

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## DESERVED TRIBUTE TO THE ORDER OF AHEPA

### HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1972

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct pleasure for me to join with many of our colleagues in a special tribute to the Order of Ahepa which, during the year of 1972, is celebrating its golden anniversary. I am proud to point out that one of the most active local chapters of the AHEPA, not only in the State of Michigan but the Nation as well, is located within our Eighth Congressional District: the Saginaw chapter.

All of us are very familiar with many of AHEPA's contributions to worthy causes during its 50 years of existence. They have ranged from special relief help for victims of hurricane and flood disasters, not only in the United States but other parts of the world, as well as scholarship help to worthy students.

The local chapters of AHEPA are active in their own civic affairs and projects, all of which conforms to its program of urging its members to be model citizens through planned civic activity. In Saginaw, our current AHEPA officers—Pete Metropoulos, president; Christ C. Psetas, Jr., vice president; Ted J. Veremis, secretary; and Gus Paron, treasurer—continue a tradition of quality leadership that this chapter has enjoyed over the years.

I have been honored to attend AHEPA national conferences here in Washington and I am impressed by the objectives of this fine organization:

First, to promote and encourage loyalty to the United States of America;

Second, to instruct its members in the tenets and fundamental principles of government, and in the recognition and respect of the inalienable rights of mankind;

Third, to instill in its membership a due appreciation of the privilege of citizenship;

Fourth, to encourage its members to always be profoundly interested and actively participating in the political, civic, social, and commercial fields of human endeavor;

Fifth, to pledge its members to do their utmost to stamp out any and all political corruption; and to arouse its members to the fact that tyranny is a menace to the life, property, prosperity, honor, and integrity of every nation;

Sixth, to promote a better and more comprehensive understanding of the attributes and ideals of Hellenism and Hellenic culture;

Seventh, to promote good fellowship, and endow its members with the perfection of the moral sense;

Eighth, to endow its members with a spirit of altruism, common understanding, mutual benevolence and helpfulness;

Ninth, to champion the cause of education, and to maintain new channels for facilitating the dissemination of culture and learning.

A recent release by the Order of the Ahepa contained the best possible summary of its works and activities. It read:

The Order of AHEPA has only one axe to grind—and that is the important improvement and betterment of our social, moral and family life. All programs of the AHEPA are designed towards this end.

My congratulations and thanks to the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association—AHEPA. May it enjoy another 50 years equal to its first 50. Our country will be better for the services rendered by this fine fraternal organization.

### FATHER DANIEL E. POWER

### HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 31, 1972

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have just learned that our good friend, Father Daniel E. Power, has just retired as director of public affairs for Georgetown University. Father Power has been one of the outstanding community leaders in the Nation's Capital. His good spirit and light touch have impressed all who have been associated with him because those qualities have permitted him to inject a strong spirit of religious faith and political democracy wherever he has been.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks an excerpt from the current issue of Georgetown University magazine commenting on Father Power's career and retirement.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### FATHER POWER RETIRES

Daniel E. Power, S.J., has retired as Georgetown's Director of Public Affairs, effective June 30.

Father Power established the Georgetown University Forum, a show aired by 380 radio and 11 television stations. He served as program director since the beginning of the Forum, which has been run nationally on radio since 1946 and on television since 1951.

Father Power also is a founder of Channel 26, Public Broadcasting Station, and for many years was vice president of the Greater Washington Educational Television Association (GWETA). He is currently a Public Trustee and a member of the Executive Committee. In the association's May newsletter, Father Power was hailed as a "man who, by his foresight, helped to provide the aggressive leadership which put WETA/26 on the air."

Father Power's duties, including production of the University Forum, have been assumed by the Office of Development and Public Relations. Program Director for the Forum will be Brian L. Moran, who has joined the public relations staff as radio-television coordinator.

His other duties include handling news

program and special productions for the electronic media and scheduling university personnel on radio-television talk shows. Mr. Moran, who majored in broadcast journalism at the University of Utah, was recently discharged from the U.S. Army, where he last served in the Information Office at the U.S. Military Academy, West Point.

## AMERICA HONORS POLISH ASTRONOMER: NICHOLAS COPERNICUS

### HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1972

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, I am pleased to learn that when the National Aeronautics and Space Administration—NASA—launches our next astronomical satellite from Kennedy Space Center during this coming month of August, this global space venture will carry the distinguished name of the Polish astronomer Copernicus.

I join with my colleagues here in the House in hailing this U.S. contribution to the Copernican celebration for astronomers throughout the world in commemorating NASA's Orbiting Astronomical Observatory-C to the memory and honor of the famous Polish astronomer Nicholas Copernicus as it commences its orbiting for 1 year of active life collecting detailed scientific data available only by satellite.

The Copernican year, which celebrates the 500th anniversary of the birth of the Polish scientist, who revolutionized astronomy in the 16th century, begins formally on February 14, 1973. The Copernicus astronomical satellite will be carrying experiments from the University College, London and Princeton University, New Jersey and producing the bulk of its data by that date.

Copernicus's contributions to science were many, but his crowning achievement was the recognition that it was the Sun and not Earth that was the center of the then-known universe. The Copernican revolution broke the intellectual hold of the Ptolemaic Theory, which held that Earth was the center of the universe and that the Sun revolved around it. Copernicus also described the positions of a number of planets, their relationships to the Earth and Sun, and made a number of studies of the Moon and its orbit.

Polish and other scientists throughout the world will share the data collected by the Copernicus satellite whose objectives are to study the ultraviolet and X-ray emissions of celestial bodies which contain vital clues to the composition, density and the physical state of the matter from which they originate. Normally, these rays are blocked from Earth by the filtering effects of the atmosphere.

I am sure that all of our citizens of Polish heritage can take great pride, as

we all do, in NASA's proposed historic August 1972 satellite launching and we look forward to a most successful mission evolving a highly valuable international exchange of goodwill and technical information among all peoples of the world as the Copernicus spacecraft orbits around the earth during the celebration of the Copernican Year commemorating a most distinguished Polish scientist—all in outstanding public service to our people and our environment.

#### BOSWELL STEVENS RETIRES

#### HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1972

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, in a few months the man who has been one of the leading forces in the development of Mississippi agriculture will retire after a long and distinguished tenure as president of the Mississippi Farm Bureau.

My good friend, Boswell Stevens, has served as president of the Mississippi Farm Bureau continuously since 1950. Since becoming active in the Farm Bureau in 1923, he has served with great dedication to the farm community, his State and the Nation.

Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz, who addressed the southern Commissioners of Agriculture and farm leaders at a convention in Jackson, Miss., a couple of weeks ago, paid tribute to Boswell Stevens in these words.

No mention of farm leadership in the Magnolia State would be complete without paying tribute to one of the best known farm leaders in the country. I refer to my good friend—and fellow fighter for farm interest—Boswell Stevens. I understand that "Bos" is going to give up the presidency of the Mississippi Farm Bureau this fall after serving longer than any of today's State Farm Bureau presidents. I salute you, "Bos". But more than that, I salute what you represent: the great strength and potency of private, volunteer farm leadership in this great region, and the real promise of what's to come.

I join in the tribute to this dedicated American farm leader and my fellow Mississippian and commend him for his distinguished service over the years. I would also like to include here in my remarks a recent editorial tribute to Mr. Stevens that recently appeared in the Jackson, Miss., Clarion Ledger.

The editorial follows:

#### FARM BUREAU STEVENS TO RETIRE WITH A GREAT RECORD

The longest tenure of any incumbent president of any State Farm Bureau president in America will end this November when the distinguished and esteemed Boswell Stevens retires from the high position he had held continuously since July, 1950.

Friend Stevens, age 74, recalled at a recent Jackson news conference that his first involvement in Farm Bureau Federation affairs was in 1923 with the Noxubee County Farm Bureau.

Over the years he has served with rare ability and dedication at local, county and state levels to gain national prominence for

his rare qualities of leadership. He headed his county AFB organization, later became a state director and was elevated to the presidency of the Mississippi Farm Bureau Federation in 1950 upon the sudden death of the beloved Ransom Aldrich.

In July, 1950, Mississippi voting delegates honored Mr. Stevens by electing him state president. He has been a member of the national Farm Bureau executive committee and Board of Directors since 1953.

Farm Bureau membership was only 16,000 family members at that time. Groundwork had been completed for new membership services in the mid-1940s. Under his brilliant direction, his state organization built extensive and solid farmer support of Farm Bureau programs. He developed an efficient staff and spirit of teamwork among agricultural agencies, and generated great grass roots enthusiasm in building a strong voice for Mississippi farmers.

Thousands of friends in every part of our state wish Boswell Stevens much happiness and good health in his coming retirement. He has been an outstanding leader in agriculture, with a solid record of achievements and honors in service to his fellow man.

His good deeds will be a lasting monument to work well done for the advancement of Mississippi agriculture.

#### ORDER OF AHEPA

#### HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1972

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a fine organization, which on July 26, 1972, observed its golden anniversary.

The Order of Ahepa was founded 50 years ago in Atlanta, Ga. Today its program reaches into all but one of our 50 States, and is very active in my own Golden State of California.

On this occasion I think it appropriate that each of us consider the objectives of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association:

First. To promote and encourage loyalty to the United States of America;

Second. To instruct its members in the tenets and fundamental principles of government, and in the recognition and respect of the inalienable rights of mankind;

Third. To instill in its membership a due appreciation of the privileges of citizenship;

Fourth. To encourage its members to always be profoundly interested and actively participating in the political, civic, social, and commercial fields of human endeavor;

Fifth. To pledge its members to do their utmost to stamp out any and all political corruption; and to arouse its members to the fact that tyranny is a menace to the life, property, prosperity, honor, and integrity of every nation;

Sixth. To promote a better and more comprehensive understanding of the attributes and ideals of Hellenism and Hellenic culture;

Seventh. To promote good fellowship, and endow its members with the perfection of the moral sense;

Eighth. To endow its members with a

spirit of altruism, common understanding, mutual benevolence, and helpfulness;

Ninth. To champion the cause of education, and to maintain new channels for facilitating the dissemination of culture and learning.

Are these goals not goals which can be shared by each and every one of us? Let us today on the 50th anniversary of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association not only pay tribute to the many contributions which it has made to our great Nation over the years but also in our own hearts dedicate ourselves to personal acceptance and adherence to these objectives. There is no better way that we can achieve a better Nation.

Thank you.

#### A TRIBUTE TO AHEPA

#### HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1972

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in July 1922—half a century ago this month—the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association was formed, to serve the interests of the Greek American community, promote and encourage loyalty to the United States of America, and to assist the stricken victims of disaster both here and abroad.

Better known as the Order of Ahepa, the organization has performed to the advantage of millions and is highly regarded by everyone familiar with its record of accomplishment, both in the area of charitable enterprise and in patriotic purposes.

It has contributed financially to the construction and maintenance of schools and medical institutions, educational journeys and experiences, memorials to both Greek and American heroes; and has ever been the friend of the afflicted. Hundreds of thousands of dollars have gone forth from the AHEPA to the relief of hurricane victims, and persons burdened by disease.

A staunch supporter of formal education, the AHEPA has provided scholarships for the past 41 years on the local, district, and national levels. The AHEPA Hall for Boys and the AHEPA School, both of St. Basil's Academy at Garrison, N.Y., are the product of AHEPA generosity. The AHEPA Agricultural School in Greece, is another fine example. More than 40,000 American books have been donated to high school and college libraries in Greece through the generosity of the AHEPA, and the AHEPA Medal for Scholastic Excellence in the Greek language is presented annually to local Greek Schools by AHEPA chapters. Annual scholarships are awarded through the American Farm School and Anatolia College, in Thessaloniki, Greece. Surveys are conducted of courses offered in colleges and universities in modern and ancient Greek, and in the classics. Stu-



dents are offered summer studies in Greece that cover the Greek language, history, and culture, through the AHEPA educational journey to Greece programs.

The local chapters of the AHEPA are active in their own civic affairs and projects, all of which activity conforms to AHEPA's program of urging its members to be model citizens through planned civic activity. AHEPA chapters are foremost in aiding and contributing to worthy fund drives.

**SUPPORT FOR H.R. 15015 CITED BY  
CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO**

**HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1972

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I introduced H.R. 15015 whose objective it was to provide hospital and medical care to certain members of the armed forces of nations allied or associated with the United States in World War I and World War II.

I am reintroducing that measure with certain minor revisions and I am pleased to inform my colleagues that the House of Representatives of the 77th General Assembly of the State of Illinois adopted on June 15, 1972, house resolution 732 which memorializes the Congress of the United States to "consider favorably and support passage of pending amendments to title 38 of the United States Code providing hospital and domiciliary care and medical services" for those persons who fought on the side of the allies against the enemy in World Wars I and II.

Further, I am pleased to report that Gov. Richard B. Ogilvie of the State of Illinois recently issued a proclamation in support of the objectives of my proposed bill.

Additionally, the concept set forth by my proposed legislation has gained the support of such outstanding organizations as the Illinois Division of the American Legion; the National Council of the Veterans of Foreign Wars; the 82d Airborne Division Association, Inc.; the 101st Airborne Division Association; and also of the Combined Veterans Associations of Chicago, which embraces the following organizations: the AMVETS; the Catholic War Veterans; the Disabled American War Veterans; the Italian-American War Veterans; the Jewish War Veterans; the Marine Corps League, the Navy Club, the Military Order of the Purple Heart; the Paralyzed Veterans of America; the Polish Legion of American Veterans; the United Spanish-American War Veterans; the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States; and the Veterans of World War I.

In view of the widespread support for my proposal, I am hopeful that prior to the adjournment of the 92d Congress, both the House and Senate shall take favorable action in order that these limited medical benefits may be made available to those men who fought so valiantly along with the American and allied forces, during two world conflicts for

the preservation of our freedoms, and who, because of advancing age, are in greater need than ever before of these benefits.

**THRESHOLD NO-FAULT: THE INSURANCE COMPANIES' BONANZA**

**HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1972

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, in the continuing debate over no-fault insurance, the July 1972, American Bar Association Journal article by Richard Oliver is provocative, particularly the insurance industry's claim that bills will be paid more promptly.

Having recently conducted hearings on third party prescriptions as they affect small businessmen, especially the independent retail druggists, we learned that in many cases, despite stipulated liability, payments for drugs and medicine are delayed up to 6 months.

Since the insurance companies have stated repeatedly that they can disburse funds promptly in no-fault situations, I urge them to begin immediately a demonstration of how fast they can pay under the existing third party prescription program.

As long as prescription payments are delayed up to 6 months under existing cases of admitted liability, it will be hard to persuade the American consumer his no-fault insurance claim will be paid by return mail.

Richard Oliver's article follows:

**THRESHOLD NO-FAULT: THE INSURANCE COMPANIES' BONANZA**

(By Richard L. Oliver)

Several States may enact no-fault automobile insurance laws in 1972. What form these laws may take, no one knows. There are as many forms of no-fault insurance proposals as there are groups advocating them, with each proposal being different from the others. As a result, most people know vaguely that no-fault insurance is being advocated by somebody, although they are not sure by whom. They have been told that no fault will lower insurance rates. This appeals to the average insurance buyer. They are told that claims under no fault will be paid promptly and that disputes will be settled by arbitration. They are also told that one obstacle now preventing the adoption of no fault is a group of selfish lawyers.

What the public generally is not told is the identity and motives of the principal sponsors of no-fault insurance. The public also does not realize that much lower benefits would be paid to most blameless accident victims under no fault. As a result, many people now believe that no fault is a good thing which would benefit the public if only we could push a group of selfish lawyers aside and get the law passed. It probably would take several years for the true effect of a no-fault plan to be recognized by the public. Meanwhile, the sponsors of no fault probably would reap millions of additional profits at the expense of the insurance buying public and of blameless persons unfortunate enough to have been injured.

There are usually two sets of reasons for any proposed social change: the stated reasons and the true reasons. Who are the principal sponsors of no-fault insurance, and what are their true reasons for sponsoring it?

No-fault is not a new idea. It has been with us for a generation. However, it never got off the ground until recently. Why? Why did this old and somewhat moth-eaten idea suddenly appear everywhere almost overnight in the newspapers, magazines, television, radio and in the mails?

There is a simple answer. For many years some insurance companies made good profits on automobile insurance, while others lost money. Some companies that lost money on automobile insurance found they made a profit on health and accident insurance. There is a reason. The amount of a claimant's automobile recovery is uncertain because it can be set by a court or jury. But the amount of a claimant's recovery under a health and accident policy is more certain because it is set by the policy itself, which provides given medical, hospital and disability benefits. Insurance companies writing health and accident policies can predict and control their losses and premiums more accurately and be more certain of making a satisfactory profit. On the other hand, it takes considerable skill, experience and efficiency for an insurance company to make a profit on automobile insurance, because courts and juries often determine both liability and the amount of a claimant's recovery.

Some time ago a number of insurance executives concluded that automobile insurance would be more profitable if it could be changed over into something similar to health and accident insurance. This proposed change has been given the name "no-fault insurance". This is why we now have a big publicity campaign by insurance companies that seek to have no-fault insurance laws enacted. They believe they can make higher profits and more money if they can put over this change.

Many insurance companies sponsoring no fault belong to an association known as the American Insurance Association. During the past two years the A.I.A. and some of the companies comprising its membership have campaigned for no fault throughout the United States, using the media of mass communication, including television, radio, newspapers, magazines and the mails. In addition, they have sponsored no-fault bills in many state legislatures. Their representatives and spokesmen frequently have appeared before legislative committees and have advocated passage of the legislation.

In 1971 I attended several of these legislative hearings in Sacramento, California. I heard representatives of the A.I.A., speaking before legislative committees, say frankly that they supported no-fault insurance because they had lost money writing automobile insurance, and they thought they would make more money if the system were changed to no fault. They stated candidly that this was their reason for supporting no fault. They added, of course, that they thought no-fault insurance would be a good thing for the public. Thus, there is no secret about who is sponsoring no-fault insurance or why they are sponsoring it. This is not generally known by the public, however, because this information usually does not appear in the publicity released for public consumption.

Many social movements originate at the grass-roots level. No fault is not that kind of movement. It did not originate among automobile insurance buyers or automobile accident victims. The big push for no-fault insurance originated at the top of the insurance industry. It is now being brought down to the grass-roots level by a high-powered publicity campaign through all the mass media of communication.

However, this publicity campaign does not tell the public that insurance companies want no fault in order to make higher profits. Instead, the public is told that no fault would mean lower insurance rates. The pub-

lic is not told that most blameless accident victims under no fault would receive far less than they do today. Instead, the public is told that benefits would be paid promptly and that courts and lawyers usually would be avoided. The publicity does not emphasize that the companies that now delay so long in paying claims would be the same companies that under no fault presumably would pay claims promptly without the need for lawyers or courts. Are we to assume that these insurance companies would suddenly become converted to a new moral code? If so, why must they wait for no fault before they start practicing this reformed way of life? Why can't they observe that new moral code now and pay claims without delay now under our present system?

#### CERTAIN RIGHTS WOULD BE UNJUSTLY DESTROYED

Most no-fault plans contain a medical expense threshold provision that would destroy the present rights of most blameless automobile accident victims to be compensated for the pain and suffering they undergo from an accident. Under the Massachusetts no-fault law, for example, the medical expense threshold level is \$500.

To show how the present rights of a blameless automobile accident victim are unjustly destroyed under this system, take a simple illustration. Suppose a housewife driving an automobile to a supermarket is struck from the rear by a negligent driver and sustains a painful whiplash neck injury that requires her to wear a neck collar for several weeks and to undergo medical therapy for six months at a total medical cost of \$400. Under the present law, this housewife would be entitled to have her \$400 medical bill paid by the other driver's insurance company. In addition, she would be entitled to have a reasonable amount for the pain and suffering she endured for six months. Most judges, juries and lawyers would agree that a total settlement of \$2,000 would be considered reasonable in this case—\$400 for her medical bill and \$1,600 for the pain and suffering.

Under a no-fault law with a \$500 medical expense threshold, this same housewife would receive only the payment of her \$400 medical bill. She would receive nothing whatever for the six months of pain and suffering she endured through no fault of her own. No fault would take away from this blameless accident victim 80 per cent of her present benefits.

Approximately 80 per cent of all injury claims have medical expenses under \$500. This means that under this type of no-fault law, eight out of every ten blameless accident victims would receive only about 20 per cent of the amount they are now entitled to receive, and that they would lose about 80 per cent of the benefits to which they now are entitled.

By contrast, if this same housewife should slip and fall in the supermarket because of the market's negligence and suffer the same injuries, she would be entitled to receive payment of her \$400 medical bill, and in addition she would be entitled to receive approximately \$1,600 for the pain and suffering she endured from her injuries.

Thus, this no-fault law would create two classes of justice for persons receiving similar injuries. We would continue to provide first-class justice for all blameless accident victims, except automobile accident victims. We would provide second-class justice for automobile accident victims whose medical bills are less than \$500 and allow them no recovery whatever for pain and suffering. But we would provide first-class justice for blameless automobile accident victims whose medical bills were more than \$500 and who would also receive reasonable compensation for pain and suffering. In other words, this no-fault insurance proposes to provide second-class justice for approximate-

ly 80 per cent of all blameless automobile accident victims.

#### MASSACHUSETTS EXPERIENCE ILLUSTRATES NO FAULT

The experience in Massachusetts, the first state to adopt a no-fault insurance law with a \$500 medical threshold level, illustrates graphically what happens to accident victims and to insurance company profits. The January 17, 1972, issue of *Barron's* reports that for the last six months before the adoption of no fault, the insurance companies in Massachusetts paid approximately \$4,000,000 in benefits to automobile accident victims. But during the first six months after the adoption of no fault, these same companies paid accident victims approximately \$800,000, or only 20 per cent of the benefits formerly paid. Is it not reasonable to assume that the remaining \$3,200,000, which was retained by the insurance companies in their treasuries, probably would have been paid to accident victims had the law not been changed to no fault? Meanwhile, bodily injury automobile insurance rates in Massachusetts were reduced only 27.6 per cent as compared to the reduction of benefits to claimants of 80 per cent. These figures illustrate some of the true reasons why the insurance industry is supporting no-fault insurance.

Insurance companies that advocate the threshold form of no-fault insurance are really seeking to reduce benefits for blameless accident victims without providing for a corresponding reduction of insurance company profits. Is this fair?

One reason some people may support no fault, to their future regret, is that they think as a buyer of insurance rather than as a potential future accident victim. Most people own automobiles and buy automobile insurance each year. They are very much aware of automobile insurance costs. They seldom think that someday they might be injured. However, on the law of averages most drivers will be injured in an automobile accident sometime during their lifetimes. They should also reflect on what benefits they believe they should receive when it becomes their turn to be the accident victim.

Many people believe that under no fault there will be a large reduction of insurance premiums. This is a hoax. No fault, if enacted, will apply only to the bodily injury portion of the premium, not to the entire premium. Insurance policies make different premium charges for bodily injury, property damage, fire, theft, comprehensive, collision, medical reimbursement and uninsured motorist. Under no fault, all of these charges would remain the same, except that for bodily injury coverage, which is usually only 20 to 25 per cent of the total premium. Thus, if no fault should make a saving of 20 per cent on only the bodily injury portion of the total premium, there is a saving of \$5 or \$6 for each \$100 of total premium. And even this is mostly hot air and speculation, for not one no-fault insurance proposal guarantees any reduction whatever in premiums.

In 1971 I debated no fault over a Los Angeles radio station, KFI with a representative of the American Insurance Association. He made the claim that no fault, if adopted in California, would save California motorists approximately \$50,000,000 a year in premiums. This sounded very impressive except for the fact that in 1971 more than 10,000,000 private passenger automobiles were registered in California, so that this estimated saving of \$50,000,000 divided over these 10,000,000 plus automobiles would equal a premium reduction of a little less than \$5 per car per year.

Many well-informed actuaries say no-fault insurance will not lower insurance costs at all. Under the most optimistic estimates of most no-fault proponents, the saving on insurance premiums would not be more than \$4 or \$5 per year per automobile. The insur-

ance industry seeks to persuade us to destroy 80 per cent of the present rights of blameless automobile accident victims in order that insurance companies can make higher profits and in order that insurance buyers may or may not be able to save as much as \$4 or \$5 per year. This is some of the truth about the cost of no-fault insurance.

If the cost of insurance is the only consideration and there is no concern about benefits, then it would be possible to have life insurance at half its present cost. We could provide that the insurance company should pay only half a policy when a policyholder dies. Fire insurance could be obtained for half price merely by providing that in case one's house burns down, the insurance company would pay only half instead of its full value. Of course, we can have automobile insurance a little cheaper if we wish to provide under a no-fault law that a blameless accident victim shall receive only 20 per cent of present benefits. But do we want to do this? Is not the price too drastic for the slight saving?

It has been the law since the dawn of modern civilization that if one person negligently injures another, he should pay not only the injured person's medical expenses and loss of earnings, but he should also pay a reasonable amount for the pain and suffering he negligently inflicted. Our civil rights to be free from unwanted pain and suffering and not to have our happiness destroyed—in other words, our human rights—have always been considered as important, or even more important, than our property rights. The threshold type of no-fault insurance proposes to destroy these rights we have always valued. It also proposes to destroy a substantial part of our property rights.

