without highways, so one needs special facilities and regulations for bicycle traffic. This means planning which must rest on firm knowledge of these special requirements of the bicycle. One simply does not design highways for automobiles and sidewalks for pedestrians, leaving bicycles squeezed in between moving automobiles, parked cars and pedestrians.

First let us review the history of the Davis bicycle path network. About 8 years ago a group of concerned citizens formed the Bike Safety Committee which investigated bicycle traffic problems in the city and made various suggestions about how to alleviate them. The city Public Works Department became interested and made traffic counts to determine the streets most heavily used. There was very little precedent to follow in developing bike lanes. The City Public Works Department believed that the most feasible plan was to create bike lanes on the outside of the streets over 50 feet wide. Where this contradicted the California Motor Vehicle Code, a special bill relating to bike lanes was passed with the help of the State Assemblymen. This bill permitted the Davis City Council in 1967 to pass Ordinance 442 creating bike lanes and regulating bike traffic. The Davis City Council is very favorable to bicycle lanes and present plans call for 12 miles of bicycle paths by 1974, including 5 miles of lanes completely separated from the roadway.

The establishment of these pioneering paths offered an opportunity to study the use of the path, the attitudes of car drivers, bike riders, and city officials toward them, and the effect of the paths on safety. The safety record of the lanes is very good. Thus far not a single car-bicycle collision has taken place in the bicycle lanes. Damaged front wheels are rare problems at the bike shop. However, while the lanes protect the riders for the length of streets, they left them exposed, and in a somewhat more vulnerable position, at the intersections. There are some real problems connected with left turns from inside the bike lane, particularly when automobiles are turning right from what has become the center lane. There are also problems about educating out-of-town drivers about the bike lanes. For these reasons, and with the assistance of a small grant from the National Safety Council, we undertook a study of the bicycle path situation in the city. We felt that this information would be helpful to other cities planning bicycle paths. Over the past three years we have conducted a number of surveys among city and police officials, like riders, and car drivers. Our goal was to get an overview of the bicycle situation in the city, the ways in which problems connected with the bicycle have been met and to specify the problems that remain and how they might be solved.

In Davis the great bulk of the population lives within two miles of both downtown and campus. During the Spring of 1970 Marle

Rorvik interviewed 327 young adults living in apartment houses at various distances from the campus and downtown. The bulk of those surveyed were college students. The percentage of students using bicycles as transportation to campus was the same whether they lived two blocks or two miles away, but the rate of use was not. Those students living within a mile averaged about 10 round-trips a week, while those 1½ to 2 miles away averaged about five round-trips per week. The percentage of non-students young adults who use bicycles is about 70% (no different than the students) but the number of trips per week is somewhat less. Both students and non-students rarely used their bicycles as transportation at night. There are approximately ten times as many trips during the day as at night.

It is the writer's feelings, supported by our survey results, that the bicycle path network in the city is an important factor in this heavy use of the bicycle. At Santa Barbara, where another campus of the University is located on flat terrain, one finds much less frequent use of the bicycle than at Davis.

The Davis city officials were very favorable towards the bicycle paths. However, to a man they commented about the intersection problems—the paths provided safety while riding parallel to the curb but did not help much at intersections. They also mentioned the need for continuous public education. It was difficult to reach new residents, incoming students, and people who live elsewhere but come to Davis to work. The bike riders we interviewed were also favorable towards the paths. They felt it was safer and less anxiety provoking to ride in a bike lane. Virtually everyone stated his preference for a bike path over a conventional street if the distance were the same.

We were interested in knowing whether or not bike riders like bike lanes enough to go out of their way to use them. In our first survey we asked all bike riders if they would go a block out of their way to use a bike lane. Only 1 in 5 said they would.

The study of young adults in apartment houses asked a slightly different question, "Do you go out of your way to use bike paths?" In their answers to this question college students and other young adults differed. Among the students 1 female in 4 and 1 male in 7 said they did. On the other hand when the young adult non-students were asked the same question 60% of the males and 75% of the females said they did.

The other responses supported the idea that many people would take the bike paths when available but would not make an extra effort to reach them. Virtually all of the automobile drivers who were interviewed in various parking lots, were favorable to the bike lanes. Most confessed to feelings of apprehension when they rode on a street that contained mixed car and bike traffic (i.e. without bike lanes). They felt that the paths made it easier to drive since the driver didn't have to worry about bicycles. The only improvement in bicycle paths they proposed was creating more bikeways and marking them better. Only two of the eighteen drivers said they ever went out of their way to avoid streets with bike lanes. As a follow-up, a smaller survey was undertaken in Woodland, California a nearby city of approximately the same size as Davis, but with a much smaller number of bicycles. The city officials interviewed said that Woodland did not have a significant bicycle problem and special bicycle paths were therefore unnecessary. In Woodland the use of bicycles (with identical terrain and climate to that in Davis) was almost exclusively restricted to school children. All of these interviews were uninformative since the respondents had no contact with separate bike lanes and lacked any opinions about their potential value. It was clear that the bicycle was viewed as a minor and incidental part of the traffic situa-

tion in Woodland—something to be used by children getting to and from school. However, the survey did seem of some educational value to the adult respondents. A few of them, particularly parents, considered for the first time the possibility of bike lanes in Woodland.

During the spring of 1970 a door-to-door survey was undertaken by Frank Becker in 132 households in a residential neighborhood of Davis. This is largely a white middle-class neighborhood with single family dwellings. Approximately equal proportions of men and women owned bicycles, and ownership was clearly related to age. Of the adults in the 25-35 range, 80% owned bikes, compared to 46% of those age 36-45, and only 14% of those over 46. More husbands than wives use their bicycles regularly. The major destination of the husbands was the University where they were employed or went to school, while for the women the major destinations were downtown stores or other households in the neighborhood. More men's bikes than women's had lights on them, which supports the greater reliance of the men on the bicycle for transportation.

Virtually all of the parents had discussed bicycle safety with their children. The major items mentioned were cautioning the children to watch out for cars, signaling, driving on the correct side of the street (moving in the same direction as automobiles in Davis), stopping at lights and signs, staying in bike lanes, not hurrying, and obeying traffic rules. Several parents taught bicycle rules and safety to their children during actual practice rides. Two-thirds of the parents had specifically instructed their children to use streets with bicycle lanes whenever possible, and those who hadn't, often mentioned that there were no bicycle lanes between their houses and the children's school. The vast majority believed it was safe for children to ride bicycles in Davis, and that this was due largely to the bicycle lanes. Most everyone wanted to see more bicycle lanes in the city, as well as better enforcement of existing regulations, both for bicycles and automobiles. Specifically this means keeping cars out of bike lanes, especially at intersections where cars moved into them to make right turns. No respondent expressed any dissatisfaction with the bicycle lanes or wanted to see them removed or restricted. In no case were bicycle lanes considered an inconvenience. Each respondent was asked directly whether he had ever avoided driving a car on a street containing a bicycle lane, and not a single one answered affirmatively. Most felt safer driving along a street with bicycle lanes because there was less to worry about. On the other hand, few were willing to go out of their way to drive on a street with bicycle lanes.

The parents were asked about bike usage by their children. Age was the determining factor in how far and when a child could ride. Preschoolers were restricted to the immediate vicinity of the home while children between six and twelve were allowed to ride to school. About half the children in this age group were allowed to ride downtown to the movies during the day, but not at night. Almost half of the junior high school students rode their bicycles to school every day, were permitted to go to daytime movies, and about half were increasing radius of distance and freedom of movement. However, some 16-18 year olds were still not allowed to ride bicycles at night, thus emphasizing the perceived hazards of night riding. To supplement the interview data, a brief survey of bike use was made in the nearby elementary school. Initially we had planned to do more work in the schools, but the close of the school year prevented this. The interviewer visited one class at each grade level to determine the number of students who had ridden their bikes to school that particular day. None of the kindergarteners had come by

bike, compared to 22% of the first graders, about half the students in grades 2-5, and 71% of the sixth graders.

OBSERVATIONS

Along with the surveys, we have also observed bicycle traffic patterns in various parts of the city. Early in our work, it appeared that there were serious problems connected with signaling. In the driver education programs, school children are taught the various hand signals for turns yet even the most cursory observation of bike riders showed that very few people use hand signals. This is particularly true for right turns. A few hardy individuals will signal for left turns, but they are a definite minority. In fact where traffic is particularly heavy, signaling may be dangerous since it requires the rider to remove one of his hands from the bars and keep it in a nonfunctional position which may adversely affect his balance.

Another problem concerns stop and yield signs. We have collected several thousand observations of bicycles and cars at different types of intersections. It is not easy to obtain a clear-cut definition of what "stopping" means. When pressed for a legal definition, a police official is likely to give the literal phrase "the complete cessation of movement." In practice this can be measured in several ways. Some policemen insist that the rider's foot must come to the ground. Others will use wobbly handlebars as an indication of stopping. Whatever criterion is used, our observations indicate that whether or not a rider stops at an intersection is determined less by the sign at the corner than the presence of traffic in the intersection. Before a rider reaches an intersection he looks up and down the street. When his head sweep shows traffic present, he will stop to the point of placing his foot on the ground, but if the intersection is clear, most riders will continue.

Bicyclists show much greater respect for stop lights than for stop signs. This might explain the results of another survey dealing with preferred route from domicile over to the University campus. The investigator (David Kenny) was impressed by the fact that bike riders chose one route to campus and car riders another. Further analysis showed that the bicyclists' preferred route contained an average of 4.9 stop signs and 1.8 stop lights. The automobile drivers chose, from the same origin to the same destination, a route that contained an average of 2.3 stop signs and 4.2 stop lights. Our observations provide some basis for interpreting this difference. Bikes don't usually stop at stop signs, they simply slow down and continue through, traffic permitting, while they stop completely at stop lights. For a car rider, subject to greater enforcement pressure, a stop sign always means stop, but he has a 50-50 chance of going through with a light. Another observation is that bicyclists generally make more turns than automobile drivers do. This may be due to the increased maneuverability of bicycles or to the fact that they are used for shorter trips than cars whose drivers choose the most direct route. Whatever the reasons, the greater frequency of turns by bicyclists compounds the seriousness of intersection problems.

EXISTING PROBLEMS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The major problems connected with the bike paths appear at the intersections. There is some difficulty in making a left turn from the inside bike lane or a right turn from the automobile lane when there is cross traffic present. Many bike riders and automobile drivers are unsure as to the proper turn procedures. The Davis Police Department distributes diagrams showing the proper turn procedures to school children and these are reprinted in the local newspaper. Some bicyclists sometimes solve the left turn problem by making their turn in the middle of the street before the key in-

tersection. The result is that they are riding up the bike lane in the wrong direction, confusing the traffic situation for both car and bike riders.

Recommendation: If accidents or near-accidents resulting from left turns from bicycle lanes increase, some action will be necessary. One possibility would be to prohibit left turns from bicycle lanes at key intersections during peak traffic. This is similar to what is done in many cities with automobiles where one finds signs at key intersections declaring "no left turns between 7 and 9 a.m. or 4 and 6 p.m." With an appropriate campaign of education and enforcement, there would be value in signs in bicycle lanes that tell the bike rider at key intersections "no left turn between 4 and 6 p.m." In addition to going one block beyond the intersection and making his turn, he has the option of dismounting and walking his bicycle across the intersection, thus gaining the priorities as well as the increased safety of a pedestrian. In Amsterdam many of the bikeways have independent signal lights (a green, yellow or red bicycle lights up on the post), and these could make provision for bicycle left turns.

Problem: Drivers from out of town do not understand the bike lanes and occasionally drive in them. This behavior is understandable since the drivers have received no clear instructions as to the meaning of bike lanes.

Recommendation: A large sign at each of the major entrances of the city to inform visitors that driving in bike lanes is prohibited. Formerly the bicycle lanes as well as the center strips had been painted white, with bikeway signs over the sidewalk on the right lane. To help inform out-of-town drivers that they should stay out of bike lanes, the city authorities have now changed to a broken yellow line for the center strip and a solid white line to delineate the bicycle lane. The most unpleasant feature of the bikeway network in Holland is the ubiquitous presence of motor bikes (bromfiets). While riding on bike paths alongside the highway, it was frequently necessary to look back to see if a bromfiets was approaching since the noise of highway traffic could obscure even the noisy bromfiets. In Davis motorized bikes of all varieties are excluded from the bicycle paths.

Problem: Some improvement needs to be made in present signaling practices. The small number of people who actually use signals indicates that the present system is not working.

Recommendation: Possibly drop signals or experiment with bike turn indicator lights.

Problem: Some of the newer streets contain a bike lane which is sandwiched between a pedestrian sidewalk and a parking lane for automobiles. This provides considerable safety for the bike rider but it is difficult for him to see automobiles coming along the street when he wants to pull out because the parked cars block his vision.

Recommendation: Where the bicycle path is inside a parking lane, the city has prohibited parking at some distance from an intersection so the rider can see traffic coming down the street.

Problem: Bicyclists, particularly children, have difficulty in knowing how to navigate in the parking lots of large shopping centers where the traffic lanes are not clearly marked.

Recommendation: It may be desirable to develop special bike routes in and out of major shopping centers.

Problem: There have been some accidents where bike riders in bike lanes were injured when car drivers opened their doors just as the bike rider was coming along.

Recommendation: Bike riders must be cautioned about the possibility of doors opening in front of them and automobile drivers should be careful to look at oncoming bike traffic before they open their doors.

Problem: Downtown merchants used to be annoyed when the entrances of stores was blocked by bicycles.

Recommendation: The practice followed in Davis was to install bike racks on most blocks in the downtown area and require bicyclists to use them. Many of the bicycle racks were donated by local service clubs.

Problem: There is some ambiguity about the meaning of bikeway, and little standardization in its meaning from one situation to another. In Sausalito, California there are bikeway signs down the main street which is the main traffic artery containing virtually bumper-to-bumper traffic on week-ends. In fact one rarely sees a bicycle on this street. In Seattle there are bikeway signs but apparently these only have meaning on certain designated days. The out-of-town driver has no conception of what the signs mean. In Davis one occasionally finds an out-of-town driver in the bicycle lane trying to guess why people are gesturing to him. Some interpret the bicycle lanes to mean that bicycles must stay in them but that cars can use them too.

Recommendation: The phrase "bikes only" might be preferable to "bike lane" or "bike-way." (Put into effect Fall, 1970).

CONCLUSIONS

The overall conclusion from the surveys and observations is that the Davis bikeways are almost unanimously regarded as a desirable safety feature. At present, many riders will use the paths when they are available but many will not go out of their way to use them. As the city grows (to approximately 75,000 within ten years) this situation will change. A bicycle path that is a good safety feature with light automobile traffic should be a much better safety feature in heavy car traffic. However for the bicycle to remain a viable form of transportation, and not be squeezed out by the automobile, certain structural and social requirements must be met. Just as the automobile requires the availability of gas stations, good roads, highway regulation, licensing procedures, and driver education, so the bicycle requires, in addition to a moderate climate and terrain, the separation of bicycle from automobile traffic at some points, the respect of motorists at intersections, special regulations pertaining to bicycles, bicycle racks in sufficient numbers in the downtown areas, and bicycle education in the schools.

It should be clear that we are not advocating the bicycle as the sole means of transportation within cities or in the countryside. The complexity of modern society requires a mixed system of transportation which would include railroads, buses, private automobiles, bicycles, and pedestrians. Each one of these not only has its unique capabilities and requirements, it also needs to be meshed in with the others. For a suburbanite to drive his car to the railroad station requires parking facilities at the railway station. If he should want to use a bicycle to get over to the station, there should be bike racks available for him. The system of mixed transportation presently available in Holland, the most densely populated country in the Western world, is instructive. A commuter can ride his bicycle to the station and check it in a park inside the station, and then rent another bike when he arrives at his destination. Bicycles can be rented in more than 90 city railroad stations. People on vacation can take along their bikes with them on a special bicycle train run by Netherlands railways. These are not "luxury" programs but rather these are indispensable ingredients of a successful mixed transportation system.

Our research has led us to the conclusion, that at least in the cities—no bicycle paths, no bicycles. This should not be a cause for pessimism as much as an urgent call for action to create and maintain a viable bicycle support system.

ATLANTIC UNION IS POWER OVER PEOPLE—THE CONSTITUTION IS POWER TO THE PEOPLE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, it is almost incredible that the President of the United States, who has taken a solemn oath to "preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States," should accept the Atlantic Union Pioneer Award which was presented to him this past November by Mr. Clarence Streit, leader of the Union Now movement.

The first promoter of Union Now, Benedict Arnold, wrote on October 7, 1780:

I am now led to devote my life to the reunion of the British Empire.

This was just 18 months after George Washington was sworn in as the first President of this Nation.

The man who advocates the same proposal today is honored. Instead of being accused of treason or sedition, he is allowed to praise the President of the United States who likewise has for many years been a leading exponent for the union of the United States with Great Britain in an Atlantic Union. Had this fact been widely publicized and had the President made this scheme a plank in his platform as a candidate for the Presidency, it is questionable that the people would have chosen him as their President.

In addition to the President favoring an Atlantic Union, a bipartisan group of 71 House Members reintroduced the Atlantic Union Resolution on February 17, 1971.

Besides doing violence to the Constitution, an Atlantic Union would remove the power of government more distant from the people. Moreover, Atlantic Union would be a step toward world government—the ultimate in the destruction of "People Power" and the death knell to the U.S. Constitution.

The Communist International in 1936 proposed a three-step plan for bringing about world government: First, socialize the economies of all nations; second, achieve federal unions—such as Atlantic Union—of the socialized nations; second combine the regional governments into a world government of socialist states.

Clarence Streit, the Union Now leader who acclaimed President Nixon as a leader in the movement for America's entry into an Atlantic Union, proposed a similar plan when he wrote in 1941 in his book "Union Now With Britain:"

Democrats cannot . . . quarrel with Soviet Russia or any other nation because of its economic collectivism, for democracy itself introduced the idea of collective machinery into politics. It is a profound mistake to identify democracy and Union necessarily or entirely with either capitalist or socialist society, with either the method or individual or collective enterprise. There is room for both of these methods in democracy. . . .

Democracy not only allows mankind to choose freely between capitalism and collectivism, but it includes marxist governments, parties and press as well as laissez-faire governments, parties and press, and plenty of gradations in between. . . .

In his state of the Union message, President Nixon called for returning power to the people when he said:

I have faith in people. I trust the judgment of people. Let us give the people of America a chance, a bigger voice in deciding for themselves those questions that so greatly affect their lives.

Participation in an Atlantic Union would but take power out of the hands of the people at the local level. The greatest instrument for "people power" ever devised is the U.S. Constitution.

Our Founding Fathers, representing the Thirteen Original States, established the Federal agency. They made a contract which committed the people in the States to certain obligations, delegated certain specific powers to the Federal Government, and bound today the Federal agency by certain restrictions. We need to be reminded that the Federal Government is the creature of the sovereign States and not vice versa. Say, the tail is wagging the dog.

If power is to be restored to the people, the States must regain their original powers. We of the Congress can make a good start in this direction by restoring to the people power over their money by returning ownership and control of the Federal Reserve banks to the elected representatives of the people—the Congress—and by returning power to the people over taxes by so revamping the tax structure that States and local governments keep a much larger share of the tax money at the State and local levels.

I urge all of my colleagues to give early consideration to three measures which I have introduced so as to restore power to the people over money, taxes, and war. H.R. 351, my "people power over money" bill, would vest in the Government of the United States the full, absolute, complete, and unconditional ownership of the 12 Federal Reserve banks; House Joint Resolution 23, my "people power over taxes" bill proposes an amendment to the Constitution to abolish personal income, estate, and gift taxes and prohibits the U.S. Government from engaging in business in competition with its citizens; and House Joint Resolution 535, my "people power over war" bill proposes an amendment to the Constitution for a referendum on war. The text of the three bills follows:

H.R. 351

A bill to vest in the Government of the United States the full, absolute complete, and unconditional ownership of the twelve Federal Reserve banks

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States is hereby authorized and directed forthwith to purchase the capital stock of the twelve Federal Reserve banks and branches, and agencies thereof, and to pay to the owners thereof the par value of such stock at the date of purchase.

(b) All member banks of the Federal Reserve System are hereby required and directed to deliver forthwith to the Treasurer of the United States, by the execution and delivery of such documents as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, all the stock of said Federal Reserve banks owned or controlled by them, together with all claims of any kind or nature in and to the capital assets of the said Federal Reserve banks, it being the intention of this Act to

vest in the Government of the United States the absolute, complete, and unconditional ownership of the said Federal Reserve banks.

(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any funds not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

H. J. RES. 23

Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to abolishing personal income, estate, and gift taxes and prohibiting the United States Government from engaging in business in competition with its citizens

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States.

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The Government of the United States shall not engage in any business, professional, commercial, financial or industrial enterprise except as specified in the Constitution.

"Sec. 2. The constitution or laws of any State, or the laws of the United States, shall not be subject to the terms of any foreign or domestic agreement which would abrogate this amendment.

"Sec. 3. The activities of the United States Government which violate the intent and purposes of this amendment shall, within a period of three years from the date of the ratification of this amendment, be liquidated and the properties and facilities affected shall be sold.

"Sec. 4. Three years after the ratification of this amendment the sixteenth article of amendments to the Constitution of the United States shall stand repealed and thereafter Congress shall not levy taxes on personal incomes, estates, and/or gifts."

H.J. RES. 535

JOINT RESOLUTION

Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States for a referendum on war

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, to be valid only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years after the date of final passage of this joint resolution:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. Except in case of attack by armed forces, actual or immediately threatened, upon the United States or its territorial possessions, or by any non-American nation against any country in the Western Hemisphere, the people shall have the sole power by a national referendum to declare war or to engage in warfare overseas.

"Sec. 2. Congress shall have the power to carry out this article by appropriate legislation."

If the Congress fails to act on these measures, then it is incumbent upon the States to act to protect themselves and their people against infractions of the constitutional contract by their agent, the Federal Government.

The solution to the restoration of power to the people is not an Atlantic Union but strong and vibrant State and

local governments controlled by local citizens.

I insert an article entitled "Union Now—With Europe?" written by writer Don Bell in his newsletter "Close-Up:"

UNION NOW—WITH EUROPE?

Dear American—"What an awful thought it is that if we had not lost America, or if even now we could arrange with the present members of the United States Assembly and our House of Commons, the Peace of the world is secure for all eternity. We could well hold your federal parliament five years at Washington and five years at London. The only thing possible to carry this idea out is a secret one, (a secret society) gradually absorbing the wealth of the world to be devoted to such an object . . ."—Cecil Rhodes in a letter to W. T. Stead, written in the autumn of 1890, and made public in the London "Review of Reviews" of May, 1902.

"Presentation of the Atlantic Union Pioneer Award to President Nixon by Clarence Streit, and its acceptance for him by Robert Finch, Councillor to the President, formed the major event of the 4th Biennial Convocation of the Federal Union association, held in Washington, D.C. Nov. 20-22. The Convocation began with the Award Dinner, which overflowed the Congressional Hall and also filled the Senate Room of the Statler Hilton. . . ."

So began a 1 page brief appearing on page 1 of the November-December 1970 issue of Freedom & Union, official organ of Clarence Streit's Union Now movement, now in its 25th year, and apparently more powerful now than ever before. In presenting the award, Streit closed his address with these words:

"And so we Federal Unionists are proud to be the first to hail Richard M. Nixon as an Atlantic Union Pioneer, for his trail blazing toward it through 18 years before he became President. We are confident that as President he will not re-enact the past but grow in stature as do the giants that create 'man's vast future.'

"We regret deeply that his heavy schedule does not permit us to honor him in person, but happy that he has chosen his closest adviser to be his alter ego tonight, Mr. Finch, if you will please approach, I would like to give you, for him, our Atlantic Union Pioneer Award, after reading its inscription:

Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States.

Far-seeing Senator, he Cosponsored in 1951 the Original Atlantic Union Resolution.

As Vice-President, his Bold Action Led to the 1962 Atlantic Convention in Paris.

Alone among Presidential Aspirants, he Wrote the 1966 House Hearing, Urging a Stronger Bill—Still Pending—With these Words that History Will Remember:

"The United States should be a Main Force' for a 'Federation of Free Atlantic Nations. . . . In the Age of the Rocket, Dreams become Reality with a Speed Difficult to Imagine. The Atlantic Union Resolution . . . a Forward-looking Proposal . . . Acknowledges the . . . Incredible Change Going on Around Us. I Urge its Adoption.'"

Now—before Nixon sells us out and steers us into the first channel leading to the Open Sea of World Government, let us review the strange course our Ship of State has been directed into taking:

Atlantic Union is the name being used by a group of Internationalists who would substitute regional interdependence for our present federal independence, through the process of merging our Nation into a federation of North Atlantic Nations, thereby creating a Regional World Government.

Neither the idea nor the name is new. On page 98 of Catherine Palfrey Baldwin's book *And Men Wept*, we read:

"The Atlantic Union was established in 1897 through the aid of Sir Walter Besant

and later amalgamated with the English Speaking Union. . . . (An article in the London Times, July 4, 1919) further states that the occasion of the foundation was the attempted seizure of the German fleet during the Spanish American War, when the British came to the assistance of the threatened Americans and the Germans withdrew. (They forgot to mention that Winston Churchill joined the Spanish forces and fired on the Americans.) The Atlantic Union was the pioneer of hospitality in London to English speaking visitors . . . and it sowed many seeds of friendship and good-will which have played no small part in bringing our people together."

Winston Churchill, mentioned parenthetically in the above, was quick to propose common citizenship with the French at the time of the Dunkerque evacuation. He also spoke up in favor of a United Europe, though he did not propose to surrender British leadership of such a regional government. Then, he came to the United States and in a speech at Fulton, Missouri on March 6, 1946, which is chiefly remembered because of his use of the term "Iron Curtain," Churchill called for "Joint Anglo-American military and naval administration and even for a common citizenship." Again three days later at Richmond, Virginia, according to the New York Times, he said "he was the unofficial but earnest bearer of a message from his people to ours a simple message, but one which he thinks we can both understand. 'It is that we should stand together.'" This, said the Times, "would amount to an Anglo-American military union which would mean, and has been objected to, as one that would not only bind us to fight for the English Speaking peoples but for any part of the Empire already restive under British control."

In this speech (we're quoting from the Times) "that it was the destiny and the Will of God that 200,000,000 Americans and Britons in the world should follow a common path." (Destiny and the Will of God brings to mind the British-Israel Message).

Meanwhile, here in the United States, the first and almost fatal epidemic of One World Movements featured the promotion of the idea of the establishment of a series of Regional Governments, preparatory to their merging into a total One World Government. And here Clarence K. Streit and his revived Atlantic Union program became popular indeed. His book *Union Now*, published in 1939, according to the Gallup Poll "won 2,000,000 supporters in less than a year." His second book *Union Now With Britain* became even more popular.

Clarence Kirshman Streit, Rhodes Scholar, calls his organization Federal Union, Inc., but in March, 1949, he set up a political action unit called the Atlantic Union Committee. It is this same Atlantic Union Committee which, last November 20, honored President Richard M. Nixon with its Atlantic Union Pioneer Award.

In commenting on Streit and other Atlantic Union and Union Now With Britain advocates, Joseph Kemp made the following classical—or should we say historical—remark:

"On October 7, 1780, only 18 months after George Washington took the oath of office as the first President of the United States, the first advocate of Union Now wrote: 'I am now led to devote my life to the reunion of the British Empire.' The man who expressed those sentiments in London, in 1780, was Benedict Arnold!"

The man who promotes those same sentiments today, is honored; not accused of treason or sedition, but permitted to praise the President of the United States because the latter also promotes a scheme to reunite the United States with the British Empire.

In praise of Richard M. Nixon, Clarence

Kirshman Streit said, in part, on the night of November 20, 1970:

"Now let me explain how we measure the pioneering that we find worthy of our Atlantic Union Pioneer Award. We measure it by comparing the recipient's pioneering to the record of his peers . . . and the peers of Richard Nixon are Presidents of the United States and the heads of other major Atlantic democracies. It happens that I have known all five of his predecessors since our movement began in 1939—Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson . . . I have discussed Atlantic Union, and the proposed convention to explore it, with each of them orally and/or in writing. . . . All had the opportunity to pioneer for Atlantic Union to the degree that President Nixon has already done. All had the opportunity that he still has, to become the George Washington of this greater Union of the Free by bringing it about . . .

"Yet none (of them) went nearly as far in blazing this trail as Richard Nixon has already done. All let this opportunity to pioneer slip through their fingers when it was in their powerful hands. . . . Why and how did they lose this opportunity? . . . Tonight I would say only that each let slip his opportunity for one or more of these reasons: 1) lack of faith in his powers of persuasion, and in the powers of understanding of the American people; 2) over-cautious advisors who thought it more important to protect him from tomorrow's difficulties than at the bar of History; and 3) the reason General Eisenhower sadly gave at Gettysburg to Atlantic Unionist friends on at least two occasions—in substance, this: 'The great difficulty at the White House is that the urgent—the day-to-day problem—is always crowding out the important.'

"Against this background, let us now look at the pioneering President Nixon had already done before he reached the White House. . . . Mr. Finch reminded me tonight that it really started . . . in 1947, when Mr. Nixon was a freshman Congressman on the Herter Marshall Plan committee. . . . (Streit then explains how Nixon cosponsored with Senator Kefauver in 1950, the Atlantic Union Resolution—Ed.)

"In the 19 years since then, I have often—when I heard Mr. Nixon called an 'opportunist' and worse—told with good effect that story and its sequel; facts such as these: During the 1952 campaign the most powerful isolationist daily paper tried to get him, as candidate for Vice President, to disown the Atlantic Resolution but he stuck to it. . . . In 1960 the Senate Foreign Relations Committee reported to the Floor a weaker version of the resolution. . . . To make sure it would get on the Senate calendar, Elmo Roper, then President of the Atlantic Union Committee, went to see both Vice President Nixon and the Majority Leader, Senator Lyndon Johnson, the same morning, separately . . . he found the Vice President much more forthright and cooperative than Senator Johnson. Elmo, an ardent New Dealer Democrat, spoke of Vice President Nixon with an enthusiasm that surprised me. . . . Elmo added, in substance: 'If I had to choose between Nixon and Johnson for President on the basis of my experience today, I'd vote for Nixon without hesitation.' If my memory does not fail me, he did vote for him that November. . . .

" . . . later he won the nomination for President—immediately after an agreement with another leading candidate, Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller, who had long been favorable to our case, and gained our Atlantic Union Pioneer Award in 1964. Point 2 of that Nixon-Rockefeller agreement of July 23, 1960 reads:

"The vital need of our foreign policy is new creativity, leading and inspiring the formation of all great regions of the world of confederations large enough to meet modern

problems and challenges. We should promptly lead toward the formation of such confederations in the North Atlantic community and in the Western Hemisphere.' (Italics added for emphasis.)

"Invited to address the annual conference of the Society of Newspapers Editors on April 1963, Mr. Nixon used the occasion to give a 3-point 'strategy of victory.' This time, he made its point one *the transformation of the Atlantic Alliance into a political confederation*. Here are some excerpts from t' at speech:

"There is only one solution to the problem. The U.S. must take the lead now in expanding NATO from a pure military alliance into a political confederation. . . .

"When House hearings on the (Atlantic Union) resolution were announced to begin on August 30, 1966, its supporters invited the known Presidential aspirants or possibilities to testify . . . Mr. Nixon . . . alone took the trouble to help. Here is the statement he sent on Sept. 1 to Chairman Thomas Morgan (D. Pa.) of the House Foreign Affairs Committee:

"It is fitting that the United States, the world's first truly federal government, should be a main force behind the effort to find a basis for a broad federation of free Atlantic nations. Although the accomplishment of the ultimate goal of the Resolution may well be impossible to attain for many years, recent events of history and numerous scientific and technological advances of the past 20 years point the way in this direction . . . the dialogue which this (Atlantic Union) Resolution contemplates will provide a resourceful tool for coping with the problems of a world which in 20 years will have undergone even more drastic changes than have occurred since World War II. . . . To be sure, the concept of an 'Atlantica' is at present only a dream, but in the age of the rocket, dreams become reality with a speed which is difficult to imagine. The Atlantic Union Resolution is a forward-looking proposal which acknowledges the depth and breadth of incredible change which is going on in the world around us. I urge its adoption."

"How was the record of President Nixon's five predecessors . . . who, with tragic lack of faith in their fellows and themselves, merely toyed with the Atlantic Union idea . . . how was their record appears already in this regard! How hard it is even now for our grandchildren to understand them! How pallid will they become in 50 years—not to speak of the verdict of 2070! . . .

"And so we Federal Unionists are proud to be the first to hail Richard M. Nixon as an Atlantic Union Pioneer. . . ." (End of quotes from speech of Clarence Kirshman Streit.)

The Atlantic Union Resolution was reintroduced in the House of Representatives on Feb. 17, 1971 by Congressman Paul Findley, Illinois Republican. We quote from the *Congressional Record* of that date, p. 2773:

"Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago the statesman who is now President of the United States strongly urged the Congress to adopt the Atlantic Union resolution. Today virtually the same resolution is being reintroduced in the House by a bipartisan group of 71 Members from 25 States, and every region of our own Federal Union. . . . The text of the Atlantic Union resolution follows:

"Whereas, the interdependence of the nations of the Atlantic Community has steadily grown with the increased mobility of capital and goods, while the revolutionizing speed of science, technological advances has outstripped the North Atlantic Treaty and made it necessary to forge new bonds to maintain the unity of these nations, so essential to international prosperity, peace and freedom;

"Whereas, the defense of the nations of the Atlantic Community against not only war but monetary crash and depression continues to be a mutual concern;

"Whereas, the citizens of these free na-

tions are already united also by a common devotion to democratic traditions and the rule of law;

"Whereas, this common heritage enables and requires them, when facing such challenges as those now confronting them, to meet and explore together how best to enlarge and extend the rule of law so to provide for effective democratic government and regulation of their common concerns;

"Whereas, our Original States, when beset by divisive dangers under their Articles of Confederation, sent delegates to the 1787 Convention, who traced the trouble to the confederal structure and to replace it invented the federal system, which has effectively safeguarded member States from domination by one another, equitably apportioned among their sovereign citizens voting power on common concerns, assured each State of independent government of State affairs, met other challenges like those now facing the Atlantic allies and not merely worked but proved that free people can thus work marvels;

"Whereas, a joining together for such purposes of the democratic nations of the Atlantic Community to create an Atlantic Union within the framework of the United Nations would reduce the cost of the common defense, provide a stable currency for world trade, facilitate commerce of all kinds, enhance the welfare of the people of the member nations, and increase their capacity to aid the people of developing nations: Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That (1) The Congress hereby creates an Atlantic Union delegation, composed of eighteen eminent citizens and authorized to organize and participate in a convention made up of similar delegations from such North Atlantic Treaty allies as desire to join in its enterprise, to explore the possibility of agreement on:

(a) A declaration that the goal of their peoples is to transform their present alliance into a federal union;

(b) A timetable for the transition to this goal; and

(c) Democratic institutions to expedite the necessary stages and achieve the objective in time to save their citizens from another war or depression, and let them enjoy, as soon as possible, the greater freedom and higher moral and material blessings which federation has brought free people in the past;

(2) The convention's recommendations shall be submitted to the Congress for action (by constitutional procedure)

(The remainder of this resolution deals with the manner of selecting delegates, etc., and need not be reprinted here—Ed.)"

Lest you be deceived, we offer two quotations which will explain exactly what Atlantic Union is all about:

In 1936 the Communist International formally presented its 3-stage program for achieving world government: 1) socialize the economies of all nations; 2) bring about federal unions of various groupings of these socialized nations; 3) amalgamate the regional unions into a world union of socialist states. The following passage is from the official program of the 1936 Communist International: . . . dictatorship can be established only

by a victory of socialism in different countries or groups of countries, after which the proletariat republics would unite on federal lines with those already in existence, and the system of federal unions would expand . . . at length forming the World Union of Socialist Soviet Republics.

Clarence Streit, a Fabian-approved Rhodes Scholar, not only proposes the same plan—though in somewhat different words—but he also wrote in 1941, on page 192 of his book *Union Now With Britain*, the following:

Democrats cannot . . . quarrel with Soviet Russia or any other nation because of its eco-

conomic collectivism, for democracy itself introduced the idea of collective machinery into politics. It is a profound mistake to identify democracy and Union necessarily or entirely with either capitalist or socialist society, with either the method of individual or collective enterprise. There is room for both of these methods in democracy. . . .

Democracy not only allows mankind to choose freely between capitalism and collectivism, but it includes marxist governments, parties and press as well as laissez-faire governments, parties and press, and plenty of gradations in between. . . .

Unless Americans awaken and act—quickly—we shall surely have World Government. The only question: will it come upon us through persuasion, or by coercion?

DR. JAMES A. LEWIS RETIRES

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join those who are honoring Dr. James A. Lewis upon his retirement as professor of education at the University of Michigan after 17 years. Few people have contributed so much over the years in the way of innovation and creativity as Jim Lewis. At this time, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the recent resolution passed by the Michigan State Legislature attesting to the high esteem and best wishes of all Michiganders for Dr. Lewis:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. 93,
MICHIGAN LEGISLATURE

Offered by Representatives Smart, McColough, Pilch and Senator Bursley.