The person who will truly suffer under the threshold type of no fault is the blameless accident victim. The insurance company will not suffer; it plans to make more money. The buyer of insurance will not suffer; his rates may be slightly lower, although not nearly as much as he has been led to expect. Much of the saving made at the expense of the blameless accident victim will be retained by the insurance company as additional profits, as illustrated by what has happened in Massachusetts under its no-fault system.

Accident victims are not organized. An accident can happen to anyone. It may be the bank president or the bank janitor, an old age pensioner, a housewife or a small child, all with little in common except that they have been injured in an automobile accident. The people who would lose under no fault haven't even been injured at this time. They are walking around in normal health with no knowledge that later they are to be automobile accident victims. Instead of thinking as future accident victims, they think as insurance buyers, and they assume it is the other person who will be injured in an accident.

Since blameless accident victims are the only group that will be harmed and short-changed by the threshold type of no-fault insurance and since they are unorganized and have no way of organizing or of knowing each other or of having a spokesman, it follows that there is only one group in our society that knows the plight and prospective harm they await under no fault. That group is composed of the lawyers who represent accident victims and know what is happening and know what is going to happen to blameless accident victims under a threshold type of no-fault insurance.

These lawyers know what is going on and are doing their utmost to prevent the blameless accident victim from being carved up as a sacrificial lamb by the insurance industry on the altar of higher profits. Organized labor is not speaking up, even though many of their members will be heavy losers



under no fault. Management is not speaking up. Neither is the farmer nor the city dweller. Lawyers are the only group standing up to be counted on behalf of the blameless accident victim.

One would think the consumer groups would be coming to the rescue of the blameless accident victim. The consumer of automobile bodily injury insurance is not the insurance company. The ultimate consumer is the blameless automobile accident victim. If anyone should speak up for him and oppose the threshold type of no-fault insurance, shouldn't it be the Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs? But incredible as it may seem, we recently saw the spectacle of an attack by Virginia Knauer, who holds that office, on that part of the legal profession that has been leading the fight to protect the insurance consumer.

#### LAWYERS REPRESENT AN OBSTACLE TO INSURANCE COMPANIES

Since lawyers represent an obstacle to insurance companies and their hopes for no-fault insurance, it is not surprising that the companies have mounted a publicity campaign against lawyers and accuse them of opposing no fault for selfish reasons. Insurance companies would have us believe that their motives are commendable while they advocate no fault in order to make higher profits, but that lawyers show bad faith in opposing no fault.

There are two answers to this attack. First, the plaintiff's lawyer usually works on a contingent-fee basis whereby he charges nothing if he loses and usually one third if he is successful in obtaining a recovery for his client. The plaintiff's lawyer would lose this fee of one third in those cases in which, under no fault, recoveries are abolished. However, the irony of it is that while he loses this one third of the recovery, the unfortunate blameless accident victim loses the other two thirds, as no fault would abolish the recovery entirely. The blameless accident victim loses twice as much as the lawyer.

Second, if no fault should be adopted and the services of the plaintiff's lawyer are no longer needed, he will not close his office or withdraw from the law practice. He will change his practice and enter other fields of law, and he will continue to earn a livelihood as a lawyer. He may be inconvenienced by no fault, but he will not be put out of business. However, the blameless accident victim will be put out of business. He cannot turn to another part of his profession. His rights will be permanently destroyed, and he will have no place to go where he may have them restored. He will have had it. Such is the glory of no-fault threshold insurance.

Contrary to the distorted picture of lawyers painted by the insurance industry and those allied with it, the fact is that lawyers favor almost all parts of the no-fault proposals now being advocated, except for the threshold feature. For example:

No-fault sponsors want insurance that will pay medical and hospital bills promptly, regardless of fault. Lawyers favor this.

No-fault sponsors want insurance that will pay disability benefits promptly to disabled wage earners, regardless of fault. Lawyers favor this.

No-fault sponsors want smaller cases handled by arbitration instead of courts. Lawyers favor this.

No-fault sponsors favor compulsory insurance. So do lawyers.

No-fault sponsors favor highway safety programs to reduce accidents. So do lawyers.

No-fault sponsors favor safer design of automobiles to reduce injuries. So do lawyers.

No-fault sponsors favor limiting multiple payments of medical and disability benefits. So do lawyers.

No-fault sponsors want uninsured motorist

coverage to be made compulsory. So do lawyers.

In fact, lawyers favor about 90 per cent of the changes advocated by no-fault proponents. There is only one big and very important area in which lawyers oppose the insurance industry on no fault, and that is the threshold feature that would set an arbitrary medical limit to take away from blameless accident victims their present rights to recover damages for pain and suffering. The threshold proposal is morally and legally wrong. On this one issue, lawyers should fight without compromise. There is absolutely no reason as a matter of moral principle for the insurance industry to ask a blameless automobile accident victim to give up 80 per cent of his present rights so that the insurance companies can make more money or a motorist can save \$4 or \$5 a year on insurance premiums.

It is wrong in principle for a person whose medical bills are \$499 to get nothing for pain and suffering while one whose bills are \$501 should receive \$2,000 or \$3,000 for pain and suffering. It is wrong in principle to make second-class litigants of blameless accident victims and to give them second-class justice while others get first-class justice. It is class legislation without reasonable justification, directed at an unorganized group in our society who at this time do not even know they are the future blameless accident victims whose rights are being destroyed.

Lawyers will support no-fault proposals that do not take away from a blameless accident victim any of his present rights. But they will vigorously oppose placing any threshold provision in no fault which seeks to destroy any of the present rights of these victims. If they are slandered by the insurance industry or by the press or by politicians for doing this, it is a small price to pay for a just cause.

Lawyers will continue without apology and with pride to fight on behalf of present and future blameless accident victims. They invite all others to help in the battle to save innocent accident victims from having their rights plundered by the insurance industry for higher profits.

When a profession of private practicing lawyers tries to thwart the designs of an organized, \$40 billion industry that has access to all channels of mass communication, it is not an even contest. It cannot be won by lawyers alone. Their hope is that by fighting courageously and vigorously to protect the blameless accident victims of the future, they can alert the public before it is too late.

#### ORDER OF AHEPA CELEBRATES ITS GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY

##### HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1972

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago, on July 26, the Order of Ahepa was founded. They have been 50 years of growth and 50 years of accomplishments too numerous to mention.

It is a nonpolitical, nonsectarian, fraternal organization dedicated to education and to the promotion of our American way of life. One of its foremost objectives is to promote and encourage loyalty to the United States. It does so by instilling in its membership an appreciation of what it means to be a citizen of the United States.

It has, indeed, contributed a great deal for the promotion of our American way of life. And needless to say, in these difficult times we need to remind ourselves how fortunate we are to live under the "Stars and Stripes."

During these past 50 years the Order of Ahepa has contributed financially to many worthy causes, and its 430 local chapters throughout the United States have given of their time and resources for worthy local community undertakings.

I take this opportunity to congratulate the Order of Ahepa, its officers and all its members, for all that they have accomplished for the betterment of all of us. I wish this very fine organization continued success in the coming years.

#### AHEPA GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY

##### HON. FLOYD V. HICKS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1972

Mr. HICKS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in paying a well-deserved tribute to one of America's most distinguished fraternal organizations—the Order of Ahepa. Founded 50 years ago in Atlanta, Ga., the AHEPA family has grown to 430 local chapters in 49 States, Canada, and Australia.

As you know, AHEPA's record of service to its fellow man, both here and abroad, has embodied the highest ideals of Hellenic tradition. For half a century it has generously given of its time and money to aid disaster victims from the Mississippi Delta to the villages of Ecuador; it has supported orphanages, hospitals, schools, and libraries in Greece; and it has contributed annually to local community programs, such as scholarships for needy students.

Of great importance to us all is the fact that AHEPA has helped preserve the rich cultural heritage of the Greek people throughout the world. Through its labors the bonds of friendship between the people of Greece and the United States have been strengthened.

Mr. Speaker, while the impact of AHEPA has been felt around the globe, its emphasis has always been focused upon the very foundation of our society—the family. As you know, their work is carried on through the AHEPA "family": the Order of Ahepa, the Daughters of Penelope, the Sons of Pericles, and the Maids of Athena. And, anyone who has ever attended an AHEPA convention can tell you that they are family conventions. Every member of the family is in attendance and all are included in the work and festivities.

Again, I wish to salute this fine organization on its golden anniversary and to take special note of the Tacoma chapters and their officers: Spiro J. Kalivas, Elias Panges, Nicholas Vitos, and Phillip Squoros; Mrs. Pauline Ginnis, Mrs. Mary Basil, Mrs. Bess Javaras, Mrs. Kathryn Turlis, and Mrs. Gladys Caras; Miss Angela Buldis, Miss Gloria Tshida, Miss Irene Tomaras, and Miss Tina Pantellis.

# FIFTY YEARS OF SERVICE BY THE ORDER OF AHEPA

## HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1972

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the course of our history as a nation, America has been blessed with an abundance of citizen participation. We are fortunate in this fact because it is the only way that a democracy can work.

For 50 years, the Order of Ahepa has dutifully encouraged such citizen participation. It is fitting that the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association should be engaged in such an endeavor for it was ancient Greece that nurtured and formulated the first concepts of democracy.

AHEPA has always encouraged its members to be profoundly interested in and to actively participate in political, civic, social, and commercial fields of endeavor. It has also sought to instill in its membership a due appreciation of the privileges of citizenship. It is doubtful that the original founders, meeting in a classroom of the Greek Orthodox Church in Atlanta, Ga., some 50 years ago, could have guessed how far-reaching their actions would be. From that small meeting on July 26, 1922, AHEPA has grown to a membership bordering on the 100,000 mark. From one small chapter AHEPA has extended its jurisdiction to 49 States, Canada, and Australia with 430 local chapters.

The primary objective of this large international organization has been that of service. Many worthy causes, both on a national and an international level, have been the recipients of AHEPA generosity. At the local level, AHEPA chapters have always given generously and vigorously in support of local community undertakings in the fields of education, charity, and civic improvement.

At the local and at the national levels, AHEPA has always been in the forefront of patriotic efforts. During World War II, AHEPA was responsible for selling half a billion dollars in war bonds as an agent of the U.S. Government. Following the war, AHEPA was instrumental in aiding the victims of colossal devastation through the Greek War Relief Association. In addition to this effort, AHEPA established hospitals in Athens and Thessaloniki and seven health centers in other parts of Greece. A shelter home was founded in Athens as well as a war orphans program for the country as a whole.

AHEPA has also provided assistance for the fatherless children of refugees through the Near East Relief. AHEPA has, of course, always made a special effort to aid the victims of disaster, whether of natural or man-made origin.

Over the years, AHEPA has acquired an enviable reputation for achievement. AHEPA has championed the cause of education. It has also successfully fought for the freedom and self-respect of minority groups in its justice for Greece and justice for Cyprus programs.

The members of AHEPA can be justifiably proud of the accomplishments of their organization. AHEPA truly represents the best aspects of service-oriented organizations. America is fortunate in having such a patriotic and civic-minded advocate. On this, the 50th anniversary of AHEPA, it is only fitting that we extend a special measure of praise to this outstanding fraternity.

## CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1959-72

## HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1972

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, since July 1959, when Congress unanimously passed the Captive Nations Week resolution, the American people have annually observed Captive Nations Week in the third week of July. Each observance made its successful mark, and the 14th observance in 1972 was no exception, especially in view of the euphoric atmosphere in our country. The following examples show the basic American feelings and attitude toward the one billion of mankind still kept in the bondage of totalitarian and imperialistic Communist rule: First, proclamation by Mayor Henry W. Maier of Milwaukee and Mayor Roman S. Gribbs of Detroit and second, a penetrating article in the VFW magazine on "Conscience and Stalin's Ghost" and the program at Georgetown University featuring the Honorable Philip M. Crane of Illinois on the subject of "The Captive Nations and U.S. Policy" and third, resolution adopted by Americans for Freedom of Captive Nations.

### PROCLAMATION

Whereas: The imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkistan, North Vietnam, Cuba and others; and

Whereas: The desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas: The freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas: The Congress of the United States, by unanimous vote, passed Public Law 86-90, establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples;

Now, therefore, I, Henry W. Maier, Mayor of Milwaukee, do hereby proclaim the week commencing July 16, 1972, as Captive Nations Week in Milwaukee, and I call upon all citizens to join in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

### CAPTIVE NATIONS

The reality of captive nations existing in Eastern Europe, the U.S.S.R., Asia and the Caribbean cannot be ignored if we value our own freedom.

The prime Communist objective has been to obtain Western acquiescence to their goal in holding under their control twenty-seven European nations.

Detroit has many residents with close personal and family ties with the peoples of Albania, Armenia, Byelorussia, Bulgaria, Cossackia, Croatia, Czechia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, Serbia, Slovakia and the Ukraine, who feel the hand of Communist dictatorships.

It is of great importance for us to morally sustain the hope and faith of the captive peoples in their eventual freedom.

Therefore, I, Roman S. Gribbs, Mayor of the City of Detroit, issue this proclamation calling attention to the plight of those who live from day to day in the captive nations of the world.

[From the V.F.W. magazine, June, 1972]

### CONSCIENCE AND STALIN'S GHOST

(By David Green)

Stalin may have been dead for nearly 20 years, but his spirit seems to be alive and well in the USSR.

Just how much more of the Stalinist era's repressive malignancy has carried over into present-day life in the Soviet Union may soon be revealed if the fears of many in the West are realized.

The USSR consists of the world's largest land mass with the second largest population, approximately 240 million. Land and peoples are divided among 15 republics. Largest is the Russian Republic, which has a population of nearly 130 million. Among the others are Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia and Ukraine, with proud traditions of liberty arising in the mists of history.

Other republics also are trophies of Russian imperialism over the past four centuries: Kirghiz, Tadzhik, Kazakh, Armenia, Georgia and Azerbaijan.

They surround Russia proper like great puffs of air to soak up the punch of any invaders, for Russia has never forgotten the nudity of its borders. With a second rank of buffer states in Eastern Europe, Russia conceivably could convert the inner Soviet republics into a homogeneous, Greater Russia.

Ukraine, with 46 million, is the most significant state of the inner circle. Its population is too big to resettle, as Stalin once complained, too steeped in its own history to succumb easily to a divorce from its past, too different from the Russians to blend in the Marxist melting pot. And Moscow has not forgotten the Ukrainian risings in support of the Germans in 1941 and 1942. They thought the Teutons had come as liberators.

Concern is mounting that the arrest of a 24-year-old Belgian citizen last January in the USSR will soon trigger a "monster show trial" reminiscent of those parodies of justice that took place in the 1930s during the Great Purge.

Except for the brief announcement in "Radyanska in Ukraina," of Feb. 11, that Yaroslav Dobosh had been accused of coming to the Soviet Union "for the purpose of carrying out a criminal mission for the foreign anti-Soviet center—the Bandera-OUN (Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists)—which is financed by imperialist secret services and used by them to carry out diverse activities against the Soviet Union," little is known definitely.

However, for several months there have been waves of arrests of writers and other intellectuals in the Soviet Ukraine. The article announcing Dobosh's seizure noted that three others "have been taken to task for engaging in hostile activity directed against the socialist order."

They were I. O. Svitlychny, a literary critic who was a KGB prisoner for eight months in



1965 for allegedly smuggling another writer's manuscripts abroad; Vyacheslav Chornovil, who spent three years in prison for exposing illegalities in the trials of writers in 1965-66, and Yevhen Sversyuk, who defended a banned novel.

Besides these, 16 others were arrested in Kiev, Lvov and Ivano-Frankivsk in mass raids last Jan. 12 and 13. Included among them were Ivan Dziuba, whose "Internationalism or Russification?" published in the West in 1969 won for him expulsion from the Writers' Union, and Zinoviya Franko, grand-daughter of Ivan Franko, one of Ukraine's most celebrated pre-Communist poets.

Alarm that she has been prepared as a witness against the others has been engendered by the publication last March of a "self-criticism" in which she admitted her "guilt" in carrying out "anti-Soviet activity" and in distributing "slandering anti-Soviet" materials abroad. She concluded, "I will do penance for my guilt before the people."

One Western observer said "this shopworn form of personal degradation has not been practiced for a number of years, which makes its application in her case all the more remarkable. If the KGB has decided to employ such rusty instruments to keep the intellectuals in check, it must be aware of the risks involved. Zinoviya Franko's statement, even to the uninitiated observer, is obviously anything but a spontaneous expression of guilt . . . they do not flow from the pens of competent scholars like her but are unmistakably a KGB product forced on her."

Apparently also the ones now facing trial are being used as pawns in the Sino-Soviet conflict. Soviet Ukrainian press comments on the Dobosh case have mentioned a "pro-Chinese Ukrainian group" even though the OUN-Bandera referred to earlier is pro-Nationalist China.

One of the most blatant cases of Russian suppression is that of Valentyn Moroz now serving an additional nine years' sentence for writing "A Chronicle of Resistance" (which appeared Feb. 1971).

While the so-called offenses of other imprisoned writers generally have been "proven" to be "crimes" against the people, they are not political prisoners in the usual—espionage, sabotage or treason—sense. In some cases, their error was in championing a cause that has gone out of style because of the twists and turns in the Soviet political line.

In 1958, for example, a declaration by delegations of Ukrainian, Czech and Slovak writers in "Zakarpatska Pravda" extolled the cordiality and sincerity of their meeting on "pressing literary problems," and they vowed to continue to strengthen their creative relations as "our sacred duty to the fraternal peoples of Czechoslovakia and the Ukrainian SSR."

A dozen years later, with the warm sun of destalinization past its zenith, a letter to Oles Honchar, secretary of the Ukraine Writers Union, moaned, "How happy would the literary and cultural community of our republic . . . be to hear . . . about a congress . . . of people interested in Ukrainian studies, and . . . language courses for writers-translators from other republics."

Smuggled manuscripts and documents or publications, such as the Honchar letter, have been assembled in a frightening dossier for the UN Human Rights Commission.

"Violation of Human Rights in Ukraine—Documents" published in 1970 by the World Congress of Free Ukrainians reveals some of the details, such as forced Russification, discrimination based on national origin, persecution of churches, arbitrary arrests and deportations, secret trials, subjection of people to cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment and denial of freedom of movement, thought, conscience, religion, opinion, expression, peaceful assembly and association.

Combined with careful study of day-to-day

reports from the Soviet Union, this tends to reinforce evidence that Russification guides Soviet policies.

One can only speculate on its significance today, but there are some clues.

Russia, it may be surmised from the reaction to any questioning of policies, puts Russia first, ideology second. In this light, the persecutions appear aimed at routing out and destroying individual nationalism. And the Soviet Union is well organized to uncover and punish such deviations.

A favorable review of Honchar's book "Sobor" ("The Cathedral"), later banned, cost S.Y. Shynin his Communist Party card and his newspaper job. An evening of reading Ukrainian poetry was dubbed by the Russian carpetbaggers in top party policy positions as being nearly in the class of a counter-revolution. A director was fired for staging a Ukrainian play.

Thus, the post-Stalin easing of Soviet strains, internally and externally, probably is ending.

Although the 1971 Soviet budget called for more consumer goods, the line of liberalism was drawn when it came to "imitation of Western stars' body wiggling and face-pulling" by Russian pop singers. That criticism, by the way, came from Leonid Utyosov, 75, a popular dance band leader.

Expulsion from the Communist Party is serious punishment for an offending intellectual. He can be jailed (with or without hard labor), or just cast loose, a situation in which he can find no employment and no outlet for his talents.

The state may not let him starve, yet the work he will be permitted to find will not pay enough to let him eat properly. Someone like Chornovil could subsist properly only because his doctor-wife continued to work and remained in party favor.

Intellectuals in the USSR are forces to be watched. Two of Russia's last three Nobel Prize winners for literature, Alexander Solzhenitsyn and Boris Pasternak are celebrated in the West but unsung in their own lands, while Mikhail Sholokhov has at least had wide domestic recognition.

(In the case of Solzhenitsyn, who spent eight years in one of Stalin's prison camps, there is a satisfying irony in the message of congratulations to him, smuggled out of a forced labor camp south of Moscow from a dozen inmates. "Unfortunately," they wrote, "barbed wire and automatics in the hands of unthinking boys deprive us of the possibility to express to you personally the depth of our delight in your courageous work.")

(Within hours the Soviet Novosti press agency began saluting Solzhenitsyn as a man of the "morbidity self-importance" who "made of his loneliness not a tragedy but a business.")

They don't all go so quietly when packed off to prison. Andrei Amalrik, 31, author of "Involuntary Journey to Siberia" and "Will the Soviet Union Survive Until 1984?" (it won't, he says in the latter, anticipating a showdown with China), declaimed at his trial: "I think I am a better patriot than those who shout about their love for the fatherland but mean by that, love for their privileges . . ."

So Amalrik gets tucked away; Yuri Daniel goes free. Daniel, whose imprisonment with Andrei Sinyavsky in 1966 touched off an international furor, is forbidden to visit Moscow as one of the terms of his early release. He, too, could end up as a tractor driver or minor writer, condemned to produce each day, but fated never to publish.

Zhores Medvedev is back in circulation, too. A top-flight physiologist, he has been given a senior research position in Borovsk where he may languish nicely out of sight of Moscow. He had been in a mental hospital. He was the man who dashed the nonsense of Trofim Lysenko, Stalin's favorite charlatan

geneticist. Possibly even that debunking wasn't so bad; but he also was the author of a major—unpublished—work on Soviet barriers to international scientific cooperation.

Again it must be emphasized that virtually all of these people—and there are thousands more, possibly; no one can say how many—are guilty of honesty, or a desire for reform, or progress, or recognition of individualism. They write letters to editors, to Party or union secretaries.

Word steals out from Soviet forced labor camps, into the Iron Curtain cities, to circulate in mimeograph form or in some underground newspaper, and filters through to the West.

One tells how a Ukrainian, Vasyl Makukh, burned himself to death in Kiev in protest against Russification and persecution in the Ukraine.

Ukrainian prisoners are able to sneak word through of their plight:

"We the Ukrainian political prisoners . . . were arrested for demanding improvements in the condition of Ukrainian workers and defending the rights of the Ukrainian language, education, and culture . . . Having failed to break us morally, the KGB are trying to transform us biologically from intellectuals into primitives.

"Poison is also added to the food in the camp. We have done a number of tests and have proved this to be true . . . Food packages from home are even more strongly poisoned . . . When we complained . . . we were transferred to separate cells . . . we live under electric lights all day with the exception of one hour each day when we walk outside . . ."

"A Letter from the Creative Youth of Dnepropetrovsk" to the chairman of the Ukrainian Council of Ministers was circulated in manuscript form. It cited the punishment of various writers, "accused of that fantastic 'Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism' invented in the building at Korolenko St. (KGB headquarters)."

"In fact they were punished for their concern about the fate of the Ukrainian language and Ukrainian culture in madly Russified Dnepropetrovsk. The question arises, why people of high principles are so easily disposed of, dismissed from universities, expelled from the Party and dismissed from work? Are they criminals? Not really. Real criminals live quite comfortably.

"Is it possible that these honest citizens of the Ukrainian SSR who perceived their people's tragedy, who cannot renounce their native language and cannot renounce themselves, are enemies? Regarding this, a great Russian writer, V. Soloukhin, said: 'If I were born a Ukrainian, I would never want to be a Russian.'"

Conscience, stalked by Stalin's ghost.

#### THE AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY FORUM

Sponsored by: Georgetown University Summer School and the Institute on Comparative Political & Economic Systems.

Presents the Honorable PHILIP M. CRANE, Member of Congress from Illinois.

Speaking on "The Captive Nations and U.S. Policy," Tuesday, July 18, 8:00 p.m., New South Faculty Lounge.

Congressman Crane has won wide recognition nationally as an educator, author, and lecturer. He served on the faculty of Indiana University and Bradley University. Since 1968, Dr. Crane has worked as an educational consultant and President of the Foundation for Human Rights. Dr. Crane serves on the Board of Directors of the Intercollegiate Studies Institute and the Senior American Advisory Council of the World Youth Crusade for Freedom. In 1969 he was elected to Congress from Illinois' 13th Congressional District. He serves on the Banking and Currency Committee and the House Administration Committee in the House of Representatives.

## AMERICANS FOR FREEDOM OF CAPTIVE NATIONS

Resolution adopted by the Freedom Rally on Saturday, July 15, 1972, at City Hall and County Mall in Los Angeles.

Mindful of a mounting Communist danger to freedom and rightful law in this country and all the world, we, Americans for Freedom of Captive Nations and citizens of Los Angeles gathered on July 15th, 1972 at the Captive Nations Freedom Rally in Los Angeles, do adopt and proclaim the following resolutions:

(1) We shall devote our ever increasing efforts to fulfilling the purpose of Captive Nations Week, as proclaimed in Public Law 86-90. We shall support the President's proclamation by informing the nation on the plight of the Captive Nations each year and all year . . . until freedom and independence . . . have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world.

(2) We regard as our duty to speak out on the true nature of Russian imperialism and its tool—Communism. Knowing the methods and modes of operation of the illegal pseudo-governments led by Red Moscow, we consider the so-called "cultural exchange" program in its present form as false and harmful, in that it gives Red Moscow a convenient disguise to spread red propaganda in our entire United States.

(3) We support the endeavors of the President and Members of Congress directed toward stopping the continuing Red aggression and the Red oppression of enslaved nations which are so courageously striving for freedom.

(4) We remember, on the fortieth anniversary of the dreadful famine of 1932-33 in the Ukraine, the 8 million victims who lost their lives in it. We state, that Red Kremlin deliberately caused and maintained that famine which is a true case of unrestricted mass genocide.

(5) We remember ten thousand Polish officers massacred by the Soviets in 1940 in the Katyn Forest.

(6) We remember the hundreds of thousands of victims murdered in the Baltic States—Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, since the Soviet aggression in 1940.

(7) We remember the hundred thousand Croats—prisoners or war—murdered at Bleiburg-Maribor by Tito's guards.

(8) We remember how Communists ambushed King Boris the Third of Bulgaria killing Ilchev, then murdered Gen. Konstantin Georgiev and dynamited the cathedral church Sveta Nedelya in Sofia on April 16, 1925 during the funeral mass, killing 125 and maiming 500. We remember the two hundred thousand Bulgarians murdered in the Sept. 9th, 1944 takeover of Bulgaria by Soviet military force and the Fraternal Front of Moscow henchmen.

(9) We remember the two hundred thousand Hungarians murdered by the Soviets in and after the Hungarian Uprising of October 1956.

(10) We remember the many millions of people murdered, deported and enslaved by Communist conspiracies in all countries under Communist rule—such as Albania, Armenia, Bulgaria, Byelorussia, Croatia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, German People's Republic, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Mainland China, North Korea, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Soviet Union, Ukraine and Yugoslavia. We demand that the perpetrators of such murders and crimes against nations and peoples be brought to justice.

(11) We ask for steps toward an international condemnation of Red Kremlin for its aggression policies.

(12) We send greetings to all enslaved peoples. They remain free in their mind and resist the Communist brainwashing. Their youth, born under occupation rules, has discarded the false doctrines and knows of freedom, hoping to attain it in the near future.

(13) We ask all free people to unite in re-

peating Red brutality rule and rejecting Red claims for supremacy over freedom.

## WHAT TO DO WITH JANE FONDA?

## HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1972

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I have had some rather irate letters about what action should be taken with Miss Jane Fonda, who has made some pretty wild and unsubstantiated accusations against her country lately.

I submit that Scott Alexander, editor of the Franklin, Ind., Daily Journal, has a novel and rather intriguing idea. Following is his column from the July 16, 1972, Journal:

## COUNTY CHATTER

(By Scott Alexander)

Judging from some of the coffee-cup banter of late, quite a few folks around these parts are getting "mighty sick and tired" of reading and hearing about the "world traveler" exploits of actress-activist Jane Fonda and a host of other entertainers who exploit their notoriety by projecting opinions about everything from "soup to nuts."

"What does she know about anything anyway," exclaimed one of the coffee-cup regulars. "Just being an actress . . . if that's what she is . . . doesn't give her any special insight into the world's problems," he added.

"I don't mind if she 'does her own thing,'" said another. "If she doesn't like our country or the way we do things, that's her privilege," the businessman added. "But I don't think the newspapers and television should blow up everything she says and does," he said.

"Yea, who cares?" piped another coffee-cup customer.

For those who may have missed it, the conversation was prompted by a United Press International news item concerning Miss Fonda's recent trip to Hanoi that appeared on page one of several newspapers, including the Journal.

It seems Miss Fonda called a news conference to tell the world that the United States is bombing civilian targets in North Vietnam and she says she has "documentary evidence" to prove it.

She claims the bombing of civilian targets is "deliberate," while U.S. officials say it isn't.

At any rate, that's the gist of the story relating to Miss Fonda's latest "activist" exploit and that's what the boys at the coffee shop were irked about.

In a rather feeble effort that got nowhere, we tried to explain that Jane Fonda makes "news" because (among other things) she is the daughter of famous film actor Henry Fonda.

"So what," said one of our companions. "Just because she's his daughter doesn't mean that she knows what she's talking about or that people give a . . . one way or the other."

"Do you think people give a hang about the Kennedy youngsters . . . or Nixon's kids," we asked?

"I don't," said one of the "regulars."

"That's different," said another.

"The thing is, if you people (news media) didn't give 'em so much publicity, they wouldn't be so important. Why don'tcha print what some of us think about that stuff," challenged one of the regulars.

Okay . . . we agreed.

So, we have.

Viewing the conversation in retrospect, it does occur to us that a great many ordinary and not-so-ordinary people are getting mighty disgusted at the widely publicized

rantings and ravings of "entertainment folk" who, in many cases, don't know any more about the great issues of our time than anybody else.

Maybe . . . just maybe . . . we could eliminate such frustrations by scheduling a series of TV debates featuring Miss Fonda and her conservative, patriotic counterpart John Wayne.

Who knows . . . Dick Cavett and Bob Hope might even agree to moderate the debates.

Would they have an audience?

We'd predict a Fonda-Wayne debate would command a prime-time audience that would number in the millions.

Why?

You answer the question. Would you watch? If so, why?

## CONGRESSMAN McCLODY SALUTES THE AMERICAN HELLENIC EDUCATIONAL PROGRESSIVE ASSOCIATION ON ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

## HON. ROBERT McCLODY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1972

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, this month the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, better known as the Order of Ahepa, is celebrating its 50th anniversary. Founded on July 26, 1922, in Atlanta, Ga., this society has enjoyed a spectacular expansion and today includes 430 local chapters in 49 States, Canada, and Australia.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to pay tribute to this exceptional organization. I am especially proud to have as my constituent Mrs. Adeline Jay Geo-Karis, past national president of the Daughters of Penelope, the senior auxiliary of the Order of Ahepa. During Mrs. Geo-Karis' term of office, she established an AHEPA chapter in Athens, Greece, to insure that the organization was kept fully informed of conditions in their homeland. I should also point out that Mrs. Geo-Karis has maintained an outstanding record of community involvement, highlighted by her current campaign as Republican candidate for the Illinois State General Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, special attention should be given to the nine objects of AHEPA, goals which we would all do well to strive for. This order has been instrumental in fostering patriotism and civic responsibility while promoting improved education opportunities for all. AHEPA's outstanding record of contributing generously in both time and money to countless worthwhile causes is equally indicative of its unceasing devotion to the public good.

Mr. Speaker, AHEPA has shown that it is possible to adapt fully to the American way of life while retaining love and admiration for one's ethnic background. Through hard work and devotion the Order of Ahepa has demonstrated that individuals can become an integral part of our society without forsaking their ethnic traditions.

Mr. Speaker, the Order of Ahepa has a record of 50 years of service and accomplishment, and I am confident that in the coming years this society will continue its remarkable record of achievement.



## HALT THE KILLING OF POLAR BEARS

**HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1972

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, today I had the pleasure of commenting on the increasing interest shown by many individuals and groups regarding the plight of the polar bear.

In testimony to a subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I reviewed the need for the Federal Government to adopt an international treaty protecting the polar bear and legislation providing for the accurate data needed for further protection. I include the testimony at this point in the RECORD.

TESTIMONY OF THE HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

Mr. Chairman, thank you for giving me the opportunity to testify on behalf of my bill, HJR 1179, calling for a moratorium on the killing of polar bears.

Since introducing this measure on April 26 of this year, I have come across increasingly contradictory and incomplete facts about the polar bear. I have come to the conclusion that my resolution should be adopted if for no other reason than to put a halt to the placing of blame. I am convinced that there is a real need for the immediate passage of my resolution.

The polar bear is the largest carnivore alive today. It inhabits the lands and floating ice of the Arctic region, and it comes under the separate jurisdictions of five nations: the United States, Canada, Norway, Denmark, and the USSR. The size of the various herds, the total population, and the degree of danger of total extinction vary dramatically according to the organization to which you speak. It is obvious, however, that the polar bear is in trouble and should be given immediate protection to assure its continued existence.

The estimated population of polar bears varies from a low of approximately 10,000 (according to the Red Data book of the IUCN) to a high of "not less than 20,000" given by the US Department of the Interior. Data regarding the migration habits are inadequate, as are the data concerning the feeding and denning habits of these magnificent animals. Because of the lack of definitive data, it is virtually impossible to obtain an accurate determination as to whether the world-wide population is increasing or declining. There are indications that the Alaska population is declining, because the sizes and ages of the bears in the annual harvest are lower than in previous years.

Many allegations have been made claiming that Alaska is allowing exploitation of the polar bear similar to that which occurred in the Soviet Union and prompted the USSR to institute total protective measures against the taking of polar bears in 1956. This action by the Russians has been effective.

In consonance with a federal law against shooting from aircraft, Alaska has recently announced a halt in aerial hunting. However, it is alleged that not only is this ban not being enforced, but that neither are the quota limits. The estimated annual harvest in Alaska is set at 300, and there are estimated to be an equal number killed illegally.

When you consider that the total world-wide legal kill is 1300, these figures are devastating. I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the Committee that both the National Rifle Association and the Boone and Crockett Club consider the plight of the polar bear so desperate that they have removed it from their lists of animals eligible for trophy points.

Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to attempt to point the finger of blame at anyone. I am simply pointing out the misunderstandings that surround this animal. One of the greatest frustrations affects the humane and conservation organizations which have tried to have the Department of the Interior declare the polar bear an "endangered species."

The Department claims that it is not possible to declare this animal an "endangered species," because it does not contain a subspecies and must therefore be considered on the basis of its world-wide population rather than on the state of a herd in a single geographic location. This is the result of the language of the Endangered Species Act, which states that a species or subspecies must be "threatened with worldwide extinction."

Furthermore, even if the polar bear were declared an "endangered species," there would be nothing much the Department of the Interior could do, because they have no authority to offer protection to any endangered animal unless it is on federal property, and they cannot prohibit the importation into the United States of an animal, its offspring, or its by-products, unless it is "imported from a foreign country." Taking the animal on the high seas does not fit the category of "foreign country." Needless to say, I am disturbed by this situation, but I do understand the limitations which the Department must operate within.

Currently there are three legislative measures under consideration that would deal directly with this subject. The first is HJR 1179, which your Committee is considering today; the second is the Endangered Species amendments contained in HR 13111, still in the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee; and the third is the Marine Mammal Bill, HR 10420, which has passed the House and is currently being debated in the Senate.

The Endangered Species Amendments would go a long way toward solving many of the problems affecting animals, and would be of direct benefit to the polar bear (as, let me add, would HR 14316, which I have introduced).

This bill would cover "animals imported" to those protection, instead of only those "imported from foreign countries." The bill would also extend the protective provisions of the Act by creating an additional category of animals, those likely to become threatened with extinction instead of simply those in danger of becoming extinct. This would cover the polar bear. Finally, and most important, the bill would extend coverage to all animals under its jurisdiction regardless of their location.

The Marine Mammal Bill, HR 10420, would extend protection to marine mammals taken on the high seas, as would HR 13111. But while these measures will go a long way toward providing protection to all threatened animals, they will not provide the type or degree of international protection that is needed for the polar bear, and that is why HJR 1179 is so necessary.

Mr. Chairman, the concern of the Members of this Committee for the plight of animals has been demonstrated in the past by the passage of a similar resolution calling for a moratorium on commercial whaling.

Time is needed for the collection of adequate and accurate data, and the passage of HJR 1179 along with the other bills I have mentioned can provide this time.

It is important that the US Government pursue the adoption of an international treaty based on the recommendations of the polar bear group of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN).

I thank the Committee for giving me this opportunity to testify, and I hope that favorable consideration can be given to HJR 1179.

## A CALL TO ALL FARMERS

**HON. JOHN M. ZWACH**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1972

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, the problems of our family farms should be of concern too all of the people of America because our very way of life is dependent upon a healthy farm economy.

However, that economy has not been healthy and it is reflected in the shaky state of our national economy.

One of the problems with our farm economy is the failure of the various farm groups to unite and discuss these problems.

This matter was developed in a recent article by Rev. John J. McRaith, co-director of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference in the St. Cloud Visitor, a Catholic weekly newspaper in our Minnesota Sixth Congressional District, which, at this time I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

### A CALL TO ALL FARMERS

(By Rev. John J. McRaith)

What would happen if every farmer who belongs to a farm organization were to find out the time of the next monthly meeting and with his wife attended the meeting? Now that in itself would be a real shock for most farm groups to say nothing of the rest of a TV watching America. What would happen if these same farmers and their wives were to go for the purpose of demanding that their respective organization work together with the others to accomplish something for them? Now this would likely create a rather nervous leadership in many cases. You say this is rather naive to even think such a thing—much less to put it into print.

Well is it so foolish? We all pray or should pray very often for peace in the world. We have put great pressure upon our government to solve the problem of the Viet Nam War. We really think that the world should be able to get along—and when we see the possibilities of a War we think they better get along. Well if Americans can have this eternal hope before them as far as world peace—is it really so foolish to think that a few Farmers working through their organizations could work together for the common cause of the Family Farmer and Rural America? It really shouldn't be that difficult. I would like to suggest that the reason this has not been done is not because farmer Joe and farmer Jim can not get along or can not agree or what is good for them. Rather, I suggest that it is the Leadership that has kept us all apart for these years. Leaders who have a vested interest in their jobs and positions and want to be the only Man in American Agriculture with all the answers. I also suggest that our politicians have used this human weakness within the leaders to continue to exploit the Family Farmer and Rural America. Have you ever considered how foolish all of this concern for the salvation of Rural America sounds when you find so many people who supposedly are utterly frustrated trying to do something to help. Foolish because if all were honest an answer would have been found.

Now I would like to go one step further. Everyone who lives in Rural America and makes his living by serving the Family Farmer and Family type Agriculture go to the same meeting. You may not be able to vote—but you can bring a goodly amount of pressure to bear upon those who can vote. You can see you really have a right to be there in that capacity because if they fail to unite and save themselves—you will join them in

the parade to the Big City. If you don't, all your children will. So you see you have much at stake in all of this. And just as you have much to gain from a quick and satisfactory solution—you also have a great obligation to do all you can to bring it about.

We hear much of coalitions these days. The problem with most of them again is that they are coalitions of people who are not farming. I am not suggesting a new farm organization—God forbid—but I am suggesting that All of America has a right to expect the existing organizations to cooperate in solving the problems of Rural America as they relate to the farmer. Other problems—such as moving industry into rural areas is the problem of the government as it relates to the federal policy on population distribution.

We all know that any organization is as good as its members. This is true whether they be the Dallas Cowboys, the Catholic Church, the Boy Scouts, the AFL-CIO or a farm organization. So if there has not been unity—it might be as I suggested the fault of the leadership—but in the end it is the fault of the membership—your fault Mr. farmer...

There may be forces that really want you to fail as a family farmer and as a family small town business man. The possibilities are there. You know what—they will succeed if you don't get together and now. Also you must face God knowing that you did not do what you could have done for Rural America and the family farmer—unless you try as we have suggested in this message. I wouldn't want that on my conscience—and I doubt if you do.

O.K.—we will see all of you at your farm group meeting—the very next meeting. All Rural America might be there to see if you are there and how you do. Don't disappoint us again.

## FREEDOM OF SPEECH, THE ROLE OF PRESS AND ACADEMIA

HON. ROBERT C. McEWEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1972

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to have as a constituent of my district Ambassador Roger W. Tubby of Saranac Lake, N.Y. Last month, Ambassador Tubby, on his retirement from the Foreign Service Institute, Department of State, concluded a long and distinguished career of service with our Federal Government. In addition to his various posts with our Department of State, including 7½ years as U.S. Ambassador in Geneva, Mr. Tubby also served as press secretary to former President Harry S. Truman.

My purpose, however, is not to call attention to the well-known facts of this great citizen's service to his country, but to call to the attention of my colleagues an address delivered by Ambassador Tubby to the Mississippi Press Association at Biloxi, Miss., on June 2, 1972.

The text of the Ambassador's speech follows:

ADDRESS OF AMBASSADOR ROGER W. TUBBY

Just twenty-five years ago this month, on May 8, at the Teachers College at Cleveland, Mississippi, an historic speech was made by the then Under Secretary of State. He called it later "the prologue to the Marshall Plan."

The proposal there outlined on the tree-shaded college lawn called for massive American aid to the war-devastated countries of Europe. "This is necessary," Acheson said, "if we are to preserve our own freedoms and

our own democratic institutions. It is necessary for our security. And it is our duty and privilege as human beings."

In early 1947 I was in Europe with Will Clayton of Texas, then in charge of economic affairs at the State Department, when he noted how close to complete economic, political and social collapse were the countries of that continent. His memo to Acheson and Secretary Marshall recommended a great American aid program, not just as relief, but to revive agriculture, industry, and trade so that the stricken countries might again be self-supporting.

Thanks to the Marshall Plan, Western Europe recovered, became prosperous, remained free.

Today we are again living in momentous times with historic new initiatives, those of President Nixon's; his opening toward the People's Republic of China, his working for and reaching new understandings with the Soviet Union.

I am not in a position to talk knowledgeably about these developments. Rather, I thought I'd share some of my thoughts about communications, especially those of the newspaper and academic worlds. About half of my working life has been in newspapering, and much of the other half has been in working closely with newsmen.

For the last two and a half years I've been with the State Department's Foreign Service Institute, enjoying enlightening contacts with the academic world. The FSI trains officers of the State Department and of other agencies with personnel serving abroad. Included in our programs are teaching of languages (some 54) and economics. We have area and country studies and review of cultural, economic and political developments in the United States so that our representatives abroad can speak knowledgeably about them.

Eminent professors lecture at FSI. We supervise academic year programs for about 70 mid-career officers at various universities, and we send six senior officers each year to serve with university faculties. We call them Diplomats-in-Residence. One of them, Lewis M. Purnell, will be nearby at the University of Alabama and Troy State University next year.

I myself have visited several campuses, and have been greatly impressed by the high quality of many of the offerings. Yet I have been disturbed, as we all should be, by the intolerance which has developed in certain departments on some campuses. It is the intolerance of the so-called New Left intellectuals, a contemptuous kind of intolerance which not only mocks those who disagree, or may disagree with them, but which has led on many campuses to the barring of non-New Left professors from faculty appointment. This behavior is not like that of a mad gunman. It is even more reprehensible, for it is the calculated, deliberate action of intellectuals denying freedom of expression on campus.

"Lux et Veritas," Light and Truth, is the motto of Yale, my alma mater, but Yale, like other great citadels of liberal education, in recent years has allowed its noisy, violent radicals to prevent freedom of expression, or to seriously inhibit it, through disruptive behavior.

We are told by these people that this country is rotten, that our traditions and democratic practices are a joke, that Blacks and other disadvantaged groups cannot get fair trials, and that our salvation can come only through destroying our way of life and replacing it with some form of socialism, a euphemism as they use it for communism of one form or another, or anarchy.

We have problems, plenty of them though not so severe and desperate as those of Western Europe after World War II, but we have the strength, the wisdom, the idealism needed to meet them, as we have met earlier problems in our history.

But we should not be complacent. We need to guard against acceptance of the notion, so ceaselessly repeated in so many ways, that we are finished, that we have had it, that our past was dishonorable.

We need to know, and be proud of, the great things we have achieved in our short history. We need to know that we are still the promised land to millions.

I'm aware of this especially for, as U.S. Ambassador in Geneva for 7½ years, I worked with refugee organizations which were helping hundreds of thousands, many of whom had risked their lives to flee from behind the Iron Curtain. The U.S.A. was overwhelmingly their first choice for asylum and a new life, and this despite years of indoctrination about communist achievements and prospects, about the evils of capitalism, about U.S. decadence and immorality. Hungarians, East Germans, Poles, Czechs, Cubans have nevertheless in great numbers chosen freedom in the U.S.

I wish that those of our young people who are partial to Marxist dogma, or to communist governments, would live for even a few months in a communist country, or at least read Solzhenitsyn or Pasternak, those enormously gifted Russian novelists who have dared to tell the truth about life under Stalin. It would give them greater understanding of the strengths and weaknesses in communist lands and enable them better to understand our own strengths and weaknesses.

Thanks to President Nixon's initiatives tensions will be lessened and more bridges of cultural, economic and political understanding will be built between the U.S., Russia, China and other communist countries, and their people in time hopefully will enjoy not only the blessings of peace but of greater freedom.

In the meantime we should improve the strength and quality of our own way of life. This we are working at, in racial relations, in dealing with the problems of pollution, unemployment, health, commerce and education.

In education, it seems to me, consideration should be given to including courses in world affairs as part of each school and college curriculum, on the same basis as English and math.

As citizens of the United States, and the world, our young people should acquire a broad understanding of geographic, economic, historic, cultural, and political factors affecting our development and our relations with other countries and with the United Nations and other international organizations.

This would be a lot to cover, but starting in grade school and going on through high school, and for the 2 in 7 who go on through college, such courses should give them a reasonably sound basis for making judgments about U.S. domestic and foreign policy.

And our young people should be encouraged to supplement their studies by reading a variety of newspapers and magazines and books. They should discover, or rediscover, the pleasure of reading broadly, of gaining knowledge and of weighing alternatives based on knowledge.

Jefferson spoke of the need for an informed citizenry. We've never before had such sophisticated means to spread information. We've never before, perhaps, had such a need to do it well.

Yet never before has it been more difficult to reach through to our people because of the infinite diversity of their interests.

This is why I suggest that in the school and college years we make the study of world affairs part of the curriculum.

Knowing about ourselves and others, making a lifetime habit of searching for the truth about ourselves and others, should be a basic and essential part of our education and our way of life.

If we do this we should be less naive, less gullible, and have more confidence in stand-



ing up for our country, for ourselves, whether from Vermont or Mississippi.

You of the press since our earliest days have played a key role in informing the people.

Your probing has been recognized as essential to a healthy democracy by Presidents from Washington to Nixon, though every one of them at times has disagreed with, or resented, things that the press has said about them or their administrations.

I hope in the future you will report and comment in even greater depth while offering different points of view.

I plea here for balance, for fairness, for tolerance, for doing a more thorough job of reporting and teaching so that our people can react wisely and move to do what needs to be done, to make this a still better country, while keeping our freedom.

#### PROMISING MENTAL HEALTH PROGRAM INTRODUCED IN NORTH DAKOTA

**HON. ARTHUR A. LINK**

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1972

Mr. LINK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to an innovative mental health program introduced by the North Dakota Mental Health Association. Yesterday's Parade magazine, in an article titled "They Tell It to Bartenders and Beauticians," pointed out the importance of citizen involvement in the success of mental health programs. The article by Theodore Irwin follows:

NEW MENTAL HEALTH PROGRAM: THEY TELL IT TO BARTENDERS AND BEAUTICIANS

(By Theodore Irwin)

In most American communities, people with emotional problems can go to a psychiatrist. But in North Dakota, with only 19 psychiatrists in the entire state, this is not always feasible.

To help solve the problem, the state's Mental Health Association has enlisted the aid of bartenders and beauticians (the nation's unpaid psychiatrists).

Says Sally Speidel, who runs Sally's Beauty Boutique in Bismarck: "A woman may be in our stylist chair for an hour and a half. All this time she is usually unburdening herself by confiding in the beautician."

"A bartender," says Ken Habiger, who owns the Red Baron Lounge here, "can sense that a customer is begging for help. The guy may become belligerent, start an argument, but sooner or later he'll tell the bartender what's wrong."

As a board member of the Mental Health Association, it was Habiger who suggested last year that the Association reach out to bartenders as "mental health helpers."

#### BARTENDERS COACHED

The Association explained the idea to bartenders, and provided them with "Help" booklets listing agencies for referral, including social services centers, alcoholism clinics, and the like. Over 60 bartenders became involved.

Meanwhile, Mrs. Gerridee Wheeler, Association president at the time, was in the beauty parlor one morning for a manicure when she overheard an operator advising another woman who was having marital problems.

With the bartending experiment fresh in mind, Mrs. Wheeler was struck with an idea. Why not beauticians, too?

"Troubled people are usually reluctant to go directly for professional aid," she ex-

plains, "perhaps because they feel it creates a stigma. I thought we should use trained citizens who are in constant contact with people as a bridge or conduit into available services. They could encourage those in distress to get the help they need."

In the case of beauticians, however, Mrs. Wheeler went about things a little differently, by approaching the state's 12 beauty colleges and urging them to provide training in mental health care. North Dakota Governor William L. Guy did his part, writing a letter to the state Board of Haldressers in which he called for "broader understanding of mental health problems."

#### TO HELP CUSTOMERS

As a result, students at all 12 colleges now take a week-long intensive training course in how to be "mental health helpers." In addition, Mrs. Joyce Robson, an experienced beautician and one of the instructors, plans courses for already-licensed operators. As for the bartenders, they were sufficiently impressed by the beauticians' experience to institute training sessions of their own. Soon they will meet on holidays to listen to a psychiatrist, a priest who does counseling, and a recovered alcoholic who teaches on a college faculty.

The idea, of course, is not to replace the psychiatrist's couch with a barstool or beautician's chair. Mental health helpers are reminded, however, that "you can do a lot of good by guiding patrons, and encouraging them to get professional help if they seem to need it."

#### SCALP TELLS

Mrs. Robson, who maintains that she can tell when a customer is "shook up" by noting the tightness of her scalp, or unusual dryness or lack of glossiness in her hair, also cautions students against making critical judgments or probing too deeply for information. Rather, she explains, they should provide support by expressing reassurance, warmth, and empathy. "In a way," says Mrs. Robson, "we are sounding boards."

Students also visit social agencies, and engage in "psychodrama skits" which demonstrate ways of handling different kinds of problems. Like the bartenders, they are given a directory of various community services. Equally important, they are instructed in the need to respect customer confidences.

Real life situations run the gamut of human tragedy: alcoholism, mentally retarded relatives, marital disputes, rebellious children.