A concurrent resolution honoring Dr. James A. Lewis upon his retirement as professor of education at the University of Michigan.

Whereas, Dr. James A. Lewis has announced his retirement after some seventeen years during which he has given distinguished and devoted service to the University of Michigan, first as Director of the Bureau of School Services in 1954, then as Vice-President for Student Affairs from 1954 to 1965, and finally as Professor of Education; and

Whereas, Dr. Lewis' departure will be sorely felt, not only by his University colleagues and students, but by all those persons in professional circles throughout the State who have become familiar with the excellence of his work and who have come to value his academic leadership and guidance; and

Whereas, A native of Owosso, Michigan, James Lewis received most of his education in Michigan. After attending Michigan State University, he received a Bachelor of Arts degree from Central Michigan University in 1930, a Master of Arts degree from the University of Michigan in 1937, and subsequently a Doctor of Education degree from Harvard University in 1955; and

Whereas, Dr. Lewis also gained his considerable public school experience in Michigan public schools, having held teaching and administrative posts in Cass City, Dowagiac and St. Joseph before becoming an instructor at Western Michigan University in 1949. He also was Superintendent of the Dearborn Public Schools from 1948 to 1954; and

Whereas, Many honors have accrued to Dr. Lewis. The recipient of honorary degrees from Central Michigan University and Cleary College, he also has received the Michigan High

School Coaches Association Award. Dr. Lewis has been a member of many advisory committees and educational associations and has served as President of the Metropolitan Detroit Administrators Association and as Vice-President of the Michigan Association of School Administrators; now therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That by all present the highest tribute and warmest best wishes be extended to Dr. James A. Lewis of the University of Michigan as he concludes over four decades of dedicated work in education; and be it further.

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to Dr. Lewis, as testimony to the high esteem of the Michigan Legislature.

Adopted by the House April 6, 1971.

Adopted by the Senate April 7, 1971.

Attest:

T. THOS THATCHER,

Clerk of the House of Representatives.

BERYL I. KENYON,

Secretary of the Senate.

MALCOLM MUGGERIDGE COINS
NEW WORD, "NEWZAK"

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, one of the great speeches that I have heard in recent years was made by Malcolm Muggeridge, a former editor of *Punch*, the famous British magazine of humor. He has sprinkled some of that humor in this speech but he has also said much that ought to be heard. His creation of the word, "newzak" is something to be remembered. His observations with reference to television are very worthwhile. I am sure my colleagues will be glad to read this very pungent and creative speech which follows:

[From the Sunday Star, April 18, 1971]

ON THE TRANSFORMATION OF NEWS INTO
"NEWZAK"

(By Malcolm Muggeridge)

It is a special pleasure to me to be addressing this particular company in this particular place. Something like a quarter of a century ago, I worked in Washington as the correspondent of a London newspaper—the *Daily Telegraph*. Thus, most of the newspapers you represent are familiar to me, if only as names seen through frosted-glass darkly in the National Press Building on the way down from a visit to the top floor. It was the most lively stint of news-gathering in which I have ever been engaged. Subsequently, I drifted into editorial functions of one sort and another, and then into becoming a free-lance writer and knockabout television man, temperamentally preferring, as I once put it, the hazards of street-walking to the security, such as it is, provided by one or other of the licensed houses.

Incidentally, of the licensed houses with which I have been connected, far the most exacting, in terms of curious tastes to be catered for and clients to be placated, was *Punch*, an ostensibly humorous magazine I edited for a few years. Trying to be funny about what goes on in the world and those who conduct its affairs, gave me the feeling, which I have never been able to shake off, that the originals are infinitely more derisive than anything one can invent. So that even today I can never open the *New Yorker* without a sigh or the *New York Times* without a smile. Indeed, the two seem to me to be

mirror images of one another. I feel quite sure that no one would notice if the mighty waters of the *Times* were to be channelled into these tiny rivulets of copy which wend their way through the lush pastures of *New Yorker* advertising. Or vice versa.

I spoke of news-gathering in Washington, but really, you know, in those days it was more a case of selecting from the superabundance which just fell in one's lap. My office was a rather small one, with two-ticker-tapes hard at work in it. If I happened to leave it even for an hour or so, I could scarcely get the door open for the pile of yellow paper accumulated there, into which I had to dive to pull out the one or two nuggets conceivably of interest to readers of the *Daily Telegraph*. Then there were the trudges up Massachusetts Avenue to the British Embassy, presided over by a bizarre figure called Lord Inverchapel, or up the Hill, were—to speak of long-forgotten, not to say spent, things—the British Loan hearings were moving along their serpentine and interminable way. Or to the State Department, then still in the old Executive Mansion before its transfer to Foggy Bottom. Or to the White House under the genial rule of President Truman and his public relations man, Charlie Ross.

BUSY WIRES

News, I have always contended, like beauty, is in the eye of the beholder, and somehow we managed to keep the wires across the Atlantic busy. The newspapers here were a great help, despite the difficulty they presented, especially on Sundays, in actually man-handling them. I worked out once that it took something like 420 acres of forest land to provide the newsprint for a bumper Sunday issue; staggering under the weight of several of them on my way to my office on a Sunday morning, I used to see in my mind's eye the wide expanse of trees against a grim Norwegian or Finnish sky which had been hewn down to provide my load.

Of all the contributors, I found Scotty Reston far the most serviceable. I've used him as "a source close to the White House," as "a high State Department official," or just as "usually well-informed." Thus attributed, one could whisk off some of his more sagacious and prescient sentences to London, where, with a bit of luck, particularly in the somnolence of a Sunday evening, someone would whisk them back to Washington. It was a kind of trans-Atlantic tennis which hurt no one, and greatly enriched Western Union and Marconi.

Then there were the requests from London for public reactions to something that had happened. Every trade has its own special fatuities, and this belongs to ours—the assumption that in the back streets of Detroit, in the cotton fields of Alabama, across the wide plains of Montana, brave men grow pale and mothers clutch their babies to their breasts at the news that, in Whitehall, Mr. So-and-so has been moved from the Department of Civil Aviation to Agriculture and Fisheries.

My first experience of the genre was in Moscow in the early thirties when I was briefly standing in for one of the wire-service men. A request came in for the reactions of the Russian toiling masses to the lavish scale of entertaining at Soviet embassies abroad. Knowing that there was no possibility, then as now, of discovering anyone's reaction to anything in that weird capital, I decided to chance my arm, and cabled back that the most noticeable reaction was a strong desire on the part of the toiling masses to get nearest the buffet. It must have been almost the only entirely truthful sentence ever to be cabled from Moscow, and doubtless for that very reason remained, to the best of my knowledge, unprinted and unsung, possibly, even, unsent.

Some thirty years later, almost the precisely converse situation arose in Chicago,

where I happened to be with a BBC camera crew on the day Harold Wilson became Prime Minister for the first time. The BBC cabled me to test the reaction of the man-in-the-street to this momentous event. What we call in the trade a Vox Pop operation. So, I stationed myself in Michigan Avenue outside the Tribune Building with a microphone in my hand and asked passersby what they thought about our new Prime Minister. To my inordinate delight, no one I stopped had ever heard of Harold Wilson, or even that a General Election had been taking place in England. Their delectable indifference was given an added visual point because, high up above where we were standing, there was one of those arrangements whereby racing fiery letters spell out news-flashes. Every few minutes they spelt out: Douglas-Hume Resigns; Harold Wilson New British Premier. It provided a superb background to cut to.

HANDIER METHOD

In Washington, I may add, I discovered a handier method of uncovering non-existent reactions. The editor of the Washington Post at that time was a delightful Yorkshireman who permitted me, once in a way, to contribute a small editorial piece myself to his columns on some topic thought to be of world-shaking importance on the other side of the Atlantic but for some reason unnoticed on this one. Then I could quote from my own editorial, press a sentence or two from it upon Reuters, and honor was satisfied; the preoccupation of the Old World had been duly taken account of in the New.

There was also, of course, the White House Press Conference; quite a gala occasion in those days, I can tell you. Why, it was no uncommon thing for one of the reporters to break a leg or otherwise suffer physical injury, so ardent was he to get his story off. Sometimes, too, it was possible to use the conference, not just for getting news, but for making news as well. How well I remember sitting with some colleagues and languidly turning over the pages of a long turgid speech by Henry Wallace—then Secretary for Agriculture—taken from a great pile of similar discourses available in the Press Club. The speech, we noticed, contained some decidedly curious observations on American foreign policy, and just for the fun of it, it was arranged that the President should be asked at his press conference whether he agreed with it.

Mr. Truman's attitude, as it turned out, to Mr. Wallace's speeches—and who shall blame him?—was like Dr. Johnson's to the novels of Congreve; he would sooner praise them than read them. The speech in question, he said, was admirable in manner as in content. Thereby a story of world-wide dimensions was launched which kept us busy for days afterwards.

Looked back on, those essays in journalism in the Truman years have a very faraway air about them. Such vast changes have happened in the techniques of news transmitting that they seem to belong to the days of the flatbed press and type-setting by hand. The camera has moved in and carried all before it. Increasingly, it dominates the news scene, rendering individual efforts to find and report news a very secondary, if not obsolete, proceeding. The reporter has given place to the pundit—to the considerable annoyance of, among others, Vice-President Agnew. In my young days, as a journalist, the heroic figure par excellence was the news-hawk padding about the world in search of a scoop; today, he's the Cronkite or Seavard sitting sedately in a studio with green hair and purple cheeks telling us all what everything is about.

Mr. Agnew is convinced that these universal interlocutors are, to a man, liberal, if not subversive, voices. And it is, of course, true, that the anarchic or death-washing temperament, with its built-in passion to be

on the losing side, tends to produce a more effective practitioner at the Media than the temperamental upholder of orthodoxy and the status quo. We know this well in the B.B.C., whose weird Charter, begotten by Lord Reith out of the Free Church of Scotland with the London School of Economics intervening, imposes a statutory obligation to produce what are called "balanced" programs. You'd never believe the difficulty we have in finding a suitably articulate balance on the conservative side, and how envious we are of your Bill Buckley, who seems to be capable of balancing almost anyone or anything all on his own at the drop of a hat.

In the religious department, where I've been working of late, the difficulty is even greater. To look for an articulate clergyman who believes in God, or an articulate priest who supports celibacy and *Humanae Vitae* is as unrewarding a quest as searching for vegetarians in the Worshipful Company of Butchers. No, what Mr. Agnew is actually complaining about, if he only knew it, is the camera itself; the most easily manipulated and plausible instrument for deceiving our fellows ever to be devised. "The eye is the window of the soul; the camera an iron shutter," Kafka wrote. Blake made the same point more mellifluously long before photography was invented:

*This Life's dim "Windows of the Soul
Distorts the Heavens from Pole to Pole
And Leads you to Believe a Lie
When you see with, not thro', the Eye."*

The camera is essentially for seeing with, not through. And what a multitude of lies it has induced belief in! What a world of fantasy created in which we all live! Like Caliban's Island, full of sounds and sweet airs, so that when we wake—if we ever do—we cry to sleep again. The fantasy of all our hopes and desires—love found in a cigarette, beauty in a jar, peace in a capsule, joy in a brassiere and fulfilment in an automobile. The fantasy of violence—was it the Vietnam War, or someone being assassinated, or just another episode in "The Saint"? Finally, the fantasy of news itself, becoming a sort of "Newzak," a melange of different stories as Muzak is of different tunes, drolling away in a motorist's ear as he speeds along the motorways from nowhere to nowhere, or assailing a viewer's sleepy eye as he surveys the evening's offerings in his tiny screen.

PRESS CONFERENCES

One may form some idea of how the process from news into Newzak works by noting what has happened to the White House Press Conference as a result of the intrusion of the cameras: developed, like numerous other dubious innovations, during the Kennedy regime. Whereas before the proceedings were characterized by a certain informality and spontaneity, now they have to be a set piece; both the President and his questioners cannot but be conscious that they are under millions of eyes, and react accordingly. As a set piece, any possibility of an unexpected and unrehearsed story emerging can be ruled out. The cameras impose on their subjects the rigidity of a wax-works ensemble; under their aegis, the world becomes a sort of universal Madame Tussaud's Exhibition. I doubt very much whether any reporter nowadays would think it worthwhile to risk breaking a leg in his eagerness to get to the telephone first with a story that the whole population will be gooping at before the day is out.

There is quite a strong pressure in England, as I imagine there is here, to get the Legislature likewise on television. This if it happen (as it well may) would finally fulfill de Tocqueville's gloomy prophecies about the outcome of universal-suffrage democracy. He correctly foresaw the growing fraudulence of the system as the franchise was extended; the nightmare prospect of the voters actually

seeing their representatives deliberating upon their affairs was something he was mercifully spared.

A foretaste of what is likely to happen may be glimpsed at Canberra, Australia, where the proceedings of the Federal Parliament are regularly broadcast on radio. As the evening peak-listening time approaches, one may observe Honourable Members gathering around the microphones, into which they shout messages to their constituents and other ribaldries. How they would behave if their precious images as well as their words were being transmitted, I prefer not even to speculate.

The last time I was in New York I happened to catch a glimpse of Newark at the production end. I was walking back to my hotel, and came upon a little group of people standing about in the road. It was, in fact, a demo. There were the usual bearded academics and lib-females carrying slogans, a little group of police with a van, and one or two reporters. Nothing seemed to be happening, and when I asked why I was told that the cameras hadn't turned up. Shortly afterwards they arrived and set up; someone snapped a clapper-board and shouted Action! and the demo slogan began. The bearded academics and lib-females raised their slogans and shouted in unison; the police grabbed one or two of them and pitched them in their van. Then someone shouted Cut! and it was all over. Later in the evening I caught the demo on television in my hotel room. It looked fine.

RUBIN ON TV

We were visited the other day in London by one of your citizens named Rubin; also a product of the groves of academe, who signalized his presence among us by shouting obscenities on television and aiming a water-pistol at David Frost, the compere of the show, in its way quite a laudable enterprise. What impressed me about him, however, was not so much this performance—which is fairly routine by now—as the understanding he showed of how television works. "Television," he observes, "creates myths bigger than reality. . . . The medium does not report news; it creates it. An event happens when it goes on television and becomes myth." "The way to understand television," he goes on, "is to shut off the sound. No one remembers any words they hear; the mind is a technicolor movie of images, not words. . . . The pictures are the story."

This, unfortunately, is all quite true, and we who still traffic in words seem to be fighting a losing battle. In London the newspaper business is in the doldrums. It will not be surprising if, quite soon, the same state of affairs prevails there as in New York—one obnoxious tabloid (which probably won't be the Mirror) and one long-winded "serious" newspaper (which probably won't be the Times). Fantasy, as it seems to me, is taking over, and fantasy represents a far greater danger to what is called civilization than other, more ostensibly, destructive forces. In the past, civilizations have been destroyed by outside barbarians moving in; in fantasy, as Mr. Rubin clearly sees, we create, support and humor our own barbarians, dreaming up our own death-wish in the minds of our own soi-disant intelligentsia.

Must we, then, resign ourselves to this world of fantasy? Occasionally blowing our tops with Mr. Agnew when we note that, in it, our enemies always seem to come off best, and the forces of dissolution, as Mr. Rubin sees so clearly and gleefully, get all the play. Otherwise meekly submitting.

I do not think so. At the beginning of our era, in the days of the Emperor Nero, fantasy was pretty strong. If there was no television, there were the games, which in many respects fulfilled the same function; providing a spectacle of vicarious violence and eroticism to which the Roman public became addicted. Yet it was in these circumstances that the

Apostle Paul took the great moral propositions of the New Testament to the pagan world, in the process founding Christendom and the civilization whose inheritors, and perhaps liquidators, we are. It is often forgotten that it was this very Paul, not Henry Ford or Henry Luce, or Dr. Timothy Leary, or even Hugh Hefner, who was our civilization's founding father.

In the Dark Ages that followed, what were then called barbarians, but what we in our 1984-style double-think are invited to regard as forces of progress and enlightenment, tore the civilized world to pieces. Yet in Hyppo, in North Africa, a St. Augustine, in total disregard of these calamities, continued to propound his Christian faith with a charm and elegance which survive to this day to delight us. Or—to take a more homely, but to me infinitely sympathetic, prototype—a Paulinus could decide that, yes, the darkness must fall, but not forever. And he would signify his faith in the return of light by keeping a little lamp burning in one Christian shrine.

BREAKDOWN

His faith, as we know, was amply justified; the light did shine again, most splendidly. I think often of these men, living in circumstances in some respects uncannily like ours, and wonder whether another Dark Ages awaits us; whether, indeed, it has already come. In terms of power, military, economic and technological, the only possible counterpoise lies here in America. You have the means to go to the moon, and explore and perhaps colonize the universe; the resources to blow the human race and our little earth to smithereens, and to produce in virtually unlimited quantities all the necessities of mankind. Will the verdict of history be that no nation ever commanded so great a preponderance of power, or used it to so little effect?

I don't know. Of one thing, however, I feel sure. What is happening throughout the world today is, in one form or another, a breakdown of order. This applies just as much in the Communist countries as elsewhere, though the iron frame of dictatorship still serves to disguise the fact in their case. All order depends, ultimately, on a sense of moral order, which for us in the West means the Christian religion. If this has gone, then all other forms of order—political, economic, social, what you will—have likewise gone with it, and the curtain falls at last inexorably on Christendom's two thousand years. Nor will any academic or other investigation, taking of sample opinions, counting of genes or planning of families or yelling of slogans—nothing of that sort—reverse the position. Our articles of association are set forth in the New Testament, and if that is no longer valid, the association is automatically dissolved.

It is in the nature of our trade to live in the passing moment. Yesterday's papers are for pulping or wrapping fish; tomorrow's are still empty dummies, the video tape is wiped to record another story. I like this in a way it delivers one from much undue campus or faculty solemnity and pretentiousness. Swinburne used to say that he looked forward to the day when the last king would be strangled in the entrails of the last priest; I similarly should like to live to see the last sociologist fed into the last computer. Even so, I must confess that, now I am old, I look back on all the yelling down telephones, the frenzied tapping out of words, the rushing to the stone with some last minute sensation, yet another version of Shakespeare's tale told by an Idiot, full of sound and fury and signifying nothing. I doubt if I shall ever again address so large and eminent a gathering of fellow-journalists, and, like an old super-annuated clown on his last benefit performance, I should like to say something serious. Just that, over the years, looking, not very as-

siduously or systematically, but always looking, looking, for a light in a dark time, the only one I have found shone first in Galilee.

THE CLEAR-CUTTING CONTROVERSY

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing controversy over the forest management practice of clear cutting. Certainly, there are many timber areas in this country where clear cutting is not a wise approach, and a moratorium on the practice may well be in order. On the other hand, there are also areas, such as the Douglas-fir country of Oregon, where clear cutting is undoubtedly the soundest conservation practice in forest management. As the debate develops, we should make all views available for public consumption, and I submit the following editorial from the April 7, 1971, Oregon Journal of Portland, Oreg., in that spirit:

LAWMAKERS NOT SILVICULTURISTS

A proposal by Sen. Gale McGee, D-Wyo., that clearcutting in national forests be banned for two years is a knee-jerk reaction to a few timber harvest mistakes. It could have devastating impact in the Pacific Northwest.

McGee's intention to introduce such a bill was revealed at a Senate Public Lands subcommittee hearing on clearcutting subject of a growing controversy.

The Wyoming senator is responding to what he regards as a "spectacular tragedy" in timber cutting in the Jim Bridger National Forest. Similar complaints have been made about clearcutting in West Virginia.

What must concern Oregon is that clearcutting or some modification of it is essential to good silviculture in the Douglas fir forests which abound in this state. (Clearcutting and acceptable variations of it are discussed in an article elsewhere on this page.)

A politically motivated decision that could veto the judgment of foresters trained to manage timber in the interest of the general public as well as in the interest of the timber economy might produce a depression in this state equal to that in the Seattle area. And it might in fact jeopardize good silviculture practices, to the detriment of the long-term health of the forests.

The key point is that no single policy dictated by an act of Congress could be made to apply intelligently to all regions, since the growing conditions in different parts of the country and the harvest requirements of various tree species are so different.

Western Oregon is one of the best growing regions in the world for Douglas fir. Beautiful new forests are thriving on countless acres once cut over. Members of Congress who will be acting on the McGee proposal ought to drive the forest wayside tour which takes off from Scappoose and winds over hills and valleys to Astoria. This land, once completely cut over, is rich with growing timber.

In many parts of the country, including Wyoming, what constitutes good silviculture here may not apply. Different parts of Oregon require different practices.

The Forest Service is sensitive to public pressure. It is making changes in its own practices as a result of rising environmental concerns. Congress has already set broad

policy guidelines with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, which the Forest Service in this region is already following.

But Congress has no business trying to decide harvest methods which simply cannot be put in a pattern suitable to all regions and all species.

TRIBUTE TO JOEL CARLSON, SOUTH AFRICA'S LEADING POLITICAL LAWYER

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, Joel Carlson has been one of the few brave voices in South Africa speaking out and acting against the repugnant apartheid system and the erosion of the rule of law. As South Africa's leading political lawyer, Mr. Carlson defended many prisoners accused under South Africa's repressive Terrorism Act and similar legislation. He exposed torture in the prisons although none of the 100 cases of torture he brought to court were successful.

Increasingly, he, his family, and his staff were harassed, intimidated and physically threatened, and he faced probable arrest himself by the security police. His passport was removed in 1969 for defending the family of a prisoner who died after electric-shock torture.

Mr. Carlson felt that his effectiveness as a lawyer was severely diminished by these incidents. Last week, he renounced his South African citizenship and left the country with a British passport to which he was entitled by birth. Now in seclusion in England, Mr. Carlson expects to come to the United States shortly to assume a law lectureship at New York University.

Mr. Carlson is a man of infinite courage, of principle and commitment. I salute him for the difficult decision he has made. At this point, I insert in the RECORD an editorial on this subject from the New York Times and a descriptive piece on Mr. Carlson's activities by Colin Legum from the London Observer:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 15, 1971]

CASUALTY OF APARTHEID

High on any list of those meriting the thanks of people of goodwill everywhere are the small company of white South Africans who defy heavy odds to resist the evils spawned by apartheid. For years one of these has been Joel Carlson, a young Johannesburg lawyer who scored notable victories for justice for black Africans even when confronted by such legal monstrosities as the Terrorism Act.

His case last year in behalf of twenty-two Africans accused, under the Suppression of Communism Act, of plotting to overturn white rule was so effective that the prosecution abruptly dropped the charges. When the Africans were rearrested under the Terrorism Act even before they could leave the court, Mr. Carlson resumed the fight and won an acquittal in the Supreme Court.

Mr. Carlson's skill in defending Africans and exposing police barbarism got him into deep trouble. The Government lifted his passport without explanation. He was assailed as the "terrorist lawyer." A bomb was

thrown into his study and he found another in a book mailed to him. His car and office were shot up. Police "investigated" but failed to turn up anything.

Last year Mr. Carlson warned University of Witwatersrand students of the "hard and long struggle" against injustice in South Africa. "a struggle in which you may not see results." That struggle now must go on without Mr. Carlson. The police had harassed his law office staff to the point where it was obvious he was facing arrest himself, probably under the Terrorism Act. He was able to obtain a British passport and fly to London. "I found it impossible to continue within the borders they set," he said. It seems doubtful that any South African whites will find it possible to work within those narrowing boundaries with anything approaching the effectiveness of Joel Carlson.

[From the London Observer, Apr. 11, 1971]

TORTURE LAWYER AT KENT HIDEOUT

(By Colin Legum)

JOEL CARLSON, South Africa's leading political lawyer, has temporarily taken refuge in a Kent village after quietly slipping out of Johannesburg last Monday, having renounced his citizenship in favour of a British passport, to which he is entitled by birth.

Speaking for the first time yesterday about the reasons for his sudden decision to leave—he did not dare even to tell his wife until an hour before his departure—Joel Carlson said: 'I could have gone on taking it if it were only myself who was involved. But there comes a time when the strain begins to tell on one's wife and children. It was unfair to expect them to continue leading the kind of life which my work was forcing on my family.'

'To continue with my work was being made impossible,' said Carlson. 'I was becoming like leprosy to all my contacts; no sooner did I or my family visit anybody than they in turn were visited by the security police.'

He was no longer able to interview his clients in privacy. 'I had taken to conducting confidential talks either by travelling up and down lifts, or by walking them up and down flights of stairs.'

He was taken in for police interrogation on several occasions, and felt that at any time he might be detained under the draconian BOSS law, which provides for indefinite detention.

'After years of this kind of life I had begun to feel that my dynamo was beginning to run down. What I now desperately need is a recharge,' he said.

Mr. Carlson and his family have been under close police surveillance and constant harassment for years. He has escaped four attempts on his life. Six months ago he narrowly avoided being blown up by a bomb only because his suspicions were aroused by the title of a book—the 'Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung'—delivered to his office with a Zambia postmark.

A fortnight earlier shots were fired into his fourth-floor office in broad daylight; this attempt followed the throwing of a Molotov cocktail into his study at home. On other occasions his car was shot up and he was physically assaulted.

In none of these cases did the police succeed in making any arrests.

Carlson's home and offices were bugged; his telephone was tapped; all his mail was opened; his staff were suborned; his family was continuously disturbed by late-night telephone calls; he received dozens of poison pen letters threatening the lives of himself and his family; and he was constantly tailed by security police.

Three years ago an old car was parked outside his house one night, and despite complaints by himself and his neighbours

the police refused to allow it to be moved it is still there.

Carlson could not leave South Africa in the normal way because his own passport, as well as those of his family were taken away in 1959 after he had appeared in court for the family of a detainee who had died in prison after electric-shock torture. But he was able to make use of a British passport which he had legally acquired.

His career as a political lawyer started in 1957 when, as a young lawyer in Government service, he first exposed the brutal conditions under which farm labourers lived in the Bethal district.

Both as lawyer and lecturer he exposed the prevalence of torture methods in South African prisons. He has presented almost 100 cases of torture to the courts; in not a single case was he successful. He still has cases which have been awaiting trial for more than a year.

There are 14 known cases of detainees dying in prison, and he says he knows of more. 'Torture in prisons,' he says, 'is standard operative procedure.' But the routine official answer to such charges is that they are 'Communist propaganda.'

He points out that 455 police were charged last year with assaults on prisoners; but although this figure was officially given in Parliament, not a single policeman was discharged from the force as a result.

In a paper delivered to the National Union of SA Students (of which he is a Vice-President), he made a careful comparative study of the erosion of law in Hitler's Germany and Vorster's South Africa. His conclusion is that 'the rule of law has been cast to the winds in South Africa.'

The Government today, he says, maintains a form of democracy only for its own supporters.

Carlson believes that the South African Government will no longer allow political trials to be held that could be used as a platform to tell the world what is going on in the country. Only trials of a political kind that can serve to show how the Republic is being threatened by 'communist and terrorist subversion,' will be held.

He is unwilling to say how he left the country in case others similarly placed may be prevented from using the loophole he found.

His wife and four children are still in Johannesburg but he expects them to join him shortly when he goes to the United States to take up a law lectureship at the Centre for International Studies, New York University.

Mr. Carlson was the lawyer for Nelson Mandela, the African leader serving a life sentence at Robben Island, and for his wife, Winnie, who was at the centre of the last political trial held in the Republic. One of his last acts was to take Winnie for a reunion with her husband on South Africa's notorious prison island.

Now 44 years old, Carlson has been involved in most of the major political trials staged in Johannesburg in the last 10 years. His reputation was such that most opponents of the Vorster regime turned to him first for their defence when they fell foul of the law.

Asked whether he did not feel some guilt about leaving the country without an outstanding lawyer to whom Africans and others could turn for help, Joel Carlson said:

'My own capacity to fulfill this role had become so limited that it is questionable whether I would be able to do much in the future. The laws as they now stand make it almost impossible to conduct a proper case for the defence. I'm glad, though, that there are some younger lawyers who are still willing to continue with this work.'

There are also extremely able people at the Bar—first-rate people who are always

ready to help. They are less exposed to direct police pressures than are the lawyers who are engaged in direct consultation with accused persons.'

Carlson enjoys a high standing in international law circles. During the trial of Laurence Gandar, editor-in-chief of the *Rand Daily Mail*, he acted as an observer for both the International Commission of Jurists and for the International Press Institute.

He is the only non-American lawyer to have been briefed by the American President's Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights. He will be one of the guest speakers at the next annual meetings of the American Society of International Lawyers.

SPEEDING AND RECKLESS DRIVING

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting the following editorials from *Car Craft* magazine and the *Washington Post* as a reminder not only to drag racers, but to drivers of any car that cars are not toys to be played with. Warnings about speeding and reckless driving are too often looked upon as jokes or nagging but with the number of highway casualties and deaths for 1970 at the unbelievably high figure of 5 million people, no one is joking. We must begin to slow down, to use caution in handling our cars, and stop killing each other.

The editorials follow:

OPINION

When someone I don't know dies, it doesn't put much of a dent in my psyche. I'm no more callous than anyone else, it's just that death is more often than not reduced into easily digestible statistics by the evening news or the morning paper. Even the death of someone like Pete Robinson, who was not a close friend, but a friend, nonetheless, I can accept with a certain stoicism. A race driver, after all, lives with the spectre of sudden death by choice. Kathy Russell never made that choice. She was killed on her birthday—suddenly and for no reason at all.

It happened on Sunday morning just before the start of eliminations at the Nationals. She and her husband Dave, a Top Fuel driver, were walking through the pits when a roadster, full throttle and out of control, bore down on them, seemingly from nowhere. She tried to run but was struck. She died instantly.

It's not clear how the roadster got into that condition. The driver (I won't mention his name, he'll have enough demons bedeviling his mind for the rest of his life without my adding another one) claims the throttle stuck while warming the car up. Others say he was doing a burnout and lost control. Whatever the reason, it should never have happened and should never be allowed to happen again.

Standing on the line photographing the races, I thought about the tragic incident throughout the day. I could only imagine it happening to my wife. I tried not to imagine the way Dave Russell felt, but I couldn't help it. The thought that most overwhelmed me was the total needlessness, the utter waste of unredeeming death.

It's too late, of course, to do anything about what happened to Kathy Russell. But it's not too late to make sure it doesn't happen again.

Maybe drag racing has become so safe that a lot of racers have lost respect for their machinery. Maybe they no longer realize that the potential energy of their race cars, if released unwittingly, can kill and maim. Why else would so many of them perform their impromptu Chi-Town Hustler imitations in the pits and staging lanes? It certainly isn't for the reason of "warming the tires." Every drag strip I've ever seen has sufficient asphalt behind the line to allow for tire warming just before a run. It can't be for engine tuning. If you want to tune up, make a run. Then analyze your problems. It can't be to warm up a motor, a car need not be in motion for warming up.

The only reasons I can see for displays of power in areas patently unsafe are stupidity, ignorance and a childlike desire to feel power or show off. Drag racing cannot afford to indulge anyone for these reasons. Surprisingly, there is a lot of this stupidity to go around. I've seen guys, who are otherwise intelligent and respectable racers, cavort like fools in pits, staging lanes and on return roads. They must be stopped. How often have you heard a track announcer make repeated pleas for racers to slow down on the return road or cease doing burnouts in the staging lanes? This isn't the announcer's job. It should be the responsibility of the management of every drag strip to have a set of specific, explicit, strict rules dealing with car operation in the pits, staging lanes and on the return roads. Penalties for deviation must be stiff. I recommend instant expulsion from the grounds or if the transgression is serious enough, permanently barring a competitor from racing.

And it is also the responsibility of everyone operating a race car to refrain from using its powers outside the prescribed racing area. If you think this is an unreasonable thing to request, then consider the burden of having Kathy Russell's needless death on your conscience.—Fred Gregory.

A SURE WAY TO SLOW DOWN SPEEDERS

"The worst mess that we've ever seen, the worst traffic accident in Detroit's history." That's how police described the Easter Sunday tragedy that occurred on Detroit's Ford Expressway . . . Police say that a car driven by 20-year-old John Giddens was traveling eastbound on the Ford Freeway at a speed estimated at over 100 miles per hour. Giddens lost control, careened off the median guardrail, and flew into the oncoming traffic in the westbound lane. Giddens' auto landed on top of a car driven by 28-year-old William Westphal. It glanced off, a 4,000 pound missile flying through the air; it smashed down on top of an auto driven by 40-year-old Dr. Jack Derderian. The impact was so great that it crushed the Derderian auto flat, killing the doctor, his wife, his father and his father's wife. Giddens, a 14-year-old passenger in his car, Helen Hawkins, and Westphal were all killed. According to police, John Giddens had been driving for only two and one half years. In that time he had compiled 11 convictions for violating traffic laws. His driver's license had been suspended three times. He had been convicted of traveling at speeds of 75, 80 and 90 miles an hour in 55-mile-an-hour zones." (From the WWJ-TV (Detroit) Monday evening news, April 12, 1971.)

American fascination with speed is nowhere more evident, or more dangerous, than in the automobile. For whatever reasons—the need to express one's personality, wanting to impress the squares in the right hand lane, contempt for authority, the hope of "saving time" or other rationalizations—tooling along at illegal or high speeds has turned many stretches of America's highways into imitation Bonneville Flats. Yet the one

sure result of abused high speed cars is roadside death and injury. A 1969 Department of Transportation study on the maximum safe speed for motor vehicles confirms grimly "that high speed is involved to a major degree in the highway crash death toll." In addition, "the top speeds of passenger vehicles now produced and on the roads are markedly inconsistent with road design, operator skill, crash design of vehicle and highway . . ."

One remedy, recently proposed by the department's National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, would be to ban production of vehicles—cars, trucks, buses, motorcycles and others—able to exceed 95 mph as of October 1, 1972; vehicles would also have to be equipped with speedometers that would not function above 85 mph and a device that would trigger the horn and flasher lights at speeds above 85.

The most crucial of these is the banning of high-speed cars. The 95-mph figure was chosen according to federal officials, only as a target to shoot at; it may be lower before the proposal becomes final. The government invited comments and to date has received a record response—some 15,000 documents and letters. By last count, on 5,000 comments—per cent favor the standard, 19 per cent want a lower limit and 85 per cent oppose. This is a gratifying and hopeful response, suggesting first that much of the public sees no purpose in paying for engine power it will likely never use and, second, is beginning to realize that the greater the speed the greater the danger.

Technologically, DOT officials say that if speed controls do become law, the designs of the engine will "not affect performance of the cars at lower speeds," nor will power needed for safe passing, accelerating and hill climbing be hampered. The devices will not be governors—the power would still be there—but would be built into the engines, something General Motors and Chrysler agree is technically "feasible."

Opposition to the speed control standard has come from three out of four of the large American car-makers, with the fourth (GM) saying the device would be complex and raise the cost. Twisting logic like spaghetti, the Fiat car company of Italy said, among other reasons, that limiting maximum speeds "will make trips boring and dangerous inasmuch as alert drops dangerously when traveling becomes tedious." Thus, smooth and steady driving "may induce drowsiness and finally be determinant in causing the accident." In other words, push it up to 100, 110 or more if you want to stay awake—and never mind staying alive.

Among those favoring the standard are motorists who drive within legal speed limits themselves but mortally fear the wild characters who don't. The Insurance Institute for Highway Safety and the Center for Auto Safety insist the 95 limit is too high and should be lowered. Nationwide Insurance, in supporting the standard, said "it is unconscionable for today's vehicles to be capable of speed levels which are so grossly over-matched with their headlight and braking effectiveness and their occupant-restraint and crash-survivability design."

It is hoped the DOT will remain firm in its proposal; in fact, the 95-mile top speed is probably too high. The DOT's own 1969 study said that "fatalities might be reduced (some) 13 per cent if the speed maximum were set as low as 60 miles per hour" and a possibility of an 8 per cent cut at 70 mph. With 56,000 killed and 4½ million seriously injured on U.S. highways last year, the discussion is not about children's scooters but about the most abused machine ever invented. Almost anything is worth trying to make it less capable of abuse.

NO PING-PONG IN THE CONCENTRATION CAMPS

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the large uproar surrounding the visit of a U.S. ping-pong team to Red China is just a touch ludicrous. From the noises emanating from the mass media one would think the Chinese Communists had released the American servicemen whom they hold, or perhaps granted some type of limited freedom to the subjects over whom they hold sway, or perhaps even stopped developing the intercontinental missiles which will pose such a grave threat to population centers in the United States by 1975.

Perhaps the most significant factor about this entire nonevent is the insight it provides into just what the mass media considers significant and what it considers to be of little consequence. Several weeks ago the House Committee on Internal Security, of which I am a member, held hearings during which expert testimony was given about the conditions existing inside Red China. The horrors of life under the Chinese Communists was fully brought forth by two college professors who had been fortunate to escape from the mainland.

The reality of life within the Communist slave state was made crystal clear by highly educated men who had actually experienced life in Red China. The slave camps, the hatred and suspicion, the "total world of fear," was vividly described. Very few people could have listened to what these men had to say and reacted with anything but incredulity over the meaning found in a ping-pong match by so many of our articulate commentators.