In Williston, N. Dak., a bartender chatted with a regular customer who had just been jilted by his girlfriend. The young man contemplated suicide, and even bought a gun. After two drinks he spilled his story to the bartender. The bartender consulted his "help" booklet and persuaded the young man to stop in at the local Social Service Center.

Beautician Sally Speidel tells of the wealthy patron whose breath reeked of liquor and who always carried a bottle in her large purse. One morning the woman blurted out that her heavy drinking was ruining her marriage, that she was thinking of "ending it all." Mrs. Speidel soothed her with the tale of another customer who had quit drinking after going to the Heathview Alcoholism Treatment Center in nearby Mandan. There really wasn't any such customer, but there is now, for two weeks later, the woman wrote to Mrs. Speidel. She was sorry, she said, but she was canceling her regular appointment at the beauty parlor because she had just entered Heathview. "Sally," the letter concluded, "I think I can really lick it this time."

#### PROJECTS PRAISED

Already, North Dakota has received awards from the American Psychiatric Association, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for its pioneering achievements in mental health. Moreover, its approach

may catch on. Inquiries have come in from 15 other states, and the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) has filmed training sessions at Bismarck's beauty colleges.

How come North Dakota, one of our most rural states, is setting the pace for the rest of the country? The answer, says Mrs. Wheeler, is citizen involvement. "We've made mental health so exciting," she declares, "it's caught the imaginations of volunteers all over our state."

To which NIMH official Herbert L. Rooney adds: "We're beginning to recognize that people are a natural resource for helping other people."

#### DUKE POWER CO. INVESTS IN SOUTH CAROLINA

**HON. TOM S. GETTYS**

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1972

Mr. GETTYS. Mr. Speaker, Duke Power Co. has just announced that it will build a \$700 million nuclear powerplant in my home county of York in the Fifth Congressional District of South Carolina.

Construction of the new plant is scheduled to commence in 1974 and be completed in 1979 with a capability of generating 2,360,000 kilowatts. It is interesting to note that the generating capacity of the first Duke power station which was built in 1904 had a capacity of 3,300 kilowatt.

The plant will represent the largest investment in a single facility in the history of South Carolina. According to a formula used by the Federal Power Commission, the new installation will produce annually about \$16 million in local and State taxes and about \$19 million in Federal tax revenues. During the 6-year construction period, an average of about 1,500 people will be employed with a total construction payroll of approximately \$85 million. Upon completion, the plant will employ about 100 people with an annual payroll well in excess of \$1 million.

The direct effect of the plant, of course, will be construction and operating payrolls, taxes, and local purchases, but there will be a tremendous indirect impact on the area because of the economic benefit deriving from the assurance of an adequate, reliable supply of electrical power at reasonable cost in the Piedmont Carolinas, one of the fastest growing sections in the Nation.

Duke Power has been analyzing the environmental effects of heated water discharged into its lakes for many years. Recent studies made in cooperation with the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission and Johns Hopkins University show some beneficial and no ill effects of this discharge into Duke lakes.

Most significantly, Duke officials say the radioactive effect of the facility on the environment will be so small as to be practically immeasurable. For example, they say a person living continuously at the edge of the plant site will receive no more radiation in 1 year than a passenger would receive on a single jet flight to California.

Duke Power Co. and the Carolinas have come a long way since March 30, 1904,

when power flowed for the first time from the Catawba River station to the Victoria Cotton Mills at Rock Hill, a firm, incidentally, with which my own father was then associated and of which he later became president. Dr. W. Gil Wylie, a native of nearby Chester County, and William S. Lee, a young engineer, obtained a charter from the South Carolina Legislature in 1901 to mark the beginning of Duke Power Co.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Mr. Carl Horn, president of Duke Power Co., and his associates who have the foresight to plan for the future energy needs of our section of the country. I appreciate too their excellent judgment in expressing their faith in the future by locating this plant in my area of South Carolina.

#### RESULTS OF HON. JAMES HARVEY'S LATEST QUESTIONNAIRE

### HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1972

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the results of our 12th annual congressional questionnaire conducted within our Eighth Congressional District in Michigan. I was delighted with the nearly 20,000 individual responses and we were able to tabulate 18,680 votes.

As I mentioned in a news statement, which follows, along with the detailed county-by-county breakdown of the voting, we did achieve participation by a good number of Eighth District residents.

As always, I am particularly grateful for the wonderful cooperation received from the public media, especially weekly and daily newspapers which printed the questionnaire as a reader service.

The final tabulation includes those totals from the counties of the new Eighth Congressional District but does feature the results of St. Clair County, now aligned with the 12th District.

The news statement, which is being released today, follows along with the final questionnaire results:

#### NEWS STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN HARVEY

WASHINGTON, D.C.—With but three exceptions, Michigan Eighth District residents casting votes in Congressman Jim Harvey's 12th annual Congressional questionnaire were emphatic in taking positions on key domestic and international issues confronting the nation. In the largest response ever, Congressman Jim Harvey announced today results of the "poll" which attracted nearly 20,000 individual responses. The tabulation also is presented in a more comprehensive fashion with a county-by-county breakdown.

Congressman Harvey, expressing great satisfaction with the citizen participation, commented, "We have achieved one of our primary goals of the questionnaire—to get people involved, to give them a convenient and easy way to express their opinions. I am particularly grateful to the fine support and especially those weekly and daily newspapers which saw fit to print the questionnaire as a public service. Everyone had a chance to vote."

The three close votes came on the questions dealing with discontinuance of the

draft next year; Federal legislation on gun controls; and legalization of abortion on a Federal level. The votes on the other 11 questions were one-sided.

On the two special questions, President Richard M. Nixon, as was the case in last year's poll, topped the choices for President by a wide margin while law and order, for the second consecutive year, led a host of "problems" as the "single most important problem facing the nation."

Mr. Harvey said that the results of the question on gun control legislation on a Federal level was also the most surprising. "There is no question that the shooting of Governor George Wallace may have had some influence on this result, as well as continuing deep citizen concern on crime," Harvey said.

Based on tabulation of all the Counties in the new Eighth District, gun control legislation carried by a 49.4%-46.3% margin. On the question of Federal legislation to legalize abortion, it barely lost by a 47.9%-44.8% difference. The third close vote centered on voters favoring continuance of the draft next year by a 51.4%-41.6% edge. "Obviously," Harvey said, "there is serious doubt that a volunteer military service is either possible or acceptable."

President Nixon's Vietnam policy received strong backing. 79.5% voted in favor of a complete withdrawal within four months if American prisoners are returned and there is a cease-fire. On the other hand, some 11.9% favored an immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam without any conditions. Some 8% did not make a choice between the two.

Congressman Harvey, on domestic issues, was keenly interested in the lopsided vote on the question dealing with compulsory arbitration of labor-management disputes in the Transportation industry when a strike is deemed to damage the national interest. Harvey has provided the leadership in Congress with legislative efforts to get approval of such a bill. Over 70 House Members became cosponsors of Harvey's legislation which has been acknowledged as a reasonable compromise. On the questionnaire, 85.1% favored enactment of such legislation with only 10.3% in opposition.

But it was the busing issue that recorded the most resounding result. The question of busing school children in order to achieve racial balance in public schools received a vote of 92.8% against with only 5.6% favoring such action. "Developments in Michigan forecasted a vote against busing," Harvey said, "but I did not expect such a wide margin of defeat."

Voters also turned down extending the Presidential term to six years with a one-term limit by a 70%-26.6% with a near identical result in rejecting a check-off on Federal income tax form for donations to a political party, 71.1%-24.0%.

Perhaps tired already of the Presidential campaign, voters gave strong backing to a national Presidential primary election, 62.3% to 30.5%.

It wasn't close on the question of whether to grant amnesty to those who evaded military service during the Vietnam conflict. Voters turned this down 75.8% to 19.8%. The same margin existed on present wage and price controls to combat inflation with 76% favoring the program and only 19.5% against. Also, 74.2% as against 20.6% favored expansion of cultural and trade relations with both Communist China and the Soviet Union.

On two final votes, the margin was closer. 56.2% voted against Federal assistance to private and parochial schools with 41.2% in favor. On whether to divert some highway user taxes for financing urban mass transit systems, 39.9% were in favor and 53.5% against.

President Nixon gained favor with 50.2% of the voters as compared to his percentage of 54.4% last year. Governor Wallace ran second with 15.8% and Senator George McGovern was third with 10.2%. There was a large undecided vote, some 20.4%.

On the single most important problem, law and order was selected by 18.4% with Vietnam named by 14.4%. The economy was the choice of 12.2%. These were the three biggest vote getters with taxes, drugs, welfare, unemployment, morality, governmental bureaucracy and pollution also receiving wide mention.

#### FINAL 1972 CONGRESSIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

[Total responses, 18,680; new 8th district, 15,116; St. Clair County, 3,564]

	Percent			Total tabulated (percent)
	Yes	No	Unde- cided	
<b>DO YOU FAVOR</b>				
<b>1. Expanded cultural and trade relations with Communist China and the Soviet Union?</b>				
Arenac County (part).....	73.2	24.7	2.1	155
Bay County.....	75.4	20.2	4.4	3,190
Huron County.....	78.1	15.8	6.1	1,177
Lapeer County.....	72.9	21.9	5.2	834
Saginaw County.....	73.5	20.2	6.3	6,632
St. Clair County.....	70.5	24.0	5.5	3,564
Sanilac County.....	70.6	24.7	5.7	1,448
Tuscola County.....	74.9	21.4	3.7	1,583
Total new 8th district.....	74.2	20.6	5.2	14,961

(Select 1):				
<b>2. (a) Immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam without any conditions?</b>				
			Yes (percent)	
Arenac County (part).....			9.3	
Bay County.....			15.2	
Huron County.....			12.2	
Lapeer County.....			11.2	
Saginaw County.....			11.0	
St. Clair County.....			10.2	
Sanilac County.....			7.3	
Tuscola County.....			11.5	
Total new 8th district.....			11.9	

<b>(b) Complete withdrawal within 4 months if American prisoners are returned and there is a cease-fire?</b>				
Arenac County (part).....			74.2	
Bay County.....			76.1	
Huron County.....			80.3	
Lapeer County.....			78.3	
Saginaw County.....			80.0	
St. Clair County.....			80.2	
Sanilac County.....			83.0	
Tuscola County.....			79.5	
Total new 8th district.....			79.5	

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Undecided
<b>3. Granting amnesty to those who evaded military service during the Vietnam conflict?</b>			
Arenac County (part).....	13.4	83.5	3.1
Bay County.....	21.4	75.2	3.4
Huron County.....	21.0	73.1	5.9
Lapeer County.....	18.2	77.6	4.2
Saginaw County.....	20.0	76.0	4.0
St. Clair County.....	17.0	79.9	3.1
Sanilac County.....	16.7	80.9	2.4
Tuscola County.....	18.9	74.8	6.3
Total new 8th district.....	19.8	75.8	4.4

<b>4. Discontinuance of the draft next year?</b>			
Arenac County (part).....	34.0	58.8	7.2
Bay County.....	44.7	49.4	5.9
Huron County.....	39.2	52.2	8.6
Lapeer County.....	42.0	49.5	8.5
Saginaw County.....	40.0	53.0	7.0
St. Clair County.....	42.9	48.9	8.2
Sanilac County.....	41.4	49.6	9.0
Tuscola County.....	43.2	48.7	8.1
Total new 8th district.....	41.6	51.4	7.0



	Percent		
	Yes	No	Undecided
5. A national Presidential primary election?			
Arenac County (part)...	57.7	37.1	5.2
Bay County.....	67.4	27.7	4.9
Huron County.....	57.9	36.5	5.6
Lapeer County.....	67.3	25.9	6.8
Saginaw County.....	62.0	30.0	8.0
St. Clair County.....	57.6	35.2	7.2
Sanilac County.....	59.9	31.0	9.1
Tuscola County.....	56.8	35.2	8.0
Total new 8th district.....	62.3	30.5	7.2
6. Extending Presidential term to 6 years with 1-term limit?			
Arenac County (part)...	18.6	77.3	4.1
Bay County.....	24.8	71.7	3.5
Huron County.....	21.7	77.6	1.7
Lapeer County.....	25.2	72.7	2.1
Saginaw County.....	30.0	68.0	4.0
St. Clair County.....	21.7	74.7	3.6
Sanilac County.....	20.4	76.8	2.6
Tuscola County.....	24.5	71.5	4.0
Total new 8th district.....	26.6	70.0	3.4
7. A check-off on your Federal income tax form for donations to political parties?			
Arenac County (part)...	12.4	80.4	7.2
Bay County.....	27.6	69.2	3.2
Huron County.....	25.6	68.8	5.6
Lapeer County.....	20.0	77.4	2.6
Saginaw County.....	26.5	68.3	5.2
St. Clair County.....	23.6	70.9	5.5
Sanilac County.....	14.9	81.2	3.8
Tuscola County.....	21.3	74.7	4.0
Total new 8th district.....	24.4	71.1	4.5
8. Busing of school children in order to achieve racial balance in public schools?			
Arenac County (part)...	7.2	91.8	1.0
Bay County.....	7.5	90.5	2.0
Huron County.....	6.4	92.7	0.9
Lapeer County.....	5.8	92.8	1.4
Saginaw County.....	6.0	93.0	1.0
St. Clair County.....	4.9	93.5	1.6
Sanilac County.....	2.1	96.5	1.4
Tuscola County.....	3.4	93.9	2.7
Total new 8th district.....	5.6	92.8	1.6
9. Federal assistance to private and parochial schools?			
Arenac County (part)...	39.2	56.7	4.1
Bay County.....	45.5	52.2	2.3
Huron County.....	37.5	57.7	4.8
Lapeer County.....	30.6	65.8	3.6
Saginaw County.....	44.5	53.7	2.8
St. Clair County.....	35.3	61.4	3.3
Sanilac County.....	32.8	64.6	2.8
Tuscola County.....	34.4	62.9	2.7
Total new 8th district.....	41.2	56.2	2.6
10. Present wage and price controls to combat inflation?			
Arenac County (part)...	75.3	17.5	7.2
Bay County.....	73.2	22.0	4.8
Huron County.....	82.3	13.4	4.3
Lapeer County.....	75.4	19.8	4.8
Saginaw County.....	77.1	19.2	3.7
St. Clair County.....	79.7	15.7	4.6
Sanilac County.....	74.9	20.2	4.9
Tuscola County.....	74.3	19.6	6.1
Total new 8th district.....	76.0	19.5	4.5
11. Compulsory arbitration of labor-management disputes in the transportation industry when a strike is deemed to damage the national interest?			
Arenac County (part)...	84.5	11.3	4.2
Bay County.....	84.5	10.6	4.9
Huron County.....	88.0	6.3	5.7
Lapeer County.....	83.5	11.5	5.0
Saginaw County.....	85.0	11.2	3.8
St. Clair County.....	87.0	9.5	3.5
Sanilac County.....	88.7	6.7	4.6
Tuscola County.....	82.9	11.9	5.2
Total new 8th district.....	85.1	10.3	4.6

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Undecided
12. Diverting some highway user taxes to finance urban mass transit systems?			
Arenac County (part)...	28.9	64.9	6.2
Bay County.....	44.9	48.8	6.3
Huron County.....	31.7	60.6	7.7
Lapeer County.....	33.2	63.5	3.3
Saginaw County.....	45.6	47.8	6.6
St. Clair County.....	45.5	46.8	7.7
Sanilac County.....	26.7	65.1	8.2
Tuscola County.....	28.3	64.8	6.9
Total new 8th district.....	39.9	53.5	6.6
13. Increase gun control legislation on a Federal level?			
Arenac County (part)...	42.3	55.6	2.1
Bay County.....	51.4	45.3	3.3
Huron County.....	46.0	48.0	6.0
Lapeer County.....	43.6	52.8	3.6
Saginaw County.....	53.0	42.8	4.2
St. Clair County.....	55.0	39.9	5.1
Sanilac County.....	43.3	51.8	4.9
Tuscola County.....	42.2	52.1	5.7
Total new 8th district.....	49.4	46.3	4.3
14. Federal legislation to legalize abortion?			
Arenac County (part)...	44.3	48.5	7.2
Bay County.....	46.4	47.2	6.4
Huron County.....	36.4	55.5	8.1
Lapeer County.....	45.7	48.0	6.2
Saginaw County.....	47.9	45.1	7.1
St. Clair County.....	46.0	44.7	9.0
Sanilac County.....	40.0	51.2	8.8
Tuscola County.....	39.0	52.6	8.4
Total new 8th district.....	44.8	47.9	7.3

As of now, who is your choice for President in November?

Arenac County (part): Nixon 48.5%; Wallace 22.7%; McGovern 13.4%; Humphrey 3.1%.

Bay County: Nixon 40.5%; Undecided 22.8%; McGovern 15.9%; Wallace 13.9%; Humphrey 3.3%; Muskie 1.5%.

Huron County: Nixon 52.8%; Undecided 24.5%; Wallace 10.8%; McGovern 9.5%; Humphrey 1.6%.

Lapeer County: Nixon 47.1%; Wallace 21.2%; Undecided 17.6%; McGovern 10.1%; Humphrey 2.5%.

Saginaw County: Nixon 54.5%; Undecided 20.3%; Wallace 13.6%; McGovern 8.6%; Humphrey 1.8%.

Sanilac County: Nixon 50.8%; Wallace 23.1%; Undecided 17.2%; McGovern 7.4%.

St. Clair County: Nixon 48.9%; Undecided 23.5%; Wallace 17.7%; McGovern 7.7%; Humphrey 1.2%.

Tuscola County: Nixon 47.7%; Wallace 22.8%; Undecided 18.4%; McGovern 8.2%; Humphrey 2.3%.

Total new 8th District: Nixon 50.2%; Undecided 20.4%; Wallace 15.8%; McGovern 10.2%; Humphrey 2.1%.

WHAT IS THE SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEM FACING THE NATION?

Arenac County (part): Economy 14.4%; Vietnam 12.4%; Welfare 11.3%; Law and Order 5.3%; Taxes 5.2%; Drugs 4.3%; Unemployment 4.2%; Bureaucracy 4.2%.

Bay County: Vietnam 16.1%; Economy 11.3%; Law and Order 10.8%; Taxes 8.0%; Unemployment 5.7%; Bureaucracy 5.2%; Welfare 4.6%; Morality 4.0%; Drugs 3.5%.

Huron County: Law and Order 17.8%; Vietnam 15.5%; Economy 13.7%; Drugs 6.6%; Welfare 5.5%; Taxes 4.2%; Morality 4.0%; Unemployment 3.7%.

Lapeer County: Vietnam 17.3%; Law and Order 13.3%; Economy 11.0%; Morality 8.2%; Taxes 7.1%; Bureaucracy 4.9%; Unemployment 3.6%; Drugs 3.6%; Pollution 3.5%; Welfare 3.1%.

Saginaw County: Law and Order 23.5%;

Vietnam 13.2%; Economy 11.9%; Drugs 6.5%; Taxes 5.1%; Morality 3.5%; Welfare 3.2%; Pollution 2.7%; Bureaucracy 2.6%.

St. Clair County: Law and Order 16.2%; Economy 15.2%; Vietnam 13.5%; Drugs 6.3%; Taxes 5.9%; Welfare 4.2%; Bureaucracy 3.7%; Morality 3.4%; Unemployment 2.8%; Pollution 2.6%.

Sanilac County: Law and Order 17.1%; Economy 16.2%; Vietnam 13.3%; Welfare 4.2%; Morality 4.4%; Drugs 3.7%; Taxes 3.6%; Unemployment 2.4%; Busing 2.2%; Bureaucracy 2.1%.

Tuscola County: Law and Order 18.0%; Vietnam 15.1%; Economy 11.5%; Morality 6.1%; Taxes 6.0%; Bureaucracy 4.3%; Drugs 4.5%; Welfare 3.6%; Unemployment 1.9%.

## SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN SPENCE

### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, to observe Captive Nations Week, the people of the Republic of China held a mass rally at Taipei, Taiwan, with our colleague, Congressman FLOYD SPENCE, as the featured speaker. Congressman SPENCE is an outstanding Member of Congress who is especially knowledgeable in the field of foreign affairs. He is dedicated to the maintenance of firmness, courage, and realism in our foreign policy and, in view of the great significance of his remarks in Taipei, I insert his speech into the RECORD at this point:

#### SPEECH OF FLOYD SPENCE

Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Guests, and Friends:

It is a very great honor and privilege for me to be with you for this, the 13th annual observance of Captive Nation's week.

We are living in an era of uncertainty and change in the field of international relations—an era which deeply concerns and troubles me as I know it does all of you.

In the past year we have witnessed the sudden and startling admission of Communist China to the United Nations, after years of opposition to such a move and without any demonstrated change in her own position or any evidence whatsoever that she will live up to the requirements of the U.N. Charter.

It was not enough that the doors of the world's peacekeeping organization were thrown open to a belligerent, totalitarian regime, in violation of the Charter, but the United Nations further ignored and perverted its own rules in order to give China's seat on the Security Council to Peking, replacing the rightful and long-recognized legal government of China—the Republic of China.

As a Member of the United States House of Representatives, I strongly opposed Peking's admission to the United Nations. I believe it was a tragic error. Officially, the United States government stood by its traditional policy of opposing the admission of Peking. I am aware, however, that many people and nations who shared that stance are of the opinion that the then-impending U.S.-Peking summit meeting created an atmosphere in which official deeds appeared to contradict official words. Therefore the United States government is blamed for the U.N. action, despite her official opposition to it.

I am inclined to agree with that analysis. Whether or not the result was intended by

official Washington, it was imminently predictable.

From the summit meeting in Peking last Fall, we moved to the summit meeting in Moscow this Spring. Here the results of several years of Strategic Arms Limitations Talks were announced, embodied in treaties and agreements now before the United States Congress for ratification. Again, there is serious question as to just what the effect or results of these agreements will be.

If the Soviets follow their historical pattern—and there is no reason to assume they will do otherwise—they will honor the agreements only so long and to such extent, as it may suit their own purposes. On the other hand, it may be safely assumed that the United States will endeavor to honor the agreements which seem, indeed, even on their face, to place greater restraints upon our arms, both defense and offensive, than upon the Soviets.

Yet, the agreements have, thus far, engendered precious little opposition in the Congress. In fact, there now appears to be serious concern that the treaties will be ratified so easily as to place the United States in a weaker negotiating position during Phase II of the SALT talks than was the case in Phase I. An effort is now being mounted to encourage more vocal opposition.

Similarly, though they encountered much heavier opposition, the Berlin agreement and the so-called Moscow and Warsaw Treaties with West Germany survived that opposition and have, thus, branded as official policy certain aspects of Communist diplomatic blackmail which were long resisted by predecessor governments in Bonn.

These and other very significant changes have taken place recently on the international scene in terms of Communist-Free World relations. They are disturbing developments which raise many doubts and questions about the future.

But, looming massive in the background of all this change, is one undisputed constant. Communism has not changed! It is still Communism with all that it implies in terms of captive people, totalitarian states, international imperialism, diplomatic blackmail, and visions of World conquest. And those implications remain the same, whether the brand of Communism be that of Soviet Russia or Red China.

If there has been a mellowing in Soviet Russia it is not apparent in their attitude toward resolving the Vietnam conflict. It is not apparent in the backing they gave to the recent nationalization of the oil industry in Iraq. It is not apparent in the threats of renewed Cold War if West Germany did not ratify the Moscow and Warsaw Treaties.

If there is a thawing in the behavior of Red China, it is not apparent in their attitude toward ending the conflict in Vietnam and their extensive supplying of the North Vietnamese. It is not apparent in their continued holding of American prisoners. It is not apparent in the new chants heard during their May Day celebrations—chants such as these:

"Peoples of the world, unite to crush American aggressors and their running dogs."

"Support the American people against the American government's aggressive policy."

But I do not need to tell you here of the recalcitrant arrogance of the mainland government of China—or of its atrocities or its unconscionable treatment of its own captive citizens.

It is a very dangerous game to play at diplomacy with Communists. If history teaches us nothing else, it teaches us that.

That is the reason this annual observance of Captive Nations Week is so vitally important. For it regularly focuses the attention of the world upon the one immutable fact we must never forget—that Communism

does not change, it only appears to change in ways that suit the goals of international domination. Communists do not go to the negotiating table to negotiate—they go there to win. Just as the Soviets play chess to win and the Chinese Communists play ping-pong to win, their leaders negotiate, not to compromise, but to win.

You, here in the Republic of China, deserve the highest commendation and accolades of the Free World for the leadership you have exercised and the burdens you have borne with equanimity in the ongoing struggle to see that free men do not forget the real nature—the real face—of their communist enemy.

Even though I am not here as an official representative of my government, I believe I can tell you with assurance that the United States is not going to withdraw from the world or betray its long-standing commitments to its allies. You may hear voices from the United States to the effect that we should withdraw from the world and turn our attentions inward to domestic matters, but those are not the true voices of America. They do not represent the will or the desires of the American people.

As a world leader and a free nation, we cannot and will not cast aside our leadership responsibilities or abandon our many small-nation allies. We are aware that the people of Taiwan, and of many other small democratic nations, cannot defend themselves without our support. Wherever the leaders of the Free World leave a vacuum, it is clear that the Communists move in and take over. It is this process of gradualism which led to the decline of the British Empire, and we must not let history repeat itself in this fashion. It is the small island nations on the perimeter of Asia which are the key to whether or not Asians will be free or enslaved. Our leaders, both civilian and military, know this. And I firmly believe that, whatever you may hear to the contrary, the American people will never abandon their allies to communist enslavement.