In the interests of bringing the essential reality of Communist China into focus I would like to include in the RECORD at this point the testimony of Prof. Ma Szu-Tsung and Mr. Richard K. Diao before the House Committee on Internal Security as part of the committee's continuing investigation into the theory and practice of communism.

The testimony follows:

STATEMENT OF PROF. MA SZU-TSUNG

I was born on March 21, 1912 in Canton, China and presently reside in Philadelphia, Pa. I now use the surname Sitson, which is the Anglicized version of my name. I held the following offices in China: Director of the Central Conservatory of Music in Peking; Vice Chairman of the All-China Union of Musical Workers; Conductor of the China Symphony Orchestra; Director of the China Music Institute; Professor at Sun Yat-sen University; Director of the Sino-Soviet Friendship Association, Director of Chinese-Indonesian Friendship Association; Director of China-Latin American Friendship Association; Vice President of the Chinese-East Germany Friendship Association. For several years I was a Deputy at the National People's Congress. I graduated from the National Music Institute in Paris, France, in 1928.

My wife, my son, one daughter and I escaped from Red China in January, 1967. We went to Hong Kong and from there to the United States. A number of things influenced me in leaving my homeland. The people of China were slaves. There is no freedom whatsoever—no freedom of thought and no freedom of expression—nothing but a world of fear. One often cannot trust his own family or friends. Each person is like a bee in a honeycomb, confined to his own cell by the fear of being denounced by someone for something.

With the advent of the Red Guards all the intellectual groups in China came under sharp attack; actors, musicians, artists, dancers, all of the cultural groups for which China had been noted came under attack as nonproductive elements of society. The treatment of all of these persons at the hands of the Red Guards, many of whom had been former students, was too horrible to think about. Actors were disfigured, dancers were crippled, musicians had their hands damaged, all to satisfy what at that time was party policy.

China under Mao Tse-tung has had many programs which were difficult to understand. The "Great Leap Forward" was a national disaster. "The Hundred Flower Movement" sent many innocent people to their death in labor camps. The "Cultural Revolution" was the most devastating. The constant change and threat to any free expression of ideas was more than I could stand. Because of the many official positions which I occupied as a musician and well-known composer in China I perhaps was spared much of the suffering that was visited upon the average Chinese citizen. Even so, the part that I experienced left me a physical wreck and only now, four years after I left China, do I feel sufficiently recovered to again hope to compose or to play my violin. The hatred and suspicion which has become a way of life in China is a terrible thing. China today, is a cult of one person, Mao Tse-tung. He is a God to all Chinese. Every time you go out of doors you must wear a button with a picture of Chairman Mao on it. On your bicycle you have a small placard on which you must write a quotation of Chairman Mao or some form of praise for Chairman Mao. The only freedom that people have in China today is the freedom to praise Chairman Mao.

I have been to Russia six times. I was there in 1949, in 1951, 1955, 1957, 1958 and 1962 as Chairman of the Chinese Soviet Friendship Committee. I can tell you this, conditions in Russia are much, much better than they are today in Red China. I have traveled all over China. I gave concerts until my last one in 1962. I was privileged to be able to travel to nearly all of the farthest provinces of China in connection with my work. The factory worker, for example, could also travel if he had the money and the time, however, he has neither. The farmers on the other hand are tied to their communes. They are treated like cattle, and probably live and die without ever having left their commune, except for a party display or two during their lives. The Chinese have lived under so much cruelty and sorrow for so many years that they have become adaptable to much of this.

Life in China has varied considerably since the end of World War II. However, until 1956 most of the people had enough to eat and a place to live. After 1958 it began to change. After Mao's "Great Leap Forward" it became very difficult. By the end of 1958 a person had to line up to buy food and there was no food to buy. There was no rationing, there just was no food. Those of us who survived, and lived through this time, noticed that by 1962 things became a little better. The state control over people relaxed a little and we had more freedom, even though food was still very scarce. The bad years of the "Great Leap Forward" in 1959, 1960 and part of 1961 always remain in my memory. During this pe-

riod of time there was a program of communes, which broke up families, and village foundries to make steel. This was a fiasco and was later criticized by the party, though I recall seeing a picture of Chairman Mao working in one of these foundries for propaganda purposes.

During this "Great Leap Forward" thousands of people starved to death. Each village and each commune, was supposed to pledge a certain percentage of their production to the state. Many commune directors became carried away with trying to outdo one another and pledged more food than they could provide. This left the people with nothing at all, and they died. As I said before, after 1962 things began to get a little bit better. This improvement carried part way through 1963 and even though most of the time we had nothing to eat but cabbage there was more freedom and people were happier. From 1964 on, the control of the state became more and more severe.

They used personnel from the Army as models. These teams of military personnel had become used to extreme hardships and had no fear of death. Everyone was encouraged to follow their example. Those who died trying to work for the state were hailed as heroes. Because of my position at this time, I perhaps did not suffer as did most of the citizens. We had a little more money, a place to live and our rations for food were better than most. I also had friends in Hong Kong who sent us packages and money.

I recall one time my family and I went out to a restaurant at this time. The bill for our family came to \$80.00 which for me was one month's pay. Because of the shortages of food the black market grew up whereby farmers and others who had small plots of land would grow some items for sale. Eggs sold on the black market for \$2.00. I recall I once bought a pound of peanuts for \$6.00. If the eggs could have been bought in the store they would only have cost \$.10 each. During this period of time cabbage was plentiful; however, it cost about \$2.00 to \$3.00 for a hundred pounds. People dried it and stored it away for future use. Most of the food was locally produced in China. The only import that we saw during this time was wheat from Canada. Food continues to be in short supply in China.

The problem of education in China has been one of long duration. Today, I believe everyone in China goes to school through the first 6 grades. If you must work, however, because of your family situation, I think that you can be excused. A person who is free to attend school can complete up through high school or twelve grades and also go on to the University provided he has a good political background. By good political background I mean that you must be from the family of workers, teachers, military or farmers. The children from the family of a former land owner or one deemed to be an enemy of the state can never go to the University.

The only charges for the children attending school are their food and clothing. All the rest of the expenses are paid by the state. In the Conservatory of Music where I was Chairman, most of the students were the children of other teachers. These students were hand-picked from all over China to attend the Conservatory of Music. We looked for those individuals with the most musical talent. At one time the Conservatory was criticized because of this policy, because most of the students ended up being from artistic families. At that time we were branded as a school for the privileged class, and were ordered to open the doors to children of soldiers, workers, and farmers. This was in 1963 or in 1964. It was very difficult because the students we were getting in at that time had little or no talent.

A musician in China today has no difficulty finding a job. There are too few musicians in China and the Government will, of course, assign the job. When a student graduates

from the Conservatory usually the school assigns him to his job. The job may not be of his own choosing; however, he will have a place to work as a teacher or he may play in an orchestra somewhere, or he may even go into the Army as a musician. As I said before, this is up to the school, or the Ministries of Education or Culture. A student can write down his choice of an assignment but he is sent where he is needed. This is true of any occupation. If you decide not to go to that assignment then you are in great trouble. You have no job and thus nothing to eat. You are not working for the people or the state so you are punished. Those who are outstanding musicians are frequently sent to the Soviet Union to compete in world competition. Frequently they went to Russia several years ahead of time in order to study Western music.

I found it very interesting to read the Chinese constitution. It states that the people of China have all the rights that your constitution in this country provides; freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom to assemble, freedom to express your thoughts, and so forth. It's all a lie. The only rights a person in China has is to work and to praise Mao Tse-tung. I feel that the Chinese people now live in complete slavery. You could exercise your freedom of speech by saying, "The weather is good," or "The sky is blue," but you could not say for example, "I would like to go to America." A statement such as this would cause you a great deal of difficulty. You would then be called in to examine the root of your thinking. Questions would arise about where your education broke down and allowed such a bad thought. Perhaps they may think the individual might be a spy or perhaps he has contact with spies.

The individual should have been taught all of his life that America is the number one enemy of China, and the people of China. The individual would be called upon to confess to what prompted him to make such a statement. This confession would lead to more confessions. You must confess for the good of your soul and the good of your thought. You must completely understand why you made these statements. The more detailed your confession, the better you would understand why you were wrong. After you have confessed sufficiently you are sent off to a labor camp for re-education. Most trials in China today do not take place in a courtroom. They are held in the street, schools, in the factories, or in any group to which you belong. These are times of public confession and repentance. Upon completion of these hearings or gatherings you are then sent to labor camps for re-education through work. You may be interested to know that China does not have capital punishment. People are not executed. They are sent to labor camps where they are worked to death. This way the state derives some benefit from them. If they killed him quickly he would be of no value to the state.

In China today, the most casual comment to a friend, to a relative, or even to members of your own family can often bring you before such a tribunal. Everyone lives in a state of fear. Fear is everywhere. Everyone is isolated from everyone else by this fear. Allegations made by anyone can bring you before a peoples tribunal and there is no defense. Any of these groups that I have mentioned can send you away to a labor camp. In America I have found that everyone has so many rights that it seems to me at times that one cannot be punished for anything. Here one cannot walk the streets in safety. In China we do not seem to have this problem. I cannot be sure of this, however, because one never looks around to see what is happening to others. In China you live your own life, you do not question what happens to anyone else and you evidence no interest in what they are doing. The newspapers in China are only a media for carrying the praises of Chairman Mao. A person

in my position in China could have a radio. I, for example, was permitted to purchase a large radio and could listen to radio stations outside of China: BBC, Voice of America, Japanese radio, etc. To listen to these programs, of course, was illegal, but we still did it nevertheless.

Elections in China are another example of this system which has enslaved a very old and very honorable people. Elections today are only a play. Every four years we have what are called elections. They put, for example, ten names on a ballot. Everybody must vote for these names. You may never have heard of these people before and probably never will again. There are ten positions, there are ten names, they are elected, and that is it. It is possible to put down another name—to write it in below the others—but this means nothing. The elections are decided long before the ballots are counted. For example, I was appointed to the Peoples Congress. I was a representative in the Cultural group. The representatives in the Peoples Congress represent all of the occupations of the population, Economics, the Army, etc. We numbered in the thousands and we elected the Chairman of the state and the Congressional positions. They only put down the number of names that there were positions open. One man for Chairman, Chairman Mao, and so on. Such balloting as you have in the United States is not even heard of in China today. What it amounts to is each individual must show up and approve what the state has done by approving the people it has selected. There is no alternative. You do not vote against anyone.

According to the constitution freedom of religion is permitted but this is not true. A person who goes to church is always in trouble. All the churches must adapt to Maoism. It makes no difference which religion you are referring to, if you are a Buddhist you are accused of being superstitious. If you are a Christian you have ties with imperialist countries. Members of the communist party cannot belong to any religion. Mao Tse-tung is God. His word, his teachings, are to the modern Chinese what the Bible is to a Westerner.

China has a number of political parties unlike many communist countries. However, these parties are all controlled by the communist party. Their sole purpose is to say yes to Chairman Mao and all of them must follow the wishes of Chairman Mao. I know for a fact that the communist party sends personnel into each of the other parties to control them. There is never any question about which is the party in China.

In China under Chairman Mao there are so many changes that a person who is in favor today may be in a labor camp tomorrow. Personnel who are friends of Mao today may be his enemies tomorrow. No one knows from day to day whether he will be doing what is considered right or whether he will be accused of doing something that is wrong. You must not think. You must not plan. You must do nothing but live from day to day only to do what is right each day in conformance with the thoughts of Chairman Mao.

I notice that in this country there are many people who are very proud of the fact that China now has the atomic bomb and is thus one of the major powers in the world. They apparently never think of the price that was paid by the Chinese people so that this was possible. I think that those in this country who are so proud of China should be sent to live there for about two years. They would then know the truth and in all probability would have a decided change of thought.

All my life I have lived for China and for my music. Because of my prominence in music I was appointed to many positions

involving contacts with foreigners such as the Sino-Soviet Friendship Society, the Chinese-Indonesian Friendship Society and others. I was never a party member. My music was known all over China. One of my compositions, "Longing For Home," prefaced each Radio Peking propaganda broadcast to Taiwan. I have conducted concerts all over mainland China. Now all this is changed. While the "Great Leap Forward" program in China in 1958 to 1961 was a national disaster which cost many thousands of lives and reduced the people of China to starvation, my family and I managed to stay alive and kept our hope that some day things would work out and China would recover.

In the Fall of 1966 the full impact of the latest program "The Cultural Revolution" hit us. This was as close to anarchy as I ever wish to come. All intellectuals, artists, actors, dancers, musicians and members of any cultural group were singled out as useless members of the privileged class. I was among 500 who were rounded up and sent to a sort of concentration camp at the Socialist Institute to undergo thought reform. We were there 50 days while I was accused of following a capitalist line in my music. After this I was suddenly returned together with 18 others to the Central Academy of Music where I had been Chairman and immediately felt the wrath of the student nucleus of what later became the Red Guard.

They greeted me by pouring a bucket of paste over my head and stuck abusive slogans to the paste. I was called a devil, a demon and an authority on the reactionary capitalist class. I was confined to a small room where I was forced to write confessions to all sorts of crimes against the state. Crimes which I had never committed nor even thought of. Each morning I was forced to do hard labor with the result that my health began to fail. The tragic part of it all is that the Red Guards were mostly students who themselves had been somewhat of a privileged class but were now given free rein to do whatever they wished.

The excesses they carried out against those who fell into their disfavor were difficult to imagine. I was beaten with belt buckles many times; other artists, musicians and dancers were beaten so badly that their careers were finished. By the time I left China my right arm had been so badly injured that I could not raise it and could no longer play the violin. I remained at the Central Academy of Music for 103 days as a prisoner before my release. At this time in China no one could be sure that he would not be the next to be accused. Those who initiated many of the purges found that they themselves eventually became the victims.

As time went on the excesses of violence and confusion among the groups began to tell upon the way we were treated. By September 1966 I was permitted to spend some of my evenings at home. My house in the meantime had become a sleeping place for Red Guards. Sixty of them were sleeping in our former sitting room. My family was gone and all of my records and books were smashed or confiscated. My daughter, Celia, returned one evening and we spoke of leaving China. At last one bitter cold night in November we boarded a train and left Peking for good. I cannot discuss the details of my reunion with my family and our escape from China for fear of endangering others who are still in China and who took great risks on our behalf. To these will go our eternal thanks.

It is interesting to note that the Chinese communists used to play my music in their propaganda broadcasts beamed at Taiwan. After my escape this stopped and now the Nationalists play my music in their programs beamed to the mainland. All China now knows of my decision to leave and my escape from what has become the worst, most inhuman slave camp on earth.

STATEMENT OF PROF. RICHARD K. DIAO

My name is Richard K. Diao. I was born April 29, 1924, in Chengtu, China. I graduated from the National Central University, Department of Economics, in Chungking, China, in 1946, with a B.A. degree. In 1947 I came to the United States, and attended the University of Illinois, Department of Economics, Graduate School, at Urbana, Illinois. I graduated in 1948 with a Master's degree. In 1948-1949 I attended the Columbia University in New York City. From 1949-1950 I attended the Graduate School of Business Administration of New York University New York City, as a candidate for a Ph.D. I did not complete my studies for my Ph.D. and returned to China in 1950, prompted by glowing reports of prosperity and opportunity in my native country. I was accompanied by my fiancée, Eva Hsu, born August 5, 1927, in Shanghai, China. She had been attending Mary Crest College in Davenport, Iowa. We were engaged in New York City on June 16, 1950 and married in Peking on December 16, 1950. We have a daughter, 18, and a son, 14.

From 1950 until 1951 I worked at the Ministry of Finance, in Peking, China, as a researcher. From 1951 to 1952 I was a researcher for the Government Administrative Council's Committee on Financial and Economic Affairs in Peking. From 1952 to 1953 I was Associate Professor of Public Finance at the Central Institute of Finance and Economics, Peking, China. From 1953 to 1958 I was Associate Professor and Deputy Head of Teaching and Research in the Department of Finance at the Central Academy for Financial Cadres in Peking. In 1957, during the program known as the "Hundred Flower Movement", the Party encouraged criticism by non-Party members. They promised that no punishment would be given to those who criticized the Party and the government, but that this would be used to improve their work. However, after I criticized the Party I was subjected to considerable harassment. I was labeled a "rightist" and enemy of the state. I was accused of being a U.S. spy, since the State Department had paid for my transportation back to China through the ECA fund then available to all Chinese students in this country after the communist take over of mainland China. In the meantime, my three brothers, two sisters and parents were all still living in the United States. My father, a retired Lt. General of the Republic of China, has since died in New York, in 1956.

In April of 1958 I was sent to the Military 850th State Farm at Hellungkiang as a laborer to undergo thought reform. This camp was located in what is called the "Chinese Siberia" in the remote northeastern part of the country. It was only 20 miles from where the Sino-Soviet border incident occurred in 1969. I stayed in this camp for two years and ten months. I feel that the treatment at this camp was more inhuman than what I had heard of the concentration camps of the Nazis. We worked at hard labor 14-16 hours per day, 7 days a week with very little food in bitter cold. At one time they worked us 10 days and nights with only a one hour nap in the snow covered and frozen ground after midnight. We built railroads, roads, dams, but mostly we dug and built drainage canals. Most of this area is very swampy. Many people at the camp died from exhaustion and malnutrition.

In addition to landlords and rich peasants, there are three types of persons designated as anti-government in China: (1) counter-revolutionaries; (2) rightists; (3) bad elements. There were some in each category in this camp. Due to the poor condition of the persons in the camp, we were finally released in December 1960 and returned to Peking where I remained about one month.

At the end of 1960, I was then sent to Shansi province in China to the Shansi College of Finance and Economics. At the college my job was to prepare lectures for others to give since I no longer could be trusted to deliver lectures, but most of the time I was still assigned to do manual work in the countryside, which included the cleaning of public toilets. In addition, I had to report each week without failure about my thought and deeds to a Party member who was assigned to "help" me and also to submit, through this man, a written report to the Party Committee every month. At this time, my wife who had worked at the Ministry of Public Health in Peking for some 10 years was also transferred to Shansi province to teach at a medical college. We began to plan how we could escape from China. Writing to one of my brothers in New York giving him a hint that we wished to come out, it was hoped that he would write me a letter claiming that my mother had come to Hong Kong hoping to see us once more before she died. Using this as a ruse and with a good record of hard work after I got out of the Labor camp, they finally let me and my son go to Hong Kong. I made up my mind that once there I would never return to China. For almost two years my wife attempted to get an exit permit and finally on the pretext of talking me into returning to China or at least to bring my son back to China, she was permitted to bring my daughter with her to visit me in Hong Kong. After our reunion I joined Union Research Institute in Hong Kong as a Senior Researcher and Head of Research Department in Finance and Economics. My wife also obtained a position as a Mandarin Chinese teacher in the New Asia Yale-in-China Language Center of the Chinese University of Hong Kong. Through much legal maneuvering and the help of many friends, we were finally able to come to the United States and arrived in New York on the 23rd of October, 1966. From 1966 until 1969 I was a Research Associate with the East Asian Institute, Columbia University, New York City.

Looking back, I suppose that in those days I was very much pro-New China. I have never joined the Communist Party and after seeing China as it is I know I never shall.

My main reasons for leaving China were the knowledge that the Socialist system will never work in China or anywhere else. There was a constant fear of being arrested for something. Each knock on the door, each visit to a superior, especially during the political movements held the threat of being detained for something. I never knew when I went to work in the morning if I would come home that night. There is absolutely no freedom of thought and absolutely no consideration of an individual as a human being.

In discussing the economy of China prior to the Great Leap Forward, the situation in China was quite good. People had enough to eat, but during 1959-1961 the situation was terrible. People had barely enough to eat. Everything was rationed according to categories. The highest category was the Army and heavy labor. Ordinary people received 15 kilograms of grain and 2 oz. of edible oil per month. Meat or fish was rationed to a few oz. once every several months. While I had had no experience under the Japanese occupation of China, persons that I have known say that things were much worse during this time in China than it was under the Japanese control. People hoarded their food and feared that others would steal it. The fixed prices were not very high but there was just no food available. Clothes also were very difficult to obtain. Each person was rationed to a few yards of cloth per year. If you bought socks or handkerchiefs you had to surrender a certain amount of cloth ration tickets. This applied to Communist Party members as well

as those who were not Party members. Soldiers were given the best ration. Their rations on clothes and for food were the highest together with the highest officers in the Party and Government. Before 1958 things were much better. At that time the so-called higher intellectuals, which included myself, received more meat and rice and we also had the privilege of not standing in line to do our shopping. We had a card which allowed us to go to the front of the line each time. This was only from 1956 until 1958. During the bad years the higher intellectuals did receive more cigarettes and more oil than other people, but by that time I had been branded as a "rightist" and I did not receive this.

From the latter half of 1962 on, things began to get better. At that time you could buy extra food on the "free market". Some of the peasants in the country had extra vegetables or eggs or food grains and could bring it to the "free market" in the city where they would sell it. Prices here to be determined simply by supply and demand were extremely high but while the "free market" was officially illegal, the Party and Government turned their back on these transactions. At that time the Party had lost some control over the people. Later on, I understand the "free market" was closed down. I believe that the countryside was worse off in the bad days than the cities. Peking and Shanghai were show places and were always somewhat better than the rest of the country. Many persons died of malnutrition. Frequently they would become so ill and so weak that the slightest cold or illness would kill them.

In China everyone must work. When we first returned to China from the United States we were given our choice of work, the area where we thought we could do the most. However, once we selected a job we were not allowed to change unless the Party decided to transfer us. Most of the rest of the people are assigned by the Party to the job where they are needed. You can request a transfer to another job but very seldom are these requests granted. At this time you are also subject to criticism because they would ask you why you questioned the wisdom of the Party in assigning you a job. Generally speaking they put you in a job where they need you. If you decided that you did not want to work or would not work, then you have two choices; 1) you can die without food; 2) you are subject to arrest as a bad element for not contributing your part to the state. The crime of being a counter-revolutionist covers nearly everything in China, from being a thief, to not working or engaging in financial transactions not authorized by the authorities.

During 1959-1961 things were very bad. Many people resorted to stealing—not money but food. You could buy nothing with money, but food coupons and clothes were stolen very frequently. China has since imported substantial amounts of wheat every year from Australia, New Zealand and Canada and still continues to do so. During the bad years, the Party and Government encouraged people who had friends outside of China to ask for food packages. I had a sister-in-law, for example, in Hong Kong, who sent me packages. I received butter, milk, chocolate, etc., which enabled me to effect a speedy recovery from my poor condition resulting from the Labor camp.

To take care of discipline in the country, I believe there is a large network of Labor Camps throughout mainland China. Most of these are in the northeast and northwest. The land where I was in the remote northeast had never been farmed and there was almost no population living there except the demobilized soldiers from the Korean War. The land is very fertile but it is mostly swamp. The soil was black and rich and it did not need to be fertilized, but it was mostly covered with water. We dug and built

drainage ditches but the water would still come back. There were many Russian built tractors there but they just stood idle most of the time as they could not be used in that mud. The growing season was only 120 days long and the rest of the time it is bitter cold. The coldest weather is in the forties or even fifties below zero.

Since 1950 all of the large land holdings of the landlords were taken away and distributed to the poor peasants. The land was not owned by the peasants but they were told that they would be able to use it. The state retained ownership. After 1953, and especially after 1956, the Agricultural Co-operative Movement assumed close control of the land. During the hardship years around 1959 very small pieces of land next to the houses which had been seized by the Peoples' Communes during the Great Leap Forward were given back to the peasants to raise vegetables, for their own use or to enable them to sell it in the "free market". I understand that during the recent Cultural Revolution that all these private plots were again taken back by the communes. As far as owning homes, it was a very difficult situation. Before 1958 some people did own their own. After that they were all taken by the state. They were reimbursed by the state only in the form of so-called "fixed interest" which was calculated at a price decided upon by the state. When you owned your own house you were required to keep it repaired and the Government assigned you tenants if they thought that you had too much room. People were so hard pressed to keep up the taxes and repairs that they were glad to give the houses to the state in order to be rid of the troubles. Generally speaking, each family is allowed one or two rooms, though it depends upon their size and the interpretation of the authorities in the area in which you were living. Sometimes you had a community kitchen and sometimes you had a stove outside the house and you did your cooking outside. Bathrooms are always communal.

When I was Associate Professor at the Central Academy For Financial Cadres in Peking I had a quite nice apartment with two rooms, plus kitchen and bathroom. We used one room for our bedroom and the other for the children and as a living room. I even had a maid. At that time this was all right with the Party and Government as it cut down on unemployment in the countryside and enabled both husband and wife to work. Later this practice was considered a bourgeois, capitalist practice. The maids were all forced to resign and work in street factories or on farms in the countryside. This is one of the big problems with the Chinese Government, it keeps changing from year to year, no one ever knows what is right. What is right one year is bad the next. They are always changing.

There is almost no religion in China anymore except among the older people. It makes no difference which religion is involved, whether it is Christian, Buddhist or what. It is all bad as far as the Party is concerned. Of all the religions, I believe the Catholic was persecuted the most because the Party and Government felt they had closer ties to the West. All members of the Communist Party are not allowed to have any religion. The younger persons are discouraged from having any religion as well. Most of the churches and temples have been converted to schools, hospitals, or warehouses. Only in the big cities like Peking and Shanghai are a few churches and temples still operating as a sort of window dressing for foreign visitors. When the Premier of Ceylon visited China some years ago, for example, the Mayor of Shanghai and the protocol officials from Peking went to the temple with her for worship but this was only a propaganda move.

Everyone who has reached the age of 18 years may vote in China if they are not a

convicted criminal. If you don't vote they question you as to the reasons. To vote you go to the voting place and pick up your ballot. You go into a voting booth, mark the ballot, and drop it in the ballot box. All the nominees have been screened by the Party and match exactly the number of posts to be filled and thus all are elected. You just don't have any choice. To avoid trouble, people just vote for the candidates listed. In China there are 8 so-called "democratic parties" besides the Communist Party, but all take their guidance from Chairman Mao and the Communist Party. Having this many parties helps to present a picture of democratic government to the peoples of the world. It is not possible for one of these parties to become stronger than the Communist Party. There is no competition between them and the Communist Party. If any party begins to gather any strength and to challenge the Communist Party all the other parties are directed to move against it. There is one thing I might mention, concerning voting. Since China still has many illiterate persons the voting place has someone to read the ballot to you so that you can mark it. This means that it is possible that this individual does the voting, and the voter is never aware of whom he voted for. There are no campaigns for elections such as there are in the United States. There are meetings where the Party will tell you about the candidates. In China the people are so naive and so interested in avoiding any trouble that they do as they are told.

In China, as in all the rest of the Communist countries, there are labor unions. Back before the Communists seized power they controlled the labor unions and struck against the Nationalist Government. After the Communists took over the situation was changed. Now there are no strikes. The union speaks to the worker for the state. In Western countries the union speaks to the management for the workers. The function in China is to see that the workers work and that their welfare is provided for. They arrange vacations and pensions. They arrange for labor heroes and give political incentive for more work. They act as agents of the Party in all the factories and their main function is to give the workers ideological indoctrination.

As far as schooling in China goes, you can go or not as you wish. There are not enough schools in the country if everyone had to go to school. Most of the city dwellers send their children to school but in the countryside most of the children must work. If you want to go to school you can. If you don't want to go you don't have to. School is free. There is no charge for tuition, books or supplies. At the university the students have two kinds of scholarships, known as Peoples' Scholarships or Aid Type A and Type B. Type A is a basic scholarship. When you are accepted at the university it provides some money to cover food and clothes. Type B provides more money. This is for the poorer families. In all universities all students live on campus because of the many extracurricular activities in which they must engage. This is also a way the Party has of separating them from the influence of their families and the rest of the population. A student can go to college or university for four years to study liberal arts or social sciences, 5 years for engineering or applied sciences and 8 years for medicine. The Government pays for all of this. In China there is no degree offered.

In China children under 16 usually belong to the Young Pioneers and then from 16 to 25 many of them belong to the Communist Youth League. Being a member of the Communist Youth League does not necessarily make you a member of the Communist Party, but you have a better chance to join if you are a member of the Communist Youth League. The Young Pioneers, on the other hand, are somewhat like Boy Scouts and at-

tract children by interesting programs along the Party defined lines. All children from the very young of kindergarten are taught that "no matter how good your parents are they are not as good as Chairman Mao," and that they should prepare themselves to become good communists.

If you wish to travel, from one area in China to another, you must have permission. Each individual has an identity card issued by his employing agency or his school or his factory. You must check out at whenever you work and then you must check in with the police at your destination. If you are a farmer you must obtain a pass from your brigade or commune. This is for travel inside China. Travel outside of China is always discouraged and is hence very difficult to arrange.

In China we were never allowed to contact foreigners directly. Even if you speak their language you must use an official interpreter. This applies to every foreigner and especially to those from the West. It applied to contact with the Russians too but of course not many Chinese people speak Russian, though at one time everyone was encouraged to study Russian at school or through radio. It was very fashionable to study Russian in the 1950s. After the Sino-Soviet split-up in 1959 they no longer wanted people to learn Russian. Now, I have heard that a person cannot take Russian at all. Any foreigner visiting China today is prepared for in advance. Everyone who will have contact with him is provided with a paper giving the foreigner's background, political feelings, and the questions that he might ask, and what the answers should be. Some foreigners realize that the information they are receiving is all planted propaganda and try to evade their interpreters and guides. This is not really possible because in the area of the hotels used by the foreigners, all the taxi drivers and shop keepers are part of the show. Also the people don't dare to speak up, because the foreigners soon leave and then the Party looks at you as an enemy of the state. All foreign embassies have a guard who acts to protect the embassy and also to keep people from visiting the embassy. If an embassy wants to hire a Chinese as a cook or a driver or a clerk or something, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs will take care of placing the individual. This enables them to carefully select someone to do their bidding.

There is very little anti-semitism in China because there are almost no Jews. At one time back before the Communists came into power, there were a number of Jews in some of the large cities as merchants but they are all gone now.

If you are arrested in China and brought to trial, you will be given a Government appointed defense lawyer. This presents problems for a defense counsel. First, they often arrest people without any basis, almost anyone can be arrested for anything. It can come at any time. They can just confine you to your office until you write down your confession. If you don't know what to confess to they will tell you. They use three shifts for interrogation—8 hours each—while you sit there until you confess to something. The defense counsel usually advises his client to confess. He cannot justify any crime you may have committed against the state, therefore there is no real defense. If he did try to defend an accused he would probably be the next one on trial himself. These trials are really public shows. They use the trial to demonstrate to others what happens to enemies of the state so in effect it acts as a control method. It is not really a trial as we know it here but a show of public punishment. The prosecution is not even required to furnish any proof that a crime has been committed. Of course, many of the arrests are not brought to trial at all. The offender is punished with no public hearing.

I have been asked often whether China has a secret police. Yes, they do. They call it

Public Security. It is similar to the Soviet Secret Police. From my observations, however, in China the power of the secret police is not as great as in Russia. In China, especially today, the Army is the most powerful of all of the branches of the hierarchy. I think the Army also has a Secret Police of its own. In China so many people are informers for the authorities of one sort or another even though they are not directly linked with the secret police that there is a saying that if you don't need an answer, don't ask a question and never trust anybody even your own kin. It is hard to tell who is a Secret Police source. As a result you never ask your friends any questions. You comment on the weather and that's about all.

According to the Chinese constitution they say that they have almost every right that people have here in the United States, but they don't exist. There are no rights. The only rights are those of the Party to rule in any manner that they see fit.

This statement was prepared with the assistance of Investigator John Stratton.

MEMORIAL TO THE 6 MILLION JEWISH MARTYRS

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 4, 1971, I was among some 5,000 Philadelphia area residents who gathered to remember the 6 million Jews martyred by the Nazis.

We gathered at the Memorial to the Six Million Jewish Martyrs at Benjamin Franklin Parkway and 16th Street, Philadelphia, to lay wreaths, light candles, and conduct memorial services.

Rabbi Elias Charry, president of the Board of Rabbis of Greater Philadelphia, and Cantor Yehuda Mandel, national vice president of the Cantors' Assembly of America, led the spiritual part of the program. The Reverend Rufus Cornelison, of the Metropolitan Christian Council, and Father Donald Clifford, of the Cardinal's Commission on Human Relations, participated in the program. Theodore R. Mann, chairman of the Memorial Committee for the Six Million Jewish Martyrs, and Morris A. Kravitz, president of the Federation of Jewish Agencies, offered greetings. The Star-Spangled Banner and Hatikvah were sung by Bina Landau and choral music was offered by the Association of Jewish New Americans, the Philadelphia Workmen's Circle, and the Jewish Folk Choir of the Young Men's Hebrew Association. The choral singing was led by Samuel Goldenberg and Morry Helzner.

An inspirational address was delivered by the Honorable Yosef Tekoah, Ambassador of Israel to the United Nations. Tekoah said:

We in Israel cannot forget the holocaust. We are not going to be the Czechoslovakia of the Middle East.

There is not any international guarantee for freedom. Freedom lies in our strength. How can we forget the guarantees in 1957 that were broken in 1967.

Another speaker was Pennsylvania Gov. Milton J. Shapp, who, after recall-

ing liberating survivors from a concentration camp near Linz, Austria, while serving in the Army during the Second World War, said:

We meet here a little more than a quarter of a century after the men, women, and children of the Warsaw ghetto stood against the Nazi Panzers and Stukas.

The lesson of history is clear. To prevent erosion of liberty for any, we must raise our voices when freedom for any group is denied.

Today we are guilty if we fail to raise our voices against the imprisonment of 40 Soviet Jews who seek freedom. For indeed that imprisonment is compounded by the denial of freedom for more than 80,000 Soviet Jewish families who have appealed for exist visas to Israel.

The cornerstone of the program was the monument itself, created by the same sculptor who designed the Warsaw memorial to the Jews who once fought the Nazis in that ghetto. In November 1969, I visited Warsaw and stood before that monument. To stand before the Philadelphia memorial is an equally moving experience. With the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I here enter in the RECORD a description of the Philadelphia monument taken from the program notes of the April 4 service:

ABOUT THE MONUMENT

The Monument to the Six Million Jewish Martyrs was presented to the City of Philadelphia by the Association of Jewish New Americans and the Federation of Jewish Agencies.

The idea of erecting a memorial to the Jews who perished at the hands of the Nazis was conceived in 1959. The project captured the imagination of many who recognized that the Monument would be a tribute not only to the dead but a reminder of the need for constant vigilance to preserve liberty for mankind. Philadelphia was deemed to be an appropriate location for this Monument because of the historic role of the city as the birthplace of American freedom and because it is the site of so many shrines to the struggle for human dignity and equality.

The Monument was created by Nathan Rapoport, the sculptor who designed the memorial to the Jews who conducted the rebellion in the Warsaw Ghetto, the monument in Paris to the Jewish underground fighters of World War II, and the memorial in Israel for Mordecai Anshilewitz, commander of the Warsaw Ghetto revolt.

The Monument is in bronze. Eighteen feet tall, it depicts a mother dying amid flames, a writhing child upholding the Scroll of the Torah—the five books of Moses, a patriarchal figure with arms raised in benediction and several arms wielding daggers, representing resistance against tyranny, all enveloped in a blazing bush and surmounted by a flaming Menorah—the traditional seven-branched candelabrum.

For as long as it stands, the Monument will remind the people of Philadelphia and visitors to this city's historic shrines of the Jews who perished in the cause of their faith and human freedom in the ghettos, the concentration camps, and the underground resistance groups in Europe under the Nazis.

History has recorded their fate. However, history in the future may tell a different story if mankind derives a lesson from this Monument and from the fate of the martyrs it commemorates—the lesson is that we must strive more diligently than ever to eliminate the evils of bigotry, racism, and actively uphold the cause of religious freedom, racial equality and human dignity.

Z'chor—Remember. This is the exhortation taken from the Torah. We must remem-

ber—but not to seek revenge nor to perpetuate hatred.

We must remember that man must never permit such an evil force to rise again. Remember that whenever bigotry in any form appears, it must be swiftly struck down. Remember that the Monument to the Six Million Jewish Martyrs calls on the citizens of Philadelphia and of the world, of every race, creed and walk of life, to uphold the principle on which this city and nation were founded—the Brotherhood of Man under the Fatherhood of God!

THE IMPOSSIBLE DREAM

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, among the many activities of the American Legion is the annual sponsorship of the American Legion Oratorical Contests throughout the country. Each year thousands of young people spend countless hours in preparation for these contests and in the course of this activity, many older Americans are made more aware of many new facets of the fundamental ideals upon which our democracy is founded.

It is encouraging and enlightening to read and hear the speeches which these young people take such pains to prepare because they represent the best in the thinking among our youth today.

Such was my impression upon reading the splendid address of David Minton, of Petersburg, Va., who is this year's winner in the Old Dominion. David's speech, entitled "The Impossible Dream," is as fine as any I have ever read. It is a credit to his generation and to our Nation. I commend it to the reading of the Members of the House.

The speech follows:

THE IMPOSSIBLE DREAM

(By David R. Minton)

"And the world will be better for this, that one man scorned and covered with scars, still strove with his last ounce of courage to reach the unreachable star."

The man who spoke these words—Don Quixote, the legendary figure created by Cervantes in the 17th century. The idea of which he was speaking was a dream to fight for what was good and right in life, no matter how hopeless this cause might seem. To continue to press on, even in the face of irrepressible odds. As we view this unusual man from afar, he appears to be nothing more than a rather wild fanatic, who meant well, but accomplished very little. Yet by looking closer, we see that in many ways, Quixote bore a rather striking resemblance to the thirty-nine men who signed our Constitution. For here were men who were pressured from all sides to leave their famous convention in Philadelphia and go home. They were told that this dream of trying to create a perfect republic was impossible. If great men before them had attempted and failed, how could they possibly hope to do any better? Although these thirty-nine representatives were men of great vision, they had no crystal ball with which to see into the future: no magic wand they could wave to create the Utopia they hoped for so badly. Even though much could be said and done about this new Constitution, in the end, they would have to make their decision to

either be content with this nation as it was or to struggle against hardships for the rest of their lives in the fight for something better. This very same decision rests with us today and though it is not an easy one, it must be done.

Is this dream for perfection in our country really worth fighting for? In this fast, modern world we live in, do dreams really play any part in a country's greatness? Americans in the past have certainly thought so. It has been estimated that since America first began over a half-million American soldiers have lost their lives in battles. This is not even counting the millions of Americans who have worked within this country to fight in its defense. Surely there have been Americans throughout our history who believed in something and fought for it. Did these people work in vain? Did they lay down their lives on unwanted principles which were of no use to anyone, or was it for something more? As we reflect on history, we realize that it was that yellowed, ancient document in the archives of Washington in which they put their faith.

Throughout this country there are many who contend that this Constitution has outlived its usefulness. These people would attempt to paint America the picture that no government at all is better than the one we now have. What these people seem to lose sight of, is that this very document they are trying to destroy, provided them with their very freedom to speak out and be heard. Peace is the rallying cry of many groups throughout this country, but rather than using a peaceable means of betterment which the Constitution has provided, they resort to violence and terrorists activities. Are these the type of people to be believed when they speak out so forcefully against this document? But even more detrimental to this dream than those who would campaign against it are those who are not concerned one way or the other as to our country's well being. Much has been said about apathy but through the years very little has been done about it. It has been estimated that only sixty-one per cent of registered American voters turned out for the last two Presidential elections. If we have any foresight at all we can see that even something so small as one election can help to undermine years of work that were made toward a common goal.

In recent studies the British historian Arnold Toynbee has made the observation that there were about nineteen other great nations in the past, who also had dreams of becoming greater, but because of the people's lack of concern, these nations collapsed before 200 years of existence. America is now almost 200 years old. Will we too be just another nation that had an impossible dream, but failed?

The answer to this question is very clear-cut. For it lies in a decision, a decision which no one can make except the American people. It is one of either believing in the Constitution and following it to its end or giving up this dream for ourselves as well as our posterity. Freedom's flame is not such that it can be lit on and off as a nation chooses, but must remain constant if it is to exist at all. Of course there are those who would tell us that a nation without a problem, a Utopia if you will, is impossible, thereby not worth working for. In this way, our Constitution's dreams would be very dim indeed. But let us search our hearts as we consider this, "How did we get the things we love in America today? How did we get our many freedoms and rights and what gave America its greatness? Was all this the product of violent demonstrations or people who were not concerned even enough to vote?" Just by looking around we can see the answer is clearly no. The people who did give us this prosperity were the authors of our Constitution and the citizens who

worked to keep this dream alive. The people who believed in this document, not only because of the way it ran their country, but more important . . . because of what it stood for . . . the freedom and way of life that men had died to gain, the dreams of men and women everywhere who wanted something better in life.

Impossible? Yes, perhaps a Utopia is impossible. Then again perhaps it is just within our reach. One idea is for certain. In a period of history, in which there is so little left to have faith in, our Constitution stands out as one of the last great hopes. If this document held enough hope for thirty-nine men to help build a great nation, then how much more hope should it hold for all of us in the troubled times we are going through now.

The world will one day look back on what we did in these times. They will remember whether we cast aside our Constitution which had been our guiding light or held to it, that we might have been greater still. For our freedom as well as those who come after us let us go from this place being Quixote-like in our quest for the Impossible Dream of a better nation following the Constitution, that men may one day say:

"And the world will be better for this; that one nation scorned and covered with scars, still strove with its last ounce of courage to reach the unreachable star."

A NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL DATA BANK

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in the RECORD at this point the prepared testimony of Dr. Diana R. Dunn, director of research for the National Recreation and Park Association on H.R. 56, which would create a national environmental data system. This legislation, which has been introduced by Congressman DINGELL, would fill a badly needed gap in our legislative efforts to improve environmental quality.

As Dr. Dunn points out, the question of leisure and recreation has not been adequately fed into the environmental equation. Increased personal and family income and availability of leisure time make it imperative that the impact of these factors be considered by the park and recreation profession, and indeed by all of us.

I commend Dr. Dunn's statement and the accompanying article concerning the impact of motorized recreation vehicles on the environment to the attention of my colleagues.

The articles follow:

STATEMENT BY DR. DIANA R. DUNN

The National Recreation and Park Association is grateful for the opportunity to indicate our basic support for H.R. 56, which would create a National Environmental Data System.

NRPA is a citizen and professional research, educational and service organization dedicated to expanding recreation and park resources, programs, and professional services to enhance the leisure of all Americans. Over 30,000 members belong to our eight branches: American Association of Zoological Parks and Aquariums, American Park and Recreation Society, Armed Forces Recreation Society, Commissioners-Board Members, Na-

tional Conference on State Parks, National Student Recreation and Park Society, National Therapeutic Recreation Society, and Society of Park and Recreation Educators.

Our members include the managers of some 500,000,000 acres of our nation's public outdoor recreation land, approximately one-fourth of the land mass of the continental United States. A primary function of the Association is to create a balance between man and his environment. We are concerned not only with how man affects the environment, but also with how these impacts in turn affect man, particularly during his leisure time.

One of the problems faced by our profession is the present lack of effective means of systematic analysis and coordination of data and information relating leisure and recreation to other aspects of environmental quality. This need is felt with greater urgency in regard to outdoor recreation because we deal here with a multidimensional problem and must use a multidisciplinary approach in solving it. Data from the social and behavioral sciences must be combined with data from the physical and biological sciences and related to practical aspects of resource management, transportation, leisure services, and the like. In many ways this presents a unique challenge for development of systems for obtaining and analyzing information.

An example of this problem occurs in the relationship between the expansion of leisure time and the development of new instruments of recreation such as motorized recreation vehicles. More free time is creating new industries, but also new hazards to the ecology. We still know very little about the implications of these developments. NRPA is now conducting a study of currently effective state and local laws and ordinances governing the use of these vehicles. Here is an area where a National Environmental Data System could prove most useful. Attached to this statement is an article that appeared in the July 1970 issue of our Association's magazine, *Parks & Recreation*, title "Motorized Recreation Vehicles: On Borrowed Time." The article points out that public land managers at the federal, state and local levels have an awesome responsibility complicated by some of man's basic conflicts—controversies such as the rights of the individual versus the state, individual property rights versus common public rights, economic growth versus the quality of life, recreational pursuits versus environmental quality. Reconciliation of the diverse interests and needs involved in this problem will call for mobilizing a great deal of information about man and the natural environment which we simply do not have at the present time.

NRPA has been actively seeking to bridge the knowledge gap attending this problem and others relating to air, water and noise pollution as they bear upon the recreation of people in our urban areas as well as in our state and national parks and other recreation environments. The quality of our parks has been diminished by pollution, and their very existence is threatened by highways, public utilities and industrial development. Pollution, in all its forms, is decreasing the quality of the recreation experience for all of us.

Although a great deal of environmental legislation has recently been enacted and more is pending, we believe that an environmental data system is needed if all of the pieces of the package are to fit together and achieve effective results. We have watched with great interest the progress of this important legislative proposal, for the progress of the bill closely parallels an important Association project. On May 5, 1970, the day that H.R. 17436 was introduced, NRPA concluded a three-day meeting of educators, librarians, and researchers from American and Canadian universities, government

agencies and professional associations. These participants met at the Pennsylvania State University and sought to determine the status of systems, problems, and priorities of literature retrieval and dissemination as they relate to leisure and recreation. Information efforts were identified—some having one or more aspects with recreation and leisure as a primary focus, others with some facet of recreation and/or leisure as a sub-function. These centers were located in many situations: colleges and universities, government agencies, professional associations, and under church auspices.

The National Recreation and Park Association was designed to coordinate subsequent work on behalf of the participants, and the acronym *REALISE* (Recreation, Environment, And Leisure Information Systems Exchange) was devised to describe the function undertaken. Through the summer of 1970 a steering committee representing government, academia, and our Association refined the scope and direction of the effort. One important modification of the original plan was a move to embrace a system or network concept as opposed to a central physical data bank.

A second meeting was held at the National Recreation and Park Congress in Philadelphia on September 30, 1970. The session brought attendees who had not participated in the May consultation up to date and also provided opportunity for new and revised input from the expanded group. Additional centers dealing with recreation and leisure information were identified and merged into Project *REALISE*.

On December 2, 1970, the steering committee convened a dialogue in Washington, D.C., with representatives from government, business, academia, and several operational information systems. The committee solicited the advice and counsel of the "pioneers" of U.S. information system personnel.

Proceedings from the three 1970 meetings have been published by the National Recreation and Park Association, and we are pleased to transmit copies for the reference files of the Subcommittee and staff. You may wish to include portions of *Recreation and Leisure Information Systems: Status and Priorities* in the hearing record, especially pages 13-17, 35-39, 43-46, 59-61, 65-66.

NRPA cosponsored a conference on January 21-23, 1971 at the University of South Florida at Tampa which was interprofessional, multidisciplinary, and international. Over 200 researchers, college and university educators, students, government officials, planners, and consultants attended from Canada, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, England, France, West Germany, Sweden, Hungary, Switzerland, and the United States.

Supported in part by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, the conference was cosponsored by the University of Rhode Island, Program in Gerontology; the Center for Studies of Leisure, University of South Florida; and the National Recreation and Park Association. It focused on leisure and recreation information systems, and two major projects formed the basis for the exchange: Project *CIDOL* and Project *REALISE*. Project *CIDOL* (International Centre for Documentation in Leisure), a project on automated documentation systems in leisure and popular culture, was presented by French and Canadian members of the Research Committee on Leisure and Popular Culture of the International Sociological Association. Project *REALISE* was presented by the U.S. steering committee. After intensive discussions regarding the political, conceptual, technological, and financial aspects of national and international leisure and recreation information centers and systems, the conference passed the following resolution:

"Resolved, that the Conference supports the development of international documentation and information systems for leisure

and recreation, and endorses the further international cooperation of systems which will be of service to all who may benefit from this information. Every effort should be made to insure conceptual and technological compatibility of all systems through communications to include correspondence and interim meetings whenever possible."

Pursuant to this resolution, and on behalf of the U.S. steering committee, I will deliver a paper regarding the progress of Project REALISE in Prague, Czechoslovakia on May 12, 1971. Professor Premysl Maydl, director of the European Centre for Leisure and Education, extended the invitation to participate in a "Workshop on International Cooperation in the Field of Documentation in Leisure." The Centre was established by UNESCO and the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences, and has cooperative liaison with the Committee for Leisure and Popular Culture of the International Sociological Association.

The Tampa conference resolution is consistent with Section 303(c) of the National Environmental Data System Act. We find there is a keen interest in other countries regarding this need and that liaison with professionals throughout the world can contribute much to our insight regarding international environmental issues as they bear on leisure and recreation.

These activities are cited to give special emphasis to our conviction that only by creating an environmental data system will the task of mobilizing information in support of recreation and environmental problems take place. Such a system must, in our view, knit together the data-generating and data-using centers of government, industry, the professions, and the universities. Our present planning group represents these sectors.

H.R. 56 as drafted meets the principal objections raised by a number of Executive branch witnesses in testimony before this Subcommittee in the 91st Congress. We particularly endorse the system concept as described in Section 303(b), and the international aspects outlined in Section 303(c). We also favor the concept that the proposed System cooperate with federal and state operating departments and offices but be free from control by any one of these.

NRPA hopes that the studies, plans, standards, and publications contemplated in Section 305(b) of H.R. 56 will give particular attention to the relationship of recreation and leisure to the environment, and that such efforts will emphasize the role of parks in this regard. With such a focus, the National Environmental Data System will be an important contribution to the quality of the recreation experiences of our people, and a great aid to the professional efforts of the National Recreation and Park Association.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, NRPA is grateful for the opportunity to express our comments on H.R. 56, and to declare our support for its early enactment.

MOTORIZED RECREATION VEHICLES

(By Diana R. Dunn)

Motorized recreation vehicles (MRVs) are a growing problem for park administrators throughout the United States and Canada. Motorcycles, snowmobiles, jeeps, trail bikes, ATVs (all-terrain vehicles), tote goats, airplanes, dune, beach, and swamp buggies, and others are all a part of this frequently volatile issue. The camp which views them as fun and desirable and the cadre cursing them as damaging and disruptive both seem to agree that they are here to stay. This article will challenge that premise.

In an effort to obtain current information from a cross section of those involved: federal, state, and local park administrators, and representatives of conservation groups, vehicular trade groups, and sports associations were invited to present their views, concerns,

and suggestions. The response was overwhelming. Problems, solutions, programs, laws, regulations, angry protestations, and thoughtful evaluations of the challenge of these vehicles were received. By press time, the stack, including supporting pictures, was three feet high. After sifting and sorting, a new dimension began to emerge from the material—a philosophical one. It is from this perspective that the following is written. It is offered with sincere thanks to all who contributed.

ON BORROWED TIME

On Christmas Eve 1968 pictures transmitted from Apollo 8 slammed home to millions of earthlings the fact that our planet is a very finite, very fragile, and very unique spaceship—"a grand oasis in the big vastness of space."

Readers of Parks & Recreation include the managers of some 500,000,000 acres of our nation's public outdoor recreation land,¹ approximately one fourth of the land mass of the continental United States. The Apollo 8 photos made it clear that these managers—federal, state, and local—have an awesome responsibility. So does this magazine. The fact that this burden is often complicated by conflicting responsibilities is the crux of this article.

Some of man's basic conflicts are involved in the MRV issue—controversies such as the rights of the individual versus the state, individual property rights versus common public rights, and economic growth versus the quality of life (Interior Secretary Hickel's Net National Environment versus the Gross National Product).

Critical factors in the MRV issue are the land, the vehicles, and man.

The land

All land is biologically and geologically fragile. Enormous variances complicate measurement of fragility, and we have only recently begun to show proper concern with the science which addresses the task—ecology. We are also just beginning, on a broad citizen scale, to understand and to believe that our planet is an exhaustible and irreplaceable resource.

The United States contains less than 6 percent of the earth's population, yet it is well documented that Americans contribute more per capita to irreparable ecological damage to our planet than do the people of any other nation. We have conquered frontier after frontier; each more expensive in terms of long term ecological cost than its predecessor. Our aggressive pioneer spirit *must* be redirected from its traditional focus: Nature.

The vehicles

The vehicles are too new to be a well-understood factor. Even if we discount the typically unquantified warnings of authorities who claim we should not waste frivolously the nonrenewable resources of man and earth necessary for the creation, use, and maintenance of these vehicles, knowledge gaps still exist. For example, research commitment to such attendant problems as pollution control, ecological damage, and user injury prevention have been on the same priority level as they were throughout the early days (roughly 70 years!) of the automobile. We have no "index" against which to measure these sins, or their successful (or unsuccessful) amelioration subsequent to remedial action (an exception is the sound level meter used to assess noise).

We do not know the exact numbers of each type of MRV now in use, but production projection graphs show nearly vertical annual output estimates to 1980. We do know that recreation vehicles are increasing

¹ The role of the contemporary administrator is that of managing man's relationship with and impact on the land. The pioneer approach of controlling, dominating, and defeating the land is not tenable in 1970.

at a faster rate than cars did during their first decade even when population variances are considered. We also know that there are now over one million snowmobiles in use, valued at over one billion dollars!

Positive and negative aspects of MRVs were liberally sprinkled through the letters and literature received. One outstanding recreation value of the vehicles was proclaimed: they are FUN. Utilitarian values reported included their convenience to land managers, utility company personnel, physicians, researchers, ranchers, and rescuers.

Negative charges were leveled at both the users and the vehicles. The vehicles themselves were accused of tearing up trails and turf, creating fire hazards, frightening birds and animals, destroying wildlife habitat and plant life, causing the erosion of lands and the siltation of streams and lakes, creating air, water, and noise pollution, and ruining the dignity, beauty, and serenity of wilderness areas.

Man

Man is by far the most crucial factor in the MRV issue, for he is responsible and can be held accountable for actions affecting the vehicles and the land. Man is manufacturer and user of the vehicles; he is manager and steward of the land.

Man, the manufacturer, has been given one supreme challenge in the economic picture of the United States: to make money (indeed, until quite recently, this has been a noble goal for all Americans). His social conscience was long separated from his product. Although signs point to some concern by industry in the social and environmental problems besetting us all, this concern frequently requires careful nurturing (tax incentives, good publicity, etc.). The Ford Motor Company is already planning an orderly transition from Ford's traditional and current products to ones which will better serve man's post-auto society. "Now that public expectations are exploding in all directions, we can no longer regard profit and service to society as separate and competing goals, even in the short run," says Ford. "Business should look upon the rising public standards as opportunities for profit." Coincidentally, MRV sales emphasis on "family fun," safety, and regulation encouragement is significant, although their admittedly pecuniary motives may distress conservation purists.

Man, the vehicle user, has received few good report cards; as with any group, the "bad guys" attract the publicity. MRV users have been accused of littering, poaching (alligators, waterfowl, frogs, deer, moose, wolves, eagles, and polar bears were among the reported victims), endangering highway motorists and pedestrians, harassing stock and wildlife, and ignoring safety regulations. The "good press" of vehicle users is less abundant, and one must turn to sports organization newsletters and other publications for copious documentation of virtues. Organized users, for obvious reasons, are the first line of defense for manufacturers. They serve as voluntary buffers between and among the abrasive groups which seem to gravitate toward conflict wherever MRVs proliferate. Their sword is service in behalf of the good-will required to keep them in the driver's seat. They organize safety programs, raise money for charities, organize clean-up campaigns, work on trails, and perform similar service functions.

Man, the recreator, clearly requires more of the land both quantitatively and qualitatively when he is aboard an MRV than when he is on foot or otherwise using his own power. The use of horses and burros is harder on the land than man on foot, as documented by stock grazing restrictions in our wilderness areas. One can envision a recreation area where annual carrying capacity might be:

1,000,000 man days on foot.
250,000 man days with stock.

100,000 man days with MRV.

With the population increasing geometrically, and with a national commitment to serving more Americans on modestly arithmetically increasing public recreation land, man on foot or under his own power becomes progressively more desirable. This is simply because user saturation levels are higher.

Another important dimension of carrying capacity is that of user and use diversity. MRVs tend to restrict large public areas to single use; areas which could be expected to service larger numbers of people, a wider age range of people, and a broader socioeconomic range of people. Further, these areas could be expected to provide opportunity for a fuller spectrum of recreation activities. Public land managers cannot ignore the social implications of these factors.

Man, the steward of the land, has always had a very difficult task, whether protecting royalty's forests from poachers, or the local, state, or national park from freeways. Perhaps nowhere is the conflict inherent in the task better exemplified than in the charges assigned the United States Secretary of the Interior—developer and steward! At the local level, the conflict is as old as "keep off the grass" signs. Man, the enabler of recreation on public lands, has had a complex assignment too. Generally, it has been to provide safe and legal recreation programs, services and opportunities for all citizens. It is submitted that the permitting of MRVs on public recreation land, particularly at the local level, is not compatible with the intent of this trust, especially when viewed as an extension of the land stewardship function.

Where we are

Many commonalities emerged from the information sent from across the country, and they eventually formed a pattern. The message: by permitting interim use of land (marginal, extra, or otherwise), managers are actually creating a market in which investors, manufacturers, and users will flourish, creating a land demand which probably cannot be met now, and which will be even more difficult to satisfy as pressure mounts for other land uses in the future. To explicate the pattern, The Dismal Cycle has been outlined.

THE DISMAL CYCLE

1. MRV sales produce a small, identifiable group of owners of a particular vehicle displaying one common problem: no land of their own.
2. They began to use public or private land, with or without permission.
3. The group grows, damage occurs, and initial conflict develops.
4. Either (A) Users are prohibited completely and no alternative site is offered (return to #2), or (B) some informal agreement is reached, usually with public land managers.
5. The existence of approved site is publicized by the users (to friends) and by vehicle dealers (to potential customers): more sales, more users.
6. "Bad apples" emerge to jeopardize the initial agreement; conservationists, neighbors, other user types form a coalition which forces a "shot-gun wedding" between recreation vehicle users and the manager. More sales, more users, and more outsiders begin to come.
7. "Self-organization and policing" as well as explicit management controls are initiated. Subtle co-optation of public agency has occurred, and the manager feels compelled to make the "marriage" work.
8. Publicity about favorable features is distributed; *Equilibrium* is attained; more sales, more users.
9. Too many "bad apples," too much damage, too few "police," and the *Saturation Point* is reached. The anticoalition reactivates. A "final straw" event occurs.

10. The manager declares total elimination of MRVs from the area. If alternate site is offered, go to #4B; if not, go to #2 and repeat cycle.

Camelot-like claims will no doubt beseege the editor, but the writer maintains that these claims only relate to situations where the cycle is at the *Equilibrium* state—#8.

Earlier, the claim was made that the premise that MRVs are here to stay would be challenged. The materials received from across the country give evidence that they have come and gone in many areas already. It would be foolish to suggest, however, that the demise of all MRVs is imminent, or even that it will occur within the decade. In many areas they are still increasing exponentially! Ultimately, however, they will go, for they will become increasingly philosophically untenable and physically nonsupportable. The secondary cause of their extinction will be related very much to that of endangered wild species—not enough land, and too many people. The primary cause of their end will be bitter irony to MRV buffs—success caused by too many vehicles.

As with threatened wildlife species, there will probably be a few types of recreation vehicles which will survive all onslaughts, much as the wild burro and the starling. Perhaps they have not yet been invented, but man's ingenuity is at work. Watch for the second and third generation MRVs which will include "amphicats" (capable of swamp, lake, and beach travel), and "hovercraft" (45 mph on water, 60 mph on land, 75 mph on ice). Of the current crop, a likely candidate for longevity seems to be the snowmobile (typical speeds of 30 to 50 mph, with at least one claim of 170 mph on a straight run).

Park and recreation manager strategy

Park and recreation professionals have been far too ambivalent about their environmental commitment. Many have been co-opted by the very threats they were hired to regulate, becoming promoters as well as protectors of the presumed regulated group. Nearly all MRV-related "ecocatastrophes" result from successive nondecisions and nonactions. Being a nonmanager is no longer tolerable. Managers can no longer *not* look forward and *not* make decisions and *not* take stands. Isolated ad hoc holding actions and maneuvers against specific vehicular threats to the environment are not working. Particularly impotent are defenses where there has been inadequate consideration of potential alternate land uses. Managers must exercise appropriate interventions regarding potential disfunctions over which they have responsibility at the strategically expedient moment.

The choice is: will public land managers satisfy the demands of MRV users now, or will they severely limit present opportunity so that the land will not be monopolized and degraded, but will be available for broader use both today and for generations?

Ten manager strategies

The following strategies are offered as tentative; they are suggestive of some of the tactics which might be used by managers tired of reacting to new MRV challenges.

1. Support efforts to identify alternative, less destructive recreation forms. Surely if this country can reach the moon, other ways of having FUN can be found. The human race got along without MRVs for over a million years!
2. Support efforts to identify less objectionable MRVs and encourage their use over that of more destructive and dangerous types.
3. Become informed—be sure your agency has the informational capability to make intelligent decisions about the long-range social and environmental consequences of its actions. Look back to see if the ecological effects anticipated from past actions were accurate. If not, are you *still* using the same information source?

4. Inform the public and encourage them to inform themselves. If you have information and are basing decisions upon it which affect the lives of your constituents and their children, give them all the information they will absorb. You can't expect people to accept "no" for an answer without good reasons.

5. Don't confuse feasibility and advisability. If you're planning actions which will affect ecosystems and social systems, list the good reasons why NOT as well as the positive rationale.

6. Discourage proliferation of MRV sales by prohibiting use rather than entering into short-term compromise agreements which mislead buyers into a false sense of land supply security. Avoid the marginal or interim land-use trap. This is a very relative condition, and implies an obligation for further land provision when the interim or marginal condition has passed. (The proposed Everglades jetport site was less than marginal just a few months ago!)

7. Encourage private enterprise to meet the need for land. Private campground growth is helping to fill the gap near crowded national parks, and such supplemental effort will be needed even more in the future. Develop incentives to influence positive involvement from the private sector.

8. Pressure MRV manufacturers and dealers to increase vehicular safety and diminish those undesirable damaging capabilities through design modification.

9. Encourage special taxes and licenses for MRV manufacturers, dealers, users, and vehicles to pay for costs of added legislation, police patrols, damage, insurance, and ultimate product disposal.

10. If ensnared in The Dismal Cycle, try to reach *Equilibrium* quickly and maintain this condition as long as possible.

It may be argued that these strategies are Utopian, but as President Nixon said, "We have had too many visions and too little vision." And, as Pogo eloquently observed, "We have met the enemy, and he is us."

This article, and the selected comments which follow, offer insight into the current status of motorized recreation vehicles and bring into sharp focus the responsibility of the park and recreation administrator. When viewed collectively, they substantiate the thesis of this article: motorized recreation vehicles are operating "on borrowed time."

Selected comments

The following observations and information were abstracted from materials received from individuals representing conservation groups, MRV associations, and federal, state, and local park and recreation agencies.

1969 Congress for Recreation & Parks, Chicago, Illinois: With more than one million snowmobiles in operation by the end of this winter, it is imperative that public park and recreation lands be adapted to the controlled use of snowmobiles, the National Recreation and Parks Congress was told by a top executive of the world's pioneer and largest manufacturer of the winter fun machines. "All of you in the recreational field must take a serious look at whether you are fully serving members of your community if your program does not include snowmobiling."

Canadian Parks & Recreation Association: Will snowmobile regulations be enacted before ruination of the sport? Some users are carrying chain saws to cut down any fencing that gets in their way. The answer may be to urge snowmobilers to organize themselves into many more closely knit, self-policing clubs, much like ski patrols.

Michigan State University: The Recreation Research and Planning Unit has started a pilot study of snowmobile use. Questionnaires concerning socioeconomic characteristics, use patterns, attitudes, preferences, and related activities are being mailed to a sample of users.

Conservation groups

National Audubon Society: Perhaps most important of all, on public lands, laws and regulations must establish zones of use and access which will assure that off-road vehicles do not interfere with the enjoyment by nonmotorized users of a substantial part of our wild areas, do not destroy wilderness, and do not jeopardize the existence of other fragile ecosystems.

Potomac-Appalachian Trail Club, Virginia: Construction of the "Big Blue trail to the west of the Appalachian Trail is underway. Some fallen logs are being removed from the trail, and others are being left as barriers to trail bikes."

Save the Dunes Council: Dune buggy use along the beach foredunes, and inland are becoming an increasing hazard and threat to the dunes region. The vehicles "tear up the beach grasses, wild flowers, and other vegetation, creating blowouts and erosion. They level dunes, disturbing the natural contours of the region. They are noisy, destructive, and dangerous." The Council is recommending that all beach communities pass ordinances prohibiting their use.

National Parks Association: Motorized vehicles are "a substantial threat to virtually all national parks, as they damage the ecology of the area they travel through or over." NPA supports the premise that parks are for people, not vehicles, and recommends that park traffic be restricted to official, emergency, and service vehicles which would bring visitors into and through the parks. Tourist accommodations should be provided outside the parks by the private sector.

National Wildlife Federation: NWF recommends "that federal, state, and local land-managing agencies adopt and strictly enforce regulations which zone governmental areas in manners so that uses of multiterain vehicles will be restricted to suitable locations or trails which will result in the least possible impact on the environment or impairment to other legitimate uses of public properties."

The Conservation Foundation: The Foundation has prepared a publication, "Off-Road Vehicles and Environmental Quality." The document offers vehicle profiles, recreation, trail, and noise effects, effects on fish and wildlife, and discussions of trespass, vandalism, and thefts, safety, law enforcement, policy recommendations, and model state laws.

The Salt Water Sportsman: "We are witnessing the passing of the beach buggy in many areas due to stringent laws imposed primarily by local seashore communities. Self-policing had a beneficial effect for many years, but there are now too many vehicles, and too many other people on the beaches." The Massachusetts Beach Buggy Association was the first in the United States, and at one time its membership was over 2,000. This has declined as beach buggy operations have been restricted.

MRV associations

International Snowmobile Association: "Our member clubs perform valuable services and cooperate with all government agencies and industry for the benefit of the user in safe and sane snowmobiling."

National All Terrain Vehicle Association: "ATVs have come a long way since John Gower's 'Jiger' was introduced back in the early '60s. Production in 1969 was a mere 15,000, but the estimated output for 1975 is 225,000! The world is the market—we are not hindered by seasonal restrictions."

International Snowmobile Congress, Duluth, Minnesota: Delegates attending the January 1970 Congress were urged to help states regulate the design and use of the vehicles before their numbers and indiscriminate operation became a public nuisance.

International Snowmobile Industry Association, Minneapolis, Minnesota: Report of

the Committee on Environmental Quality. Major Recommendation One: "The land managing agencies should take the lead in designing, developing, and maintaining areas and trails where snowmobilers can enjoy quality recreation experiences in harmony with other special interest groups."

Federal Government

Bureau of Indian Affairs: America's Indians are determined to protect their environment. Some tribes have closed parts of their land to one or more specific vehicles; whereas others have closed areas to all motorized vehicles.

Tennessee Valley Authority: At TVA's Land Between the Lakes area, use of mini-bikes by large groups of unlicensed minors has prompted regulations banning their use. Regular motorbikes, motorcycles, and 4-wheel drive vehicles are restricted to developed roads. Future intent is to accommodate MRVs where practical.

National Park Service: "Operating a vehicle outside of established public roads, parking areas, or routes designated by the Superintendent is prohibited."

Forest Service: The anticipated increase in all-terrain vehicles could cause saturation and the beginning of extensive restrictions of the use of such vehicles on public lands. The Wilderness Act already bans all MRVs from these areas.

Bureau of Land Management: In addition to a 16-million-acre garbage dump already in the Southern California desert, BLM is worried that motorcycles, dune buggies, 4-wheel drive vehicles, and other off-road vehicles traversing the desert may wipe out plant life, archaeological sites, and centuries-old Indian trails. A 15-member BLM off-road vehicle advisory council wants to mandate strict laws and regulations to protect these public lands. It is asking for a desert ranger force to patrol a beat from the Sierra Nevada and Death Valley to Mexico, and from the Colorado River to the Pacific.

Cities, counties, and States

Bryan, Ohio: The Parks and Recreation Board passed a resolution to prohibit the use of recreational vehicles on parkland, but enforcement is difficult. "The vehicles have their place, but not in multiple-use local public parks."

Hermosa Beach, California: "The best idea is to have a very close study of the situation today and how it will shape up in the future. Then we can decide on some sane rules and regulations to be applied to all vehicles before greater destruction is realized."

Kansas City, Missouri: "Hundreds of cyclists weekly thrill to the jumps and banked curves in a marginal area between the Missouri River and river levee. We should set aside and develop such lands for motorcycle use to keep cyclists off other parklands and make issuing citations justifiable."

Midland, Michigan: A campaign is under way for larger license plates on recreation vehicles, especially motorcycles.

Anchorage, Alaska: "The problem is becoming acute—there are probably as many or more snowmobiles per capita and per square mile as in any other location in the country." The city manager has a committee working on the problem.

Ardmore, Pennsylvania: Motorized vehicles have been prohibited except at locations specifically designated for such purposes.

Concord, New Hampshire: Snowmobiles and the noise they make are the concern of a special committee working on new statewide regulations. Private development of facilities should be encouraged to reduce pressures on public lands which have more value for other use, according to the Governor's office.

Winston-Salem, North Carolina: The city is building a 91.5-acre "hobby park" to accommodate recreation "nuisances" including archery, rifle and pistol ranges, model

plane, rocket, sky diving, go-cart, and motorcycle areas.

Appleton, Maine: The town was invaded by snowmobiles, causing extensive damage to blueberry bushes and forest seedlings. An improvement committee made 50 miles of trails, provided maps, and a warming hut, and proclaimed, "Don't fight 'em, join 'em!"

Southern California: Some cities are investigating the possibility of sponsoring cycle parks. A "mechanical park" is being considered by the Orange County Parks Department, and a study has been completed for a 24-acre cycle park along the Santa Ana River in Anaheim, possibly to be leased to a concessionaire. Costa Mesa has a motorcycle and mini-bike club for boys 16 and under, "designed to keep the kids off the streets, playground, and parks with their bikes."

North Dakota State Outdoor Recreation Agency: "The step by government to tighten up rules has been a direct result of foolhardy snowmobiles who cannot tell what time of night it is, or the difference between public and private property, or have any common sense for the safety of passengers, pedestrians, and the like. A cut fence, trampled crops, dead livestock, and assorted abuses have ruined the hunter-farmer relationship. Snowmobiling is approaching this unreconcilable plateau."

New York State: Steps are necessary to cut down the growing number of snowmobile-auto accidents, and to provide identification for the estimated 100,000 snowmobiles now in use. Mufflers to cut noise to 73 decibels by June 1974 is in pending legislation.

REFERENCES

The nature of the article precludes any attempt at providing a complete bibliography. However, four recent publications are commended to the attention of readers who desire to pursue some of the basic themes.

Baldwin, Malcolm F. *Off-Road Vehicles and the Environment*. In preparation. The Conservation Foundation, 1250 Connecticut Avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C. 20036.

Ehrlich, Paul R. and Ehrlich, Anne H. *Population Resources Environment; Issues in Human Ecology*. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman and Co., 1970.

Potter, Frank M., Jr., "Pollution and the Public," *The Center Magazine*, A Publication of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. Vol. 3, No. 3 May, 1970, pp. 18-23.

"Society and Its Physical Environment," a special issue of *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 389, May 1970.

THE CONSTITUTION SECURES
POWER TO THE PEOPLE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, "power to the people" is a slogan used not only by radical socialists in their plans to communize America but also by President Nixon in his New American Revolution.

In his state of the Union address on January 22, 1971, the President stated: So let us put the money where the needs are. And let us put the power to spend it where the people are.

The further away government is from people, the stronger government becomes and the weaker people become. And a na-

tion with a strong government and a weak people is an empty shell.

I reject the idea that government in Washington, D.C. is inevitably more wise, more honest, and more efficient than government at the local or State level. . .

The idea that a bureaucratic elite in Washington knows best what is best for people everywhere and that you cannot trust local government is really a contention that you cannot trust people to govern themselves. This notion is completely foreign to the American experience. Local government is the government closest to the people and it is most responsive to the individual person; it is people's government in a far more intimate way than the government in Washington can ever be.

People came to America because they wanted to determine their own future rather than to live in a country where others determined their future for them.

What this change means is that once again in America we are placing our trust in people.

I have faith in people. I trust the judgment of people. Let us give the people of America a chance, a bigger voice in deciding for themselves those questions that so greatly affect their lives.

Whereas the rhetoric of the President is desirable and encouraging, the words unfortunately are made suspect by actions. By consistently asking for more and more tax funds for more and more Federal programs which add to the Federal payroll an increasing number of bureaucrats who increasingly control more and more facets of the daily lives of citizens; by grouping the States into regions with unelected Federal overseers, thereby removing power farther from the people; and by promoting such programs as the Atlantic Union which if effected would remove power still more distant from the people, the Chief Executive is, in effect, fostering power over the people rather than "power to the people."

"Power to the people" is a traditionally American concept which is what the Constitution of the United States is all about. When the necessary number of the Original Thirteen Colonies ratified the U.S. Constitution, they established a government in which political power was decentralized. By the constitutional contract they surrendered to the Federal Government only specified powers. Powers not delegated to the Federal Government were reserved to the States and to the people. And rather than to permit such a logical conclusion, the 10th amendment so specified the intent.

Under this concept of government, power was concentrated at the bottom—at the lowest denominator of government—the level closest to the people and most responsive to the desires and wishes of the individual person.

Locally controlled governments and systems of education, a basically religious people who in large measure recognized the Holy Bible as a guide to conduct, and a free enterprise economic system with a minimum of government interference produced the most prosperous and powerful Nation on earth. America abounded in Peace, opportunity, and true progress so long as America adhered to the Holy Bible and the Constitution.

The second decade of the present century saw the beginning of a trend in the direction of removing power from the

hands of people at the State and local level and concentrating more and more power over the lives of people in the hands of unelected bureaucrats at the regional and Federal levels, in fact, even the surrendering of national powers and prerogatives to international bodies.