Still, the struggle for freedom will not be easy for any of us. This was impressed on me with shocking vividness on a recent trip to West Germany when I endeavored to make a brief excursion into the Eastern sector while visiting Berlin.

In the process, I was separated from my companions and taken to an interrogation room where I was questioned and confined for nearly an hour. I was never told the purpose of this or given any kind of explanation. My passport and all identification were taken from me before the interrogation began. It was an altogether unreal and unbelievable experience. At the time it angered me more than anything else. But, looking back, I realize that I experienced some of the concern, some of the misgivings, indeed, some of the fear, which the people of captive nations face as a daily routine.

It is appalling that people anywhere should have to live in such fear and regimentation, possessed of no rights but those which the state sees fit to give them.

This is the struggle which must continue—the struggle to assure peace, freedom and the right of self-determination to all peoples everywhere. It is a struggle in which free peoples must maintain a common and united front. It is a struggle in which there is no room for the "quitter"—no place for discouragement and doom-crying.

I have stressed some of the cause of concern in the current course of our struggle.

Let me turn, for the moment, to some of the more encouraging signs. Though they lost the first over ratification of the treaties, the opposition party in the West German Parliament served notice that such matters cannot be taken for granted. And they obtained agreement in interpretation of some provisions which might otherwise have been

construed more disastrously—especially on points relating to German reunification.

In Italy the electorate recently chose a more conservative government.

Despite the cause for concern over the SALT agreements, they seem to have served as a catalyst for a more determined effort in the U.S. Congress to appropriate funds at a reasonable level for national defense and to move ahead with new programs such as the B-1 bomber and the Undersea Long-Range Missile program.

On a broader front, I believe there will be increased pressure upon the Soviets and upon Peking to measure up to the promise and the hopes which many in the Free World have invested in the developments of the "new era of negotiation." If they do, we are all winners. If they do not—as I strongly suspect they will not—it is incumbent upon each of us here to exploit that failure to the utmost.

Negotiation can be made a two-way street—a two-edged sword, if you will—if we do not give in to despair. One of the real difficulties in maintaining a strong united front against Communism today is the creeping acceptance among free peoples of the idea that the Communists have changed—that somehow they have come to want peace as much as we and are willing to compromise and can be trusted to carry out their agreements and abide by their treaties.

If the Communists once again raise the hopes of the world only to shatter them with cynical displays of self-serving and deceit, it may do more to awaken free people to the challenge than anything we could have done. We must be alert to that potential and prepare to seize it as an opportunity rather than accept it as yet another dismal blow to freedom.

There is an old saying in my country, "United we stand, divided we fall." While we may disagree widely among ourselves over the best ways of meeting the challenge, we must never let these differences blot out our awareness of the common enemy nor weaken our resolve to resist. Much has been made of the schism between Moscow and Peking as evidence that the world Communist movement is hopelessly divided. You and I know that, whatever their apparent differences, their goals are the same and when it suits the purpose they will be perfectly capable of uniting to further that common purpose, just as their present differences may well serve that same common purpose.

Here, then, is the lesson. Let us here resolve that, regardless of our differences or disappointments, we are determined that nothing can deflect us from pursuing our common goal which is full freedom for the captive and enslaved peoples of our world. Together, with both history and moral strength on our side, we are more than equal to the task.

#### SALUTE TO ORDER OF AHEPA

#### HON. BROCK ADAMS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1972

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association for their efforts to improve American life over the past 50 years. This voluntary fraternal organization was founded in the city of Atlanta, Ga., on July 26, 1922. Since that time, AHEPA has made innumerable and valuable contributions, especially in the areas of disaster relief, scholarships to worthy students, and the instruction of their members in American citizenship.



While preserving and perpetuating the heritage and culture that is theirs by birth, the AHEPA strives to promote and encourage loyalty to the United States. This organization is highly respected in Washington State as a champion of the cause of education and a nonpartisan force dedicated to the improvement and betterment of social, moral, and family life.

The State of Washington is fortunate and proud to have such an organization and such dedicated, loyal citizens. We salute them during their golden anniversary celebration.

#### ROSEMEAD, CALIF., CELEBRATES ITS 13TH BIRTHDAY

**HON. GEORGE E. DANIELSON**  
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Monday, July 31, 1972

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, on August 4, 1959, the city of Rosemead, Calif., was incorporated. On Saturday, evening, August 5, Rosemead citizens will be celebrating the city's 13th birthday at Rosemead Park. This year's emphasis is on community involvement, with activities planned for the entire family. Stage entertainment, rides, games, teen dance, and a barbecue dinner are some of the activities planned for the occasion. I want to take this time to congratulate the city of Rosemead and its people for their community spirit and growth.

Rosemead has a long and colorful history. In 1769, Father Junipero Serra entered what is now California and commenced the construction of the famous California missions. In 1771, the Franciscans established the San Gabriel Mission in the San Gabriel Valley along El Camino Real between Mexico and Monterey, Calif. California later, in 1821, became Mexican territory, and on September 9, 1850, it became the 31st State to be admitted to the Union.

The community of Rosemead developed around the Savannah Ranch and the Rosemead Ranch. John and Harriet Guess came to settle in the area around 1852, purchasing the Savannah Ranch—100 acres along what is now known as Valley Boulevard—by 1867. L. J. Rose established his Rosemead Ranch in 1866 between today's Rosemead Boulevard, Walnut Grove Avenue, Grand Avenue, and Shea Place. The city got its name from the old Rose Ranch. Other pioneers moving west followed Rose and Guess, and throughout the 1880's Rosemead consisted primarily of large ranches.

By 1920, Rosemead had been divided into small truck farming areas and chicken and rabbit farms. In 1919, the first grocery store was opened, with two more stores opened shortly thereafter. The 365 residents in the area objected to this "commercialism," pointing out that Rosemead was a residential area. In spite of objections, Rosemead grew, and other businesses developed. In 1925, Rosemead had its first newspaper, the Rosemead Review. In 1927, the Rosemead Chamber of Commerce was chartered. The First City Bank and a local post office were established in 1928.

By 1930, 50 businesses, the Forum Club, Women's Club, public library, a doctor, several churches, two schools, and other civic developments were situated in Rosemead. The population had grown to 5,000.

As in all of California during the 1940's and 1950's, Rosemead grew. When the city incorporated in 1959 the population was 16,000. Rosemead developed under the council-manager form of government, contracting with Los Angeles County for many of its city services.

Today, Rosemead has a population of approximately 42,000. It is a well-balanced community, with industry, commerce, and fine residential areas. It is known as a warm, friendly city with a wealth of civic and service groups and churches.

I am happy to commend the people of the city of Rosemead for their achievements of the past 13 years and to extend my best wishes for the future as Rosemead continues to make its contribution as a young city in the San Gabriel Valley.

#### FAKE IDENTIFICATION CARDS: THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE TASK FORCE REPORT—PART X

**HON. ABNER J. MIKVA**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Monday, July 31, 1972

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, every college student knows how easy it is to evade the drinking age laws with the use of a false identification card. Reporters from the Chicago Tribune found that it is just as easy to evade the licensing requirements of the Nation's gun control laws.

Guns kill 10,000 Americans each year. The Chicago Tribune recently created a task force to study this epidemic of violence. This is the final article in a series of 10 task force reports:

#### GUN REGISTRATION MADE EASY (By Pamela Zekman)

I am a registered firearms owner in the State of Illinois—or at least my face is.

The card issued June 24, 1972, by the Illinois Department of Law Enforcement bears a picture of me wearing a blond wig, but it says my name is Sally Wagner. I am not Sally Wagner.

Because the state's licensing law does not require an applicant's fingerprints, the department has no way of knowing that I am not the person I said I was, conceded Mario Costa, administrator of the Firearms Owners Identification Department.

#### IDENTIFICATION DIFFICULTIES

In fact, it has no way of knowing for sure if I am an ex-convict or a former mental patient, tho the state law prohibits such persons from obtaining firearms cards.

And the state mental health department does not give out information on former patients' backgrounds. "So we have no way of checking that," said Costa. "We usually find out after the card has been issued and a man gets in trouble and a local law enforcement officer or a relative calls to find out why in the hell the man was given a firearms permit in the first place."

#### 3,500 CARD DENIALS

Since the state law was enacted in July, 1968, 1,140,000 Illinois residents have received

firearms identification cards, Costa said. Permits have been denied to 3,500 applicants found to have a felony record when a name check was made with the FBI or the state Bureau of Identification. The cards are required for any purchase of a firearm in Illinois.

I got my card through Howard Ehrlich, 42, who placed an advertisement in a daily newspaper recently to sell an "enforcer" carbine. Reporters responded to the ad, as any citizen could have done, and found Ehrlich ready and willing to sell his "collection" of handguns. He had some 300 to sell, he said at one point, and was unloading them to buy new parts for his yacht.

Ehrlich is not a licensed gun dealer, but the 1968 federal Gun Control Act does not prohibit private citizens from selling their own weapons.

Ehrlich, who shares offices with his brother at 2726 W. Peterson Av., runs the H. Ehrlich Construction Co.; his brother operates several amusement companies that run X-rated movie theaters.

#### SURROUNDED BY GUNS

On May 19 I visited Ehrlich in his office and found him surrounded by an assortment of guns, model cars, cameras, and sheriff's badges. He had been a deputy for Sheriff Richard Elrod for three months and helped run Elrod's campaign, he said.

Ehrlich refused to sell me a gun until I got a state firearms card. I protested that it would take too long. I needed a gun soon, I said, because I was afraid of being mugged. "We'll get you a card. It won't take long. I can take care of it," he said.

#### PROMISES TO USE GUN

He informed me that he was the 48th Ward secretary [he no longer is] and was "in heavy with the Mayor's office."

Taking care of a firearms permit meant he would have the application expedited by calling his "good friend" who is a former state official.

"I'll take the application down to him, and he'll push it through. He's a friend of mine and he'll do it," said Ehrlich.

#### APPLICATION COMPLETED

With that settled, he filled out my application, using Sally Wagner's driver's license. [The firearms identification law does not even provide for revocation of a card when an applicant uses a name other than his own.]

To the questions Ehrlich read from the form, I responded: No, I wasn't an ex-mental patient, nor was I ever convicted of a crime.

#### LAPSES OF MEMORY

That was it. A week later Ehrlich told me his friend agreed to "expedite the matter." Three weeks later the card arrived in the mail. It usually takes four to five weeks, Costa said. The card enables me to buy any number of firearms at any gun shop in the state.

As Sally Wagner I later thanked the ex-state official for his assistance, and he responded: "You're welcome. I'm glad you got it. How long did it take?"

As Pamela Zekman, I asked the same man two hours later if he had helped expedite the permit as a favor to Ehrlich. "I can't recall," he said.

First he said he couldn't remember Ehrlich; then he said he could. Then he denied expediting the permit but admitted he had done such things in the past for deputy sheriffs and a handful of personal friends. "I can do it in three or four days," he said.

#### SEEKS SUITABLE WEAPON

While waiting for the card, Ehrlich and I negotiated about a gun. He pulled three handguns from his carved wood desk but then decided his supply didn't include a weapon suitable for me.

"I'll ask around and get the right kind," he said. "I have friends, and they have guns, and I'll ask them and we'll fix you up with the right thing."

The firearms laws are silent about a collector selling a personally owned weapon, Ehrlich now indicated his willingness to step into the role of a dealer, obtaining weapons from others to sell to a customer.

#### RULES OUT DERRINGERS

When I inquired if a small derringer would be best for me, he explained the disadvantages of owning such a weapon.

If assailants should come thru the door, he said, "a derringer won't stop them. It'll just make them mad. But [with] one of these babies that I want for you, the bullet will jump around inside and really mess him up, and he'll know he's been hit."

Had I gone thru with the transaction, I could have owned a weapon like that under an assumed name. It never could have been traced to me.

#### DETAILS GUN'S DRAWBACKS

Ehrlich displayed similar concern about owning the appropriate weapon when reporter Philip Caputo visited his office in response to the advertisement a week before my visit. Caputo said he wanted a good weapon for self-protection.

He should not buy a snubnosed revolver, Ehrlich said, because "you might jam it into your belt, and you may be out with a broad some night, and some guy makes you mad and you shoot him. Then you're in trouble because you're not allowed to carry a gun."

#### TRIBUTE TO ALLEN J. ELLENDER

### HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1972

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of great loss that I offer these words to the family of Allen Ellender in behalf of one of the most outstanding Members of the U.S. Congress, Allen J. Ellender. He was a man of deep conviction who stated what he thought, and when he spoke the Congress listened. His diligence and effective labors in behalf of the management of this country's funds in the U.S. Senate and in other Government agencies, his concern for our Nation's public welfare, and his leadership in developing a prosperous, strong and effective agriculture and country have left a legacy to the Congress of the United States and to the people of Louisiana which will never be forgotten.

Senator Ellender's legislative philosophy, which he lived and practiced in whatever he did, summarizes the true sense of our democratic process. He set a pace that kept most everyone straining to match; he established a record of accomplishments that was nothing short of astounding. He never forgot the needs of the people of Louisiana and he worked faithfully for them. His devotion to his senatorial duties and his performance in the execution of them serve as a model to us all.

Senator Ellender was by far one of the most influential Members of Congress during his 36 years on Capitol Hill. He was elected President pro tempore of the U.S. Senate in February 1971, which is the highest honor the Senate can bestow on one of its Members. He was also chairman of the Senate Appropriations

Committee, in which position he oversaw the entire Federal budget—more than \$200 billion annually. He also served as ranking member of the Senate Public Works Committee, as ranking member and past chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, a member of the Senate Democratic Steering Committee, and a member of the Senate Democratic Policy Committee.

Allen Ellender was an outstanding American in the greatest tradition of the Founding Fathers. He believed in America. He believed in a strong America. He was a true Southern gentleman of the highest caliber—a credit to his people in Louisiana, and to his country.

Mr. Speaker, I join all my colleagues in expressing my heartfelt sympathies and deepest respect to his family, and the people of Louisiana, in their sorrow and bereavement.

#### LONGSTANDING FRIENDSHIP ENDANGERED

### HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1972

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John D. Montgomery, publisher of the Junction City, Kans., Daily Union, who is familiar with Latin American affairs, has written a thought-provoking editorial which has significant bearing upon our U.S. economy and foreign policy. The editorial cites key examples of how State Department and congressional actions can have economic consequences here at home as well as endanger longstanding friendships with Latin American countries such as Brazil.

The editorial follows:

[From the Junction City (Kan.) Union]

LONGSTANDING FRIENDSHIP ENDANGERED

(By John D. Montgomery)

During the past few years there has been a tendency on the part of some members of Congress and some State Department personnel to promote sanctions against the Brazilian Government. These attitudes have tended to erode a long-standing friendship and also to forestall mutually beneficial transactions. Only recently a senator from an aircraft producing state proposed that the military assistance program for Brazil then pending before Congress be denied. Fortunately the program, which is a small one involving only training and technical advisory activities, was allowed to remain.

Since 1969, these negative actions and attitudes have precluded the United States from making substantial sales to Brazil. For example, in 1968 the Brazilian Government desired to buy a squadron of F-5 jet aircraft from the U.S. Because of Congressional and State Department attitudes toward the Brazilian Government, the purchase of the F-5 was denied and instead jet aircraft in an amount of over 80 million dollars were purchased in France. If our attitude had not been negative, the purchase could have been made in the United States. Another example is a ship building program of over 100 million dollars that could have been arranged with the United States but instead

went to a European ship builder. Still another example is the purchase arrangement with an Italian aircraft company for over 100 jet trainers. A more logical buy would have been the T-37 trainer from Wichita, Kansas, inasmuch as the Brazilian Air Force already has in its inventory the T-37. The additional buy of T-37 would have been a natural add-on and was preferred by the Brazilian Air Force. Each example above, it must be noted, involved a purchase and not military grant aid.

Not only did the loss of the above sales, and others not mentioned above, deny United States firms of substantial sales but also lost the residual benefits in years to come in the purchase of spare parts, handling equipment, etc. In addition, and probably more far reaching than the dollar loss, will be the additional import to Brazil of European technical know how and skills which since World War II has been a primary area of influence of the United States. This could spill over into the civilian sphere in Brazil, affecting industrial and commercial development according to Common Market trends rather than our own.

This depressing situation has been brought about by a small group who fail to recognize that Brazil is not a banana republic run by an oppressive military dictatorship. The Brazilian military did oust a corrupt regime in 1964 and installed an efficient, effective and pro U.S. government. Not only has the economy grown over 50 per cent during the past five years, with an increased GNP of 11.3 per cent in 1971, but equally important have been the tremendous social improvements in the country. To cite only two examples of many impressive gains: since 1964 primary education enrollments have more than doubled, and more public housing has been built than during the entire previous history of Brazil. If we are to continue our forward position with Brazil as this vast country develops, those few nay-sayers in Congress and in the Administration must put Brazil in its true perspective in order to develop our policies which can mutually accommodate the United States and this tremendously large and progressive country of 200 million people.

#### FOREIGN GAS HIGH PRICED

### HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1972

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Commerce Committee is soon to consider the Murphy bill. This bill provides for sanctity of gas contract so domestic oil and gas exploration can be intensified.

Drilling has been running at half past performance levels while gas demand reaches new highs. The poorest answer for gas shortage is foreign imports of extremely high-priced gas.

Clyde La Motte wrote a story out of Washington on the impact from Algerian Gas imports. This article in the business page of the Dallas Morning News makes sense. You will be interested in reading the facts in La Motte's story in the Dallas News:

IMPACT OF ALGERIAN GAS IMPORTS

(By Clyde La Motte)

WASHINGTON.—There was no dancing in the streets when the Federal Power Commission recently approved a plan which would add about one billion cubic feet a day to the nation's dwindling supply of natural gas.



The whopper of a plan involves shipments in liquefied form (LNG) from Algeria by special tankers to U.S. markets.

Furthermore, FPC approval doubtlessly will add momentum to other such plans. Already there has been talk of a deal with the Soviet Union for vast quantities of LNG. And a Pacific Coast utility is planning on importing up to 500 million feet of gas a day from Australia.

These plans, and others being formulated, would boost this nation's available supply of energy substantially.

Still there was no dancing. Rather, there were rumblings of discontent over the sobering realization that the United States, once abundantly self-sufficient is readily available energy resources at low prices, was becoming a have-not nation paying unbelievably high prices for gas from abroad.

The power commission was unhappy over its own decision. It said, in effect, that it was approving the Algerian plan because it really didn't have any other choice, short of letting U.S. consumers do without adequate supplies.

It said its action was "an exercise of our responsibility in carrying out our policy to remedy the gas shortage to the extent we are able to do so."

Commissioner Pinkney Walker voiced the discontent in this fashion: "It is not rational to approve the importation of foreign LNG, which is currently approximately twice as expensive as domestic supplies, without moving ahead to develop policies which will stimulate domestic production and lead to additional incremental supplies at a lesser price."

Commissioner Rush Moody Jr., who said he voted for the plan with "grave reservations," also noted the high-cost aspect of the imported LNG. He said the agency's approval puts it in the awkward position of permitting the purchasing companies—Southern Natural Gas Co., Columbia Gas System and Consolidated Natural Gas Co.—to contract with their respective LNG subsidiaries for gas at a price approximately \$1 per thousand cubic feet while prohibiting the same companies from paying Independent domestic producer area rate of more than 26¢.

Moody reached the conclusion domestic producers reached long ago: "Decontrol of domestic gas prices, through amendment of the Natural Gas Act, is now necessary."

Moody said: "It is self-evident that if we are to continue our regulation of natural gas prices under the Natural Gas Act as now written and interpreted, we will only bring to the American consumer the highest priced gas."

He said the FPC is bound tightly by yesterday's law which cannot meet today's necessities.

Walker said it is important to throw off "slavish adherence" to the traditional cost-of-service approach to rate-making with its heavy reliance on historical cost. "We must undertake a comprehensive review of our producer regulation and determine how it can be modified to better serve the public interest," he said.

Domestic gas producers could hardly help but be dismayed by the prospect that billions of dollars are likely to be poured into foreign facilities at a time when FPC imposed ceilings are driving away investment capital from domestic sources.

Many are convinced that the United States still has a tremendous potential of undiscovered and underdeveloped gas reserves of its own which could be brought to the marketplace if the price were right.

The cost of the Algerian project alone will run about \$1.6 billion. That's in addition to the outflow of funds for the billion cubic feet of gas daily. Through its subsidiaries, will buy the gas from the government-controlled Algerian firm, Sonatrach, in liquid form and transport the LNG by tanker to two U.S. East

Coast ports for sale to the three pipeline transmission companies.

There is a possibility that the Algerian deal may fall through yet, despite FPC's authorization. The reason: FPC imposed several conditions, including elimination of an escalation clause tied to Bureau of Labor cost indices for steel and other materials that would be used.

## "OLDSTER" WRITES OF RAILROAD HISTORY

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1972

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, the history of railroads and the men who developed them is truly an American legend. One man who has spent his entire life working with railroads is Col. Howard G. Hill of Bladensburg, Md., and he himself is part of that railroad legend. From his earliest years Colonel Hill has been fascinated by trains, and during his long railroad career he designed the first U.S. steam locomotive for overseas combat service, for which he has been widely acclaimed.

Colonel Hill has now written a book called, "Riding the Limiteds' Locomotives," which describes his experiences on steam engines when they were at their height. The Prince Georges Sentinel published an article about Colonel Hill and his book, and I would now like to share that article with my colleagues by inserting it into the RECORD:

### "OLDSTER" WRITES OF RAILROAD HISTORY (By Jennifer Frosh)

Col. Howard G. Hill, author of the soon to be published "Riding the Limiteds' Locomotives", is one of those veteran railroad characters whose love affair with the great steam-driving titans has lasted all his life.

The taped, disembodied sounds of engines he once designed, engineered and rode in for thousands and thousands of miles—guttural, growling music pierced by sharp, clear exhausts, hoarse bellowing whistles, and fierce thunderous spasms of monstrous 80-inch drivers hammering away—brings tears to his eyes.

And when he reads other writers' accounts of the now phased-out engines, his words grow faint with almost 70 years of unflinching devotion.

Except for the unlit cigar he rolls over and over in his hand, and the awesome collection of grand old steam engine relics crowded in a converted "roundhouse" study, the retired army reserves colonel strikes one as a man of quieter tastes, with a sense of urbanity well suited to his family's Bostonian traditions.

But just like his father before him, the sight of a locomotive like the J-1 Hudson model, hauling the 20th Century Limited with its 12 gleaming dark-green pullman cars and firebox glow, sends him right "off the deep-end."

He's a railroad man all right—and perhaps one of the few left in this country to consider the total mechanical beauty of the steam locomotive as an art form in itself, as much a part of America's tradition as Andrew Wyeth.

"Was there ever a prouder looking, more beautiful looking sight," reads a section of the book describing the 20th Century Limited.

"She was the Century's pride and joy, complete and ready for a superb example of locomotive and train operation, the ultimate in power, stamina, and beauty."

Relaxing in his "roundhouse", surrounded by a library of over 700 railroad books, photographs, models, and wrought-iron builder's plates, Hill listens to his railroad tapes over and over.

"It's one of the most beautiful sounds in the world. Boy, I'm telling you when I see one of those babies today, it's a real thrill."

"Next to steam engines, I love pipe organs best. They both produce the sweetest music in the world" Hill said. And then, as an afterthought, he adds "When I listen, it kinda takes the edge off things."

The sound of coal ("chunks of real estate" Hill quips) being scooped up and dumped in the firebox can be heard from the tape, and then Hill's scratchy faint voice calling out "Just listen to her go. Now she's lined for the main track. Wait'll ya hear the music when she really gets going."

A long hoarse whistle comes next and then Hill's comment, "Doesn't that curl your hair?"

As he looks around his mini-museum, Hill points out a picture, or a plate here or there, each time exhibiting his amazing wealth of knowledge, skills, and devotion when it comes to anything connected with railroads.

"You might say I'm a railroad hot-rod" says playfully as he switches off the tape.

Hill's book, "Riding the Limiteds' Locomotives", which is due on the stands in August, is the story of his trip in the cabs of the 20th Century Limited and the Broadway Limited in the hey day of New York Central Pennsylvania, and other eastern railroads.

His book will be published by Superior Publishing Co., Seattle, Wash. It contains 250 pages and 104 illustrations. Priced at \$12.95.

In his book he describes the performances of the engines, their speeds, what stops were on each line, and every detail of the schedule—how many miles they covered each day, how the engineer handled the engine, and the kinds of problems that arose.

The book is not so much a technical account, however, as a personal one of a man who relishes every part of the train experience and thrills to every sensation.

Accounts like the performance of Bob Butterfield, chief engineer for the J-1 Hudson type locomotive hauled by the Century, as he slowed his engine to a right-on-schedule stop at a station, could draw any reader, railroad buff or not, into Hill's informative text.

"Bob Butterfield produced superb music as he sat at the controls of the 5302 that day. His left hand flashed back and forth from the throttle lever to the automatic brake handle, while his right hand released the engine brakes and operated the sander valve to prevent no sudden stop, the slight slipping of the driving wheels which occurred with distracting frequency. Through it all his attitude was one of calm, unruffled competence."