This trend was given impetus in 1913, with the enactment of the Federal Reserve Act, which took away people's control over their money; the 16th amendment to the Constitution calling for the graduated Federal income tax—a plank of the Marxist platform—and in 1919, with the establishment of the Council on Foreign Relations which has been instrumental in promoting world government.

The ratification of the U.N. Charter, a plan for world government, by the U.S. Senate in 1945, transferred "people power" still farther away from the people at the local level. The present emphasis being given to regional government and to an Atlantic Union, both of which have the President's approval, further erodes the Constitution and are obstacles to circumvent "people power."

Thanks to the seeds of knowledge planted during the past 2 or 3 decades by various constitutional groups and individuals, more and more Americans are becoming informed as to who the anti-Americans are and what they are doing to emasculate our Constitution and to destroy our country by trapping us into regional and world government. Action at the local and State levels by informed groups and individuals to salvage and restore the Constitution and, as a consequence, "people power" is a most encouraging sign.

One such organization is the Committee to Restore the Constitution, Inc. which recently presented its case to a Special Joint Committee, Wisconsin State Legislature.

I insert to follow my remarks the testimony entitled "The Most Secret Science" before a special joint committee of the Wisconsin State Legislature by Lt. Col. Archibald E. Roberts, A.U.S.—retired, director of the Committee to Restore the Constitution; resolution No. 1 of the Wisconsin Legislative and Research Joint Committee, Inc.; 1971 Assembly Joint Resolution 34 of Wisconsin Legislature; statement by the president on Restructuring of Government Service Systems; White House Press Conference of Daniel P. Moynihan, Philip S. Hughes and Ron Ziegler; an enlightening article on regional government by Mary M. Davison; a provocative article entitled "While We Slept, the States Were Being Abolished" by the eminent writer Don Bell; an article entitled "Roberts Wants People Power," and several informative articles by Jo Hindman, expert writer in the field of metro government.

The material follows:

THE MOST SECRET SCIENCE

(Testimony by Archibald E. Roberts)

In consonance with the provisions of 1971 Assembly Joint Resolution No. 34, Wisconsin State Legislature, "Establishing a special committee to study the constitutionality of the federal government's relations with the United Nations", I respectfully invite the members of this Special Legislative Commit-

tee to hear my testimony on proofs of a conspiracy to overthrow the Constitution of the United States and erect a socialist state government over the American people.

Intelligence which I have previously submitted to every member of the Wisconsin State Legislature ("United Nations-Creature of the Invisible Government of Monetary Power", Congressional Record, December 14, 1971) provided evidence to indict an ambitious and morally degenerate group of financiers and industrialists who seek to erect an international, non-elected authority upon the ruins of the American civilization. This documented study explained how, via interlocking subversion, the Council on Foreign Relations (Harold Pratt House, 58 East 88th Street, New York City) captured principal agencies of the Federal Government and created the United Nations Organization as their private instrumentality for global conquest.

In documents subsequently submitted to Wisconsin Legislators, I illustrated the charge that so-called "Revenue Sharing" and "Regional Government" is the final technique for stripping away State sovereignty and eliminating elective office at State and national levels.

During the next few minutes I will show how this same group of international bankers and industrialists, by guile and deceit, gained control over the money and credit resources of the United States and thus captured the power centers of the American civilization.

First, however, I offer my credentials.

My ancestors, like yours, were mostly farmers, preachers, soldiers and laborers.

They arrived on the North American continent long before there was a United States of America and challenged the wilderness with a confidence borne of an abiding faith in God. My people fought in the Revolutionary War and have served this country in every succeeding conflict to the present day.

Our forebears, yours and mine, raised up mighty cities and establish a civilization of free men—the envy of all others. The blood and sweat of our clans fertilized the soil of America. Their achievements constitute our heritage; their culture a legacy for our children and our children's children.

Or so it seemed a few short years ago.

It is now evident that a subtle and perilous change has occurred in our America. Within the past two or three generations the civilization of our forefathers has come under sophisticated assault. The structures of freedom erected at such great cost in blood, sweat and treasure, are crumbling. Our God is blasphemed, our lineage reviled, and our Constitution dismantled.

Our destiny has turned to dust.

The descendants of the pioneers, the warriors, and the engineers of this unique order are now economic serfs in an industrialized society ruled by a self-anointed elite. We are manipulated by massive propaganda, betrayed in international military adventures and exploited by a rapacious, insatiable bureaucracy.

The founders of this nation, in the Declaration of Independence, established a course of action to which every responsible citizen must adhere when government becomes master instead of servant.

"Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed . . . whenever any form of Government becomes destructive of (Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness) it is the right of the People to alter or abolish it . . ."

If we are to survive as a race and as a nation, the People must regain control over the centers of power in America.

Let us begin by reviewing the manner in which they were lost.

The most secret knowledge, a science which outdates history, is the science of control over people, governments and civilizations.

The foundation of this ultimate discipline is the control of wealth.

Through the control of wealth comes the control of public information and the necessities of life.

Through the control of news media comes thought control.

Through the control of basic necessities comes direct physical control of people.

The rule is to finance the education of members of the money aristocracy in the professions, business, political science, management, research, public speaking, writing and education. By placing trusted members, well trained and financed, in positions of influence in their communities, and in positions of leadership in nearly all organizations including the religious order and in opposing associations, it is possible to direct local, regional and national policy toward long-range objectives.

The fate reserved for less fortunate citizens, those not born of the money aristocracy, was succinctly stated by Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Sr. In a policy statement published by his General Education Board, forerunner to today's ill-famed Rockefeller Foundation, John Rockefeller heralded the plan to mold an American peasantry through control of educational process.

"In our dreams", said Rockefeller, "we have limitless resources and the people yield themselves with perfect docility to our molding hands. The present educational conventions fade from our minds", Rockefeller predicted, "and, unhampered by tradition, we work our own good will upon a grateful and responsive rural folk . . ." (Occasional Letter No 1, General Education Board, 1904).

A significant portion of the American public is yet to become aware of "The Invisible Government of Monetary Power" although this knowledge is common in Europe. Americans still believe that they are working toward a better way of life. Surreptitiously, however, social customs and forms of administration in the United States are being carefully and gradually modified. The change from one type of culture to another is thus accomplished without arousing serious public challenge.

The stark truth is that America is now passing from a constitutional republic into a totalitarian, world wide government. World dominion is the ages-old dream of the matroids who have mastered the science of control over people.

Their success in the United States is directly related to two central issues:

One—transfer of money control from the people into the hands of an international banking combine, and

Two—creation of a complex and confusing judicial system designed to frustrate justice.

The remainder of this presentation will be concerned with the first principle—money, and those who control it.

In 1913 the money aristocracy effected a major advance toward their long-range goal of world dominion. They duped the United States Congress into adopting the Federal Reserve Act. This coup resulted in the transfer of the power to coin and regulate U.S. money from the Congress to their private banking combine, the Federal Reserve System.

Since passage of the Federal Reserve Act, the American destiny and the personal life of every citizen has been controlled by a financial elite whose sick-brained policies have spawned depression, war and revolution.

The existence of an "Invisible Government of Monetary Power" was dramatically confirmed in 1933 by the late Louis T. McFadden, Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, United States Congress, who said:

"Every effort has been made by the Fed to conceal its powers but the truth is—the Fed has usurped the government. It controls everything here (in Congress) and it controls

all our foreign relations. It makes and breaks governments at will."

Representative John R. Rarick, denouncing President Nixon's plan for deficit spending ("Deficit Financing," Congressional Record, February 1, 1971) also revealed the dominant position held by the Federal Reserve System over the American economy.

"He" (President Nixon), said Mr. Rarick, "has asked the independent Federal Reserve System to come up with enough new money to reach a projected increase in the GNP by \$88 billion in order to achieve his 'objective of prosperity without inflation.'"

"The Federal Reserve", Congressman Rarick pointed out, "is not an agency of Government. It is a private banking monopoly."

"As I have said many times before," Rarick declared, "the policies of the monarch are always those of his creditors."

Gentlemen, the safety of the State and the peace and security of Wisconsin citizens now urgently require an investigation of the vast powers claimed by the Federal Reserve System.

The first consideration should be a public examination of the authority which the Federal Reserve System says established its legal status as a Government agency. Such authority is quoted in a statement submitted to Congressman Wright Patman, House Banking and Currency Committee, by the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System and Federal Reserve Banks, dated April 14, 1952.

"The 12 Federal Reserve Banks," said the Federal Reserve Board, "are corporations set up by Federal law to operate for public purposes under Government supervision."

The Board further advised Mr. Patman that, "The Board of Governors was created by Congress and is a part of the Government of the United States. Its members," they said assuringly, "are appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, and it (the Fed) has been held by the Attorney General to be a Government establishment (30 Op. Atty. Gen., 308, 1914)."

Retorting to these impressive claims to "legality" and "public service" Congressman Patman stated:

"There is no free market that can cope with a national debt of \$272 billion (1952), with \$85 billion of it to be refunded within one year. Free market," he said, "means private manipulation of (private) credit."

Private manipulation of PUBLIC credit is, of course, the purpose and objective of the Federal Reserve System. This international banking cartel, as will be shown, manages the credit of the United States for the profit and advantage of its foreign and domestic members. In so doing the Federal Reserve exploits the entire producing strata of the American society for the gain of a select, non-producing few.

"The Federal Reserve Board, to my mind," continued Mr. Patman, "is guilty of the grossest kind of misconduct in failing to support the Government of the United States at a time of its greatest economic peril in Government securities."

Congressman Patman then revealed the contradiction in the spurious Federal Reserve claim of "Government agency" status and explained how the Fed generates illegitimate profits for its members.

"The Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve System," he said, "is composed of the 7 members of the Board of Governors and 5 members who are presidents of the Federal Reserve banks and who are selected by private commercial banking interests. The Open Market Committee has the power to obtain, and does obtain, the printed money of the United States—Federal Reserve Notes—(free) from the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and exchanges these printed

notes, which of course are not interest bearing, for United States Government obligations that are interest bearing. After making the exchange", Patman explained, "the interest bearing obligations are retained by the 12 Federal Reserve banks and the interest collected annually on these Government obligations goes into the funds of the 12 Federal Reserve banks."

Exploding the myth that the Federal Reserve System is an instrumentality of the Federal Government Mr. Patman declared:

"These funds (interest from Government obligations) are expended by the (Federal Reserve) system without an adequate accounting to the Congress. In fact there has never been an independent audit of either the 12 banks or the Federal Reserve Board that has been filed with the Congress where a Member (of Congress) would have an opportunity to inspect it. The General Accounting Office", he stated, "does not have jurisdiction over the Federal Reserve. For 40 years (1952) the system, while freely using the money (credit) of the Government, has not made a proper accounting."

Governor W. P. G. Harding of the Federal Reserve Board, in testimony before Congress in 1921, admitted that the Fed is a private banking monopoly.

"The Federal Reserve Bank is an institution owned by the stockholding member banks," he said. "The Government has not a dollar's worth of stock in it."

The Government does, however, give the Federal Reserve System free use of its billions of dollars of credit. This gives the Federal Reserve the characteristic of a central bank; the power to issue currency on the Government's credit.

Americans do not have Federal Government notes or gold certificates as currency. We have Federal Reserve Bank notes, fiat money issued by private banks. Every dollar the Federal Reserve System prints is a dollar in their pocket.

The compatible meshing of the Federal Reserve System with a network of international banking was explained by Mr. W. Randolph Burgess of the New York Federal Reserve Bank in an address before the Academy of Political Science in 1930.

"In its major principles of operation the Federal Reserve System is no different," he told Congress, "from other banks of issue, such as the Bank of England, the Bank of France, or the Reichsbank."

It is obvious that when control of money is transferred from the People to private banking centers, as is the case in Europe and America, the sovereignty of the People is surrendered, too. Control of wealth confers upon those who control its final decision in the domestic and international affairs of nations. When the financial aristocracy usurp the "coin of the realm", the People are disfranchised and real political authority passes into the hands of an "Invisible Government of Monetary Power".

Our founding fathers knew this principle very well.

"I believe that banking institutions are more dangerous to our liberties than standing armies", said Thomas Jefferson. "Already they have raised up a money aristocracy that has set the government at defiance. The issuing power (of money)", he said, "should be taken from the banks and restored to the people to whom it properly belongs."

Though but dimly perceived today the Declaration of Independence was actually a proclamation that the colonists would not serve a money aristocracy. The American Revolution was a struggle to wrest control of wealth from the Bank of England and to restore the centers of power to the People where it "properly belongs".

The Constitution is specific about the authority of the People, through their elected

officials, to control the money, and thus, the affairs of their Government.

"The Congress shall have the power . . . To coin money (and) regulate the value thereof . . ." (Article 5, Section 8, United States Constitution).

Nowhere does the Constitution authorize or permit the transfer of this vast power to a money aristocracy.

Exposure of the hidden forces which have cheated the people of Wisconsin of their birthright must be of gravest concern to members of this State Legislature, each of which has sworn to "defend and preserve this Constitution". I propose that we begin the task of identifying the men behind the Federal Reserve conspiracy.

A clew to the origin of the Federal Reserve Act was given by Colonel Ely Garrison, friend and financial adviser to President Theodore Roosevelt and President Woodrow Wilson. In his autobiographical book, "Roosevelt, Wilson and the Federal Reserve Act", Garrison wrote:

"Mr. Paul Warburg is the man who got the Federal Reserve Act together after the Aldrich Plan aroused such nation-wide resentment and opposition. The mastermind of both plans," declared Garrison, "was Alfred Rothschild of London."

In a preface written for a group of Warburg's essays calling for a central bank, Professor E. R. A. Seligman, of the international banking family, and head of the Department of Economics, Columbia University, said:

"The Federal Reserve Act is the work of Mr. Warburg more than any other man in the country."

Paul Moritz Warburg, whom President Wilson subsequently appointed first Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors, was an immigrant from Germany. His primary allegiance was to his family banking house of W. M. Warburg Company of Hamburg and Amsterdam.

During World War I the M. W. Warburg Company financed Germany's war against the Allied forces. Paul's brother, Max, headed the German Secret Service.

During the war years, Paul Warburg's firm of Kuhn, Loeb Company had five representatives in the United States Treasury Department in charge of Liberty Loans, thus financing America's war effort against the Kaiser.

It is unlikely that considerations of humanitarianism or patriotism inspired such interlocking, international financing of the agony of World War I.

Mr. Eustace Mullins in his book, "The Federal Reserve Conspiracy," noted that, "Woodrow Wilson and (Senator) Carter Glass are given full credit for the (Federal Reserve) act by contemporary historians, but of all the politicians concerned, Wilson had the least to do with the fight over the Act in Congress."

Mr. George Creel, veteran Washington correspondent, wrote in Harper's Weekly of June 25, 1915:

"As far as the Democratic Party was concerned, Woodrow Wilson was without influence, save for the patronage he possessed. It was (William Jennings) Bryan who whipped Congress into line on . . . the currency bill. Mr. Bryan later wrote, 'That is the one thing in my public career that I regret—my work to secure the enactment of the Federal Reserve Law.'"

Mullins summed up the effect of this fantastic law in the following words:

"The money and credit resources of the United States were now in the complete control of the banker's alliance between J. P. Morgan's First National Bank group, and Kuhn, Loeb's National City Bank, whose principal loyalties were to the international banking interests then quartered in London, and which moved to New York during the First World War."

Congressman Charles A. Lindbergh of Minnesota, father of the famous flyer, made a

prophetic statement on the swindle which had been foisted on the American people. Speaking on the floor of the House on December 23, 1913, the day the Federal Reserve Act became law, Mr. Lindbergh said:

"This Act establishes the most gigantic trust on earth. When the President (Wilson) signs this bill the invisible government of the Monetary Power will be legalized . . . the worst legislative crime of the ages is perpetrated by this banking and currency bill."

The crimes alleged by Congressman Lindbergh were subsequently defined by the Honorable Louis T. McFadden.

In a statement of particulars, here offered in abridged form, Chairman McFadden, on May 23, 1933, brought impeachment charges against members of the Federal Reserve Board and the heads of the 12 member banks (Congressional Record, bound volume, pp. 4055-4058).

"Whereas I charge them jointly and severally with having brought about a repudiation of the national currency of the United States in order that the gold value of said currency might be given to private interests. . . .

"I charge them . . . with having arbitrarily and unlawfully taken over \$80,000,000,000.00 (eighty billion dollars) from the United States Government in the year 1928

"I charge them . . . with having arbitrarily and unlawfully raised and lowered the rates on money . . . increased and diminished the volume of currency in circulation for the benefit of private interests

"I charge them . . . with having brought about the decline in prices on the New York Stock Exchange

"I charge them . . . with having conspired to concentrate United States Government securities . . . and thus . . . having conspired to transfer to foreigners and international money lenders title to and control of the financial resources of the United States

"I charge them . . . with having published false and misleading propaganda intended to deceive the American people and to cause the United States to lose its independence. . . .

"I charge them . . .", Congressman McFadden concluded, "with the crime of having treasonably conspired and acted against the peace and security of the United States, and with having treasonably conspired to destroy the constitutional government of the United States."

Congressman McFadden's shocking indictment of the members of the Federal Reserve System, and those who maneuvered its adoption by the Congress, was moved to the Committee on the Judiciary. It still awaits reporting to the House floor and action to impeach both former and present members of the Board of Governors and Federal Reserve Banks for criminal conspiracy against the People of the United States.

The final decision as to whether or not an "Invisible Government of Monetary Power" will continue to control the American destiny and the lives and fortunes of her People must ultimately be made by the citizens of this nation.

To begin the task of exposing and neutralizing the men and the system which seeks to overthrow constitutional government and impose a world governance over our domestic and foreign affairs, I am empowered to present to the lawmakers of the State of Wisconsin the following resolution adopted by the Wisconsin Legislative and Research Committee, and subscribed to by constituents who support the Wisconsin campaign to restore the Constitution:

A resolution declaring that the people of this State should debate the question of whether or not any agency or instrumentality of government which derives its powers from the consent of the governed can voluntarily, by treaty or otherwise, alienate the political sovereignty of a free people.

The resolution calls for an investigation by the Wisconsin State Legislature of the actions of Federal agents who have purported to negotiate with foreign governments and with private interests to transfer vast powers of government, and to surrender rights and liberties assured to the People under the Constitution of the United States, to foreigners and to international money lenders in violation of the prohibitions of the Constitution.

The resolution further requests that the Wisconsin State Legislature promulgate and enact appropriate statutes which will provide for the enforcement of the Constitution of the United States within the boundaries of the State of Wisconsin, to include criminal sanctions for violators, with regard to the United Nations Charter, the Federal Reserve Act, and other ultra vires acts by agents of the Federal Government who have, by these ultra vires acts, attempted to amend the Constitution of the United States in a manner not sanctioned by Article V.

We respectfully demand, if it be God's will, that the elected representatives of the People of Wisconsin act at once to restore America's legacy of Freedom to the descendants of the pioneers, the warriors, and the engineers who gave their blood, sweat and treasure to establish and defend it.

Thank you for your courtesy and attention.

RESOLUTION No. 1. WISCONSIN LEGISLATIVE AND RESEARCH COMMITTEE, INC.

(A resolution declaring that the people of this State should debate the question of whether or not any agency or instrumentality of government which derives its powers from the consent of the governed can voluntarily, by treaty or otherwise, alienate the political sovereignty of a free people.)

Whereas, Federal Agencies, by treaty and other acts, allege the transfer of vast powers of government from the Congress of the United States to international agencies in violation of the prohibitions of the Constitution and without the knowledge or consent of the State or the People, and

Whereas, a compliant Congress permits the commitment of America's soldier sons to international military adventures "with neither promise nor hope of Victory"; and

Whereas, the actions of Federal agents exhibit a contempt for the limited delegated powers enumerated in the United States Constitution, which is very explicit about the authority for making war and keeping peace; and

Whereas, American citizens, acting through their State Legislature, are morally and legally obligated to do whatever may be necessary to insure that all provisions of the Constitution of the United States shall be respected and enforced, be it therefore

Resolved that the Wisconsin Legislative and Research Committee does hereby call for an investigation of the actions of Federal agents with regard to United Nations agreements and other ultra vires acts and demands enforcement of the Constitution of the United States in relation thereto.

To implement these objectives, the Wisconsin Legislative and Research Committee submits to the Legislators of the sovereign State of Wisconsin, in accord with the oath to which these officeholders subscribed upon accepting position of public trust ("to support this Constitution") and in consonance with the obligations of the parties to the Constitutional compact ("to insure that all provisions of the Constitution are respected and enforced within the boundaries of the State"), the following proposals and demands:

1. That the Wisconsin State Legislature investigate the actions of certain Federal agents who have purported to negotiate with foreign governments to coerce the State into agreements which would surrender to for-

eign governments the rights and liberties assured to the People under the Constitution of the United States, and

Which would surrender the powers of government which this Constitution guarantees to preserve to our People, and

Which would transfer citizens of the State of Wisconsin now serving in the United States military establishment to a United Nations army in the name of "international peace and security."

2. That the Wisconsin State Legislature promulgate and enact appropriate statutes which will provide for enforcement of the Constitution of the United States with regard to the United Nations Charter and other ultra vires acts within the boundaries of the State of Wisconsin.

3. That such deliberations, decisions and statutory enactments by the Wisconsin State Legislature shall be disseminated in compliance with Section 1, Article IV, and shall respect the provisions of Section 2 and Section 4, Article IV, of the United States Constitution.

Adopted this 25th day of July, 1970, by the Wisconsin Legislative and Research Committee, Inc., Post Office Box 45, Brookfield, Wisconsin 53005.

1971 ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 34 OF THE STATE OF WISCONSIN

Establishing a special joint committee to study the constitutionality of the federal government's relations with the United Nations.

ANALYSIS BY THE LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE BUREAU

This joint resolution establishes a special joint committee, comprised of 4 senators and 4 representatives to the assembly, to study the constitutionality of the actions of federal agencies with regard to the United Nations, the effect of these actions on the state and possible measures which could be taken by this state to punish unconstitutional actions. The committee shall report its findings to the legislature within 6 months after adoption of the resolution.

Whereas, the state of Wisconsin, at the time of its admission into the Union of the States as attested by its ratification of the agreement known as the Constitution of the United States, assumed all obligations to the people of Wisconsin, and to the people of the several states that were parties to the same agreement, to insure that all provisions of the Constitution of the United States shall be respected and enforced within the boundaries and under the jurisdiction of the state of Wisconsin; and

Whereas, 3 federal agencies of government were created by Article I, Article II and Article III of that compact; and

Whereas, it appears, under what has been asserted to be a legal use of these limited and enumerated delegated powers, that the federal executive and legislative branches have negotiated with foreign governments and entered into agreements which may constitute a surrender to foreign governments of certain rights and liberties assured to the people under the Constitution of the United States, and which may surrender certain powers of government which this Constitution guarantees to preserve to our people; and

Whereas, as a result of some of these agreements, Wisconsin men have been drafted into the armed forces and sent to foreign countries to fight and die in a series of undeclared "No-Win" wars; and

Whereas, engaging in war without a Declaration of War by Congress constitutes a violation of Article 1, Section 8, of the U.S. Constitution; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly, the senate concurring, That the legislature hereby establishes a special joint committee consisting of

4 senators and 4 representatives to the assembly, appointed as are members of standing committees, to investigate the question of whether the agreement which is represented to be entered into by federal agencies, acting as representatives of these United States with regard to the so-called United Nations Organization and treaties made under this organization, be within the power and authority granted to said agencies under the Constitution of the United States; and, be it further

Resolved, that the committee be further authorized and directed to investigate the question of whether these agreements affect the state of Wisconsin, or relate to the relinquishment of any of the laws or rights affecting the state of Wisconsin or its people, and whether there is any change proposed to be made which would deprive the state of Wisconsin or its people of rights and privileges or would involve any change in any of the provisions of the agreement known as the Constitution of the United States without the consent of the government of the people of this state or of the several states; and, be it further

Resolved, That the committee inquire into what measures may be taken by this state to enforce the Constitution of the United States and to punish any infractions thereof that may appear to be sanctioned by any unlawful use of purported authority by an agency not sanctioned by the Constitution of the United States; and, be it further

Resolved, That the committee report its findings to the legislature not later than 6 months following adoption of this resolution.

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT ON RESTRUCTURING OF GOVERNMENT SERVICE SYSTEMS

The Reorganization Act which the Congress has passed and which I am signing today gives the President important tools in his effort to make the machinery of government work more effectively. As a part of that same effort, I am announcing today certain structural changes which I am making in the systems through which the government provides important social and economic services.

It was possible for me to take these particular actions without the authority extended under the Reorganization Act. I announce them at this time, however, because they provide specific illustrations of ways in which we can make significant improvement in the quality of government by making it operate more efficiently.

This restructuring expresses my concern that we make much greater progress in our struggle against social problems. The best way to facilitate such progress, I believe, is not by adding massively to the burdens which government already bears but rather by finding better ways to perform the work of the government.

That work is not finished when a law is passed, nor is it accomplished when an agency in Washington is assigned to administer new legislation. These are only preliminary steps; in the end the real work is done by the men who implement the law in the field.

The performance of the men in the field, however, is directly linked to the administrative structures and procedures within which they work. It is here that the government's effectiveness too often is undermined. The organization of federal services has often grown up piece-meal—creating gaps in some areas, duplications in others, and general inefficiencies across the country. Each agency for example, has its own set of regional offices and regional boundaries; if a director of one operation is to meet with his counterpart in another branch of the government, he often must make an airplane trip to see him. Or

consider two federal officials who work together on poverty problems in the same neighborhood, but who work for different Departments and, therefore, find themselves in two different administrative regions, reporting to headquarters in two widely separated cities.

Coordination cannot flourish under conditions such as that. Yet without real coordination, intelligent and efficient government is impossible; money and time are wasted and important goals are compromised.

This is why I said in the campaign last fall that "the need is not to dismantle government but to modernize it." The systematic reforms I announce today are designed to help in that modernization process. I would discuss those reforms under three headings: rationalization, coordination and decentralization. It should be recognized, of course, that the three elements are interdependent. Without one the others would be meaningless.

I. The first concern is to rationalize the way our service delivery systems are organized. I have therefore issued a directive which streamlines the field operations of five agencies by establishing—for the first time—common regional boundaries and regional office locations. This instruction affects the Department of Labor, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the Small Business Administration. The activities of these agencies—particularly in serving disadvantaged areas of our society—are closely related. Uniform boundaries and regional office locations will help assure that they are also closely coordinated.

The eight new regions and the locations of the new regional centers are as follows:

Region I (Boston)—Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont.

Region II (New York City)—New York, New Jersey, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Region III (Philadelphia)—Delaware, District of Columbia, Kentucky, Maryland, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia.

Region IV (Atlanta)—Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Tennessee.

Region V (Chicago)—Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, Michigan, Ohio, and Wisconsin.

Region VI (Dallas-Fort Worth)—Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas.

Region VII (Denver)—Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming.

Region VIII (San Francisco)—Alaska, Arizona, California, Guam, Hawaii, Nevada, Oregon, and Washington.

I am asking all other federal agencies to take note of these instructions, and I am requesting that any changes in their field organization structures be made consistent with our ultimate goal: uniform boundaries and field office locations for all social or economic programs requiring interagency or intergovernmental coordination.

My directive also asks that the five Departments and agencies involved provide high-level representation in cities where regional offices do not exist. Such physical relocations as are required will be made over the next eighteen months, with special efforts to minimize disruptions to the programs, the employees, and the communities involved.

II. The second step in this reform process emphasizes coordination. It calls for an expansion of the regional council concept from the four cities where it presently operates (Chicago, New York, Atlanta, and San Francisco) to all eight of the new regional cen-

ters. The regional council is a coordinating body on which each of the involved agencies is represented. It offers an excellent means through which the various arms of the federal government can work closely together in defining problems, devising strategies to meet them, eliminating friction and duplications, and evaluating results. Such councils can make it possible for the Federal government to speak consistently and with a single voice in its dealings with states and localities, with private organizations, and with the public.

III. The third phase of this systematic restructuring of domestic programs focuses on decentralization. I am asking the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to join with the heads of nine departments and agencies in a review of existing relationships between centralized authorities and their field operations. Participating in the review will be the Departments of Agriculture; Commerce; Health, Education, and Welfare; Housing and Urban Development; Labor; Transportation; Justice; the Office of Economic Opportunity; and the Small Business Administration.

This review is designed to produce specific recommendations as to how each agency: (1) can eliminate unnecessary steps in the delegation process; (2) can develop organizational forms and administrative practices which will mesh more closely with those of all other Departments; and (3) can give more day-by-day authority to those who are at lower levels in the administrative hierarchy. Decentralized decision-making will make for better and quicker decisions—it will also increase cooperation and coordination between the Federal government on the one hand and the states and localities on the other. Those Federal employees who deal every day with state and local officials will be given greater decision-making responsibility.

Again, this action is a concrete manifestation of a concern I expressed during the campaign: "Business learned long ago that decentralization was a means to better performance. It's time government learned the same lesson."

Some of the reforms which I am announcing today have been urged for many years—but again and again they have been thwarted. This inertia must be overcome. Old procedures that are inefficient, however comfortable and familiar they may seem, must be exchanged for new systems which do the job as it must be done.

The particular reforms I have discussed here are part of a broad and continuing process of restructuring the basic service systems of government. The reorganization of the Manpower Administration in the Department of Labor—announced on March 13—is another example of this process. So are the reforms which are being made in the postal system and in the Office of Economic Opportunity.

I have established both the Urban Affairs Council and the Office of Intergovernmental Relations in part so that the government could be better advised on additional improvements in service systems. Further systematic restructuring is on the way. Each reform, I believe, will have a major impact on the quality of American government—an impact which will benefit all of our citizens—in all parts of our country—well beyond the lifetime of this Administration.

The Federal government has been assigned many new responsibilities in the last several decades—many of which it carries and many of which it fumbles. Many of the disappointments and frustrations of the last several years can be blamed on the fact that administrative performance has not kept pace with legislative promise.

This situation must be changed. The actions I announce today are important steps toward achieving such changes. By rationalizing, coordinating, and decentralizing the

systems through which government provides important social and economic services, we can begin at last to realize the hopes and dreams of those who created them.

PRESS CONFERENCE OF DANIEL P. MOYNIHAN, ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR URBAN AFFAIRS; PHILIP S. HUGHES, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF THE BUDGET; AND RON ZIEGLER, PRESS SECRETARY TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ZIEGLER. You have the statement by the President on restructuring of Government service systems. It is relatively self-explanatory. Dr. Moynihan and Sam Hughes are here to discuss this with you and answer any questions you may have. Their comments are on the record, contrary to yesterday when it was on a background basis.

Is Frank Porter here? (Laughter.)

Dr. Moynihan.

Dr. MOYNIHAN. One can say anything one thinks on the record on something about the public administration because it never gets printed anyway. If we had a war to announce, by golly, everyone would be here.

This is about the first major reorganization which the President has put into effect. I think it is a matter of some interest, as Sam Hughes, our distinguished Deputy Director of the Budget will attest, that it has been something Presidents have been trying to put into effect for almost 20 years now.

This is the first time in the history of the American Republic that the regional boundaries of the major domestic programs will be co-terminus.

You see how quickly you lose audiences with things like that? (Laughter.)

The pattern has built up that each department, when departments have been established and agencies have been established, their regional boundaries have responded to the sort of peculiarities of subjects or the Congressional arrangements that led to their enactment or just randomness. The result has been that there has been wide variation in the regional headquarters.

There are two subjects, if I could point this out. One is what is the city which has the regional headquarters, and secondly, which are the States that make up the region. Both the States have varied and the regional headquarters have varied. This, as we have gradually found in domestic affairs as more and more we have had to work one program in relation to another or we have developed programs such as Model Cities, which, by definition and by statute presumed the working between different departments on a common subject, that the regional arrangements simply impeded us very seriously.

It made it possible to stand in the Fish Room, now in the Roosevelt Room, and announce enormous events and nothing happened, because there was no structure out there to make it happen, because if there is a rule in political science, it is that Government follows its structure.

What the President has done in the face of not a little bit of presumed difficulty, is to draw common boundaries to establish common regional headquarters cities for this beginning group of domestic departments with the expectation that they will be expanded in the future.

It is this, I think, that begins to make not just the question of coordination of Federal programs a serious issue and a possible result, but also begins to give some structure to the subject of decentralization. It can't be decentralized government unless you have a system of arrangements in the field to which, with authority, with discretion and responsibility, it can be given.

I think we are creating such a structure. It will be a long time, perhaps, in becoming a reality, but it is an absolutely indispensable first move. As I say to you, for

20 years we have sought this arrangement and now, at length, we have it.

I suppose my final comment would be that there is still quite a bit of detailed working out of the forms in which authority is delegated from different agencies to their regional headquarters. As between different departments, there are quite different levels of regional responsibilities, initiative and so forth, and bringing some responsibility into that is the work of years to come—the year to come in any event.

Q. Can you really put these together in a field where you do have a central office or are we going to have a half dozen or dozen offices to go to? Can one person speak with authority in the regional authority?

Dr. MOYNIHAN. Sam, do you want to join me here at the lectern?

That is the work of the years to come. We have already begun in four cities a Regional Council, begun last August; just getting some sense in itself, not more than announced, really. But the question of how much of a coherent decision-making apparatus we will be able to develop at regional levels remains to be seen.

It becomes a question of how much you want, but it is now possible to find that out, and up until now it has simply been a hypothetical question for professors.

Q. Will these offices all be in one office building?

Dr. MOYNIHAN. Some of these are pretty large offices. There is a Federal Office Building in each of these cities. In some cases they will all be in the same structure and in other cases they will not. Some of these are big places.

If I could just say, in the whole question of public administration, making the Government work, in delivering public services, the biggest single weakness of the American National Government has been its field structure.

Mr. HUGHES. I agree.

Dr. MOYNIHAN. And not to attend to that is just not to be serious about this subject. It is perhaps the least exciting subject in Government, and that has been the source of the problem, just not in being able to muster the attention of persons to its absolutely essential nature.

For that reason it was almost the first issue we took up in the Urban Affairs Council out of the experience that if you didn't take it up early and get it done fast, other more glamorous issues would drive it into the next Administration.

Q. Will you save money, too, or is this just for efficiency?

Mr. HUGHES. I would regard it as in the interest of efficiency. In your terms it is a management action. It could produce savings. It is not designed to do that. Rather, it is designed to make it easier to manage Federal programs out in the field where services must be delivered, and also to make it easier for the States and cities to deal with the Federal agencies.

Think of the Governor of Colorado, for instance, or the Mayor of Denver, who must deal with Federal regional offices in Denver, San Francisco, Fort Worth-Dallas, or Kansas City. He has an almost impossible kind of a problem, in a physical sense, to span. He is left with correspondence and telephone calls and so on.

So the co-location is the starting point for a whole range of actions which, as Pat said, we hope to evolve over the coming months.

Q. How many Congressmen are losing offices in their cities and how mad are they about it?

Mr. HUGHES. On the latter point, I am not really an authority. My impression is that the decibels, at least at this point, are not impossibly high. Part of the difficulty over the years, the major part of the difficulty

has been, as Pat said, on the one hand this is not a glamorous kind of action, and on the other hand it has been a kind of controversial action and has taken courage and determination on the part of the agency heads, the Urban Affairs Council and the President to bring it off.

If you are interested, we have a map of the revised organizational structure, and a listing of the State movements that are involved, agency by agency. The picture gets fairly complicated because each agency, and in some instances even bureaus within agencies, have a different field structure, so you have to look at it in fairly fine detail.

Dr. MOYNIHAN. Could I add one point? In those cities which have been regional headquarters for departments and will cease to be, we are leaving behind a high-level department representative responding to the fact that those are important cities and are intended to be sub-regions at the very least.

There will be very little actual movement of people here as compared to that which would take place in the normal course of events.

What do you estimate, about 1,800 people?

Mr. HUGHES. Probably less than that net, and we anticipate that the moves would take place, to the extent they are necessary, over a year or a year and a half, so that the personal impact could be minimized.

Dr. MOYNIHAN. These are high-level and particularly high-level people in America tend to move around anyway.

Q. Do you mean you are not closing offices?

Mr. HUGHES. I think the situation is this: With eight regions obviously there are major concentrations of population that would not have a regional office in them. On the other hand, to have as many regions as would be implicit in that kind of arrangement creates an impossible kind of administrative structure.

So as we see it the ideal would be to have cities not included as regional headquarters, like Kansas City, St. Louis, Detroit, Pittsburgh, perhaps, as focuses within a particular region, focuses of Federal personnel also, and having significant Federal representation and some authority in their own right.

Q. Can either of you name the cities that are losing regional headquarters?

Dr. MOYNIHAN. There are five times eight.

Mr. HUGHES. We can list cities. There are lots of moves back and forth. Because of the change in structure certain agencies move one way and other agencies move another. We can, if you would like, take an agency at a time after this session, if you want to, and discuss the moves individually. We know this, but—

Q. Are there 40 different regional offices now?

Dr. MOYNIHAN. You can have eight regions and five agencies. You don't have 40, but you have a maximum of 40. The areas from which people are moving in and out are much simpler.

Mr. HUGHES. I can run through the list. Charlottesville will be affected; Washington, D. C., Austin, Kansas City has been discussed; Birmingham, Baltimore, Nashville. There are a number of moves back and forth involving New York City itself, depending on whether the particular agency had headquarters there or not. New Orleans, Cleveland, Seattle—

Dr. MOYNIHAN. I will give you an example of the kind of thing involved. New York City is no longer a regional headquarters for HUD, but it becomes a regional headquarters for the other agencies. People who were in New York City in a HUD arrangement who will move to New England and HUD—

Mr. HUGHES. HUD stays.

Dr. MOYNIHAN. But the New England people go out. HUD's regional headquarters remain in New York, but there will be a trans-

fer of persons who have been in New York working on New England which now goes to Boston. It sounds complex, but it is a simple reorganization.

Q. Will Buffalo, New York be affected by any of these moves?

Mr. HUGHES. Not so far as I know.

Q. The President said the things you are doing today are not involved in the signing of the Reorganization Act. What are you planning to do with the Reorganization Act to streamline the Government, or what are the plans of using the powers of the act the President has just signed?

Dr. MOYNIHAN. Don't you think we have enough trouble for one day? (Laughter.)

Q. You don't have that in the works?

Dr. MOYNIHAN. Yes. Remember that the reorganization powers have existed for 20 years, and are sort of a standing concomitant of the Presidency and in a normally effective Government reorganization considerations are always going on. It is a more intensive point than in the earlier Administration and President Nixon has spoken with special interest on this. I think you can look forward to proposals, but we have nothing right now.

Mr. HUGHES. Lots of things are being looked at.

Q. You pointed out that for 20 years people have been interested in this. Can you identify some of the obstacles that have come up over the years?

Dr. MOYNIHAN. I think Sam put it best. This is the kind of subject that people who are close to Government are very passionate about and people out of Government don't even know about. It always happens. To be associated with the movement of some resources from one part of the Congressional map to another. So there have always been people who by definition will have to be against it.

This combination of a rather low level of public interest and a rather specific level of local opposition has meant by and large that no President has ever been willing to bite the bullet. Now we have done so.

Mind you, once it takes place, then the new arrangements become sacred and absolutely imbedded in the Constitutional division of the Republic.

Mr. HUGHES. I think a factor, also, is the growing obviousness of the need to do this sort of thing, given the structures that the President has set up, the Urban Affairs Council, the interrelationship that this group of agencies and others who are involved in urban problems.

Q. What progress is being made in those cities picked for Regional Councils?

Mr. HUGHES. The Regional Councils that have been established are four in number. They were established at the only four cities where the four agencies involve happen to have co-located regional offices.

Interestingly enough, none of those regions coincide. For instance, the New York regional office, those four agencies have only one State in common, New York State. So that they have been experimental in nature thus far. They have proved, in our judgment and I believe in the judgment of the people who have participated in the Councils, to be a very useful and productive experiment in working together in a fashion that is increasingly necessary, but still is somewhat novel in Federal activities, and this particular geographic action that we are talking about here is designed to encourage that kind of cooperation.

The Federal Government has been organized categorically over the years, and agency programs, I think, have tended to construct walls around themselves. We need, by these kinds of measures, to attempt to pierce these walls and put doors in them, and so on, and by the process of co-location and the advantages that are obvious in these four

cities, have people being able to meet and discuss common problems, whether it is the Model Cities program or any other of mutual interest.

Those advantages, I think, have appeared in these four locations, and we do plan, hopefully, if the experiment succeeds, to extend it in other areas and to other agencies and programs where there is this same kind of relationship and need.

Dr. MOYNIHAN. We are going to establish Regional Councils in the four regional headquarters. Automatically that is done today.

Q. What is the make-up of these Regional Councils? Who sits on them?

Dr. MOYNIHAN. HEW, HUD, Labor and OEO. Mr. HUGHES. We started with these as a nucleus. We don't regard it as the end of it all, but we do want to keep the Councils more or less homogeneous in terms of their interest and involve those agencies essentially that would be involved in the Urban Affairs Council structure here in Washington.

Q. The figure 1,800 was dropped, and then you seemed not sure of that. How many people are going to be moved out of the cities?

Dr. MOYNIHAN. The problem there is that these moves will be phased over 18 months and an unknown number of those people will leave their jobs for other reasons, find other places they can stay in and so there will be an empty slot moved—join the Army.

Q. Can you give me a count at all?

Mr. HUGHES. I would say 1,200 or 1,400 may be confronted with a move at some time in this period. I hate to use the numbers, because they focus attention on a problem that may not exist, given the time interval, given turnover, and given the opportunity to establish what may be called essentially sub-regional offices in some of these cities where the employees might otherwise have to move from.

Q. Are these only high-level people, or are you talking about clerical support, too?

Mr. HUGHES. The numbers involve the total rage of personnel. Some of them obviously will elect to stay, perhaps, in these agencies or otherwise disassociate from the regional office so they don't have to move. That is part of the problem of estimating the moves.

Q. Do you mean then that there will be 400 who might find jobs in the cities that are now working within Government. Is that your estimate?

Dr. MOYNIHAN. Sure. It is a long-established industrial practice now when you have to make changes in personnel to do them through the normal turn-over as much as you can. These end up to be surprisingly painless affairs if they are given time and advance notice.

Q. I am still not clear on whether any of the current regional offices will completely close in Kansas City.

Dr. MOYNIHAN. Is Kansas City a regional headquarters?

Mr. HUGHES. Yes.

Dr. MOYNIHAN. It will no longer be. That is the one that immediately comes to mind.

Q. Some will disappear but reappear as sub-regional offices?

Dr. MOYNIHAN. Yes. They may have to go around and write "sub" on some of the windows.

Q. Is Kansas City—

Mr. HUGHES. There is a map which would show the new regional structure and we have a map which shows agency by agency the impact in terms of boundaries.

Q. How about the numbers of jobs?

Mr. HUGHES. The jobs we don't have, simply because we don't know what the impact will be over a period of time on these people. We don't know how the sub-regional structure will be involved.

Dr. MOYNIHAN. If we seem to be a little vague on this, it is not that we are vague, it

is because this is an immensely complex subject. If you want to know why we are doing it you ought to sit down and spend the day trying to find out what is the present state. We set up a regional council of four major departments in New York City—New York City being the headquarters for each of those departments or agencies—only to find that the only State those four departments had in common was New York itself. It is just not beyond anybody's comprehension, it is just a very complex business.

Q. You have not said exactly whether there will be any regional offices completely closed down. Is the answer no?

Dr. MOYNIHAN. Yes, there will be, in terms of specific departments.

Q. Which ones?

Dr. MOYNIHAN. All over this map. We can spend the afternoon on it and we will give you the data.

Q. Are those the ones you read?

Mr. HUGHES. I read the list of cities where there are now regional offices or equivalent which would be affected by this action.

Q. Does that mean they will be closed down?

Mr. HUGHES. No. It means that that will no longer be a regional office. There may be—and in my judgment probably will be—personnel remaining there, perhaps the same personnel, but that will not have the label on it, on the door "Regional Office."

Dr. MOYNIHAN. Let's be very clear. There are not going to be any doors locked in this process. There is no major city in the country that doesn't have in it offices of almost all the major departments of Federal Government. The question is: Where we have tried to establish regional systems, we have settled on eight, and the question is: can we transfer to those areas a measure of initiative, a measure of responsibility and authority so that in fact the work of Government in those very areas can go on closer to the areas involved. Most of these regions are, in terms of population, if you broke these eight regions up and put them in the U.N. Gazetteer, they would be the 8th, 9th, 10th, 11th, 12th, 13th and 14th biggest and richest countries in the world.

Finding a structure where you can give real power and authority is difficult. It is not a question of the taking of people out of Kansas City and into St. Louis and so on. There are going to be HUD and HEW, DOT and Labor people in all those places. It is a question of where do you locate the man you call Regional Director and what kind of authority do you give him and do you give to each of your people a sufficiently convergent set of powers and responsibilities so they in fact can sit down and make decisions of their own that have consequences.

Q. Implicit in that, it seems to me, there will have to be a coordination among these agencies in the level of authority granted regional directors.

Dr. MOYNIHAN. That is correct. That is the next phase of our operation.

Q. Is there going to be any single man representing all of those?

Dr. MOYNIHAN. No, we have specifically rejected that idea.

Q. How about in the cities where you are leaving some people behind, is there going to be a single man there?

Dr. MOYNIHAN. No. The curious fact of the American National Government is that there is only one "single man" and he is called the President and that is the arrangement we have.

Q. I would like to talk about Kansas City. You are going to move HEW, OEO and Labor. That is 825 people involved. That is \$10 million a year in payroll. HEW said it will cost them \$800,000 to go to Denver. The Missouri and Kansas delegations, Republicans and

Democrats alike, are upset. They don't understand why you are moving three bigger offices to Denver instead of two smaller ones to Kansas City.

Dr. MOYNIHAN. There are numbers about have to do with the headquarters functions. They do not in any sense reflect a necessary net loss to that city of Federal employees or Federal payroll. They just don't. It would be our hope that any actual change to this would be very minimal, indeed.

They are changes in our organizational structure, not in the economic structure of Kansas City.

Mr. HUGHES. I think that is a fair statement. The reasons for Denver versus Kansas City—judgments differ on this—but there are reasons of transportation networks, regional practices, regional associations, the suitability of Denver versus Kansas City as the headquarters city for the mountain states and those sorts of things.

We have tried also to minimize the moves within the total structure.

Dr. MOYNIHAN. Let's be very candid. When you ask what is the difference between Kansas City and Denver, the answer is that a good case can be made for either, but if you are going to have one regional headquarters you have to have one. It has just been the unsatisfactory nature of the decision that has been part of taking 20 years to make it.

Mr. HUGHES. One of the problems here is that you can slice 50 States and some territories and so on almost an infinite number of ways and it has been extremely difficult to get any measure of consensus or agreement as to the best arrangement. In evolving an arrangement, you cannot just look at the mountain states or Kansas City or Denver. You have to look at the country and the feasibility of fanning out from Washington, how many regions there ought to be in total and those kinds of questions. That is what we tried to stress.

Q. Can we find out about our specific regions?

Dr. MOYNIHAN. The Bureau of the Budget has it.

Q. Should we call the Bureau?

Dr. MOYNIHAN. Yes.

Mr. ZIEGLER. We will pass out maps, together with that release, which spell out the area covered in each region. They will give you an indication of what area the various headquarters cover.

The Press. Thank you.

[From the Woman Constitutionalist
Jan. 9, 1971]

REGIONAL GOVERNMENT: VOICES OF PROPHECY (By Mary M. Davison)

Many years ago Don Bell (Don Bell Reports and Closer Up) warned of a plan on the part of those who have usurped the Washington government to establish within our borders a Regional Government composed of twelve regions whose capitals would be in the cities occupied by the twelve Federal Reserve Regional banks. It was not a very glamorous story and received little attention.

Several years later David Brinkley, addressing students in an Ohio University, predicted the abolition of the States, saying that within the lifetime of most of those students there would be no more sovereign States; something else would replace them. Nobody paid any attention to that either; not even the students. Now some startling facts have come to light.

At a Press Conference held at the White House March 27, 1969, Mr. Daniel P. Moynihan officially revealed the creation of eight regions—eight separate governments within the United States (two others were added later in that year, 1969), leaving two to go to meet the Don Bell prophecy. And strangely enough the capitals of these Regional Gov-

ernments are located in the cities housing the Federal Reserve branches. We will quote some of the discussion of the Moynihan Press Conference which we believe to be indicative of the manner in which the Government is being run; not by Congress, much less by the hand-picked Presidents from the stables of the Council on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. "One can say anything one thinks on the record about the public administration because it never gets printed anyway. If we had a war to announce, by golly, everyone would be here. . . . This is about the first major reorganization which the President has put into effect. I think it is a matter of some interest . . . that it has been something Presidents have been trying to put into effect for almost 20 years now. This is the first time in the history of the American Republic (??-ed) that the regional boundaries of the regional domestic programs will be coterminous. You can see how quickly you can lose your audience with things like that. Laughter." (The language was designed "to lose your audience," reporters as well as the rest of us-ed). The next paragraphs probably explain why the news media failed to report this most momentous incident—the "restructuring" (rebuilding-ed) of the United States Government without the knowledge or consent of the Congress or the People. This, the job "presidents have been trying to put into effect for nearly 20 years."

Mr. MOYNIHAN. "The pattern has been built up that when each department, when departments have been established and agencies have been established their regional boundaries have responded to the sort of peculiarities (the word "peculiarities" scarcely describes them-ed) of subjects or the Congressional arrangements that led to their enactment or just randomness. The result has been that there has been wide variation in the regional headquarters."

The above is typical of the hokum Congress is subjected to hours on end, when they call in some of the over-educated phonies of State, Defense, Treasury or other departments of "government" to explain such activities as Viet Nam, Interest rates, Prisoners of War or other vital subjects. Congress, for the most part, sits openmouthed listening to this senseless babble, then compliments them on their "scholarly presentation" and their "erudition" and suggest the need for a pay raise. When the "erudite" ones are out of ear-shot, they—the Congressmen—ask one another if they knew what in tunket they were talking about.

Our State representatives who have been pleading for "taxsharing" with the Federal "Government" might, if they could muster a little extra concentration, find that they have "tax shared" themselves out of business. The Fed has no intention of sharing anything. They intend to operate all the "services" out of the Regional Governments.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. "If I could just say, in the whole question of public administration, making the Government work, in delivering public services, the biggest single weakness of the American National Government has been its field (State) structure. . . . And not to attend to that is just not to be serious about this subject. It is perhaps the least exciting subject in Government and that has been the source of the problem, just not being able to muster the attention of persons to its absolutely essential nature."

Why could they not "muster the attention of persons to its absolutely essential nature?" Have the lines of communication with the One-Worlders broken down or was the necessary publicity too risky? They had taken the State Governments for a ride with a downhill pull and even under the watchful eyes of the various Rockefeller Brothers control agencies, the scheme just might come to the attention of some person or group with suffi-

cient interest and influence to prevent the eradication of State Government.

Q. "Will you save money, too, or is this just for efficiency?" Mr. HUGHES. "I would regard it in the interest of efficiency. In your terms it is a management action. It could produce savings. It is not designed to do that. Rather, it is designed to make it easier to manage Federal programs out in the field (the States-ed) where services must be delivered and also to make it easier for the States and Cities to deal with the Federal agencies." (which will be handling all the "tax sharing" money-ed.)

Mr. MOYNIHAN. "Remember that the Reorganization powers have existed for 20 years, and are sort of a standing concomitant of the Presidency, and in a normally effective Government reorganization, considerations are always going on. It is a more intensive point than in the earlier Administrations and President Nixon has spoken with special interest in this. I think you can look forward to proposals, but we have nothing right now."

Mr. HUGHES. "Lots of things are being looked at." (And somebody with an interest in the nation should be helping them "look"-ed.)

Q. "You pointed out that for 20 years people have been interested in this. Can you identify some of the obstacles that have come up over the years?"

Dr. MOYNIHAN. "... This is the kind of subject that people who are close (but not too close-ed) to Government are very passionate about, and people out of Government don't even know about (it is none of their business-ed). It always happens. To be associated with the movement of some resources from one part of the Congressional map to another. So there have always been people who by definition will have to be against it (if they ever find out about it-ed) . . . This combination of a rather low level of public interest and a rather specific level of local opposition has meant, by and large, that no President has been willing to bite the bullet. Now we have done so. Mind you, once it takes place (and it has—the President, by his own admission signed it on March 27, 1969-ed) then the new arrangements become sacred and absolutely imbedded in the constitutional division of the republic."

This is something to think about. A Council on Foreign Relations President and a covey of Council on Foreign Relations empire builders, elected by nobody, have divided the United States into at least 10 regional governments, at least four of which have already been set up and are ready for action: Region 2—New York City; Region 4—Atlanta; Region 5—Chicago; Region 9—San Francisco. (Press Release by the President May 21, 1969).

While the Congress was turning the Federal Government over to the United Nations and the States were surrendering their powers and the sovereignty of the People to Rockefeller Brothers 1313 agencies, the One World operation in Pratt House, New York, was cutting up the United States like an enormous pie.

Each of these regional governments will have all the appurtenances of government. In the beginning, says Mr. Nixon in his May 21, 1969 Press Release, each regional government will be equipped with its own Departments of Labor, Health, Education and Welfare, Housing and Urban Development, Office of Economic Opportunity and the Small Business Administration. These are the very agencies from which the 1313 State legislatures expected to collect a juicy "tax-sharing." We might note in passing that 10 of the Regional Government capitals are located in the cities housing the Federal Reserve branches. At the time of this report (May

1969) Cleveland and St. Louis were excluded. This may now have changed.

A few years ago your editor conducted a one woman campaign against 1313, charging that it was operating in violation of Article 4, Section 3, of the Constitution of the United States, i.e.:

" . . . nor any state be formed by the junction of two or more states or parts of states without the consent of the legislatures concerned as well as of the Congress."

Lawyers convinced me that 1313 was not in violation because they had not organized by law but by voluntary agreement. But now we have the United States divided into regions by law, for Congress and all the legislatures have passed laws permitting the division of the United States. The laws at both Congressional and State levels are drawn in such language that it might take an Einstein two weeks to decode them, but they are there and if the people of the States permit the continuation of this outrage the prophecy of David Brinkley that the States would be abolished in our lifetime will have proven true.

I have spoken with probably the most knowledgeable man to have served in a State legislature in recent years and he expressed the opinion that no State legislature in the country would have enacted this legislation if they had known what they were doing. He was not in the legislature at the time the legislation was enacted but having received a copy of that particular Bill we feel that he will realize that they did not understand the Bill and that is the reason for its passage. Inasmuch as every State (together with Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia) are covered by the legislation, it is quite likely the Bills were written at a central point and distributed to the States.

It should therefore be a matter of top priority for all persons who desire to live in a sovereign State to acquaint our State representatives, Congressmen and Senators immediately of the realities of the "Reorganization Acts" of States and Nation, insisting that these bills be promptly reviewed and rescinded. Remember that Mr. Moynihan stressed the fact that once it had been adopted—as it was when the President signed it—that it became sacred and "absolutely embedded in the Constitutional division of the Republic."

This is not possible under the Constitution which guarantees "to every State in this Union a republican form of government. . . ." Get busy—consult your lawyers, particularly those lawyers in your State legislatures. Demand a return to Constitutional Government which has been the prime objective of Women for Constitutional Government from the beginning.

The Press releases of Mr. Nixon and Dr. Moynihan are too long to be published in a column such as this, therefore we have arranged with the Council for Statehood (P. O. B. 5435, Lighthouse Point, Florida) to distribute a packet at 50 cents (postage included), the contents of which may be shown your representatives as proof that these actually did come from the White House.

In closing I wish to thank my many friends for their prayers, cards, flowers and gifts sent to me during my recent stay in the Montgomery Hospital, and to express the highest possible praise for that wonderful hospital and its services.

WHILE WE SLEPT, THE STATES WERE BEING ABOLISHED

Dear American—"New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed or erected within the jurisdiction of any other State; nor

any State be formed by the junction of two or more States, or parts of States without the consent of the Legislatures of the States concerned as well as the Congress."—United States Constitution; Article IV, Section 3, Paragraph 1.

President Nixon currently is engaged in the promotion of a plan to consolidate the twelve existing Cabinet-level Departments and reduce them to eight, allegedly to save money, increase efficiency, eliminate duplication of services, streamline the admittedly cumbersome machinery of bureaucracy, etc. And the plan, on first reading, sounds commendable—until one discovers that this is to be one more step in an overall plot to consolidate the fifty States and reduce them to Regional Departments; thus abolishing the States!

Lest we be labeled an alarmist without a cause, permit us to present the facts in more or less chronological order:—

When the Constitution of the United States was ratified by the original Thirteen States, there was established a kind of government different from any ever conceived before; not because it was a Republic, but because the political power was decentralized. The Federal Government was ceded certain specified and enumerated powers; all other powers were reserved to the States and the people.

No such system of government had ever been tried before; the greatest power was confined to the local level of government; and this for over 200 years prevented power-grabbers from gaining too much power. In all other countries, power was concentrated at the top; so ours was indeed an unique form of government.

And for this very reason, our system has been attacked, called inefficient, horse-and-buggy government for a nuclear age, etc. And over the years—especially since 1917—there have been repeated and almost constant attempts to reverse the flow of political power and make ours a centralized government, like other nations of the world, republics or otherwise.

The plans became more or less solidified through the efforts of a network of organizations which came to be called Terrible 1313, and which we exposed as early as February, 1958. The plans called for the establishment of Metro, megalopolitan and regional governments that cross State lines; of gigantic authorities stretching from city to city and denying State authority while appealing to the Central National authority; of the abolishment of States altogether . . .

As early as 1933, Luther Gulick, a Planner, a promoter of Metro, etc., declared: "The American State is finished. I do not predict that the States will go, but affirm that they have gone." And in his blueprints they were gone, replaced by regional districts after the manner of the twelve Federal Reserve Districts into which this Nation already has been divided.

In 1934 a writer (William Kay Wallace, in Our Obsolete Constitution), observed that "the multiplicity of forty-eight states . . . has no valid social or political reason for being preserved."

In September, 1969, Representative _____ of New York, told the U.S. House of Representatives: "I recently discussed with Governor Nelson Rockefeller, of New York, at a public meeting of the Intergovernmental Affairs Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee, the need for reorganizing our State governments. One suggestion I made was that the 50 States be abolished and regional governments be substituted for them."

To justify his suggestion, _____ submitted a study made by the Committee for Economic Development, a satellite organization of the powerful Council on Foreign Relations, which has been called our Secret Govern-

ment, and justifiably so called. The CED study concluded that "the failure of state governments to meet their commitments was attributable to geographic handicaps, outmoded structures, inadequate resources, and political weaknesses. . . ." The study hinted that States should be abolished and new regional boundary lines be drawn, with such regional authorities looking to Washington for guidance.

Now, let's drop back to 1965, and we quote from an article written by Lee Bolman, which appeared in *The Freedom Press*:

"The 'Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965' became law last August. . . . This Act, cited as Public Law 89-136, provides the master plan for Dictatorship of the United States. . . . Close analysis of the Act itself will prove there is 'no way back' if the States and local officials do not withhold cooperation and 'hold-the-line' against Federal Commissioners and their direct dictatorial powers through "federal fund blackjacks."

"This Public Works and Economic Development Act authorizes the setting up of 'regions' throughout the United States. . . . These 'regions' would eventually wipe out State boundaries. America may remain as a continent but you may end up saying you are from Federal Region #9 instead of from California. . . . We would be asked to give up towns, cities, counties, and States, for Regions, Districts, Areas, and Centers. But this is not merely a transfer of labels; the new boundaries will be very mobile and overlapping, changing at the whim or pleasure of the Secretary of Commerce and his staff, who have the final decision (if the President agrees)."

"By law, the United States is to be broken up into 'Regions,' and each 'Region' must have a comprehensive master plan. No one can disregard this plan which will include something for every square inch of American land and the compliance of every person in it." (End of quotation.)

Now, let's note how President Nixon chose to invoke and utilize the power contained in the above mentioned Public Law 89-136. We call your attention to an article appearing in the *Washington, D.C., Evening Star* of March 27, 1969, which we reprint. We call your attention to the President's apology for having waited from 1965 to 1969 to put the changes into effect: "fumbings, disappointments and frustrations" are blamed. Here is the article, in full:

NIXON COORDINATES CITY AID

(By Garnett D. Horner)

President Nixon today directed five government departments and agencies dealing with urban and poverty programs to establish common regional boundaries and regional office locations in eight cities for their field operations.

He also ordered expansion of regional councils to the eight headquarters to coordinate the work of the agencies involved. In a third directive, he asked nine departments and agencies to move toward greater decentralization of their operations to give more decision-making powers to federal employees who deal daily with state and local officials.

"The federal government has been assigned many new responsibilities in the last several decades—many of which it carries and many of which it fumbles," Nixon said in a statement. "Many of the disappointments and frustrations of the last several years can be blamed on the fact that the administrative performance has not kept pace with the legislative promise. This situation must be changed. The actions I announced today are important steps toward achieving such changes."

The restructuring was done by executive action.

The President pointed out that each agency now has its own set of regional offices and regional boundaries, which often means that if a director of one field operation is to meet with his counterpart in another branch of government he often must make an airplane trip to see him.

State and local officials often must go to regional federal offices in different cities on the same problem. Nixon said the new uniform regions and regional headquarters will streamline and coordinate the systems through which the government provides social and economic services.

The five divisions involved are the Labor, Health, Education and Welfare, and Housing and Urban Development departments, the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Small Business Administration.

The eight regional centers are:

Region 1, Boston—Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island and Vermont.

Region 2, New York City—New York, New Jersey, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

Region 3, Philadelphia—Delaware, District of Columbia, Kentucky, Maryland, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Virginia and West Virginia.

Region 4, Atlanta—Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina and Tennessee.

Region 5, Chicago—Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, Michigan, Ohio and Wisconsin.

Region 6, Dallas-Fort Worth—Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma and Texas.

Region 7, Denver—Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah and Wyoming.

Region 8, San Francisco—Alaska, Arizona, California, Guam, Hawaii, Nevada, Oregon and Washington.

Philip S. Hughes, deputy director of the Budget Bureau, said the reorganization will mean that regional headquarters of one or more of the agencies involved will be abolished in Charlottesville, Washington, Austin, Nashville, Baltimore, New York, Jacksonville, New Orleans, Cleveland and Seattle. Congressmen representing these districts have opposed Nixon's plans.

Hughes and Daniel P. Moynihan, assistant to the President for urban affairs (since resigned—Ed.) said the order will not mean these cities will lose any substantial number of federal employees, however. They said federal offices would be maintained in each of the cities, some of which functioning as sub-regional headquarters. Actual movement of personnel probably will involve 1,200 people or less and will be spread over the next 18 months, they said.

You will note that the foregoing article calls for only eight Regions. Here someone apparently slipped up. There are *twelve* Federal Reserve Districts, with headquarters at Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Cleveland, Richmond, Atlanta, Chicago, St. Louis, Minneapolis, Kansas City, Dallas and San Francisco. It would seem logical, therefore, that these Regional Government Centers be the same as the centers where Federal Reserve Banks are located, which would call for the establishment of four more Regional Headquarters.

President Nixon moved toward that ultimate goal when on May 21, 1969, he named two more "Regional Capitals": Kansas City and Seattle. Because of the importance of this subject, we reprint the whole of a press release issued by the White House on May 21, 1969.

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

On March 27 I announced a series of steps being taken to streamline the structure and processes of Federal agencies in the field. I am confident that these changes will greatly improve the effectiveness of Federal social and economic services.

The first of these actions was the establishment of a common pattern of regional boundaries and headquarters for the Department of Labor, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the Small Business Administration.

Since the announcement we have met with congressional, state and local interests from many areas of the country and received from them a great deal of valuable information on implementing this plan.

After considering this information, I have concluded that the level of Federal service which would be required of the planned sub-regional offices in Kansas City and Seattle warrants their elevation to full regional status.

Three other changes are desirable. With the establishment of the new Seattle region, it is appropriate to shift Idaho to that region from the Denver region. Also, after reviewing the situation, I have concluded that the States of North Carolina and Kentucky would be better served from Atlanta than from Philadelphia.

In summary, the new alignment for the regions is as follows:

Region I (Boston)—Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont.

Region II (New York City)—New York, New Jersey, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Region III (Philadelphia)—Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia.

Region IV (Atlanta)—Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee.

Region V (Chicago)—Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, Michigan, Ohio, and Wisconsin.

Region VI (Dallas-Fort Worth)—Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas.

Region VII (Kansas City)—Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska.

Region VIII (Denver)—Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming.

Region IX (San Francisco)—Arizona, California, Hawaii, and Nevada.

Region X (Seattle)—Alaska, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington.

So, here is all the necessary machinery, all installed and ready to run; in the case of five federal departments Nixon wants to revamp the Cabinet structure at Washington, so that the consolidation of departments which is to be carried out at each Regional Capital, will be carried out also at the National Capital.

However, there is "a fly in the ointment." Congress permitted the setting up of the machinery for Regional Government, but it did not provide the fuel to run the machinery; indeed, it could not without wrecking the United States Constitution which declares, in effect, that if the States are to be abolished, the States themselves must do the abolishing. We'll explain that:

The authority to set up these Regional Governments is derived from this Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. This Act empowers the Federal Government to set up Regional Centers but, to be Constitutional and lawful, it also stipulated that the *State Governments must request the Federal Government to put this regional plan into operation*. The one weapon which the Executive had to force the States to ask to be destroyed was the money weapon: Welfare funds would be withheld unless the States fell into line.

To supply additional money power, Rep. — introduced H.R. 2519 in January, 1969 providing bloc grants to States if they met regional modernization conditions. In other words, to qualify for the promised bloc grant, a State would have to enact legislation at

the the State level which would permit the setting up of sub-regions which, in turn, would fit into the Federal Ten Region structure.

To put it bluntly, the States would have to vote themselves into the Regional Structure if they were to qualify for Federal assistance!

Incidentally, that bill introduced by Reuss did not pass, though several States rushed through enabling legislation in preparation for the expected bloc grant. A Maryland correspondent informs us that State passed such legislation but that it was later defeated by a referendum vote of the citizens. To complete this story of the money bill: H.R. 2519 was reintroduced as H.R. 11764 but time ran out; and it is to be reintroduced this year, revamped and giving control over \$22½ billion which will be doled out for welfare, health, education, guaranteed income, etc., if the States agree to the Regional Plan.

Tied to this Regional Plan are most of the Nixon goals: Revenue sharing, Government reorganization at the Cabinet level, new health care proposals, the guaranteed annual income plan, etc. (Please note: We refer to these as "Nixon's goals;" but we do not mean this to designate Nixon the individual. A Conspiracy is difficult to explain or comprehend as an abstraction, it must be personalized; and since Nixon is the front man and the public voice of the Conspiracy, we speak of "Nixon's goals." Personally, Nixon may know little of how these proposals coordinate, interweave, complement each other to promote Regional Government at the National level, then Regional Government at the Inter-National level, and finally Regional Government at the world level, *a la* 1984. But since Nixon is known to favor Atlantic Union and Rockefeller's "New Federalism," his "Ignorance is no excuse," if he should happen to plead that condition in 1974).

Prof. R. J. Phillips of New York State University says "the only effective way to modernize state government is to abolish it." Then he explains what, supposedly, is on Mr. Nixon's mind:

"The plan . . . would call for substituting a number of regional governmental units for the present fifty states. . . Each region would serve in a dual capacity. On the one hand they would be administrative units of the national government, charged with the implementation of federal programs. . . On the other hand they would have the responsibility for supervising local programs. Changes in the latter area would call for a dramatic alteration of existing units of local government through the development of fewer but more viable local governments.

"With the demise of the existing states we could develop a national court system, standard suffrage legislation, a national public school system that would include higher education, uniform marriage and divorce laws, standard automobile registration and licensing, and many others. . .

"We must remove from our thinking the idea that there is something sacred about our federal system of government. . . we do not need to establish more commissions to examine ways of strengthening and revitalizing state governments. . . What we need now is the courage to embark upon a different course and to attack these problems. How long are we willing to permit the problems of an urban and industrial society to be administered by governmental machinery developed in a rural and agrarian society of two centuries ago?" (End of quotation)

Shall we have Regional Government, whether we like it or not? This much is certain: any appeal to the President, your Senator, or U.S. Representative, is futile. But there is this hope: you may be able to

interest your State and County officials in keeping their jobs!

[From the Wisconsin State Journal, Mar. 30, 1971]

RIGHT WING ADVOCATE HERE—ROBERTS WANTS PEOPLE POWER

(By William R. Wineke)

Ideology, like politics, makes strange bed-fellows.

For example, Arch E. Roberts, a retired Army colonel popular among right wing groups, will testify before a joint legislative committee meeting today that America must return power to the people.

Roberts, who believes an international banking conspiracy is behind most of the world's ills, assesses the current state of the nation in much the same way that college radicals do, although his solutions run opposite theirs.

"If we are to survive as a race and as a nation, the People (he capitalizes the word) must regain control over the centers of power in America," Roberts says in testimony prepared for today.

"The stark truth is that America is now passing from a constitutional republic into a totalitarian world-wide government."

Roberts does not find it upsetting that his words, if printed on a mimeographed leaflet, would be attributed to bearded radicals.

"We have a great deal in common" with the radical students, Roberts said in an interview Monday.

"We are opposed to the polarization of the American people into right and left camps . . . The student is not an instigator of revolution; he is a product of his education."

That education, in Roberts' view, relies heavily on foundation funds, and foundation funds rely heavily on enormously wealthy people who want to see American society destroyed so that the banking conspiracy can control the world.

Roberts finds other things in common with the radical young.

He scoffs at the reasons the United States government gives for its involvement in Vietnam and suggests that the real reason for that involvement is to gain control of the vast oil reserves lying under its soil.

"When that is accomplished, we will see troops pulled out and sent on to the next place of economic exploitation, probably the Mideast," Roberts predicted.

And, although Roberts was kicked out of the Army in 1962 after he charged that some American political leaders had Communist leanings (the U.S. Court of Appeals reinstated him in 1964), Roberts now maintains that he is not anti-Communist.

"The historical fact that has been concealed from the American people" is that the Soviet revolution was bankrolled by a New York banking house, he said.

The former officer believes that the conspiracy he sees wants a world society that operates on a Soviet model with a few men making all the decision and the people obeying them.

If Roberts and radical leftists agree on many assessments of the world situation, they obviously disagree on proposals for curing the situation.

Roberts thinks violence is useless because the other side has the power; he hopes that state legislatures will expose the alleged conspiracy, pull out of regional governmental deals—which Roberts thinks lead to world government—and go back to the ideals of the founding fathers.

Roberts is an executive of the Committee to Restore the Constitution, nationally based in Ft. Collins, Colo.

He did not reveal the committee's budget, but said funding comes from individuals

who send small amounts. He lives on his Army pension (he was a public information officer) and on speaking fees.

Roberts and his wife have five sons, two of whom have served in the Marines and three of whom live at home.

[From the Valley (Minn.) Times, Apr. 1970] MINNESOTA WORLD CITIZENS IN TAX REVOLT

(By Jo Hindman)

Over the wires came the electrifying news, "World Citizenship has been declared over the whole State of Minnesota."

State officials gathered at St. Paul to sign The Declaration of World Citizenship of the State of Minnesota, March 25, 1971 and verified by Governor Wendell Anderson's office. These signed: The Governor, Lt. Gov. Perpich, state senators Holmquist, majority leader; Coleman, minority leader; state representatives Lindstrom, majority; Sabo, minority; Speaker Aubrey Dirlam.

This is the second world unity paper signed in the state. Three years ago almost to the day, a former governor and various officials inked the Hennepin County-Minneapolis world citizenship pact, said to be almost identical with the new state document.

Governor Anderson was unavailable for comment on what the action implies.

The same question put to the chairman of the Concerned Taxpayers of Minnesota, Mrs. Joan Van Poperin, drew this: "The Declaration indicates take-over right now . . . we are in the position of citizens against World Government."

Mrs. Van Poperin sketched prior events of the week. Rep. John Bares, Jr. introduced a bill to repeal Minnesota's Regionalization Act of 1969, a radical piece of the world regionalization movement. The subcommittee hearings on March 23 were jammed with repeal citizens, many of them farmers coming from all points of the state.

A lawmaker said that he "believes in World Government." Asked why, by a constituent, the official reportedly replied that he "got new streets and new sidewalks through urban renewal."

The point is significant. Controversial urban renewal laws increasingly are attacked on the premise that they are unconstitutional, existing only because the United Nations global treaty has pre-empted the U.S. Constitution. Unprotected Americans are left defending themselves against present-day world law such as urban renewal and regional laws.

As this is written, a statewide protest march is scheduled on April 3 converging on the Minnesota capitol steps. The Governor and legislators are invited. Originally planned as a tax protest against the state legislature, the event undoubtedly will protest the world citizenship betrayal.

A press conference by CTM, 628 Stryker Ave., St. Paul 55107, dealt the cards. The words of Joan Van Poperin were picked up by TV, newspapers and radio. She said: "We have a tax crisis. Rates are 10 to 15 times what they should be. People are losing their homes. We want property taxes to be levied at one per cent (1%) of the year 1967's assessed valuation. 1967 was picked because that year the legislature passed the law to change tax base due to regionalization." (Twin Cities regional government created in 1967 consists of St. Paul, Minneapolis and seven counties).

"We urge the repeal of the statewide Regionalization Act of 1969 which followed, putting all powers under appointed officials and taking away our right to vote on those representing us on tax matters. If the April 3 protest has no effect," she said, "We shall withhold our real estate taxes."

"As for world citizenship, if it can be for-

ably imposed on Minnesotans, so can it be done to all citizens in these United States!"