The description reminds one of a picture of Hill on his roundhouse wall, shot 20 years ago as he leaned out the window of a cab engine, cap tilted slightly over brow and an expression of serene control on his face. Suddenly you see that calculated, precision-marked skill is what's really involved in handling these steam monsters—not the brawn and unleashed energy of all the railway legends.

Precision, urbanity, calmness is what railway men respect most in each other, and Hill, representative of this tradition, teaches this in his book as well.

Hill says he got the idea for his book 15 years ago as a result of a suit brought against his company for claims made on their new oil greases.

Bill was sent all over the country demonstrating the product and testified at the trial using his own drawings and photographs of engines.

One of his photographs was recognized by a lawyer for the other side. It was of a locomotive known to be running just fine on the old form of grease.

"I was sent the very next day to ride the 20th Century Limited straight through to Chicago, to see if her performance was noticeably affected by the old form of grease."

As it turned out, Hill discovered they were using the grease with satisfactory results, but they were changing grease at every stop and thus increasing the cost of maintenance.

Hill has run engines in the United States, Mexico, Canada, Guatemala, Morocco, Algeria, Italy, England, and Japan.

His railroad life began at the age of 15 when he began submerging himself in technical railroad engineering books at the public library.

"All I could think about was steam engines" he says and this pattern never changed for the rest of his career.

Hill spent all his spare time in the Houston railroad shops or roundhouses of the Southern Pacific Railroad, watching and studying engines.

In five years he rose from apprentice machinist to mechanical engineer. Later he moved to the field where he was required to make general inspections and offer suggestions for improvements.

In 1920, Hill left the SP and joined the Texas firm which eventually sent him on his 20th century odyssey.

During World War II, he was called up for active duty in the Railway Branch, Office of the Chief of Engineers in Washington.

While here he designed the first U.S. steam locomotive for overseas combat service, and by 1942, 200 of them were ordered by the British and sent to Iran, Egypt, Palestine, Syria and Turkey. By 1943, the Northwestern Railway in India received 584 engines of a similar design, called the Mikado type.

Honors have been heaped on Hill over the years, ranging from the Legion of Merit awarded by Gen. George Patton while he was in Sicily during the war, and letters from the President of Iranian State Railroads congratulating him on the "best steam locomotive ever running on their railroad course."

Col. Howard Hill presently lives in Bladensburg with his wife.

## SECRETARY BUTZ IS "AS WELCOME AS A REFRESHING RAIN"

### HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1972

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, at the close of the recent recess, I had the honor of hosting a meeting attended by Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz and over 500 farm residents of east central Wisconsin. Secretary Butz traveled to Fond du Lac expressly to meet with working farm people. He met them by the hundreds, joined them in consuming beef bratwurst and pork patties, and responded to their straight questions with straight answers.

Harley Buchholz, farm editor of the Fond du Lac Reporter, presented a sampling of the Secretary's concerns:

The average age of the American farmer is 52; we are 10 years behind time in re-man-

ning American farms (a matter of concern to everyone who eats food); and, food is still economically priced in terms of how hard you have to work to get it.

The feeling and atmosphere that was present at the Wisconsin gathering is also aptly captured in a July 23 Chicago Tribune report entitled, "America's Farmers Think Butz Is Beautiful." I include this article as part of my remarks and I heartily commend it to my colleagues who are interested in farm problems and the cost of food.

The article follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, July 23, 1972]

AMERICA'S FARMERS THINK "BUTZ IS BEAUTIFUL"

(By Richard Orr)

In the spring and summer of 1966 spiraling inflation was boosting costs of food and other consumer items, creating widespread complaints over Johnson administration economic policies, and boding ill for Democratic candidates in the fall elections. At a closed briefing for Democratic congressional candidates in Washington, an Ohio candidate asked Orville L. Freeman, secretary of agriculture, for advice on how to handle questions from voters about the rising cost of living.

"Slip, slide, and duck any question of higher consumer prices if you possibly can," Freeman advised. "Don't get caught in a debate over prices between housewives and farmers."

That prize piece of political profundity might never have been revealed had not Aldo Beckman of The Tribune's Washington bureau been sitting unnoticed among the candidates in the back of the room. He promptly wrote a story to the embarrassment of the Johnson administration and its red-faced secretary of agriculture.

#### AGAIN IN HEADLINES

This year soaring food prices have again been making headlines, bringing widespread complaints about Nixon administration effort to curb inflation. But there was no slipping, sliding, or ducking from a new secretary of agriculture, Dr. Earl L. Butz, when he met a barrage of press conference questions about high food prices.

"I don't want to see food prices come down," said Butz. "Farmers have too long realized too little profit and often no profit."

Such candor in behalf of 9.5 million farm people against 207 million consumers' hardly standard political operating procedure in a Presidential election year. It tells a lot about why Butz, a gutsy, give-'em-hell fighter for agriculture, is turning things around in farming areas where Republican prospects were gloomy less than eight months ago when he took office.

Since then Butz has been saying and doing things which have delighted farmers, irked consumer advocates and labor leaders, confounded political critics, and focused national attention on agriculture.

His message, repeated over and over, is simply this: Farmers are not to blame for higher food prices or inflation. Their prices have gone up relatively little, while their rate of productivity zooms upward at a record rate. Farmers deserve higher prices and better incomes because they earn only three-fourths as much as city people. Rising food prices are largely the result of higher wages and other distribution costs, together with rapidly growing demands by consumers who have more money to spend.

"It isn't so much the high cost of living as it is the cost of high living," he tells his audiences.

When C. Jackson Grayson Jr., Price Commission chairman, hinted that prices of live stock and other "raw" farm commodities might have to be controlled, Butz replied

promptly he would "fight like a wounded steer" to prevent it. Rationing, black markets, and empty meat counters would be the inevitable results of such controls, he declared.

Butz reminds housewives who complain about high food prices that they never had it so good. Food costs are the lowest in history—down to 15.6 cents of each dollar of take-home pay, compared with 23 cents two decades ago. In the same 20 years the farmer's share of the consumer's food dollar has shrunk to 38 cents from 49 cents.

"One reason why housewives think food is expensive is that they buy it several times a week and are aware of every little change in prices," says Butz. "On the other hand, they buy, say, furniture or a refrigerator once every 10 years, and they are not as aware of what has happened to prices of those items."

"The housewife may spend more on her week's trip to the store, and when she gets home she complains about food prices as she takes the panty hose, detergent, mouthwash, and floor wax out of her shopping bag."

To labor leaders who demand controls on farm prices, Butz points out that in the last 20 years those prices have gone up a total of only 6 per cent, while wage rates were rising an average of 6 per cent a year, or a total of 130 per cent.

"Through the years the power of labor leaders willingly and deliberately helped create inflation—and the same power should have the will to help correct inflation," he asserts. "It was a sorry sight to see labor leaders walk out of the Pay Board as if to say this is somebody else's responsibility."

The secretary of agriculture takes pains to remind farmers that farm income this year will be at an all-time record high any way you figure it—in total realized net income, net income per farm, and net income per capita. Yet per capita net income of farmers is only 75 per cent of that of nonfarm people.

"And that's not good enough," Butz adds. "I won't be satisfied until the income of farm people is at least on a par with city people."

As might be expected, his message draws mixed reactions.

"I get letters from farmers saying 'Glory hallelujah,'" he says. "I also get letters from housewives saying, in effect, 'You silly S. O. B., what are you trying to do to us, anyway?'"

#### A DIFFICULT PROBLEM

"Politically, of course, you've got a very difficult problem with the election coming on. You don't want to antagonize consumers, of whom there are 207 million, nor do you want to offend producers, of whom there are many fewer than that."

Earl Lauer Butz, 63, was born and raised on a farm near Albion, Ind., one of three sons and two daughters of German Lutheran parents. He was a 4-H Club boy and leader before attending Purdue University and graduating in animal husbandry in 1932 in the midst of the great Depression.

After farming for a year with his father, he returned to Purdue, where he received his doctorate in agricultural economics and became an instructor in 1937. He has been at Purdue most of the time since then as head of the department of agricultural economics, dean of agriculture, vice president of the university's Research Foundation, and dean of continuing education.

Butz gained experience in practical politics in an unsuccessful 1968 bid for the Republican gubernatorial nomination in Indiana and during three years of service as assistant secretary of agriculture for marketing and foreign agriculture in the Eisenhower administration. As an agricultural consultant to Richard Nixon in the 1968 Presidential campaign, Butz was prominently mentioned as a possible candidate for secretary of agriculture.

But the job went to Dr. Clifford M. Hardin, chancellor of the University of Nebraska, an economist who had been one of Butz's students at Purdue. In his nearly three years as



secretary, Hardin proved to be a lackluster performer in Washington's supercharged political atmosphere. By last November, G.O.P. leaders were in near panic over signs of an incipient farm revolt over low farm prices and what farmers considered to be Nixon administration neglect of their economic plight.

Out went Hardin. In came Butz. But not before an assortment of Democratic leaders and some farm groups, baying like bloodhounds on a fresh trail, had raised a much publicized ruckus that threatened to block his Senate confirmation.

The main issues were Butz's conservative economic philosophy and his directorships and stock holdings in three large agriculture-related business firms. His detractors charged he would dismantle federal price support programs and toss farmers to the vagaries of the free market. They cited his associations with "agribusiness", as proof that he was an agent of "giant corporations that are destroying family farms and driving farmers off the land."

Sen. McGovern called Butz' appointment "a catastrophe for American agriculture." Sen. Hubert Humphrey proclaimed that "Dr. Butz can hardly be considered a champion of America's small family farmer."

#### JOIN IN ATTACK

The National Farmers Union and the National Farmers Organization joined in the attack, calling his economic views "archaic" and his appointment the "worst possible choice." A last minute endorsement by the American Farm Bureau Federation, the nation's biggest farm group, helped Butz squeak thru the Senate by a narrow 51 to 44 vote.

Butz shrugged off these attacks as the "opening salvo of the election campaign in the Farm Belt." Within minutes after taking the oath of office, he began dispelling the charges of his critics in his first official utterance: "The price of corn is too low." Next day he ordered his department to buy corn to jack up prices.

A few days later he told the annual Farm Bureau convention in Chicago, "We're going to do everything possible within the limitations of reasonable budgetary soundness to restore farm income to the level that you people are entitled to."

Since then he has changed the feed grain and wheat programs to give farmers more money to cut surpluses by not planting crops. He has won release of an additional \$109 million in rural electrification loans and \$55 million for the rural environmental assistance program, got another \$200 million for the food stamp program, and boosted rice allotments by 11 per cent. Farmers in the \$1 billion wheat subsidy program, which went up by \$132 million this year, have been promised another \$100 million next year.

These and other administration moves before Butz took office, coupled with a fortunate rise in some market prices, should make Republicans odds-on favorites in the campaign for the farm vote.

Net farm income this year is forecast at an all-time high of \$17.7 billion, up \$2 billion from last year. Half of the increase results from higher cash subsidies which bring total 1972 direct farm payments from the federal Treasury to a record \$4.3 billion.

Agricultural exports reached a record \$8 billion high in fiscal 1972. They may go higher next year as a result of the recently announced three-year trade agreement under which Russia will buy \$750 million or more of American grains. In addition to direct farm spending, the Department of Agriculture is spending a record \$2.9 billion this year—double 1969 expenditure—to improve housing, water and sewage systems, electric and telephone services, recreation facilities, and community development in rural America.

Rural America includes more than the 9.5

million farm people living on 2.8 million farms and comprising less than 5 per cent of the total population. Altogether, about 53 million persons live in rural America, a fourth of the population, the bulk of them dependent on a healthy agriculture for their welfare.

Despite the declining number of farms, agriculture remains the nation's biggest industry, employing 4.5 million workers, or almost as many as are employed in the transportation, steel, and auto industries combined. An additional 2 million persons have jobs supplying things farmers use in production, and 8 to 10 million more people have jobs storing, transporting, processing, and merchandising commodities farmers produce. One of every five jobs in private employment is related to agriculture, directly or indirectly.

It is this agricultural complex, comprising the world's most efficient food producers and related industries, for which Earl Butz undertakes to be a "vigorous spokesman." He also regards it as the secretary of agriculture's obligation to "assure a continuity of ample, healthful food at reasonable cost—and reasonable cost means fair play in the marketplace for both consumers and farmers."

Butz still has his critics who contend he isn't doing enough for agriculture, along with many farmers who hesitate to rate his performance thus far. Illinois farmers polled last April by *Prairie Farmer* magazine indicated that 45.9 per cent of those questioned approved of his performance, 8.8 per cent disapproved, and 45.3 per cent were undecided.

Tony T. Dechant, president of the National Farmers Union, concedes that Butz is a "very knowledgeable agriculturalist and articulate spokesman," but says he isn't doing enough to raise farm income.

#### ASSESS BUTZ' PERFORMANCE

Nevertheless, recent soundings by Midwest farm editors indicate that many farmers agree with the G. O. P. National Committee's assessment that Butz performance is "as welcome as a refreshing rain after planting." A veteran Kansas farm editor commented, "I can't find anyone who is against him." An Iowa farmer told a New York reporter, "Farmers are pretty satisfied right now with Mr. Butz, and I don't hear much talk against the Nixon administration's economics as far as farm prices are concerned."

Sen. Herman Talmadge [D., Ga.], chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, who opposed Butz' confirmation, observed recently: "I must say that since that time I've been impressed. The other secretaries were always lurking in the shadows, but he's looking after the interests of American agriculture."

An Illinois hog raiser summed up his impression succinctly: "Butz is beautiful."

#### MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN— HOW LONG?

#### HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1972

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 1,757 Americans prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

#### FOUR-DAY, FORTY-HOUR WORK- WEEK

#### HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1972

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of legislation in the House of Representatives to permit the 4-day, 40-hour workweek for government contractors, I have sought to inform my colleagues of recent developments in this area. The *New York Times* carried an article which describes the benefits and difficulties of this new workweek concept.

The article indicates that, despite some objections to this change, there is a continuing and growing trend toward the 4-day workweek. For those desiring further information on the 4-day workweek, I would recommend a recent study by Judi and Raymond Peddersen, "Shorter Workweek," which provides an excellent introduction to the 4-day workweek.

The article follows:

#### FOUR-DAY WORKWEEK GETTING MIXED RECEPTION

(By Agis Salpukas)

DETROIT, July 15.—Small companies at the rate of two a day are switching to the four-day work week, but the new schedule has yet to become a major trend in American industry.

In the two years since the altered work week began to catch on, not one major company has adopted it for all of its work force. However, some large companies, such as the Equitable Life Insurance Company, have put part of their clerical workers on it, and Pacific Southwest Airlines has one-half of its 2,400-member work force on the four-day schedule.

There is little prospect that mass-production industry, which is largely unionized, will soon try the new system, under which workers normally have three days off in return for working 10-hour shifts for four days.

One major reason is that it has aroused the opposition of the labor movement, which views the rejuggling of days merely as a gimmick, diverting its member from the goal of shortening the total number of hours they have to work.

Opposition from American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations was largely responsible for the recent defeat of a proposed change in the Walsh-Healy Act, which requires overtime pay after an eight-hour day from companies engaged in Federal contract work.

#### A MAJOR OBSTACLE

Most small, nonunion companies can get around the requirement by offsetting the time-and-a-half provision and having workers agree to take a pay cut to balance things out. But it is a major obstacle to companies with unions that are reluctant to tamper with ratified contracts.

For the small companies, the enthusiasm is growing. About 1,000 of them, employing about 75,000 workers, are now on a four-day week, compared with 50 companies, employing 10,000 workers, two years ago.

Most of them report that the benefits, such as less absenteeism and turnover, better use of plants and equipment and higher employee morale, have become permanent.

"It's beautiful," Linda Laus, a 21-year-old darkroom technician at the Hoechstetter Printing Company in Pittsburgh, said in an interview. "I traveled around the state or to

Washington and I don't have to hurry back to work Monday morning."

"If I have things to do in town," she said, "I do them on Mondays. Saturday when I don't go away I clean at home or do other chores. I'd never give it up. What's an hour or so more a day when I can have Monday all to myself."

Clark Davis, a pressman, was not as enthusiastic when the plant, specializing in color lithography, went on a four-day week a year ago. He has a one-hour ride on a bus each way and so it's a 12-hour day for him. "But it's worked out fine," he said. "I spend weekends in Uniontown with my family and I can go to the courthouse or take care of other business on Mondays."

The four-day week has proved itself well suited to police departments, car dealerships and smaller concerns employing professionals.

Some police departments, including those in Houston and Washington, have found that they can overlap their two, 10-hour shifts and have double the manpower on patrol during high crime periods.

In Pasadena, a suburb of 90,000 people near Houston, the 10-hour day has enabled Police Chief Ellis Means to double the number of men on patrol between 8 P.M. and 2 A.M.

"With double the number of cars," he said, "we can cut the time of response to police calls from an average of seven minutes to three and a half."

In the four months since the new week was adopted, he said, there has been a slight decrease in nighttime burglaries and a big increase in the number of charges filed for drunken driving.

"When the joints close up at midnight," he said, "we're out there on the streets to grab them."

Since most shifts on a four-day week begin at 8 A.M., when other companies have established "quiet periods" during which workers do not have to deal with customers, take phone calls or go out on assignments.

At Ellerbee Architects in St. Paul, for example, where 75 per cent of the workers are professionals, there is a quiet period from 7:30 to 10 A.M. Kenneth Mahal, president of the firm, said that a survey of 500 employees showed almost unanimous support for the change.

The four-day week has also become popular with car dealers, who have been able to stay open later in the evening.

Al Stokes, a Volkswagen dealer who put his service and parts employees on a four-day week now stays open 11 more hours a week. "It meets the growing demand by car owners for longer and more convenient service hours," he said.

The shift can cause problems, too. John Wierenga, a mechanic at the dealership who works on a commission, said he had been able to handle fewer customers and had lost money.

Some workers complain about fatigue on a 10-hour shift. Velma McFadden, who works as a teller at the Merchants Park Bank in Houston, said she had a problem getting up at 5:30 in the morning. "I take vitamins from getting too tired," she said.

Edmund Gifford, president of the Rockland Insurance Company in Boston, said that an experiment with the four day week was abandoned recently after a year because salesmen had to continue to work five-hour days. "Who would a salesman call at seven in the morning?" he asked.

He also said that people on the 8 A.M.-to-6 P.M. shift did very little work in the last hour, adding: "They were wandering away from their desks or spending excessive time in the ladies' and men's rooms."

There are also critics who contend that shuffling the work week may bring about some temporary gain but that they are of

no lasting benefit to workers and actually put greater pressure on them. Absenteeism decreases, they say, because it is more costly to lose one-fourth of one's pay instead of one-fifth.

There is also concern that the four-day week may further intensify the feeling that work is a penalty for pay and leisure.

Thomas K. Connellan, a research associate for the University of Michigan, said in a recent article that the four-day week might divert companies from dealing with the growing problem of job dissatisfaction.

#### LESS PHILOSOPHICAL

"The vast majority of jobs, and this includes positions from the top to the bottom of organizations, simply do not challenge the ability of individuals," he wrote. The four-day work week, he argued, does not make the nature of the work itself more interesting.

Unions are less philosophical in their opposition. Dominic Fornaro, president of the A.F.L.-C.I.O. council in Baltimore, said that if union members were asked to work 10 hours a day for four days they should be paid time-and-a-half for the last two hours.

It was the issue of overtime that led the United Automobile Workers and the Chrysler Corporation to end talks concerning the four-day week a year ago. Chrysler contended that 10-hour shifts would be difficult to incorporate into plants that now operate 24 hours on three shifts of eight hours.

There is also some concern that moonlighting would increase, intensifying the job shortage.

A survey of 51 companies on the four-day week made by the School of Business at the University of Pittsburgh found that 10 per cent of the workers chose to get a second job. This is two times as high as the national average of 5 per cent of all employed persons who have two jobs.

But the survey also showed that about two-thirds of the workers liked their work more than before and that only one of six was more tired at the end of the day than before the new work week.

Supporters of the movement are optimistic. They feel they are part of a general trend in which workers prefer to have their leisure in bigger chunks, allowing them to take longer trips or finish work at home.

Gus Sirotzki, a four-day supervisor at a Colonial Carbon plant in suburban Chicago, said: "I accomplish much more. I have more time with my family."

His sister-in-law, Mrs. Dorothy Czajka, who is a packer at the same plant, said she enjoyed saving one trip to work each week. "The Fridays off are valuable to me," she said. "I do my shopping and beat the Saturday rush. I don't know what we'd do without my Fridays."

#### A TRIBUTE TO AHEPA

### HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1972

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the Order of Ahepa on the occasion of their golden anniversary which is being celebrated this month.

AHEPA's objectives are numerous; they include the promotion and encouragement of loyalty to the United States, instruction of its members in the tenets and fundamental principles of government and in the recognition and

respect of the inalienable rights of mankind.

The organization has sponsored and contributed to such benevolent and worthwhile causes as the relief of victims of the Florida hurricane, the Missouri flood, the Turkish earthquake, and the war orphans of Greece.

On the domestic scene, the organization contributes to the betterment of American life by offering scholarships to deserving high school students and by promoting participation in civic organizations to insure responsive and honest government.

While I have mentioned only a limited number of AHEPA's activities, I wish to commend all their efforts and to express the hope that they will continue and expand these admirable projects in the future.

#### THE MYTH OF SO-CALLED EXECUTIVE PRIVILEGE—PROFESSOR BERGER SUGGESTS CONGRESSIONAL ACTION TO REGAIN ITS LOST POWERS

### HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1972

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, on May 25, 1972, I placed in the Appendix of the Record—page 19060—the text of a remarkable statement by Prof. Raoul Berger, Charles Warren, senior fellow in legal history at the Harvard Law School in which he totally destroyed the constitutional and historical basis of the so-called doctrine of "executive privilege." Professor Berger, a well-known legal historian and author, is a recognized expert on this subject. His statement was presented to the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee during our hearings on the denial of information by the Executive to Congress—part of our exhaustive study of Government information policies and practices.

A clear summary of Professor Berger's arguments against "executive privilege" and some suggested actions which Congress could take to restore our prerogatives as a coequal branch of Government were contained in a recent article by Sareen R. Gerson in the Boston Globe for July 23, 1972. So that all Members may share the views of Professor Berger on this vital matter, I am inserting the full text at this point in the Record:

#### THE DOCTRINE OF "EXECUTIVE PRIVILEGE": NIXON MEN REMAIN INCOMMUNICADO

(By Sareen R. Gerson)

WASHINGTON.—Retired law professor Raoul Berger, whose book "Impeachment: Some Constitutional Problems" will be published this fall, is trying to quicken congressional courage against White House claims of "executive privilege."

A senior fellow at Harvard Law School, Berger testified this spring before Rep. William S. Moorhead's Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee, which is looking into President Nixon's growing controls over information.

"I have no favors to ask—I'm retired and devoting myself to writing—but for God's



sake do something, get on with it: your task goes to the roots of American government," Berger said.

#### REVIVAL OF POWER

Berger wants Congress to revive the use of its contempt power, authorizing the sergeant-at-arms to physically arrest recalcitrant witnesses and lock them up.

The Nixon Administration claims for "executive privilege" to shut off congressional inquiry have no real precedent in history, Berger said. Instances cited by William Rehnquist when he was assistant attorney general "went back no further than the Truman Administration." Reducing the "privilege" concept to a sort of Johnny-come-lately mythology, Berger said there is plenty of precedent for Congress' role as "the Grand Inquest of the Nation," but no comparable history for the "executive privilege" claim.

"What you have here is a brand new doctrine called geographic location: if you're located on the White House staff, you've got immunity," he said.

For more than two hours, Berger spoke and answered questions, reviewing the pre-constitutional theory of separation of powers, and Congress' right of inquiry. Even the originator of the doctrine of separate branches of government, the French philosopher Montesquieu, whose works greatly influenced the US Constitution, said that the legislature "should have the means of examining in what manner its laws have been executed by the public officials," he said.

The US Supreme Court in 1927, in the wake of the Teapot Dome scandals, gave broad interpretation to Congress' investigative powers.

Berger also gave his course for immediate action:

"Pick a lesser man," he suggested (meaning, presumably, someone less than Peter Flanagan or Dr. Henry Kissinger). "One of the bureau chiefs.

"Ask for information. Issue a subpoena. If he fails to appear, have your sergeant-at-arms arrest him. Lock him up.

"He has to begin a habeas corpus suit to get out, and the court has got to decide it. I don't see how the court could dodge it.

"It won't require an endless series of contempt and the President and his staff will comply," he said.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

On a long-range basis, beyond the immediate use of the contempt power, Berger urged Congress to:

Amend the 1928 statute which requires the executive branch to furnish information to the Government Operations Committee, by adding the right for Congress to take into court any official denying testimony or documents.

Authorize, by specific statute, a suit against any member of the Executive Branch who refuses to testify before the committee.

Appoint permanent legal counsel to bring such suits on behalf of Congress (and to screen all suits proposed by Congress, in order to prevent abuses.)

Make cut-off of funds explicitly dependent on information ("no information, no funds.")

At the very least, Berger advised (adding that "for one thing, it would hit the front pages"), Congress could boldly ask President Nixon to appoint a special counsel to represent Congress in such actions—on the theory that the Attorney General, representing the executive, would have a conflict of interest.

#### COURT JURISDICTION

Berger favored putting great controversies—particularly on questions of boundaries of power—into the laps of the court.

Although he knows of no case where a Congressional suit about "executive privilege" has ever been submitted to the courts,

Berger does not think the Supreme Court would disclaim jurisdiction.