[From the Yakima (Wash.) Eagle, Mar. 25, 1971]

STATES TO QUESTION UNITED NATIONS TREATY
(By Jo Hindman)

The United Nations strategy to bleed and conquer is running into a groundswell of American counter-action. Significantly, the movement is state, not Washington, D.C. inspired.

The aversion against the UN and its agencies stems from countless disasters that the international trouble makers bring upon Americans within the United States and upon their soldier sons outside the U.S.A.

The advancing thrust of a citizen-sponsored campaign in Wisconsin brilliantly demonstrates how the intelligent anger of Americans is zeroing in on the root of the trouble—the UN's Charter/Treaty (1945) ratified by the U.S. Senate in ill-advised lack of prudence.

The Wisconsin Legislative & Research Committee, a citizen group, seeks to restore the U.S. Constitution and thus eliminate the UN Charter's chaotic influence on the economic, social, political, cultural, educational, and judicial institutions of the U.S.A. and Wisconsin State.

A first step—to study the injurious effects of the UN Charter—is underway, coordinated by the Wisconsin L & R Committee working through a legislative steering committee comprised of members of both houses.

Assembly Joint Resolution No. 34 (1971) will come up for hearings before the Wisconsin Legislature late in March. Technically worded, "This joint resolution establishes a special joint committee comprised of four senators and four representatives to the assembly, to study the constitutionality of the actions of federal agencies with regard to the United Nations, the effect of these actions on the state and possible measures which could be taken by this state to punish unconstitutional actions." A list of grievances is included.

The objective is to initiate legislative action by the State which will outlaw the United Nations Treaty-Charter and other illegal acts of Congress within the boundaries of the State of Wisconsin.

The legislative "first" is part of a nationwide movement designed to help the states clean house. The legislatures of several states must investigate the UN Charter to see if it is pre-empting the Constitution of the United States or of the State. When this fact has been established, then each investigating legislature will declare that the U.S. Senate had no right to ratify the Charter. Next, each investigating state will declare the Charter to be an act outside of the law and make it a felony for anyone to try to enforce the provisions of the UN Charter within the state.

Archibald E. Roberts, Lt. Col. AUS ret., author of the state-oriented strategy, heads the nationwide Committee to Restore the Constitution, Oak at Howes St., Fort Collins, Colo. 80521. The Wisconsin L & R Committee is affiliated with the national organization.

Both the national and its affiliates believe that it is necessary to inspire public awareness of the UN peril and to encourage the voice of reason to be heard in the halls of the State capitols.

The model legislation from which the Wisconsin joint resolution is adapted was prepared under the direction of the late John Janney, nationally recognized constitutional authority and Mr. T. David Horton, counsel for the national committee.

Implementation of the legal instrument will go far in probing the forces which are manipulating the American economy, gen-

erating depression, and financing civil violence for the revolutionary purpose of establishing a Regional Governance upon the ruins of the American civilization," according to Col. Roberts who will testify in Madison, Wis.

Ref. Wisconsin Legislative and Research Committee, Inc., Box 45, Brookfield, Wis. 53005.

REVENUE SHARING OPT CAUSES SYNDICATE
TIFF

(By Jo Hindman)

Revenue sharing is losing its appeal among Congressmen who are hearing from tax payers back home.

Even politically organized Syndicate 1313, staunch supporter of revenue sharing, has split on a technical issue concerning method.

Tax payers deplore the magicianship whereby the federal government would give to public tax Spenders a portion of federal income raised by taxing the earnings of individuals. The flow of grants back to the states would blatantly detour around the nationwide demand for cuts in tax spending and would make funds available for local spending projects which have been blocked or turned down by local tax payers.

Sensible government requires the spending unit of government to collect the taxes it would spend.

It is fatal nonsense to separate the tax-collecting level from the level that spends. The split levels make it impossible for tax payers to call government to account on how it uses or misuses the funds.

But Syndicate 1313, Metro, is going all out for revenue sharing.

1313's "law factory" wrote a sample bill to call Congress into a convention to graft revenue sharing into the U.S. Constitution. The tiff in 1313 developed when the National Municipal League editorially attacked the sample but without identifying the Council of State Government faction as the author. Both the NML and CSG are powerful lead units in the political 1313 conglomerate, Chicago-headquartered.

1313's mail order samples, bearing the markings LC 838 1-15-71 hit all state legislatures meeting in early 1971, ready for copying. A legislator who introduced LC 838 as a House Joint Resolution in his state, admitted that the measure is a nationwide effort sponsored by the National Conference of State Legislative Leaders (NCSLL) and the National Society of State Legislators (NSSL).

Last year, those two organizations popped up in the company of the National Legislative Conference (NLC), the Office of Federal-State Relations of the National Governors (GC), the National Assn. of Attorneys-General (NAAG), the National Conference of Lieutenant Governors (NCLG), and the federal Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR) when those 1313 adjuncts collaborated under the CSG whip to get the U.S. Con-Con proposal on the road.

The NML supports the concept of revenue sharing; it merely objects to the U.S. Con-Con idea, fearing that revenue sharing (MML-defined as of statutory nature) will be put into the Constitution where, NML opines, only "new principles belong."

NML, claiming civic status, includes in its membership bankers, lawyers, professors, League of Women Voters, etc.; its treasury regularly receives tax exempt funds from Ford Foundation, Carnegie Corporation and other such institutions.

The CSG, composed of careerists in government, exacts annual tribute from the fifty state treasuries; its "secretariat" controls a legion of syndicate puppets, all active.

The time has come for Congress to heed

the wishes of the American constituency rather than to listen to syndicate lobbyists.

It is high time for Congress to cut spending and to forget about revenue sharing which, in the long run, is merely debt-sharing (the national government has been spending more than it takes in).

Refs. NML's "State Legislatures Progress Report" Sept.-Oct. 1970, and National Civic Review Magazine Feb. 1971, both published by National Municipal League, 47 E. 68 St., N.Y. 10021.

THERE'S ONLY DEBT TO SHARE

(By Jo Hindman)

The tussle over so-called revenue sharing—dividing federal grants between the states—exposes two factions of the same camp maneuvering state-local governments into a fatal fiscal crunch.

The main action is taking place in Wash., D.C. The Administration's "General" sharing proposal is the force working from the top down. The blank proposal, termed "constructive alternative," is the force working from the bottom up.

The Administration, talking \$5- to \$10-billion per year, would mark 1.3 per cent of taxable personal income revenue to be returned to the state-local levels as their share. Population and state-local government's tax effort ratio would determine the distribution, i.e. the heavier a state taxes its citizenry, the more federal refund it would "earn."

Using the same ratios, the blank \$24-billion proposal, letting the U.S. President handle the purse, requires an additional condition: a "masterplan for modernizing" state-local governments. States not "modernizing" would be stricken from the sharing list. The mandated masterplan would implement the Metro program to eliminate all local governments smaller than regions.

The Administration's "Special" sharing proposals are not divulged, as this is written, but the "General" proposal stays silent on the Presidential partitioning of the 50 states into 10 regions. Done in 1969, U.S.A.'s regionalization was accomplished by one stroke at the top.

Meanwhile, Metro's bottom-to-top regionalization is running into opposition. The most recent report comes from the Texas Panhandle.

At meetings of the Panhandle Regional Planning Commission whose jurisdiction covers 26 counties, no private citizen is allowed to address the board. Even commissioners not members of the board, although their unit of government is in PRPC, reportedly are likewise gagged. The meetings are shifted all over the Panhandle, apparently to discourage citizen attendance.

At first glance it might seem that the PRPC is following the Metro movement's COG pattern (councils of government). These, posing as state-local advisory groups, inevitably clamor for taxing and other powers of a full government.

At second glance, the Panhandle region looks like a new breed, it sports a peculiarity associated with the Administration's ten (10) regional councils in federal cities—ruling bodies composed of federal HUD, HEW, SBA, Labor and OEO staffings, more being added each day.

OEO (Office of Economic Opportunity, "anti-poverty") operates through Community Action Committee (CAC) at neighborhood levels. In the Panhandle, the Texas Panhandle Community Action Corporation has been chartered by the state to organize in the 26 Panhandle counties. Seven counties have joined the TPCAC by passing resolutions. That is significant. Resolutions are beyond citizen action.

Texans have sent letters to the state capitol and to the TPCAC headquarters in Ama-

rillo asking why the federal government is incorporating its "give-away" programming under the laws of Texas?

Is it possible that by so doing, a queer new administrative conduit, from the U.S. President to state-blessed federal dispensaries, would be created?

Complicating the zaniness, federal spending is exceeding its income. Therefore, the only thing to share is debt.

If Congress approves the sharing of non-existent funds, U.S. citizens will be forced into deeper public debt.

Ref. Congressional Records: 12-17-70, 1-25 and 26-71 "State and Local Government Modernization Act of 1971;" CR 2-4-71—Administration's revenue sharing proposals.

METRO REGIONS CREATED

(By Jo Hindman)

The United States has been divided into ten beggarly Metro regions by the pronouncement of a single man.

On the Day of Partitioning* a White House spokesman boasted, "The curious fact of the American national government is that there is only one 'single man' and he is called the President." That is the arrangement.

The reorganization powers to subordinate the American people under bondage have existed in the hands of U.S. presidents for more than 20 years reportedly. "No President has ever been willing to bite the bullet," according to the assistant to the president for urban affairs, "Now we have done so."

Virtually every facet of the lives of American citizens has been brought under the hand of a single man. The pattern is simple: He divided the United States into ten regions, named the states to comprise each region, designated ten cities as regional capitals, moved into them skeletal field forces of five federal agencies—HUD, HEW, OEO, SBA and Labor, all of which comprise the ten regional councils. More agencies will be added later.

The action established embryonic Metro governance over the U.S.A.

This is the first time in the history of the American nation that the regional boundaries of the major United Nations—chartered domestic programs have been made co-terminus, under the administrative governance of the chief executive of the United States.

At first, the President announced eight Metro regions fanning out from Washington D.C. To pacify Kansas City and Seattle which desired regional capital status, he upped the count to ten regions** Unless changed again, the new Metro alignment is as follows:

Region I (Boston): Conn., Maine, Mass., N.H., R.I., Vt.; Region II (N.Y. City): N.Y., N.J., Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands; Region III (Philadelphia): Del., D.C., Md., Pa., Va., West Va.; Region IV (Atlanta): Ala., Fla., Ga., Ky., Miss., N.C., S.C., Tenn.; Region V (Chicago): Ill., Ind., Minn., Mich., Ohio, Wisc.; Regions VI (Dallas-Fort Worth): Ark., La., N. Mex., Okla., Tex.; Region VII (Kansas City): Iowa, Kan., Mo., Nebr.; Region VIII (Denver): Colo., Mont., N.D., S.D., Utah, Wyo.; Region IX (San Francisco): Ariz., Cal., Hawaii, Nev.; Region X (Seattle): Alaska, Idaho, Ore., Washington.

A White House spokesman said that "if you broke these regions up and put them in the United Nations Gazetteer they would be the "8th . . . 12th . . . 14th biggest and richest countries in the world."

The Metro federal regional structure seeks to transfer administrative governance (U.N. global ruling power) FROM the single man TO ten (10) federal directors in the 10-region national field.

One of the federal money bills to finance Metro governance in the nation was H.R. 2519 introduced by Congressman Reuss, January 1969, providing bloc grants if

regional modernization conditions were met by the states.

To qualify for the promised bloc grants, the states enacted legislation enabling—or mandating in some instances—the collectivizing of counties into sub-regions which, in turn, fit neatly into the federal 10-regions under the single man governance.

Following the White House 10-region coup, the same measure (H.R. 2519) was renumbered H.R. 11764 and reintroduced later 5-28-69 by the same congressman. Sections were added giving control over the proposed \$22½ billion outlay to the "single man"—the U.S. President.

The 91st Congress, now ended, failed to approve the money bill. Watch for one like it to appear in 1971.

Refs. *White House press conference 3-27-69; **Statement by the President 5-21-69.

NACO ACTIVATES "MEIN KAMPF"

(By Jo Hindman)

NACO launched a 15-point assault in 1970 for "modernizing county governments." In Metro gibberish that means that the National Assn. of Counties began the United Nations chartered administrative rules system.

NACO is the political Syndicate 1313's unit assigned to revamp county government. In turn, 1313 is the political transformer designed to conduct the global government of the U.N. into domestic use.

By early 1971, NACO accomplishments disclosed that its "New County, U.S.A." national center has been established at NACO's headquarters, 1101 Connecticut Ave. NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

The Center is furnished with a "situation room" and a "situation map." The "situations" to be uncovered by NACO surveillance on state constitutional revisions, Metro's so-called home rule charters and other attempts to metropolitanize the United States, will be accumulated in the files and pegged on the map. Through rewritten charters and regional geopolitics, Metro's takeover of the U.S.A. is being accomplished.

NACO has tightened its nationwide "grapevine" hoping for prompt responses to its queries. A national network of clipping services and daily exchange of information with organizations such as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce which is deeply involved with the Metro 1313 syndicate, will serve as NACO eyes and ears.

An advisory committee has been appointed, drawing membership from other 1313 adjuncts such as the National League of Cities (NLC) and Conference of Mayors, International City Managers Assn. (ICMA), National Municipal League (NML), Public Administration Service (PAS), League of Women Voters (LWV), Committee on Economic Development (CED), Urban Coalition (UC) and the "portable 1313" within federal government, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

The latter ACIR is top contender in federal government for the vital spot of referee in deciding which States qualify for block federal grants. The deciding factor will depend to what extent a State has overthrown constitutional government in favor of UN-Metro administrative rule.

Spiro T. Agnew, U.S. Vice Pres. will serve as honorary chairman of NACO's advisory committee, a stance quite in line with U.S. President Nixon's delineation of duties between himself and Agnew—Spiro to oversee the domestic scene while Nixon pitches at the international level.

NACO is applying heat to accelerate Metro's "multi-county districts" project that snuggles into the new ten-region U.S.A. cassette controlled from the White House.

NACO's surveillance will be bolstered by surveys, institutes, roving teams of "experts," round tables, Urban Observatories (strategically placed watching posts), consultants,

university academicians (who accept lavish fees for their advice) and a "living library" (mall order library service).

This bristling mobilization expects to use the media of radio, television and (you'll laugh) a syndicated column to disseminate the propaganda.

Shamefully, NACO's "new county" war on existing county governments is made possible by a grant from tax-exempted Ford Foundation, which means that the taxpayers are subsidizing the destruction of their local government.

Ref.: "NC-USA, First Anniversary," Special Issue Vol. 35, #12 of The American County magazine by NACO, Wash., D.C. 20036.

THE CALLEY CASE AND CAPTAIN DANIEL

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the reverberations of the decision in the case of Lt. William Calley are going to remain with this Nation for a long time. It is right that they should, for the Calley case has served to stir the American body politic in profound ways about the tragic war in Southeast Asia.

In passing, I would say that it is unfortunate that the massacre of so many innocent civilians, more than 3 years ago, has only now prompted this stirring of the national conscience. The immorality of this war, its misguided premises, and its unconscionable practices were not first born in March of 1968, at My Lai. Nor have they been laid to rest since My Lai. But hopefully now, an American public, tired, disgusted, and sick of war, can finally force an end to the war.

As for the Calley case, itself, more is to come. The appellate procedure lies ahead. Thus, it was unwise for the President to intervene, as he has done, thereby placing the power and prestige of his office behind those who seek to uplift Lieutenant Calley as a hero. If any comments were in order by the President, they should have been commendation for the jurors—five of them veterans of the Vietnam war—who faced a difficult burden; for the Army, which at last has begun to act; and for the men who refused to participate in the My Lai massacre.

Capt. Aubrey Daniel III, the prosecutor in the Calley case, has correctly perceived the error of the President. In a letter to the President, he viewed the President's announcement that he will personally review and decide the case before the final sentence is carried out as opening the system of military justice to charges "that it is subject to political influence." The President's action enhanced the image of Lieutenant Calley "as a national hero" and it threatened to make meaningless the action and the courage of the jurors, "six honorable men who served their country so well."

As Captain Daniel said:

I would expect that the President of the United States, a man whom I believe should and would provide the moral leadership for this nation, would stand fully behind the law

of this land on a moral issue which is so clear and about which there can be no compromise.

At this point, I should like to include an editorial from the April 8 edition of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, entitled "The Captain Who Spoke His Mind"; an editorial from the April 8 edition of the New York Times, entitled "The Calley Issues"; and an editorial from the April 9 edition of the Louisville Courier-Journal, entitled "Captain Daniel's Just Rebuke of the President." The editorials follow:

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, April 8, 1971]

THE CAPTAIN WHO SPOKE HIS MIND

If any folk hero is to be fashioned out of the Calley case, we nominate the prosecutor, Capt. Aubrey M. Daniel III. He deserves several medals with oak leaf clusters for daring to speak his mind, and doing it forcefully, eloquently and unanswerably, on President Nixon's intervention in the case.

If Capt. Daniel, a draftee, were not already scheduled to leave the Army within a short time it is safe to say that his biting letter to the President would assure, if not a quick farewell, certainly a roadblock on promotions and probably assignment to the least desirable post in the world. In any event, he performed a great public service in standing up against the pro-Calley hysteria to which Mr. Nixon succumbed, in deploring a presidential intercession which is bound to weaken the judicial system, and in recalling, to President and nation alike, that the Calley case involves a clear moral issue which cannot be compromised.

As if Mr. Nixon's meddling were not enough, Senator Jackson of Washington made equal mischief when he proposed appointment of a commission to conduct yet another extra-judicial review of the affair. Public hysteria, he said, demands immediate action to "cool it." But Capt. Daniel gave everybody a lesson in how to cool it best: by upholding a legal process that has yet to run its course, instead of substituting mob law.

One of the curious twists of the uproar is that those thoughtful and sober persons who believe that Lt. Calley convicted himself are accepting a more charitable view of the American armed forces in Vietnam than those who would make him a hero. When it is argued that Lt. Calley really didn't commit a crime, but only did what many other American soldiers did, the implication is that murdering babies and women in cold blood has been an ordinary and usual practice: "no big deal," as Calley himself said.

We would rather believe that My Lai was a departure from the norm, an aberration. President Nixon once described it in those terms, but today when he gives aid and comfort to the critics of the verdict he is in effect agreeing that what Lt. Calley did was no big deal.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 8, 1971]

THE CALLEY ISSUES

The extraordinary letter of Capt. Aubrey M. Daniel 3d, Army prosecutor in the Calley case, is at one and the same time a magnificent expression of American idealism and a stark and stunning indictment of the role played in this affair by Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States.

Captain Daniel's letter, the full text of which was published in this newspaper yesterday, ought to be read in every schoolroom of America as a courageous statement of what this country is really all about: respect for human freedom, for individual rights and for impartial justice under law. Captain Daniel makes two major points,

both of which need to be affirmed again and again in the face of the hysterical outburst from those attacking the verdict against Lieut. William L. Calley Jr. for the murder of at least 22 South Vietnamese civilians in the village of My Lai. The first of these points is that Lieutenant Calley was convicted, under the most scrupulously fair procedure, of having committed a specific and despicable crime in direct violation of the laws of the United States and the rules and policies of the United States Army.

The issue in this case is not whether the Vietnam war is good or bad, nor whether the United States is in a morally indefensible position in having pursued it for these half-dozen years. The issue is not whether large-scale aerial bombing or artillery fire or naval bombardment in which many thousands of innocent civilians have lost their lives is just as reprehensible as the incident which President Nixon at another time called the "massacre" of My Lai. The issue is not whether the enemy guerrillas who have eviscerated or crucified or decapitated hundreds or thousands of innocent South Vietnamese civilians are as culpable as Calley. Nor is the issue whether or not other American soldiers who may have participated in similarly brutal killings of Vietnamese civilians have gone scot free. Nor is it even whether higher officers in the Army chain of command should be brought to trial for having concealed knowledge of the My Lai Affair.

There can be no doubt that most of these issues raised by the hawks and doves who have expressed their horror over the Calley verdict are worth raising. They are valid questions; but they are not the issue here nor do they in any way whatsoever affect the justice of this trial. Calley is not "all of us," Dean Sayre of Washington Cathedral to the contrary. Calley is a convicted murderer who deserves pity, perhaps, but neither exculpation nor adulation. To have exonerated this wretched lieutenant would have degraded the Army and made a monumental farce of American efforts to secure humane treatment of American prisoners now in enemy hands. The Army would be saying it was permissible to murder civilians under American control; and in fact the witless uproar over the Calley conviction is giving precisely that impression even now throughout the civilized world.

And here we come to the second major point made by Captain Daniel: the outrageously political intervention of his Commander in Chief, to whom Captain Daniel addressed his remarkable letter. The judicial procedures of the United States Army have been unconscionably subverted by the White House statement that the President would personally review and decide the case before the final sentence is carried out. Mr. Nixon's public entrance into this matter before the normal and automatic review procedures had even begun was an affront to the American judicial process, and has already done untold damage to respect for American law as well as justice, civil as well as military.

Captain Daniel and the rest of us had a right to expect from the President an expression of moral leadership, of reverence for the law, of honor to those millions of members of the armed forces who have not engaged in atrocities but who have done their duty just as the prosecutor, the judge and the jury did theirs in the trial at Fort Benning. Instead, the President of the United States, failing to stand up to his responsibility, has yielded to momentary public clamor and to illusory political expediency.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, April 9, 1971]

CAPTAIN DANIEL'S JUST REBUKE OF THE PRESIDENT

President Nixon's untimely intervention in the Calley case is difficult to interpret as any-

thing but a case of politics over principle—unless, most disturbing of all, principle never even crossed the President's mind.

The telegrams to the White House were running 100-to-one in favor of freeing the convicted murderer of at least 22 South Vietnamese civilians. The governor of Alabama and the lieutenant governor of Georgia had rushed to the murderer's side. The governor of Indiana was calling for American flags to be flown at half-staff. The lieutenant governor of Kentucky was calling for a public rally in support of the murderer. Politicians everywhere were throwing their minds and morals to the winds and hopping on the bandwagon. Public tensions were running high.

At moments such as that, a President is supposed to exercise moral leadership, to keep his perspective even if all about him are losing theirs, rather than permit himself to be caught up in the emotional surge of the moment. Yet Mr. Nixon, properly casting about for a way to defuse explosive passions, chose the one course best guaranteed to eat away further at public respect for the foundation stone of the nation: our system of justice.

Military law already provides for the President, as commander-in-chief, to intervene in the military judicial process whenever he wants. So why did President Nixon deem it necessary to thrust himself into this particular case almost before the ink on the sentence was dry, before an appeal could even be readied, before other officers charged in the case could come to trial? To remind the emotional outcriers that, after all, he is the President and all will be well in the end?

DIGNITY AND PRIDE ABANDONED

It was enough to goad the young Army prosecutor—who had handled the long and difficult case with taciturn competence and dignity—into an eloquent rebuke of his chief. The President's announcement that he will decide Lieutenant Calley's fate opens the system of military justice to charges "that it is subject to political influence . . ." the prosecutor said. It enhanced the image of the murderer "as a national hero . . ." It threatened to make meaningless the action and the courage of the jurors, "six honorable men who served their country so well."

Captain Aubrey M. Daniel III is right. But the President's intervention did even more harm than that. In the eyes of the world, it stripped this country of the only scrap of dignity and pride it has yet been able to salvage out of the horrible bloodbath at My Lai. "That the Calley trial took place is a credit to the United States," commented *The Sunday Times* of London. "But the President has now destroyed what good the trial has done."

Politics makes strange bedfellows. But justice has never yet lain with politics and remained pure. Whatever fate President Nixon determines for Lieutenant Calley now will have the taint of politics upon it forever. For that, the commander-in-chief deserves the rebuke of the captain and of every American who can see the end result of sacrificing principle to every passing demand.

URGES ADMINISTRATION TO RELEASE FUNDS

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, the administration's refusal to spend \$12 billion approved by Congress for vitally needed urban renewal, transportation, and sewer programs, raises serious

questions about the sincerity of the President's efforts to reduce unemployment.

With nearly 6 percent of the Nation's work force unemployed last month, there is an even greater need to spend these funds for paycheck-producing projects.

These funds are not frills in the budget, but essential appropriations approved by Congress after long consideration and debate.

What reason could the President have for impounding \$200 million for urban renewal; \$200 million for water and sewer grants; \$192 million for public housing, and \$7 billion for transportation, including \$6 billion for highways?

The administration says it is holding up this money partly to combat inflation. But the unprecedented amount of the freeze and the broad scope of these funds leads me to question the President's motives for such action at this time.

Appropriation of public funds is the historic prerogative of the Congress. When the President ignores this constitutional precedent, he threatens to compromise the checks and balances of our Government.

The Congress has exercised its responsibility by approving these funds. I ask the administration to do the same and use these funds for the purposes which Congress has directed.

IS MARCH ON WASHINGTON DESIGNED TO PROMOTE PEACE, OR IS THAT LAUDABLE OBJECTIVE BEING USED AS A SUBTERFUGE TO ADVANCE A PRO-COMMUNIST REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT?

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, there has been much publicity about pending mass demonstrations in Washington, originally announced by David Dellinger—who was convicted with the Chicago 7—and Sidney Peck, a one-time Communist Party official. Both of these men have long records of violence and pro-Communist activities.

These sponsors are joined by a motley array of subversive organizations and individual extremists aligned with the New Left. In addition, there are some veterans, pacifists, and others who appear to be confused about the war and our withdrawal plans. We must assume many of these mean well, but those who feel that way must find themselves in some dubious company. It would seem they could assert their views in more compatible circumstances.

The Dellinger-Peck announcement said the objectives of the Washington convergence are to plug for a \$6,500-a-year guaranteed annual income for every family of four; freedom for all "political prisoners"; and immediate unconditional withdrawal of all U.S. forces from Vietnam.

WHAT DO PROTESTERS SEEK?

Mr. Speaker, in regard to the war, while we recognize the presence in this country of honest differences of opinion regarding the conflict in Vietnam, it goes without saying that the Communist Party, U.S.A., is naturally determined to exploit to the limit the antiwar sentiment that has developed here.

Are the leaders of this movement interested in accelerated withdrawal of American combat troops from Vietnam? If so, that is already being done.

Are they interested in the program to train and equip the South Vietnamese forces, to enable them to cope with the Communist aggressors? If not, they have plenty of company in Hanoi.

Are they concerned about the fate of the 1,600 American prisoners of war held by the Communists? If so, they never mention it.

All their declarations call for immediate, unilateral, unconditional withdrawal of all Americans from Vietnam. That position jibes precisely with demands made by Hanoi's negotiators in Paris.

The real motivations behind these extremist leaders become apparent when we examine their modus operandi.

They discredit the successes achieved in Cambodia and Laos.

They even condemn the bombing of enemy supply lines.

They repeatedly attack the Government of South Vietnam, but never find fault with the Communist government in the north.

They seek to expose and exploit allegations of atrocities charged against those in the south, but completely ignore the monstrous atrocities committed by the Communists at Duc Duc, Hue, and literally scores and scores of other places in the south.

They demand a day-certain pullout of all U.S. forces, but they never—even suggest the same treatment for the enemy.

They join in all sorts of hate-America activities, and, strangely, are never known to indulge in hate-Communist manifestations.

Thus, we witness constant nagging and faultfinding with anything and everything that is done by Americans and South Vietnamese, but no criticism ever directed at the Communist aggressors.

WHO PROMOTES THE MARCH ON WASHINGTON?

Mr. Speaker, constructive criticism is always in order under our system. But dissent, under any circumstances, should be consistent with what is good for America. That fact prompts us to examine the motivations of those who inspired the current demonstrations.

The spring offensive, as it is called, is being promoted by the People's Coalition for Peace and Social Justice, and cosponsored by the National Peace Action Coalition. The latter is an offshoot of the Socialist Workers Party, which has been officially cited as a Communist front. In addition, the pro-Communist Young Socialist Alliance has been working on the protest since last December.

A total of 23 Members of the House and eight Senators have given their blessings to the movement.

The grand strategy for the mass convergence was recently announced by David Dellinger and Sidney Peck—already referred to.

It is of interest to note that one of the three objectives of the demonstrations is to obtain freedom for "political prisoners"—whatever that means. Apparently they are for the first time aping revolutionaries in other countries who have employed kidnaping and violent threats in efforts to obtain release from prison of their cohorts, regardless of the nature of the crimes committed.

MARCH WAS HATCHED IN STOCKHOLM

It is a known fact that the spring offensive was planned at a meeting in Stockholm last November, described in the press as the "World Conference on Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia," attended chiefly by delegates from Hanoi and other Communist countries. David Dellinger was one of the speakers.

Shortly following the Stockholm meeting plans for the Washington march began. The services of many of the old revolutionaries were enlisted.

Among them was Rennie Davis, also one of those convicted in the Chicago Seven trial; Jane Fonda, who now bills herself as a "revolutionary woman"; and Don Gurewitz, a national officer of the radical Student Mobilization Committee. The latter, whose family has been identified with Communist causes for years, was joined by Carol Lipman, another Socialist Workers Party member.

Other sponsors include such characters as James Lafferty, closely associated with the Communist-dominated National Lawyers Guild; Vincent Hallinan, of San Francisco, longtime attorney for hard-core leftists; Corliss Lamont, a granddaddy of Communist front groups; and Ruth Gage-Colby, a repeated joiner of Communist movements.

A STRANGE AGGREGATION

While some well-meaning people have been drawn into this march, it is apparent the convergence will include the biggest aggregation of kooks, hooligans, subversives, and revolutionaries ever assembled at one time and place in this country.

There is every reason to believe, so far as the leadership of this movement is concerned, the antiwar angle is being used as a gimmick designed to suck in some well-meaning and the more naive war protesters. Rather, it is to be a concerted pro-Communist effort to mold a revolutionary movement in America, sprinkled with hate-America propaganda on the part of some participants.

WILL THERE BE VIOLENCE?

It is of interest to note that four out of the five announced national coordinators of the Washington blowout have known affiliations with revolutionary organizations. Although they, for obvious reasons, do not speak of violence, it is well known that the ringleaders are of the violent type.

One thing is certain: Violence will be employed if the leaders think violence will better serve their purpose. One of their announced objectives is "to shut

down the Government until it stops the war."

Sidney Peck, one of the ringleaders, is reported to have issued a leaflet on "How to Stop the War in Vietnam," which stated:

Massive non-violent direct action implies that many people will get hurt and some may die. And it will take the lives of many of our friends and comrades before we are able to wield the leverage of mass international opinion and disruptive internal turmoil to bring the war machine to a halt.

And Rennie Davis, described in the Washington Post as "masterminding the May disruptions," said Washington demonstrators will block traffic by abandoning old automobiles purchased for the purpose, setting them afire if possible. Massed bands, he said, will provoke the police. And Federal buildings and congressional offices will be occupied. He added that not even the Supreme Court will be immune.

The police, with all their reinforcements, will be hard pressed to maintain order. Again, it all depends on how many demonstrators actually show up, how they choose to conduct themselves, and how well the police are able to control the situation.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that the American people know what is behind this march and who the people are who promote it. After all, the only possible effect this thing can have, at this time, is to harm this country. Naturally, it can be expected to encourage the Communists, regardless of what the motivations behind it may be.

We are now in a withdrawal posture in Vietnam. The Vietnamization program is proving to be exceedingly successful thus far. Only 300,000 Americans remain, and 100,000 are due to be brought home this year. According to the best military judgment, we are pulling out as fast as conditions will permit.

TRIBUTE TO A BLACKSMITH

HON. JOHN M. SLACK

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, it is my great honor to represent, among my constituents, a man of iron, a man of stout purpose and undeviating Christian virtue, cast in the mold of those who first settled this country and made our Nation possible, a blacksmith who still tends his forge each day, although 86 years of age.

In this time of too much public clamor and jostling for attention by demagogues, we frequently forget that such men actually exist and that they are the people who represent the strength of our society. But they do exist and we have become the most powerful Nation in history because of the fortitude they have had to accomplish in a lifetime.

I take this opportunity to bring to your attention a news feature describing my constituent, Tim Harper, a good American, a good Christian, and a good citizen; a blacksmith of 60 years' experience, and I extend to him my heart-

iest congratulations on his birthday just passed.

The item follows:

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Daily Mail, Apr. 12, 1971]

FORGE STILL GLOWS—HAMMER AND ANVIL RING FOR 60 YEARS

(By David McCorkle)

Almost forever there has been the blacksmith.

He lives on in our times as a legend, a symbol of the pioneer spirit of an earlier America, an exemplar of industry and toil, brawn and tenacity.

Soot-covered, tanned by his fire, with strong hands he forged and tempered the tools which plowed the ground and tilled the soil. Men of his mien built this nation.

Alone, in a small shop on the banks of Coal River, William Tim Harper still plies the ancient trade. He is a progeny of those bygone times, a vestige of the legendary village blacksmith.

Harper has been blacksmithing from day-break to dusk for more than 60 years. His shop has stood on A Street in St. Albans almost that long, a ringing testimony to a long and productive life.

Tim Harper celebrates his 86th birthday today, and even age cannot take his work from him.

His daughter, Miss Druzetta Harper, says he starts work about 7 a.m., or "as early as he can get me up to fix his breakfast." In the evening he refuses to leave his shop until he has finished his last piece, many times not until 5:30.

Harper still works six days a week. Except for holidays and occasional illness, he sets aside one day a year for vacation, traveling to Greenbrier County for the Labor Day weekend to visit a son.

As the famous village smith of Longfellow's poem, Harper swings his hammer with a measured beat and slow. At 26, however, the beat is not as measured as it once was and it's becoming slower.

There was a time when you could give him a piece of iron, tell him what you wanted and he would fashion it by hammer—a hoe, tongs, rake, plowshare, horseshoes.

But Harper hasn't shod a horse for years, and hoes are hard to make because the materials aren't as available as in times past.

He still sharpens tools though, and fits them with handles. His patrons still comment on his inimitable expertise.

Harper lives on Church Avenue but spends most of his waking hours in the shop on A Street. His daughter said, "He is happier down there. He feels like those things are his and that the house belongs to someone else."

Harper is one of the few professional blacksmiths remaining in the Mountain State. He is a survivor of another age which most have forgotten.

Day in and day out he keeps his fire burning, though, and as long as the flames glow and the hammer rings against the anvil, William Tim Harper forges a mysteriously wonderful link with the past.

THE 28TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WARSAW UPRISING

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, 28 years ago, 60,000 Jews in the Warsaw ghetto knew that they could not hope to prevail against the mighty German Army.

They had a choice. Either they could march, like so many sheep, to the gas chambers, or they could challenge the

Nazi army to battle, and fight to the last bullet.

The Jews of the Warsaw ghetto chose the latter course.

On April 19, 1943, under the leadership of Mordecai Anzelm, the Jewish combat organization launched their desperate and foredoomed revolt against the Nazi occupiers.

In reply, the Nazis threw into battle several divisions of troops and entire squadrons of the Luftwaffe.

For almost 3 long weeks, the Jews fought back with the few weapons they had been able to smuggle into the ghetto with the help of the Polish underground.

Finally, on May 8, 1943, the last outpost of the Jewish resistance fell. Those leaders who still survived committed suicide rather than be captured. Only a tiny minority survived to bear testimony to this epic struggle.

It is fitting that we pay tribute to the fallen martyrs of the Warsaw ghetto uprising, and in doing so, rededicate ourselves to the continuing struggle against the kind of prejudice and intolerance that led to the massacre of 6 million Jews during World War II.

THE NORTH VIETNAMESE MASSACRE OF CIVILIANS AT DUC DUC

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, in recent months this Nation has witnessed a sad display of one-sided criticism of anything and everything that has been done by Americans in Vietnam.

Bearing on that practice, I include a letter published in the April 18 issue of the Washington Post, written by 1st Lt. Fred M. Greguras, USMCR. Having served in Vietnam, Lieutenant Greguras is well informed about some of the reporting. The letter follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 18, 1971]

THE NORTH VIETNAMESE MASSACRE OF CIVILIANS AT DUC DUC

The last time I saw the South Vietnamese village of Duc Duc was in late August of 1970. We had crossed the Thu Bon River northwest of the village after an operation in the Arizona Territory. We were met on the east bank of the river by tanks which were to lead us to the road which would take us through the village and on into the An Hoa Combat Base. We walked in the tread tracks of the tanks to preclude the detonation of booby traps which were abundant in the area.

As we neared the village the ruins of French plantation houses became frequent. The crops they had planted a generation ago now grew wildly. When we came to the road which would take us through Duc Duc the tanks deserted us and we walked somewhat leisurely through the village. We came first to the poor section of the village where the people lived in crudely constructed shelters of lumber, tin and canvas which had been acquired in one manner or another from the An Hoa Combat Base.

As we moved toward the center of the village the shelters became houses; tile roofs, plywood floor, even some glass windows. The center of the village, unlike American cities, was the section of the affluent. There were numerous small shops selling a variety of

local products and a teashop which seemed to serve as a focal point for all activity.

The main street ran north and south and on the west side there were masonry homes with long green lawns and wide verandas. The only wire evident in the village was that used to pen their domestic animals. At the southwest corner of the village was the heavily fortified district capital. This cantonment was perhaps 25 yards in diameter.

The village itself was not fortified. It was not pro-American as a similar river crossing in May drew fire from the village. Marine helicopters were frequently the target for a .50 caliber machine gun located somewhere near the village.