Nor would public opinion sympathize with lawbreakers, he maintained.

"If you don't play a role, do something decisive, the American democracy is in peril: the root of our government is information," he said.

Subcommittee chairman Moorhead (D-Pa.) said that if the President had "a very few private advisers, that would be one thing—but when decisions appear to be made by this very large White House staff who claim not to be available to Congress, that's another."

Moorhead admitted that "Congress is no longer the first branch of government; instead of having representative democracy, every four years we elect a man who is a dictator for four years."

"There is a crisis in government," Berger continued, "when top level decisions are made in secret and you don't know until something is done. The public doesn't know that the power Truman used going into Korea, and the power Nixon is using in Vietnam, is not a constitutional power."

#### HISTORICAL BASE

On the role played by Henry Kissinger, Berger had these comments: "The Secretary of State himself enjoys no immunity, but here we have a man who is de facto secretary of state and he is incommunicado, claimed to be unaccountable to Congress. This is a vastly overrated exercise of privilege.

"I'm not saying there may not prove to be desirable areas of accommodation. You may feel it is undesirable to press Kissinger on everything he has told the President, but it is a healthy thing to stress constitutional power.

"Congress is treated like an office boy," he said. "That's up to you to correct; the executive won't do it."

#### JACK W. GORE OF FORT LAUDERDALE NEWS WINS AMA EDITORIAL AWARD

#### HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1972

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, since the problem of drug abuse became a national problem, the Congress and the various States and local governments have tried to respond in a number of ways in order to stem this growing menace.

Mr. Jack Gore, editor of the Fort Lauderdale News, authored two columns which reflect on this national problem. One details the death of a young boy who had experimented with LSD. The other pointed out the need for the Government to do more in treating the thousands of returning veterans who have become addicted.

For his efforts, Mr. Gore was awarded a first place in the 1971 Medical Journalism Awards which were presented at the American Medical Association meeting in Los Angeles. Gore was the only winner in the editorial writing category.

Although both columns were written more than a year ago, the message of both are as valid today as when they were written.

At this time I would like to insert both columns into the RECORD for the interest and information of my colleagues and congratulate Mr. Gore for a

job well done in an area which vitally needs attention:

#### TRAGIC DEATH OF YOUTH SHOULD BE WARNING TO DRUG "EXPERIMENTERS"

While it is difficult to understand the motivation that drives young people or anybody else to experiment with dangerous drugs, the tragic story of the 14-year-old boy who died at Memorial Hospital last Friday afternoon should give some second thoughts to all those who might be tempted to give these drugs a whirl, or who might even now be following the same path this boy took.

We can understand well enough the tremendous upsurge in this country in the use of marijuana, particularly among the younger generation, as the addictive or harmful nature of that particular drug on the human body has yet to be proved, so we are told, by any solid medical evidence.

Many young people tend to look upon the use of marijuana as no worse than having a few alcoholic drinks or smoking cigarettes.

The use of some of these other so-called "hard" drugs, however, is something else again as there is certainly no lack of medical evidence to show what these drugs can do to the mind and body. Thus, we simply cannot understand why anybody in his right mind and in full knowledge of what can happen to him as a result of experimenting with these drugs will even try one the first time.

For those who might still doubt what can happen we suggest they read and then read again last Sunday's front page story of young Robert Dietrick.

Here was a boy who had a tremendously bright future. He was extremely popular with his classmates at Nova High School and was regarded as a leader in almost every respect.

Somewhere along the line, however, Robert Dietrick got on the drug kick. One of his friends told police he and young Dietrick first experimented with LSD around December. Whatever the date, it didn't take long for LSD to wreak havoc on the boy.

According to his parents, they didn't even know the boy had been taking drugs until the afternoon he died in the hospital. Even though seven specialists did their best to keep the youth alive, and even brought in an experimental machine that breaks down the blood, too much damage had been done. An autopsy reportedly showed that at the time of his death his liver was almost gone and his brain was totally gone.

The doctors have indicated it was too many LSD tablets or because he got hold of some that were "real bums" that brought on his horrible death. And what makes things even worse for his stepfather and mother, is the unverified suspicion that somebody might have sneaked into the boy's room in the hospital and given him more drugs.

Whether that be true or not we have no way of knowing, but we do know that 14-year-old Robert Dietrick is dead today and his death should serve as a grim reminder of what can happen, and with increasing frequency does happen these days to youngsters who casually disregard warnings about experimenting with hard-core drugs.

Young Dietrick's death has already had one noteworthy effect. It has caused a friend who experimented with LSD with him to swear off drugs completely and to launch a one-man crusade to convince every youngster he knows who is taking drugs to kick the habit before it is too late.

When this boy was asked what he thought about using drugs now that he had seen his erstwhile best friend die of the effects, it didn't take him long to answer.

"It is the worst thing in the whole world that could possibly ever happen to anyone," he sadly remarked.

"They are curiosity killed the cat, this time it killed Bob," he added.

Perhaps the 150 or so other youths whom young Dietrick's friend says he personally

knows are involved in drug abuse will listen now to one of their own age group who has had a first-hand experience with the tragic damage drugs can cause to the mind and the body. Perhaps, also, the other revelations that have so far come out of this tragic incident will help to further alert parents and school officials to the spreading menace of drug peddling in and around our public schools and bring about a more effective crackdown on this nasty business.

As we said above, we don't know what motivates any youngster to fool around with hard core drugs when they should know they are taking a terrible chance of blowing their minds and wrecking their bodies for some kind of a temporary thrill.

Yet, they are doing it, and the tragedy of it is that more and more of them aren't finding out until it is too late they have taken an almost irreversible path to their own destruction.

That's why we advise these youngsters to read and reread the Robert Dietrick story. It's not a pleasant story, but maybe what happened to him could well cause others of his age group to walk away from drugs before they meet the same kind of fate.

#### GOVERNMENT MUST TREAT SERVICEMEN WHO ARE ADDICTED TO DRUGS

One of the more sickening aspects of the war in Vietnam, and one which makes it a good bit different than any other this nation has ever fought, is the now admitted fact that an increasing percentage of the men coming back home from the war are returning as confirmed drug addicts.

For a long while Defense Department officials, while aware of this growing problem, tended to shrug it off as a matter of minor consequence and involving a very small number of individuals.

Now, however, even the Defense Department is being forced to admit it is fast becoming a major problem that poses serious consequences, not only to the military establishment but to the returning servicemen who are coming back to this country hooked on hard drugs.

What is complicating the problem now end is the ready availability and the low price of the so-called hard drugs in Vietnam. Another complicating factor is the fact that many of the U.S. troops still in Vietnam have been withdrawn from combat positions, and now have a lot more leisure time and opportunities to fall victim to the hard-drug habit.

As a consequence, more and more servicemen are getting "hooked." When a GI addict is detected, the military procedure now in effect is to put the individual through a physical withdrawal treatment and then hand him a discharge.

But, as Rep. Paul Rogers, who is chairman of the House Health Subcommittee, has pointed out, the chances of such individuals staying off drugs after being discharged are slim.

He knows from all the anguished letters he has been receiving from distraught parents that the military's system of handling drug addicts isn't working. More often than not, it tends to turn loose on society what Rep. Rogers terms as a "human time bomb," who hasn't been cured of his drug habit, and who soon finds that feeding the habit here in the U.S. can cost him up to \$200 per day for the same quality of drugs that cost a tiny fraction of that amount in Vietnam.

Rep. Rogers has also pointed out, however, that many other drug addicts aren't detected while in the service, and these return home to learn they are stuck in an almost impossible situation.

If they aren't wealthy enough to afford a \$200-a-day habit, the Florida congressman has stated, each addict "will result in a \$20,000 to \$30,000-a-year walking crime wave to a community."

One of the letters Rep. Rogers has received came from a Fort Lauderdale businessman who explained what had happened to his grandson who had become a heroin addict while in the military service.

"They knew he was a confirmed addict, yet they palmed him off on society," the businessman wrote.

"This boy has been a problem to all of us, and he has practically killed his mother with his badgering her for money for drugs. He has impoverished her and made a nervous wreck out of her" the letter writer added. The businessman concluded his letter by stating that at the time his letter was written his grandson had been arrested and was in jail.

This isn't a unique case, according to Rep. Rogers. In the past few weeks he has had a number of similar letters from parents appealing for his help in getting their sons into a rehabilitation program to cure a drug habit they had picked up in the service.

As a result of such letters and other evidence he has received, all indicating that GI drug abuse is mounting, Rep. Rogers introduced legislation this week to require the armed forces to identify, treat and rehabilitate servicemen who are addicts.

This is hardly asking too much. If the military establishment can't keep hard drugs out of the hands of our servicemen, it certainly has the responsibility of doing everything possible to see that addicts are detected and given adequate rehabilitative treatment before they are discharged and turned loose on society.

According to Rep. Rogers, there may be as many as 40,000 drug addicts still stationed in Vietnam, and with these men due to be returned home at a stepped-up pace in coming months, it is easy to see what can and no doubt will happen if the majority of these addicts aren't detected, treated and rehabilitated before they are given a final discharge.

Wounded veterans certainly aren't discharged before everything possible in the way of adequate medical care is given them. Even after treatment and eventual discharge, they still qualify for further care, if needed, and they also are entitled to disability payments.

A returning veteran who has picked up a hardcore drug habit while in the service is, in most cases, far worse off than a wounded veteran. It may not be the military's fault he became an addict, but if it happened while the man was in the service, the armed forces have a clear responsibility to provide the man with the best curative treatment possible before he is discharged to resume his civilian life.

This is what Rep. Rogers' legislation is designed to accomplish, and while the Congress isn't noted for its speed in approving anything but emergency bills, this is a bill that certainly justifies quick approval by both the House and the Senate.

R. HAROLD DELOZIER

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1972

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, the success story of R. Harold DeLozier, of Maryville, Tenn., reaffirms the notion that America is still a land where dreams are realized through hard work and self-sacrifice.

Today, Harold DeLozier's early employers have still not forgotten the determination and dedication of purpose which allowed this outstanding Tennesseean to fulfill his dreams and ambitions.

One of these employers, the Blount National Bank of Maryville, has published a summary of Harold's journey on the road to success, so that others traveling the same path may find encouragement and hope in his story.

The following is Blount National Bank's tribute to a self-made man—R. Harold DeLozier:

R. HAROLD DELOZIER

(By Ken Powers)

It has become popular in recent years to scoff at talk of "the self-made man." But what is popular is not always correct. In spite of all the arguments to the contrary, "the self-made man" is still "the American dream." R. Harold DeLozier, a director of Blount National Bank, is a local example.

Born in Wildwood Community, east of Maryville, a year before Kaiser Wilhelm's Prussian armies introduced the world to global war, Harold DeLozier reached adulthood as the U.S. and the world entered "The Great Depression." There was little hope for a young man; jobs were scarce; relief lines were long; the "hobo" was rapidly becoming an American symbol. But DeLozier refused to accept this bleak and uninspiring world as the end of opportunity.

Penniless, but willing to work, he entered Draughon's Business College in the spring of 1932. DeLozier fired the furnace in the teacher's home in return for a room. After the morning stoking, he delivered the Knoxville Journal, until classtime. After morning classes, DeLozier hurried to Miller's cafeteria. This third job earned him his lunch and \$5 per week. A year later, he graduated from the College, having completed all courses required for a diploma in general business—with an average of 94.75 percent.

His first regular job was as an order clerk at C. M. McClung's, a Knoxville hardware firm. Eighteen months later, he returned to Maryville, which he calls "the capital of the world" because of its beauty and friendly people. He joined Blount National Bank, bringing the total number of bank employees to four. During his year and a half with the bank, DeLozier worked in all phases of the business, from teller to posting clerk to making loans.

At the age of 22, he left the security of being an employee to establish his own business—DeLozier Insurance Agency, in which he is still active today. "I liked working in the bank," he says, "but I wanted to have my own business, and insurance goes well with banking." In only eight years, he had built a reputation for competence and honesty that earned him national recognition in the Hartford Insurance Company magazine. DeLozier says that honesty is all-important—"There is no such thing as a little bit dishonest. One is honest, or he is not."

In 1945, Harold DeLozier and Beryl Bredlove pledged marriage vows. They became associates in serving Maryville's insurance needs. Mrs. DeLozier remains active in the agency, and her husband says with obvious pride, "She is a well-informed insurance lady. Our clients don't hesitate to discuss their problems with her." The DeLozier's daughter, Kathy, is presently employed in the bank's computer department.

One of the two charter members remaining active in Maryville Lions Club, DeLozier has served as president, secretary, and treasurer, and as zone secretary-treasurer. A 32nd degree Mason, he is member of Knoxville Consistory. DeLozier has been a member of Blount County Chamber of Commerce, "for a long time," and is a member of Maryville's First Baptist Church.

Appointed to the bank's board of directors in 1946, DeLozier is thankful for the opportunities he has had to serve the people of Blount County. Looking back upon those



dark years of his youth, he says, "There is always some sunshine, somewhere. You just have to look for it."

Harold DeLozier is the kind of man who had made Blount National "The Leader." He is typical of the American dream; successful because he would not accept defeat.

#### LIMITATION ON OFFENSIVE WEAPONS

**HON. JOHN G. DOW**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1972

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, it is expected that this House will, as part of the whole Congress, shortly consider for approval, an "executive agreement," limiting offensive weapons between the United States and Soviet Russia. Likewise, the Senate will consider a "treaty" limiting defensive weapons.

Since I was puzzled by the rationale for treating the offensive weapons in an executive agreement, and the defensive weapons in a treaty, I took the liberty of inquiring at the Library of Congress. While I could have addressed the same question to the Department of State, it struck me that the Library of Congress might be more objective in their response.

The Library of Congress has provided a very interesting statement that does point out some differences in the two avenues for consummating the total pact with Soviet Russia. Whether these differences justify the two avenues, one a treaty on defensive weapons to pass the Senate, the other an executive agreement on offensive weapons to pass the whole Congress, I am not attempting to assert. I do believe, however, that the explanation offered by the Library of Congress should be of interest to my colleagues. The memorandum from the Library of Congress appears below:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,  
CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE,  
Washington, D.C., July 14, 1972.

To: Honorable John G. Dow.

From: Leneice N. Wu, Analyst in International Relations.

Via: Chief, Foreign Affairs Division.

Subject: Information on the form of the SALT agreements and pertinent Congressional action.

It appears from the statements of Executive officials that the basis for their decision to use two kinds of international agreements from the strategic arms limitation talks (SALT) may be found in certain distinctions between the terms of each agreement. The treaty, which deals with the defensive weapons systems (primarily antiballistic missiles or ABMs), is of unlimited duration. Moreover, it seems reasonable to assume that further elaboration of the terms of this treaty or even further limits on defensive weapons systems in general, is not an immediate concern to either the Soviet Union or the United States. Different considerations apply in the case of the executive agreement.

In the first place, this agreement concerns offensive weapons and its terms apply for five years only. In a press conference in Moscow, Presidential adviser Henry Kissinger pointed out that in the case of offensive weapons, "the situation was so complex," and therefore, the current agreement "was an inevitable first step to get an end of the production [of offensive weapons] for a

while before one could make a rational agreement on the permanent arrangement."<sup>1</sup> Secretary of State William Rogers described the agreement to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as "temporary and not comprehensive," and it was hoped to replace it "by a more complete agreement in treaty form covering strategic offensive weapons."<sup>2</sup>

An additional point which various Administration officials have reiterated involves the relationship between the two agreements. Representative of U.S. policy on this question is a statement by Secretary Rogers, who said that "if an agreement providing for more complete strategic offensive arms limitations were achieved within five years, . . . it would constitute a basis for withdrawal from the [ABM] Treaty."<sup>3</sup> In general, one might conclude that the different forms were used to accommodate differences in the scope and duration of the limitations on offensive and defensive weapons systems, but that the two agreements are not unrelated to each other.

The second question, regarding the basis for seeking Congressional approval of the executive agreement can be answered by the Arms Control and Disarmament Act of 1961, which established the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. It requires that any agreement which limits U.S. arms must have Congressional approval. The complete text is as follows:

. . . no action shall be taken under this chapter or any other law that will obligate the United States to disarm or to reduce or to limit the Armed Forces or armaments of the United States, except pursuant to the treaty making power of the President under the Constitution or unless authorized by further affirmative legislation by the Congress of the United States.<sup>4</sup>

Although the Administration has asked for congressional approval of the executive agreement through joint resolution, we have not found any instance in which Executive spokesmen have specifically mentioned this provision as the reason for this action.

If this Service can be of further assistance, please let us know.

#### FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> Office of the White House Press Secretary Release. May 27, 1972. pp. 6-7.

<sup>2</sup> The Secretary of State. Statement in Support of the SALT Agreements to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. June 19, 1972. p. 24, 18.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., pp. 16-17.

<sup>4</sup> U.S. Code, 1964 edition. Title 22, Chapter 35, 2573. p. 4719.

#### FOUR MYTHS ABOUT WORLD AFFAIRS

**HON. PHILIP M. CRANE**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1972

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, Americans have often been accused by those in Europe and elsewhere of being "naive" in their approach to international affairs. Always prepared to believe the best of our adversaries, we have tended, in many instances, to underestimate their own dedication to a dogmatic ideology.

Today, when Communist leaders say that they seek "peaceful coexistence," we seem prepared, at a moment's notice, to forget the Berlin Wall, the invasion of Hungary and of Czechoslovakia, the persecution of religious and indigenous cultures, and the huge buildup of Soviet arms in the Middle East, the Indian

Ocean, the North Atlantic, and other parts of the world.

Too many Americans, it seems, have forgotten that actions and not words are the true mark of a nation, as they are of a man. While the words have changed, the actions, unfortunately, have not.

Prof. Anthony T. Bouscaren of Le Moyne College recently set forth what he considered to be four myths now prevalent in American thinking about world affairs.

One of these myths is that:

"The international Communist movement no longer exists, thus the danger has dissipated." Professor Bouscaren notes, in response, that "The 1971 24th Congress of the Communist Party, Soviet Union, was attended by most Communist parties in the world . . . Brezhnev and Gromyko boasted of gains in Latin America, the weakened Western position on Germany and Berlin, and the consolidation of control in Czechoslovakia and Poland, and gains in the Middle East, South and Southeast Asia.

To the idea that "the cold war is a thing of the past" and that "cold warriors should adjust to the realities of détente," Professor Bouscaren responds:

Tell it to Hanoi, Cairo and Moscow. They are the cold warriors who refuse to cease and desist. The current Communist invasion of South Vietnam is in the tradition of the Prague Spring of 1968 and the June 1967 war in the Middle East.

Professor Bouscaren concludes that:

Our experience in Berlin, the Cuban missile crisis, Quemoy and Matsu, Lebanon, South Korea and South Vietnam indicate that adventurism won't just blow away. It must be stopped. If we do not negotiate from strength, there is no chance for realistic adjustments anywhere.

It is unfortunate that the wishful thinkers who proclaim that the cold war is over are not correct. The cold war will not be over until world communism ceases its aggressive aims and policies. That day is not yet upon us.

I wish to share with my colleagues Professor Bouscaren's thoughtful article, which appeared in the New York Times of June 27, 1972, and insert it into the Record at this time:

[From the New York Times, June 27, 1972]

#### FOUR "MYTHS"

(By Anthony T. Bouscaren)

1. The international Communist movement no longer exists, thus the danger has dissipated.

The 1969 Moscow meeting of Communist and workers parties, together with "anti-imperialist forces" was attended by 75 parties, of which 61 signed the resolutions without reservations, and six with reservations. The 1971 24th Congress of the Communist Party, Soviet Union, was attended by most Communist parties in the world, except for China and its allies (which did not attend the 1969 meeting either). Brezhnev and Gromyko boasted of gains in Latin America, the weakened Western position on Germany and Berlin, the consolidation of control in Czechoslovakia and Poland, and gains in the Middle East, South and Southeast Asia.

The February, 1972 meeting of "peace" groups in Versailles, France, demonstrated how Soviet leadership (aided by North Vietnam) could persuade both Trotskyite and "New Left" groups to join with orthodox Communists in support of the forthcoming invasion across the DMZ in Vietnam.

In the fields of subversion and espionage (notably the recent K.G.B. expose in Britain)

the new international Communist movement has shown its muscle.

Even Communist parties which disagree with Moscow from time to time share common objectives with the U.S.S.R. Moscow and Peking support the Hanoi invasion of South Vietnam. Both promote anti-American programs in Africa and Latin America.

2. Since Stalin, the U.S.S.R. monolith has dissolved; Moscow has mellowed, and the Soviet leaders accept live-and-let-live.

At the 20th Party Congress, Khrushchev supported the notion of "just wars" (national liberation wars). That same year he repressed freedom in Hungary. Subsequently he built the Berlin Wall, emplaced offensive missiles in Cuba, and helped Cairo and Hanoi in military action against Israel and South Vietnam. His successor, Brezhnev, invaded Czechoslovakia, continues to support adventurism in the Middle East and South and Southeast Asia, sends dissident intellectuals into mental hospitals and displays the same anti-Semitism as his predecessors.

Not only did the Soviets send massive numbers of tanks and artillery to Hanoi for the current invasion, but top Soviet officers planned the invasion in Hanoi jointly with General Giap.

3. Communism is an idea which can't be stopped with bombs and bullets.

Communism as an idea has long since been discredited. It was Soviet power, and not ideas, which swept over East and Central Europe. The Berlin Wall was built to keep people with ideas from going west. The invasions of South Korea and South Vietnam were military actions. No elections brought Ho, Mao, or Fidel to power. Brezhnev, Kadar, Husak and Ulbright are afraid of their own people, and try to block ideas from the West by jamming their radio broadcasts.

Look at the refugee movements out of East Germany, Hungary, Cuba, the People's Republic of China, North Korea and North Vietnam. When was the last time you heard of someone trying to get through the Berlin Wall from West to East? It is the Western ideas that attract, and Communist power which repels.

4. The Cold War is a thing of the past. Cold warriors should adjust to the realities of détente.

Tell it to Hanoi, Cairo and Moscow. They are the cold warriors who refuse to cease and desist. The current Communist invasion of South Vietnam is in the tradition of the Prague Spring of 1968 and the June 1967 war in the Middle East. Hanoi rejects all overtures for a cease-fire, troop withdrawals and prisoner exchanges. It takes two to make peace. We cannot disengage from those who seek to bury us.

Incantations cannot alter the fact that the Soviet leaders have all been reared in the Communist faith, that Soviet ambitions remain an inescapable reality of world politics.

Our experience in Berlin, the Cuban missile crisis, Quemoy and Matsu, Lebanon, South Korea and South Vietnam indicate that adventurism won't just blow away. It must be stopped. If we do not negotiate from strength, there is no chance for realistic adjustments anywhere.

"NONE DARE CALL IT CONSPIRACY,"  
CHAPTERS 3 AND 4

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1972

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, following are the third and fourth chapters of Gary Allen's important book, "None Dare Call It Conspiracy," which I present to

my colleagues in Congress with the strong recommendation that—whatever your preconceived ideas about the conspiracy theory of history—you give its facts and arguments the most serious consideration.

These chapters, entitled "The Money Manipulators" and "Bankrolling the Bolshevik Revolution," explore the role of international financiers in the advance of communism and socialism throughout the world during the 20th century.

#### CHAPTER 3—THE MONEY MANIPULATORS

Many college history professors tell their charges that the books they will be using in the class are "objective." But stop and ask yourself: Is it possible to write a history book without a particular point of view? There are billions of events which take place in the world each day. To think of writing a complete history of a nation covering even a year is absolutely incredible.

Not only is a historian's ability to write an "objective" history limited by the sheer volume of happenings but by the fact that many of the most important happenings never appear in the papers or even in somebody's memoirs. The decisions reached by the "Big Boys" in the smoke-filled rooms are not reported even in the *New York Times* which ostensibly reports all the news that is fit to print. ("All the news that fits" is a more accurate description.)

In order to build his case, a historian must select a minuscule number of facts from the limited number that are known. If he does not have a "theory," how does he separate important facts from unimportant ones? As Professor Stuart Crane has pointed out, this is why every book "proves" the author's thesis. But no book is objective. No book can be objective; and this book is not objective. (Liberal reviewers should have a ball quoting that out of context.) The information in it is true, but the book is not objective. We have carefully selected the facts to prove our case. We believe that most other historians have focused on the landscape, and ignored that which is most important: the cart, boy and donkey.

Most of the facts which we bring out are readily verifiable at any large library. But our contention is that we have arranged these facts in the order which most accurately reveals their true significance in history. These are the facts the Establishment does not want you to know.

Have you ever had the experience of walking into a mystery movie two-thirds of the way through? Confusing wasn't it? All the evidence made it look as if the butler were the murderer, but in the final scenes you find out, surprisingly, that it was the man's wife all along. You have to stay and see the beginning of the film. Then as all the pieces fall into place, the story makes sense.

This situation is very similar to the one in which millions of Americans find themselves today. They are confused by current happenings in the nation. They have come in as the movie, so to speak, is going into its conclusion. The earlier portion of the mystery is needed to make the whole thing understandable. (Actually, we are not really starting at the beginning, but we are going back far enough to give meaning to today's happenings.)