As I try to remember the people of the village I picture barefoot young boys at the edge of the road giving the peace sign and saying "Hi Honcho." The bearded old men, who had lived under the French and Japanese, were sternfaced and only a few greeted us. The small girls tended their younger brothers and sisters while their mothers sewed or worked in the paddies. I recall one man walking toward the paddies with his hoe on his shoulder and it reminded me of my father going to his job, lunch pail in hand.

On March 31st two North Vietnamese battalions wantonly attacked the village of Duc Duc under the pretense of attacking the aforementioned district capital. A mortar barrage was followed by a ground assault on this defenseless village resulting in the death or wounding of 200 civilians and the burning of 1000 homes. An American pilot laconically reported that after the attack the village had the appearance of a large ashtray.

At a time when our nation's media have zealously attempted to pry into every nook and cranny of our involvement in South Vietnam to discover our wrongdoings no television commentator spoke from or of Duc Duc, newspapers gave the attack scant attention and termed the South Vietnamese civilians killed or wounded there as "casualties."

It was a massacre, by any definition and in great magnitude perpetrated by a ruthless enemy that wages a calculated war of attrition on a civilian populace.

This is no excuse for our wrongful acts for we Americans show our humanism in many forms including the quality of erring. But why, when our wrongdoings are justly labeled atrocities, are our enemies' acts not also so labeled?

Yet by much of our mass media the North Vietnamese are characterized as industrious, courageous and even humane in the mitigation of the court of world opinion. Yes, they are courageous when they are high on dope, they are industrious in developing such a variety of methods to kill or maim our fellow countrymen as to leave the imagination gasping and they are humane because it doesn't mean anything when North Vietnamese murder South Vietnamese?

It is important anytime anyone dies.

FRED M. GREGURAS,
1st Lt. USMCR.

Quantico, Va.

WHATEVER HAPPENED TO PRODUCT SAFETY?

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, during its brief 2-year life, the National Commission on Product Safety outperformed by far its more permanent and

affluent sister consumer protection agencies of Government.

Although the Product Safety Commission was directly responsible for getting a number of hazardous household products off the market, its most important legacy, in my judgment, was its carefully documented conclusions that Federal consumer protection is frequently a myth and that industry is sometimes callous in terms of the safety of their products.

In an excellent article in the New Republic, Michael Lemov, who was general counsel to the Commission, graphically illustrates those conclusions by divulging that many of the industry groups and companies whose products were scrutinized by the Commission joined with three alleged Federal consumer protection agencies of Government, to finance a study explicitly designed to refute the Commission's frightening statistics on product-related injuries and deaths.

I particularly commend Mr. Lemov's article to those who believe that "consumerism has gone too far." Of course, Mr. Lemov's article is corroborative evidence that consumerism has not gone nearly far enough. His article follows:

WHATEVER HAPPENED TO PRODUCT SAFETY?

It didn't live long, but in its two-year life the National Commission on Product Safety battled one industry after another on behalf of consumers and usually won. It compelled a leading manufacturer of dishwasher detergents to substitute less toxic ingredients in its product. It goaded gas appliance manufacturers to develop an insulated cover for dangerously hot floor furnaces and glass container manufacturers to start to develop a nonexploding soda bottle. Industry response invariably followed commission hearings.

While it lasted, the commission actually functioned as a consumer regulatory agency, and not as the study group some might have wanted it to be. Without statutory authority to force anyone to do anything, it repeatedly induced manufacturers to change the design of products to incorporate new safety features. In the two years of its existence it probably had more impact on consumer product industries than most permanent federal agencies. One Federal Trade commissioner called it "the most effective federal commission in existence." According to Ralph Nader it was the "best \$2 million the government ever spent." In its final report, in June 1970, the commission advised President Nixon and Congress that notwithstanding its efforts thousands of Americans continue to be needlessly killed and injured by the products they buy.

The commission's report was handed to an employee at the White House gate, the President having declined to meet with the commission's chairman, Arnold Elkind. The only official recognition given the report was a press release by Virginia Knauer, President Nixon's consumer advisor, promising a careful review and evaluation. As yet none has been forthcoming.

With the release of the President's consumer message, the reason for the cold shoulder becomes obvious. To his credit, the President has recommended the passage of new product safety legislation. However, he has recommended the law be enforced by The Department of Health, Education and Welfare, not an independent consumer product safety agency.

The Administration's decision against the creation of an independent consumer safety agency is of great significance for consumers. The commission was highly critical of the performance of existing federal agencies with consumer safety responsibilities. It empha-

sized that the Food and Drug Administration, the Health, Education and Welfare agency that would probably enforce the new law, had taken more than two years to remove from the market the deadly household cleaner carbon tetrachloride. It had never used its powers to temporarily ban hazardous consumer products during extended administrative proceedings, and had generally concentrated on food and drug matters to the exclusion of other consumer products.

The commission undoubtedly had the FDA in mind when it concluded: "... where it exists, Federal product safety regulation is burdened by... bureaucratic lassitude, timid administration, bargain-basement budgets, distorted priorities, and misdirected technical resources."

When the commission's initial product hearings opened in Boston in December, 1968, a manufacturer of a lidded crib that had caused the strangulation death of an infant ignored the commission's invitation to testify. The father, however, did testify, along with a medical examiner who described the manner in which the crib caused the death. The press fully reported the story. After that, no manufacturer ignored the Product Safety Commission.

Although most study commissions do no more than file their reports, the Product Safety Commission pushed through a new law—the Child Protection and Toy Safety Act of 1969, which closed a loophole in federal protection for children by giving the Food and Drug Administration authority to ban mechanical, electrical and thermal hazards in toys. The Toy Manufacturers Association sought to weaken the bill in committee but did not succeed. Unfortunately, the enforcement of the law, by the Food and Drug Administration, has been less than vigorous.

In January 1969 when the commission began looking into the safety of sliding glass doors, storm doors and other glass products used in the home, it met resistance from the National Association of Home Builders and the Federal Housing Administration. At that time the FHA still permitted dangerous nonsafety glass in sliding doors in FHA-insured houses. The commission invited Eugene Gullledge, former president of the Home Builders and now assistant secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, to testify on the reasons for the Home Builders' opposition to safety glass. Gullledge refused to testify and the commission was about to issue a subpoena when the White House intervened and asked that he be excused since the Home Builders were having their annual convention in Houston on the day of the hearing. The commission went ahead without Gullledge. When the FHA failed to send policy-level officials to the hearing, commission chairman Elkind established that they were in Houston with the Home Builders. Elkind's public criticism of the FHA and extensive testimony on the deaths of consumers who walked through glass doors again demonstrated the commission's clout. The FHA subsequently reversed its position and published new regulations requiring safety glass. The Home Builders too changed their minds on the issue and at least six states passed mandatory safety-glass legislation.

The commission's last fight was with one of the largest consumer industries, manufacturers of television receivers. Based on reports of spontaneous fires, primarily in color television sets, the commission investigated and found that thousands of fires were occurring each year, apparently caused by combustible and defective parts. Manufacturers were requested to redesign the sets and recall the defective models. In a confrontation between Elkind and two other commissioners and representatives of virtually every US and Japanese TV manufacturer, the industry at

first refused to do anything, claiming the problem was insignificant. Elkind stated the commission would immediately hold public hearings on the hazard. Industry spokesmen requested one hour to meet privately. Shortly thereafter, the industry agreed to develop new standards for color television sets to eliminate the fire hazard. They kept their promise, but without the commission around to review the standards' effectiveness and compliance by manufacturers the consumer can't be sure how well his interest has been protected.

While mail from consumers to the defunct commission has continued to pile up, industry lobbyists have been searching for alternatives to its recommendations, particularly that of an independent safety agency. Twelve trade associations and corporations contributed some \$90,000 for a study of household product injuries that the industry hopes will refute the commission's injury estimates: 30,000 deaths, 22 million injuries annually in accidents associated with household products. The industry contributors are the American Gas Association, American Insurance Association, American Ladder Institute, Association of Home Appliance Manufacturers, Electronics Industries Association, Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, National Electrical Manufacturers Association, Outdoor Power Equipment Institute, Sears, Roebuck, J. C. Penney and Underwriters Laboratories, Inc. Three Government agencies also contributed several thousand dollars to this study, due to be completed by May. The Food and Drug Administration of HEW, the Environmental Control Administration, and the National Bureau of Standards each allocated federal funds to an industry group to conduct a study designed to refute the findings of another federal agency. The funds were committed notwithstanding the fact that the government had already spent \$2 million for the product safety commission's investigation.

With the demise of the commission, the industries it compelled to design safer products were freed from effective government control. At the injury rates projected by the commission, 2500 Americans die each month and over a million are injured in accidents involving consumer products. Consumers lost more than they know when the commission expired.

FORMER AMBASSADOR YOST ON WITHDRAWAL FROM VIETNAM

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, former Ambassador to the United Nations Charles W. Yost has written a most cogent article concerning Vietnam. It appeared in the April 11, 1971, edition of the Washington Post and is entitled "Deadline: A Way Out of Vietnam." It is very unfortunate that Ambassador Yost's views were not heeded while he was a member of the administration, but, as he notes, his "advice was never asked on any substantive aspects of the problem."

Ambassador Yost presents a persuasive, reasoned argument. He accurately assesses the "real reasons why the President and Kissinger are preoccupied with at least the appearance of victory in Southeast Asia."

First, the simplistic conception . . . of an apocalyptic bipolar global struggle between communism and the free world in which any setback to either side anywhere threatens critically the delicate balance of power everywhere.

Second, their fear that the loss of South Vietnam would produce a domestic political upheaval in the United States which would discredit their administration and throw the Republican Party into the arms of its rightwing; and

Third, the panic which seems to overcome any American President at the thought of being the first to lose a war.

Ambassador Yost proposes five steps. They are proposals of an experienced diplomat who certainly cannot be charged with having any ulterior political motive. Ambassador Yost proposes:

First. We should promptly and publicly fix a date for the total withdrawal of all United States Military forces from South Vietnam—subject only to North Vietnamese agreement to commence releasing United States prisoners as soon as the date is fixed and to complete the release of all prisoners before withdrawal is completed.

Second. We should propose a general cease-fire, without making withdrawal conditional upon it.

Third. We should offer the South Vietnamese Government a last opportunity to negotiate a political settlement on the basis of an interim government acceptable to both sides to carry out elections.

Fourth. We should propose to all participants in the Geneva accords a return to the full application of those accords, with such changes as are required or are desirable.

Fifth. We should reiterate our past offer to contribute substantially to a program of economic rehabilitation, reconstruction and development in Southeast Asia.

I do not subscribe completely to all of Ambassador Yost's proposals. But I do subscribe completely to his view that the Paris negotiations were allowed to degenerate into a charade . . . I believe he presents a balanced, intelligent plan which can form the basis for movement in Paris, if only the administration will forswear the policy of military victory—however unreal the so-called victory may be in terms of reality—which it pursues.

I commend Ambassador Yost's article to my colleagues. The article follows:

[From The Washington Post, Apr. 11, 1971.]

DEADLINE: A WAY OUT OF VIETNAM

(By Charles W. Yost)

(Note.—Yost was charge d'affaires at Bangkok in 1956-6, ambassador to Laos in 1954-6 and capped his Foreign Service career with two years as ambassador to the United Nations. Since February, he has been associated with the Columbia University School of International Affairs.)

In 1968 I prepared for the Carnegie Endowment on International Peace and the Council on Foreign Relations a paper in which I urged that the recently commenced negotiations in Paris be used to seek a political settlement which, I pointed out, would require "substantial and painful concessions" by both sides.

It was perfectly clear that Hanoi would not accept a settlement which left the Thieu-Ky government in power indefinitely or which provided for elections to be carried out by that government, even with some international supervision. There is a strong tendency among Asian voters, even in relatively free elections, to accept "the mandate of heaven"—that is, to vote for the party in power. To Hanoi, elections managed by the present Saigon government would mean loss of all it had fought for so long and so hard.

My paper suggested, therefore, that we explore seriously and urgently in Paris whether the North Vietnamese would accept a neutral interim government to carry out elections, a government from which both the Thieu partisans and the National Liberation Front would be excluded or, alternatively, one in which both would be included but in a minor role. If this were possible, I thought an immediate cease-fire could be brought about and the war rapidly wound down. If Hanoi insisted on an interim government which the NLF would clearly control, that would be unacceptable to our side and the negotiations would fail.

This paper was just about to be circulated to the members of the two organizations which sponsored it when I was offered by the incoming Nixon administration the post of U.S. ambassador to the United Nations. The first request which was made to me after I accepted the post was that this paper not be circulated. It was clearly inconsistent with the policy which the administration intended to follow.

During my two years service with the administration, I was not involved in any way in the formulation or execution of its policy toward Southeast Asia. My advice was never asked on any substantive aspect of the problem nor was I involved in any National Security Council deliberations on it. I therefore watched from the sidelines with growing apprehension and heartache the prolongation of our military effort in Vietnam far beyond what seemed to me a rational or justifiable point.

In October, 1969, I was moved to submit a memorandum to the administration in which I made this argument as strongly as I could. I urged that we either "bring about a drastic change in the character of the Saigon government as a basis for political settlement" or, if that was considered to be unacceptable, that we "substantially accelerate troop withdrawals without a political settlement."

I never received any response to this memorandum. On the contrary, the Paris negotiations were allowed to degenerate into a charade and troop withdrawals continued at the same deliberate pace which in April, 1971, still leaves 300,000 American troops in Vietnam. Even last Wednesday's announcement by the President of slightly accelerated withdrawals would leave about 180,000 Americans there at the beginning of 1972, nearly seven years after our major involvement in the war began.

It was and still is quite clear that, despite the Nixon Doctrine and the commitment to "Vietnamization," the President and his national security adviser, Dr. Henry Kissinger, continue to believe that "victory," in the sense of the maintenance of power of the Thieu-Ky government, can still be achieved, and that continued substantial U.S. participation in the war for this purpose is not only acceptable but necessary.

They contend that all their military actions, both defensive and offensive into Cambodia and Laos, are designed to reduce American casualties, to protect American forces as they withdraw and to secure the release of American prisoners of war. Actually, there seems little doubt that, if the administration were prepared either to accept a political

settlement involving a change in the Saigon government or to fix a proximate date for the total withdrawal of U.S. forces, the North Vietnamese would be only too willing substantially to reduce hostilities, as well as to release all U.S. prisoners by the time U.S. withdrawal was completed.

AN EMOTIONAL BASIS

It appears more likely that the real reasons why the President and Kissinger are preoccupied with at least the appearance of victory in Southeast Asia are: (1) the simplistic conception, stamped on their minds in their politically formative years and never relinquished, of an apocalyptic bipolar struggle between communism and the "Free World" in which any setback to either side anywhere threatens critically the delicate balance of power everywhere; (2) their fear that the loss of South Vietnam, after the expenditure of so much American blood and treasure in its defense, would produce a domestic political upheaval in the U.S. which would discredit their administration and throw the Republican Party into the arms of its right wing, and (3) the panic which seems to overcome any American President at the thought of being the first "to lose a war."

These deeply felt emotions are, I suspect, much more decisive with the President and Kissinger than are the more prudent considerations which led them to proclaim the Nixon Doctrine. They cannot yet bring themselves to renounce military "options" involving U.S. forces which they still hope will preserve the status quo in South Vietnam and which the American public could still be persuaded to tolerate. The President has, partly by the exercise of his own rhetoric, persuaded himself, as President Johnson did earlier, that the "loss" of South Vietnam, however it came about, would be an intolerable "humiliation," would cause the U.S. to be considered by both foes and friends, "a pitiful, helpless giant" and would fatally blot the reputation in history of the President who presided over it.

Actually, of course, the more leaders use this sort of language in public, the more they create the atmosphere which could make it self-fulfilling. It is at least as reasonable to contend that the U.S. has, after six years of massive engagement itself and a vast buildup of the ARVN, far more than fully met any obligation it might have had to self-determination in Vietnam. If the government of South Vietnam cannot in 1972 maintain itself without U.S. military involvement, it is unlikely to be able to do so in 1973 or at any time thereafter.

Moreover, it would now seem to be demonstrated that no practicable expansion of the war is likely to be profitable or even tolerable. The Cambodian "incurSION" last year and the Laotian "incurSION" this year, while they produced marginal tactical advantages, have had two much more prejudicial strategic consequences: (1) they have seriously overextended the South Vietnamese forces which we have been trying to prepare to defend their own country and, in the Laotian case, have badly damaged their morale; (2) they have so aggravated U.S. public dissatisfaction with the whole Southeast Asian enterprise that, as the polls indicate, a majority of Americans now wish to withdraw almost immediately. Under these circumstances no further expansion of the war, concerning which the President still seems determined to keep his "options" open, lies within the realm of political reality.

In this connection, neither the administration nor the public has faced up to the role, present and future, of U.S. airpower in Southeast Asia. The impression is, however, emerging that the massive way in which it has been used in South Vietnam since 1965, and in Laos and Cambodia more recently is

not only indecisive and often counterproductive in a war of this character, but is so indiscriminating between combatant and non-combatant, so devastating to the lives and livelihood of friends more than of foes, so cruel and inhuman in its scale and consequences, that it is unjustifiable under either the laws of war or the laws of humanity.

AN ABSOLUTE DEADLINE

In summary, in light of all this tragic history and these inexorably accumulating facts of life, what should the United States do now about getting out of Southeast Asia? I would propose the following five steps.

1. We should promptly and publicly fix a date for the total withdrawal of all U.S. military forces from South Vietnam—subject only to North Vietnamese agreement to commence releasing U.S. prisoners as soon as the date is fixed and to complete the release of all prisoners before withdrawal is completed. This date should preferably be Dec. 31, 1971, but, if this should turn out not to be logistically feasible or if agreement on the release of prisoners could not be obtained soon enough, it might be March 31 or even June 30, 1972, but certainly no later.

2. At the same time that we fix a date for withdrawal, we should propose a general cease-fire, to take effect at once or at any time prior to completion of withdrawal. We should not, however, make withdrawal conditional on a cease-fire. Acceptance of a general cease-fire would mean that the status quo throughout South Vietnam, and perhaps Laos and Cambodia as well, would be frozen while the Americans were withdrawing. It seems unlikely that such a freezing for a period of many months would be acceptable to either the North or South Vietnamese. On the other hand, after a date had been fixed for U.S. withdrawal, local cease-fires to facilitate withdrawal might be quite feasible.

3. Before announcing a fixed date for U.S. withdrawal, we should offer the South Vietnamese government a last opportunity to negotiate a political settlement on the only basis on which it might conceivably be negotiated—that is, an interim government acceptable to both sides to carry out elections. Obviously, if Saigon were willing to try to negotiate such a settlement, it would have a better chance of doing so successfully while the Americans were still militarily present in Vietnam and participating in the Paris negotiations. Since, however, I very much doubt that the Thieu-Ky government would agree to negotiate a settlement of this kind, even faced with the prospect of early U.S. withdrawal, I should not suggest delaying for this purpose for more than one month the announcement of a terminal date for U.S. withdrawal.

4. We should, simultaneously with this announcement, propose to all participants in the Geneva Accords of 1954 and 1962 return to the full application of those accords, with such modifications as changed circumstances require or as seem desirable to all concerned, but specifically including withdrawal of all foreign forces (including North and South Vietnamese) from Laos and Cambodia and reaffirmation of the neutralization of these two countries. One modification of the accords which would be most desirable, if it could be obtained, would be the creation of more effective supervisory machinery than the old International Control Commission. If a new Geneva Conference were necessary to accomplish these ends, as it very likely would be, such a conference, with the same or larger participation, should be convened as soon as possible. The conference could also concern itself with Vietnam, if the governments of both North and South so desired, but it would not necessarily do so.

5. We should at the same time reiterate the offer we have made in the past to

contribute substantially to a program of economic rehabilitation, reconstruction and development in North and South Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, to be carried out preferably under United Nations auspices.

Achievement of the objectives proposed under these five points seems to me realistic and practicable. Achievement of the objectives apparently still being pursued by the administration seems to me an empty fantasy, the continued pursuit of which under present circumstances would be disastrous to the security, welfare and moral character of the American people.

EIGHT ERRORS CAUSED OVERINVOLVEMENT

The direct and massive U.S. military involvement in Southeast Asia beginning in 1965 was grossly disproportionate to any national interest the United States had in the area, and soon proved to be prodigiously damaging to the welfare of the Vietnamese and Laotian people. There are many reasons why this highly motivated but disastrous miscalculation by U.S. leadership occurred. In my view, eight major errors of judgment caused us to get in so deeply:

1. The first was the belief that Communist China had in the 1950s and 1960s both the intention and the capability to extend its dominion beyond its borders, especially southward either through invasion or, more probably, through "wars of national liberation" which it would inspire and support. In the cooler light of hindsight we can now note that, with the exception of the war in Korea, which was certainly felt to be defensive, and the war in Vietnam, which derives almost wholly from Vietnamese rather than Chinese inspiration, Communist China has shown little intention or capability of involving itself directly or indirectly in military adventures outside its borders.

2. The second mistake in judgment, the "domino theory," was the belief that Southeast Asia outside Vietnam was acutely vulnerable to wars of national liberation or to subversion and takeover; that if South Vietnam fell, others were almost certain to follow. This error arose from an indiscriminating extrapolation of the situation in South Vietnam, which for 10 years prior to 1954 had been deeply infested at the grassroots with Communist cadres, to the rest of Southeast Asia, which had not been penetrated to anywhere nearly such a degree. Of course the extension and conduct of the war in recent years have made Laos and Cambodia much more vulnerable to takeover than they were in the 1950s.

3. A third error in judgment was the belief that North Vietnam, if partially or wholly victorious in the South, would serve thereafter as a compliant instrument of Communist China. Actually, as the history of the past 25 years has amply demonstrated; only the Yugoslav Communists have rivaled the North Vietnamese in stiff-necked recalcitrance and independence.

4. The fourth error was in imagining that NATO could be duplicated in Southeast Asia and in setting up there a purported military coalition which was in fact only a facade for unilateral U.S. support of several weak countries. Nevertheless, SEATO had the effect of committing the United States to a deeper and more formal involvement in Southeast Asia than was wise, without in fact significantly increasing its capabilities there.

5. Perhaps the most decisive mistake made in Vietnam and, for a time, in Laos was, on the one hand, U.S. insistence that regimes it supported be 100 per cent anticommunist and antineutralist and, on the other, its failure effectively to insist that the support it so unstintingly provided these regimes be used to carry out reforms which might have given them an expanding popular base.

6. The sixth mistake arose from the extravagant faith in "counterinsurgency" which swept Washington in the early 1960s. Based on the correct assessment that Communist aggression was henceforth more likely to take the form of insurgency than of massive attacks across frontiers, it nevertheless enormously overestimated the capability of U.S. forces, no matter how thoroughly trained for this purpose, to conduct this highly sophisticated and acutely political type of warfare in environments where language, customs and physical conditions were so wholly alien to them.

7. The seventh error was also a military one: U.S. insistence on organizing and training most of the Vietnamese forces, from 1954 on, to fight a European or Korean-type war rather than to counter insurgency. Serious efforts have been made in recent years to correct this error but even now the ARVN is still trained to fight with massive air and artillery support, which obviously will be far less effectively available when the Americans depart.

8. The final error of judgment occurred repeatedly after our massive involvement, when we so often neglected or fatally compromised potential opportunities for negotiation, either for ephemeral military advantage or for fear of causing trouble with and for the Saigon government.

CHARLES W. YOST.

ANTIETAM BATTLEFIELD IN JEOPARDY

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, the Antietam National Battlefield near Sharpsburg, Md., was the site of a Civil War battle that has been described as the bloodiest conflict ever fought on American soil and as the turning point of the war. Today, Antietam Battlefield, one of the best preserved monuments of the Civil War, is threatened by encroachments which will mar the rustic beauty of this historic area.

The Frederick, Md., News Post of April 9, 1971, published an excellent editorial cataloging the problems at Antietam. I would like to share the News Post's thoughts. I will be introducing legislation to deal with the threats to the battlefield and would hope that the News Post editorial will serve to alert many citizens to the problem:

[From the Frederick (Md.) News-Post, Apr. 9, 1971]

BATTLEFIELDS IN JEOPARDY

The Chinese have a Confucian tenet that the highest expression of a civilization is the respect paid by a nation to its honored dead.

By this standard, the United States is woefully deficient in protecting the national shrines encompassing in part the final resting places of those who fought, bled, and died at our neighboring Civil War battlefields of Gettysburg and Antietam.

For months a seething controversy has raged between the National Park Service, historians, antiquarians, and Civil War buffs on one side and commercial interests on the other over a proposal to erect a 300-foot high tower to be used as an observation post by tourists on privately owned land adjacent to the Gettysburg National Cemetery where burials still occur almost daily.

The National Park Service brands it an "environmental insult" to the memory of those who died at Gettysburg plus the veterans of more modern wars still finding their last rest in the national cemetery.

But the promoter—a Silver Spring developer—insists that he will continue with his plans to create the observation tower despite local and state-wide protests.

And, according to the officials of the Borough of Gettysburg and the Pennsylvania State Planning Board, they are both powerless to interfere with his plans due to the fact that over the years citizens of Gettysburg have repeatedly refused to enact any local zoning laws.

Now a similar "desecration" of one of only two Civil War battlefields in Maryland—neighboring Antietam—is similarly in the cards.

While the U.S. government owns 795 acres of the Civil War battlefield near Sharpsburg—generally rated by modern historians as "the decisive battle of the Civil War"—another 1,000 contiguous privately owned acres, most of which is still vacant farmland, are also a part of the national shrine including not only the National Cemetery but the surrounding rolling countryside where Union General George B. McClellan, while failing to achieve a "decisive victory," drove back across the Potomac the Army of Northern Virginia led by Confederate General Robert E. Lee.

Until recently, according to W. Dean McClanahan, the National Park Service superintendent of the Antietam shrine, the only "development on these privately owned acres has been a few individual homes which have not markedly desecrated the battlefield."

Now, however, a housing developer has filed a petition with the Washington County Planning and Zoning Commission to subdivide a 69-acre tract on the highest point of the battlefield.

And, according to Superintendent McClanahan, the site proposed, now an open field, almost completely encircles the obelisk monument to Hawkins Zouaves composed of the 9th New York Volunteer Regiment who were engaged in one of the most decisive fights of the "bloodiest battle" fought in the entire Civil War.

The monument tops a hill and marks the point where the September 17, 1862, battle ended at dusk with the repulse of the high-water attack of the Army of Northern Virginia.

But—just as at Gettysburg—while W. D. Jones, the planning director of Washington County, says that he is personally opposed to the proposed "Burnside Manor" housing development at the site that he is powerless to halt it because Washington County, like the Borough of Gettysburg, has no zoning ordinance.

It seems unfortunate that we of this generation fail to appreciate the fact that we merely hold in trust these priceless and irreplaceable shrines which will be even more cherished in the centuries that lie ahead.

The Civil War—because it involved the entire nation—and because of the tremendous stakes involved—is one American conflict which excites more interest in each generation.

There have been more histories written on the Civil War and on its central figures, such as the immortal Lincoln, his Confederate opponent, the proud and imperious Jefferson Davis whose misguided belief in his military sagacity did more to lose the war for the South than any other factor; the leading generals and admirals of both sides, and all other facets of the titanic struggle which divided not only states and sections of the nation but families than have been penned about any other American conflict.

The Civil War is ageless. It will be as much

of a lodestone to historians and biographers in the next century as it has been in the more than 100 years since it was virtually terminated by the defeat of Lee at Appomattox by that fighter with the instinct for the jugular, Lieutenant General Ulysses S. Grant of the Union Army.

It is certainly no fault of Superintendent McClanahan of the Antietam Battlefield National Shrine that this encroachment upon its integrity is threatened.

For the past three years he has sought federal legislation in Congress to allow the National Park Service to acquire by purchase or by trade an additional 2,000 acres of farmland surrounding the national shrine.

He hoped that 1,000 acres of the total would be set aside as a "buffer zone" to prevent commercial, industrial and residential development from the edge of the battlefield.

But, he sadly adds, Congress has neglected to act.

"And right now," the superintendent says, "other property on the battlefield is for sale."

"One site is being promoted for a motel and restaurant development."

Although Congress last failed to act in 1968, there may be some lingering hope of favorable action today, according to Senators Charles McC Mathias and J. Glenn Beall Jr.

Their Washington offices revealed plans to file "very soon" new legislation in Congress to make the takeover of the surrounding land possible.

But, according to Superintendent McClanahan, action will have to be expeditious.

He says that he envisions a land development boom of major proportions overshadowing the Battlefield and National Cemetery because the new "interstate highways have opened up the country."

"Sharpsburg," he says, "is only 10 minutes away by car from the Hagerstown-Martinsburg axis and this area is just too darned attractive both to home builders, business and industry seeking to capitalize on the tourist potential of Antietam which last year attracted 300,000 visitors on battlefield tours."

The tourist, he adds, are "terribly fascinated," by the fact that Antietam probably marks the bloodiest encounter of any single day in American history.

Among the casualties, Superintendent McClanahan points out, were 12,140 attacking Union soldiers and 10,100 defending Confederate forces.

A LAYMAN LOOKS AT ATOMIC POWER

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, one of the problems with the scientific community is its general inability to explain complex issues in terms easily understood by the layman.

On the contrary, this is one of the great strengths of the press. Constrained by the length of the newspaper column, they simplify matters to a degree which often infuriates the scientist but nonetheless informs the public.

Columnist Richard Buffum of the Los Angeles Times recently toured the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Plant in California and reported on his visit.

Many of us have been trying to ex-

plain atomic power to the public for many years. Questions about safety, radiation, earthquakes, and bombs always seem to get tangled up in complex explanations.

Mr. Buffum's column clears away the technical jargon and answers many of the questions which are on the minds of the layman concerned with atomic power. I am pleased to include his column in the RECORD as a useful contribution to the public understanding of nuclear power:

TAMING THE ATOM

SAN ONOFRE.—Like it or not, it is science and technology which shape the world today. While environmentalists argue over the dangerous effects of accelerating applied science—scientific knowledge is at least doubling every decade—a new world is being forged by scientists and technologists.

The peaceful use of nuclear energy to generate electricity is only one aspect of this new world. Most of us fear this mysterious force locked in the atom, this invisible genii of potential holocaust, unleashed in war and now tamed in stainless steel cans and made to run an electric power plant.

Apprehension was within me as I toured Southern California Edison Co.'s generating plant here, a nuclear powered steam generating plant that spins the turbines that make the electricity. The SCE plans to construct two more units on the 84-acre coastal site located about three miles south of the Western White House in San Clemente.

The existing nuclear reactor, assured Hans Ottoson, plant superintendent, is protected by a complex system of redundant safety devices from over-heating. It can be shut down in a number of ways instantly.

EFFICIENT ENERGY

It uses only one pound of uranium pellets per day to produce a net capacity of 430 megawatts of electricity. He figured this is equivalent to about 18 million barrels of oil as an energy source.

That was score one in favoring nuclear power. Highly efficient utilization of space and energy source, combined with an absence of smog pollution that fossil fuels create. But will it blow sky high?

Absolutely not, said Eugene N. Cramer, Edison engineer for advanced energy systems. An atomic bomb cannot use the uranium used in a nuclear power plant. An atomic bomb needs more than 90% fissionable uranium, as opposed to about 2% to a 4% uranium mixture for power plants. There is no way here to hold this mass of fissionable material together under enormous pressure until a chain reaction builds up to explosive force, he declared.

Does the plant leak radiation? I held my radium-faced wrist watch against a detection portal through which employees must pass. A buzzer intoned loudly above the plant's hum. A needle on a dial leaped forward and pointed at 250.

QUAKE PROTECTION

That alarm goes off at 1/10th of a millirem of radiation," explained Cramer. "We who live at sea level are exposed to about 100 millirems or MRs per year naturally from the solar system. Your wrist watch (which is harmless) releases about 900 MRs per year. That would be about nine times as much as you'd get living here outside the fence. We cannot detect, and we monitor constantly, any additional radiation from the plant."

OK, what about an earthquake? Phil West, seismologist, answered: "Construction is based upon the greatest earthquake event possible. Frankly, if there were a major quake the only thing left standing will be the nu-

clear power plant." I went home and thought about it. The peaceful, industrial use of nuclear energy need not be feared—but it sure as hell must be respected. One other conclusion: When I remove my wrist watch for the night, setting it on my bedside stand, I'm taking pains that the dial is facing away from me.

RESULTS OF CONGRESSMAN McKEVITT'S 1971 QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. JAMES D. (MIKE) McKEVITT

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. McKEVITT. Mr. Speaker, during the second week of March 1971, I sent more than 170,000 questionnaires to households in the First Congressional District of Colorado. As I sent out the poll cards, which contained eight questions on domestic issues, I pledged to my constituents that I would report the results to the Congress and to the President.

The results of my poll, based on 30,500 returns, follow:

[In percent]

1. Now that 18-year-olds can vote in Federal elections, do you believe they should be permitted to vote in State and local elections?

Yes ----- 64.4
No ----- 33.9
Undecided ----- 1.7

2. Would you vote funds to continue development of the supersonic transport plane (SST)?

Yes ----- 27.3
No ----- 69.6
Undecided ----- 3.1

3. Do you favor sharing Federal revenues with State and local governments?

Yes ----- 68.0
No ----- 25.8
Undecided ----- 6.2

4. Would you vote for a national health insurance program financed by higher social security and other Federal taxes?

Yes ----- 46.6
No ----- 48.6
Undecided ----- 4.8

5. Would you be willing to pay more for products and services (autos, gasoline, electricity etc.) if they could be made pollution free?

Yes ----- 74.1
No ----- 22.2
Undecided ----- 3.7

6. When management and labor are unable to settle a rail dispute, would you support a binding settlement of the dispute by Government-appointed mediators?

Yes ----- 76.4
No ----- 19.6
Undecided ----- 4.0

7. Would you favor wage and price controls as a tool to combat inflation?

Yes ----- 69.6
No ----- 26.0
Undecided ----- 4.4

8. Do you support legislation to automatically adjust social security benefits upward with the cost of living?

Yes ----- 83.8
No ----- 13.7
Undecided ----- 2.5

I believe the results of my poll are a highly accurate reflection of how the people of Denver feel about these particular issues. I appreciate this opportunity to share the results of my poll with the Congress.

PRESIDENT OVERTURNS MILITARY ABORTION RULE

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, those who read my weekly report regularly know that I have been critical of the Federal Government for the Defense Department policy, announced last July 31, which permitted the killing of unborn babies in U.S. military hospitals without regard to local State laws.

Hundreds of people from across the Nation have written to me, and to other Congressmen, in support of H.R. 4257, my bill which would have forced the Defense Department to at least make its foeticide policy conform to the regulations established by the individual States in which military hospitals are located.

I am happy to say that President Nixon has rendered my bill unnecessary. The Chief Executive, acting in his capacity as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, has ordered this latest military abortion-on-demand regulation rescinded. The President gave as the central motive of his action his basic opposition to abortion on the grounds that it conflicts with his belief in the quality and sanctity of life. In a subsequent explanation, he indicated that he considers abortion an unacceptable form of population control.

The implications of the President's statement are even more far-reaching and complex than they would seem at first glance. Technically, the President has done nothing except make the military observe State laws with regard to crimes against the unborn. This means, of course, that military facilities in places like New York will continue to be available for abortions to military personnel stationed in other States which have more restrictive laws.

On the other hand, however, the President indicated firmly that he means his performance to be interpreted as his own view of all abortion legislation:

While the abortion issue is being debated in the states, the country has a right to know my personal views.

He continued by declaring that the unborn have rights and that "a good and generous people" will not attempt to solve its population problems by abortion. This undoubtedly means that the President shall continue to support the various other pieces of antilife legislation already passed and presently in the works, but now the White House has at least provided nominal moral leadership

in the fight to prevent the killing of unborn babies.

I applaud the President's action, while at the same time realizing full well that it was not taken in a political vacuum. As White House sources have indicated to me and to the press, the directive formulated was not unconnected with the vociferous criticism of the defense policy which emerged after I first publicized the scandal and introduced legislation to counter it. H.R. 4257 and the consequent public outcry were instrumental in the President's decision.

But whatever the motivation, it is immediately clear that the abortion proponents intend to jump down Mr. Nixon's throat with all feet. Shortly after the President's announcement, the New York Times pontificated editorially that to make the President's statement a basis for public policy would be cruel and regressive. The Times thinks that—

Issues affecting the "sanctity of human life" are far more involved in the Vietnam war than they are in the removal of legal obstacles to abortion.

It is certain that antilife automatons will pick up this dismal chorus and transform it into a transcontinental shriek. We will hear them stridently echo the Times' appraisal of Mr. Nixon's move as "an act of inhumanity and social irresponsibility."

At the same time, those of us who are concerned about human life must not become content at winning this preliminary skirmish. Hundreds of thousands of unborn infants continue to die by the knife in the United States, and our duty to them is not diminished in the least.

[Faint, mostly illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.]

[Faint, mostly illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.]

[Faint, mostly illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.]