In order to understand the conspiracy it is necessary to have some rudimentary knowledge of banking and, particularly, of international bankers. While it would be an oversimplification to ascribe the entire conspiracy to international bankers, they nevertheless have played a key role. Think of the conspiracy as a hand with one finger labelled "international banking," others "foundations," "the anti-religion movement," "Fabian Socialism," and "Communism." But it was the international bankers of whom Professor

Quigley was speaking when we quoted him earlier as stating that their aim was nothing less than control of the world through finance.

Where do governments get the enormous amounts of money they need? Most, of course, comes from taxation; but governments often spend more than they are willing to tax from their citizens and so are forced to borrow. Our national debt is now \$455 billion—every cent of it borrowed at interest from somewhere.

The public is led to believe that our government borrows from "the people" through savings bonds. Actually, only the smallest percentage of the national debt is held by individuals in this form. Most government bonds, except those owned by the government itself through its trust funds, are held by vast banking firms known as international banks.

For centuries there has been big money to be made by international bankers in the financing of governments and kings. Such operators are faced, however, with certain thorny problems. We know that smaller banking operations protect themselves by taking collateral, but what kind of collateral can you get from a government or a king? What if the banker comes to collect and the king says, "Off with his head"? The process through which one collects a debt from a government or a monarch is not a subject taught in the business schools of our universities, and most of us—never having been in the business of financing kings—have not given the problem much thought. But there is a king-financing business and to those who can ensure collection it is lucrative indeed.

Economics Professor Stuart Crane notes that there are two means used to collateralize loans to governments and kings. Whenever a business firm borrows big money its creditor obtains a voice in management to protect his investment. Like a business, no government can borrow big money unless willing to surrender to the creditor some measure of sovereignty as collateral. Certainly international bankers who have loaned hundreds of billions of dollars to governments around the world command considerable influence in the policies of such governments.

But the ultimate advantage the creditor has over the king or president is that if the ruler gets out of line the banker can finance his enemy or rival. Therefore, if you want to stay in the lucrative king-financing business, it is wise to have an enemy or rival waiting in the wings to unseat every king or president to whom you lend. If the king doesn't have an enemy, you must create one.

Premier in playing this game was the famous House of Rothschild. Its founder, Meyer Amschel Rothschild (1743-1812) of Frankfurt, Germany, kept one of his five sons at home to run the Frankfurt bank and sent the others to London, Paris, Vienna and Naples. The Rothschilds became incredibly wealthy during the nineteenth century by financing governments to fight each other. According to Professor Stuart Crane:

"If you will look back at every war in Europe during the Nineteenth Century, you will see that they always ended with the establishment of a 'balance of power.' With every re-shuffling there was a balance of power in a new grouping around the House of Rothschild in England, France, or Austria. They grouped nations so that if any king got out of line a war would break out and the war would be decided by which way the financing went. Researching the debt positions of the warring nations will usually indicate who was to be punished."

In describing the characteristics of the Rothschilds and other major international bankers, Dr. Quigley tells us that they remained different from ordinary bankers in several ways: they were cosmopolitan and international; they were close to govern-



ments and were particularly concerned with government debts, including foreign government debts; these bankers came to be called "international bankers." (Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope*, p. 52)

One major reason for the historical black-out on the role of the international bankers in political history is that the Rothschilds were Jewish. Anti-Semites have played into the conspiracy by trying to portray the entire conspiracy as Jewish. Nothing could be farther from the truth. The traditionally Anglo-Saxon J. P. Morgan and Rockefeller international banking institutions have played a key role in the conspiracy. But there is no denying the importance of the Rothschilds and their satellites. However, it is just as unreasonable and immoral to blame all Jews for the crimes of the Rothschilds as it is to hold all Baptists accountable for the crimes of the Rockefeller.

The Jewish members of the conspiracy have used an organization called the Anti-Defamation League as an instrument to try to convince everyone that any mention of the Rothschilds or their allies is an attack on all Jews. In this way they have stifled almost all honest scholarship on international bankers and made the subject taboo within universities.

Any individual or book exploring this subject is immediately attacked by hundreds of A.D.L. committees all over the country. The A.D.L. has never let truth or logic interfere with its highly professional smear jobs. When no evidence is apparent, the A.D.L., which staunchly opposed so-called "McCarthyism," accuses people of being "latent anti-Semites." Can you imagine how they would yell and scream if someone accused them of being "latent" Communists?

Actually, nobody has a right to be more angry at the Rothschild clique than their fellow Jews. The Warburgs, part of the Rothschild empire, helped finance Adolf Hitler. There were few if any Rothschild or Warburgs in the Nazi prison camps! They sat out the war in luxurious hotels in Paris or emigrated to the United States or England. As a group, Jews have suffered most at the hands of these power seekers. A Rothschild has much more in common with a Rockefeller than he does with a tailor from Budapest or the Bronx.

Since the keystone of the international banking empires has been government bonds, it has been in the interest of these international bankers to encourage government debt. The higher the debt the more the interest. Nothing drives government deeply into debt like a war; and it has not been an uncommon practice among international bankers to finance both sides of the bloodiest military conflicts. For example, during our Civil War the North was financed by the Rothschilds through their American agent, August Belmont, and the American South through the Erlangers, Rothschild relatives.

But while wars and revolutions have been useful to international bankers in gaining or increasing control over governments, the key to such control has always been control of money. You can control a government if you have it in your debt; a creditor is in a position to demand the privileges of monopoly from the sovereign. Money-seeking governments have granted monopolies in state banking, natural resources, oil concessions and transportation. However, the monopoly which the international financiers most covet is control over a nation's money.

Eventually these international bankers actually owned as private corporations the central banks of the various European nations. The Bank of England, Bank of France and Bank of Germany were not owned by their respective governments, as almost everyone imagines, but were privately owned monopolies granted by the heads of state, usually in return for loans. Under this system, observed Reginald McKenna, President

of the Midlands Bank of England: "Those that create and issue the money and credit direct the policies of government and hold in their hands the destiny of the people." Once the government is in debt to the bankers it is at their mercy. A frightening example was cited by the *London Financial Times* of September 26, 1921, which revealed that even at that time: "Half a dozen men at the top of the Big Five Banks could upset the whole fabric of government finance by refraining from renewing Treasury Bills."

All those who have sought dictatorial control over modern nations have understood the necessity of a central bank. When the League of Just Men hired a hack revolutionary named Karl Marx to write a blueprint for conquest called *The Communist Manifesto*, the fifth plank read: "Centralization of credit in the hands of the state, by means of a national bank with state capital and an exclusive monopoly." Lenin later said that the establishment of a central bank was ninety percent of communizing a country. Such conspirators knew that you cannot take control of a nation without military force unless that nation has a central bank through which you can control its economy. The anarchist Bakunin sarcastically remarked about the followers of Karl Marx: "They have one foot in the bank and one foot in the socialist movement."

The international financiers set up their own front man in charge of each of Europe's central banks. Professor Quigley reports:

"It must not be felt that these heads of the world's chief central banks were themselves substantive powers in world finance. They were not. Rather, they were the technicians and agents of the dominant investment bankers of their own countries, who had raised them up and were perfectly capable of throwing them down. The substantive financial powers of the world were in the hands of these investment bankers (also called 'international' or 'merchants' bankers) who remained largely behind the scenes in their own unincorporated private banks. These formed a system of international co-operation and national dominance which was more private, more powerful, and more secret than that of their agents in the central banks. . . ." (Quigley, op. cit., pp. 326-7.)

Dr. Quigley also reveals that the international bankers who owned and controlled the Banks of England and France maintained their power even after those Banks were theoretically socialized.

Naturally those who controlled the central banks of Europe were eager from the start to fasten a similar establishment on the United States. From the earliest days, the Founding Fathers had been conscious of attempts to control America through money manipulations and they carried on a running battle with the international bankers. Thomas Jefferson wrote to John Adams: ". . . I sincerely believe, with you, that banking establishments are more dangerous than standing armies. . . ."

But, even though America did not have a central bank after President Jackson abolished it in 1836, the European financiers and their American agents managed to obtain a great deal of control over our monetary system. Gustavus Myers, in his *History of The Great American Fortunes*, reveals:

"Under the surface, the Rothschilds long had a powerful influence in dictating American financial laws. The law records show that they were powers in the old Bank of the United States [abolished by Andrew Jackson]."

During the nineteenth century the leading financiers of the metropolitan East often cut one another's financial throats, but as their Western and rural victims started to organize politically, the "robber barons" saw that they had a "community of interest" toward which they must work together to

protect themselves from thousands of irate farmers and up and coming competitors. This diffusion of economic power was one of the main factors stimulating the demands for a central bank by would-be business and financial monopolists.

In *Years of Plunder* Proctor Hansl writes of this era:

"Among the Morgans, Kuhn-Loeb and other similar pillars of the industrial order there was less disposition to become involved in disagreements that led to financial dislocation. A community of interest came into being, with results that were highly beneficial. . . ."

But aside from the major Eastern centers, most American bankers and their customers still distrusted the whole concept.

In order to show the hinterlands that they were going to need a central banking system, the international bankers created a series of panics as a demonstration of their power—a warning of what would happen unless the rest of the bankers got into line. The man in charge of conducting these lessons was J. Pierpont Morgan, American-born but educated in England and Germany. Morgan is referred to by many, including Congressman Louis McFadden, (a banker who for ten years headed the House Banking and Currency Committee), as the top American agent of the English Rothschilds.

By the turn of the century J. P. Morgan was already an old hand at creating artificial panics. Such affairs were well co-ordinated. Senator Robert Owen, a co-author of the Federal Reserve Act, (who later deeply regretted his role), testified before a Congressional Committee that the bank he owned received from the National Bankers' Association what came to be known as the "Panic Circular of 1893." It stated: "You will at once retire one-third of your circulation and call in one-half of your loans. . . ."

Historian Frederick Lewis Allen tells in *Life* magazine of April 25, 1949, of Morgan's role in spreading rumors about the insolvency of the Knickerbocker Bank and The Trust Company of America, which rumors triggered the 1907 panic. In answer to the question: "Did Morgan precipitate the panic?" Allen reports:

"Oakleigh Thorne, the president of that particular trust company, testified later before a congressional committee that his bank had been subjected to only moderate withdrawals . . . that he had not applied for help, and that it was the [Morgan's] 'sore point' statement alone that had caused the run on his bank. From this testimony, plus the disciplinary measures taken by the Clearing House against the Heinze, Morse and Thomas banks, plus other fragments of supposedly pertinent evidence, certain chroniclers have arrived at the ingenious conclusion that the Morgan interests took advantage of the unsettled conditions during the autumn of 1907 to precipitate the panic, guiding it shrewdly as it progressed so that it would kill off rival banks and consolidate the preeminence of the banks within the Morgan orbit."

The "panic" which Morgan had created, he proceeded to end almost single-handedly. He had made his point. Frederick Allen explains:

"The lesson of the Panic of 1907 was clear, though not for some six years was it destined to be embodied in legislation: the United States gravely needed a central banking system. . . ."

The man who was to play the most significant part in providing America with that central bank was Paul Warburg, who along with his brother Felix had immigrated to the United States from Germany in 1902. They left brother Max (later a major financier of the Russian Revolution) at home in Frankfurt to run the family bank (M. N. Warburg & Company).

Paul Warburg married Nina Loeb, daughter of Solomon Loeb of Kuhn, Loeb and Com-

pany, America's most powerful international banking firm. Brother Felix married Frieda Schiff, daughter of Jacob Schiff, the ruling power behind Kuhn, Loeb. Stephen Birmingham writes in his authoritative *Our Crowd*: "In the eighteenth century the Schiffs and Rothschilds shared a double house" in Frankfurt. Schiff reportedly bought his partnership in Kuhn, Loeb with Rothschild money.

Both Paul and Felix Warburg became partners in Kuhn, Loeb and Company.

In 1907, the year the Morgan-precipitated panic, Paul Warburg began spending almost all of his time writing and lecturing on the need for "bank reform." Kuhn, Loeb and Company was sufficiently public spirited about the matter to keep him on salary at \$500,000 per year while for the next six years he donated his time to "the public good."

Working with Warburg in promoting this "banking reform" was Nelson Aldrich, known as "Morgan's floor broker in the Senate." Aldrich's daughter Abby married John D. Rockefeller Jr. (the current Governor of New York is named for his maternal grandfather).

After the Panic of 1907, Aldrich was appointed by the Senate to head the National Monetary Commission. Although he had no technical knowledge of banking, Aldrich and his entourage spent nearly two years and \$300,000 of the taxpayers' money being wined and dined by the owners of Europe's central banks as they toured the Continent "studying" central banking. When the Commission returned from its luxurious junket it held no meetings and made no report for nearly two years. But Senator Aldrich was busy "arranging" things. Together with Paul Warburg and other international bankers, he staged one of the most important secret meetings in the history of the United States. Rockefeller agent Frank Vanderlip admitted many years later in his memoirs:

"Despite my views about the value to society of greater publicity for the affairs of corporations, there was an occasion, near the close of 1910, when I was as secretive—indeed as furtive—as any conspirator. . . . I do not feel it is any exaggeration to speak of our secret expedition to Jekyll Island as the occasion of the actual conception of what eventually became the Federal Reserve System."

The secrecy was well warranted. At stake was control over the entire economy. Senator Aldrich had issued confidential invitations to Henry P. Davison of J. P. Morgan & Company; Frank A. Vanderlip, President of the Rockefeller-owned National City Bank; A. Piatt Andrew, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury; Benjamin Strong of Morgan's Bankers Trust Company; and Paul Warburg. They were all to accompany him to Jekyll Island, Georgia, to write the final recommendations of the National Monetary Commission report.

At Jekyll Island, writes B. C. Forbes in his *Men Who Are Making America*:

"After a general discussion it was decided to draw up certain broad principles on which all could agree. Every member of the group voted for a central bank as being the ideal cornerstone for any banking system." (Page 399)

Warburg stressed that the name "central bank" must be avoided at all costs. It was decided to promote the scheme as a "regional reserve" system with four (later twelve) branches in different sections of the country. The conspirators knew that the New York bank would dominate the rest, which would be marbled "white elephants" to deceive the public.

Out of the Jekyll Island meeting came the completion of the Monetary Commission Report and the Aldrich Bill. Warburg had proposed the bill be designated the "Federal Reserve System," but Aldrich insisted his own name was already associated in the pub-

lic mind with banking reform and that it would arouse suspicion if a bill were introduced which did not bear his name. However, Aldrich's name attached to the bill proved to be the kiss of death, since any law bearing his name was so obviously a project of the international bankers.

When the Aldrich Bill could not be pushed through Congress, a new strategy had to be devised. The Republican Party was too closely connected with Wall Street. The only hope for a central bank was to disguise it and have it put through by the Democrats as a measure to strip Wall Street of its power. The opportunity to do this came with the approach of the 1912 Presidential election. Republican President William Howard Taft, who had turned against the Aldrich Bill, seemed a sure-fire bet for reelection until Taft's predecessor, fellow Republican Teddy Roosevelt, agreed to run on the ticket of the Progressive Party. In *America's 60 Families*, Ferdinand Lundberg acknowledges:

"As soon as Roosevelt signified that he would again challenge Taft the President's defeat was inevitable. Throughout the three-cornered fight [Taft-Roosevelt-Wilson] Roosevelt had [Morgan agents Frank] Munsey and [George] Perkins constantly at his heels, supplying money, going over his speeches, bringing people from Wall Street in to help, and, in general, carrying the entire burden of the campaign against Taft. . . .

"Perkins and J. P. Morgan and Company were the substance of the Progressive Party; everything else was trimming. . . .

"In short, most of Roosevelt's campaign fund was supplied by the two Morgan hatchet men who were seeking Taft's scalp." (Pp. 110-112)

The Democrat candidate, Woodrow Wilson, was equally the property of Morgan. Dr. Gabriel Wilko in his *The Triumph of Conservatism*, reports: "In late 1907 he [Wilson] supported the Aldrich Bill on banking, and was full of praise for Morgan's role in American society." (Page 205) According to Lundberg: "For nearly twenty years before his nomination Woodrow Wilson had moved in the shadow of Wall Street." (Page 112)

Woodrow Wilson and Teddy Roosevelt proceeded to whistle-stop the country trying to out-do each other in florid (and hypocritical) denunciations of the Wall Street "money trust"—the same group of *Insiders* which was financing the campaigns of both.

Dr. Kolko goes on to tell us that, at the beginning of 1912, banking reform "seemed a dead issue. . . . The banking reform movement had neatly isolated itself." Wilson resurrected the issue and promised the country a money system free from domination by the international bankers of Wall Street. Moreover, the Democrat platform expressly stated: "We are opposed to the Aldrich plan for a central bank." But the "Big Boys" knew who they had bought. Among the international financiers who contributed heavily to the Wilson campaign, in addition to those already named, were Jacob Schiff, Bernard Baruch, Henry Morgenthau, Thomas Fortune Ryan, and *New York Times* publisher Adolph Ochs.

The *Insiders'* sheepdog who controlled Wilson and guided the program through Congress was the mysterious "Colonel" Edward Mandel House, the British-educated son of a representative of England's financial interests in the American South. The title was honorary; House never served in the military. He was strictly a behind-the-scenes wire-puller and is regarded by many historians as the real President of the United States during the Wilson years. House authored a book, *Philip Dru: Administrator*, in which he wrote of establishing "Socialism as dreamed by Karl Marx." As steps toward his goal, House, both in his book and in real life, called for passage of a graduated income tax and a central bank providing "a flexible [inflationary paper] currency." The graduated

income tax and a central bank are two of the ten planks of *The Communist Manifesto*.

In his *The Intimate Papers of Colonel House*, Professor Charles Seymour refers to the "Colonel" as the "unseen guardian angel" of the Federal Reserve Act. Seymour's work contains numerous documents and records showing constant contact between House and Paul Warburg while the Federal Reserve Act was being prepared and steered through Congress. Biographer George Viereck assures us that "The Schiffs, the Warburgs, the Kahns, the Rockefellers, and the Morgans put their faith in House. . . . Their faith was amply rewarded."

In order to support the fiction that the Federal Reserve Act was "a people's bill," the *Insider* financiers put up a smoke-screen of opposition to it. It was strictly a case of Br'er Rabbit begging not to be thrown into the briar patch. Both Aldrich and Vanderlip denounced what in actuality was their own bill. Nearly twenty-five years later Frank Vanderlip admitted: "Now although the Aldrich Federal Reserve Plan was defeated when it bore the name Aldrich, nevertheless its essential points were all contained in the plan that finally was adopted."

Taking advantage of Congress' desire to adjourn for Christmas, the Federal Reserve Act was passed on December 22, 1913 by a vote of 298 to 60 in the House, and in the Senate by a majority of 43 to 25. Wilson had fulfilled to the *Insiders* the pledge he had made in order to become President. Warburg told House, "Well, it hasn't got quite everything we want, but the lack can be adjusted later by administrative process."

There was genuine opposition to the Act, but it could not match the power of the bill's advocates. Conservative Henry Cabot Lodge Sr. proclaimed with great foresight, "The bill as it stands seems to me to open the way to a vast inflation of currency. . . . I do not like to think that any law can be passed which will make it possible to submerge the gold standard in a flood of irredeemable paper currency." (*Congressional Record*, June 10, 1932.) After the vote, Congressman Charles A. Lindbergh Sr., father of the famous aviator, told Congress:

"This act establishes the most gigantic trust on earth. . . . When the President signs this act the invisible government by the money power, proven to exist by the Money Trust investigation, will be legalized. . . .

"This is the Aldrich Bill in disguise. . . .

"The new law will create inflation whenever the trust want inflation. . . ."

The Federal Reserve Act was, and still is, hailed as a victory of "democracy" over the "money trust." Nothing could be farther from the truth.

The whole central bank concept was engineered by the very group it was supposed to strip of power. The myth that the "money trust" had been defrocked should have been exploded when Paul Warburg was appointed to the first Federal Reserve Board—a board which was handpicked by "Colonel" House. Paul Warburg relinquished his \$500,000 a year as a Kuhn, Loeb partner to take a \$12,000 a year job with the Federal Reserve. The "accidentalists" who teach in our universities would have you believe that he did it because he was a "public spirited citizen." And the man who served as Chairman of the New York Federal Reserve Bank during its early critical years was the same Benjamin Strong of the Morgan interests, who accompanied Warburg, Davison, Vanderlip *et al.* to Jekyll Island, Georgia, to draft the Aldrich Bill.

How powerful is our "central bank?" The Federal Reserve controls our money supply and interest rates, and thereby manipulates the entire economy—creating inflation or deflation, recession or boom, and sending the stock market up or down at whim. The Federal Reserve is so powerful that Congressman



Wright Patman, Chairman of the House Banking Committee, maintains:

"In the United States today we have in effect two governments. . . . We have the duly constituted Government. . . . Then we have an independent, uncontrolled and uncoordinated government in the Federal Reserve System, operating the money powers which are reserved to Congress by the Constitution."

Neither Presidents, Congressmen nor Secretaries of the Treasury direct the Federal Reserve! In the matters of money, the Federal Reserve directs them! The uncontrolled power of the "Fed" was admitted by Secretary of the Treasury David M. Kennedy in an interview for the May 5, 1969, issue of *U. S. News & World Report*:

"Q. Do you approve of the latest credit-tightening moves?"

"A. It's not my job to approve or disapprove. It is the action of the Federal Reserve." And, curiously enough, the Federal Reserve System has never audited and has firmly resisted all attempts by House Banking Committee Chairman Wright Patman to have it audited. (*N. Y. Times*, Sept. 14, 1967.)

How successful has the Federal Reserve System been? It depends on your point of view. Since Woodrow Wilson took his oath of office, the national debt has risen from \$1 billion to \$455 billion. The total amount of interest paid since then to the international bankers holding that debt is staggering, with interest having become the third largest item in the federal budget. Interest on the national debt is now \$22 billion every year, and climbing steeply as inflation pushes up the interest rate on government bonds. Meanwhile, our gold is mortgaged to European central banks, and our silver has all been sold. With economic catastrophe imminent, only a blind disciple of the "accidental theory of history" could believe that all of this has occurred by coincidence.

When the Federal Reserve System was foisted on an unsuspecting American public, there were absolute guarantees that there would be no more boom and bust economic cycles. The men who, behind the scenes, were pushing the central bank concept for the international bankers faithfully promised that from then on there would be only steady growth and perpetual prosperity. However, Congressman Charles A. Lindberg Sr. accurately proclaimed: "From now on depressions will be scientifically created."

Using a central bank to create alternate periods of inflation and deflation, and thus whipsawing the public for vast profits, had been worked out by the international bankers to an exact science.

Having built the Federal Reserve as a tool to consolidate and control wealth, the international bankers were now ready to make a major killing. Between 1923 and 1929, the Federal Reserve expanded (inflated) the money supply by sixty-two percent. Much of this new money was used to bid the stock market up to dizzying heights.

At the same time that enormous amounts of credit money were being made available, the mass media began to ballyhoo tales of the instant riches to be made in the stock market. According to Ferdinand Lundberg:

"For profits to be made on these funds the public had to be induced to speculate, and it was so induced by misleading newspaper accounts, many of them bought and paid for by the brokers that operated the pools. . . ."

The House Hearings on Stabilization of the Purchasing Power of the Dollar disclosed evidence in 1928 that the Federal Reserve Board was working closely with the heads of European central banks. The Committee warned that a major crash had been planned in 1927. At a secret luncheon of the Federal Reserve Board and heads of the European central banks, the committee warned, the in-

ternational bankers were tightening the noose.

Montagu Norman, Governor of the Bank of England came to Washington on February 6, 1929, to confer with Andrew Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury. On November 11, 1927, the *Wall Street Journal* described Mr. Norman as "the currency dictator of Europe." Professor Carroll Quigley notes that Norman, a close confidant of J. P. Morgan, admitted: "I hold the hegemony of the world." Immediately after this mysterious visit, the Federal Reserve Board reversed its easy-money policy and began raising the discount rate. The balloon which had been inflated constantly for nearly seven years was about to be exploded.

On October 24, the feathers hit the fan. Writing in *The United States' Unresolved Monetary and Political Problems*, William Bryan describes what happened:

"When everything was ready, the New York financiers started calling 24 hour broker call loans. This meant that the stock brokers and the customers had to dump their stock on the market in order to pay the loans. This naturally collapsed the stock market and brought a banking collapse all over the country because the banks not owned by the oligarchy were heavily involved in broker call claims at this time, and bank runs soon exhausted their coin and currency and they had to close. The Federal Reserve System would not come to their aid, although they were instructed under the law to maintain an elastic currency."

The investing public, including most stock brokers and bankers, took a horrendous blow in the crash, but not the *Insiders*. They were either out of the market or had sold "short" so that they made enormous profits as the Dow Jones plummeted. For those who knew the score, a comment by Paul Warburg had provided the warning to sell. That signal came on March 9, 1929, when the *Financial Chronicle* quoted Warburg as giving this sound advice:

"If orgies of unrestricted speculation are permitted to spread too far . . . the ultimate collapse is certain . . . to bring about a general depression involving the whole country."

Sharples were later able to buy back these stocks at a ninety percent discount from their former highs.

To think that the scientifically engineered Crash of '29 was an accident or the result of stupidity defies all logic. The international bankers who promoted the inflationary policies and pushed the propaganda which pumped up the stock market represented too many generations of accumulated expertise to have blundered into "the great depression."

Congressman Louis McFadden, Chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, commented:

"It [the depression] was not accidental. It was a carefully contrived occurrence. . . . The international bankers sought to bring about a condition of despair here so that they might emerge as the rulers of us all."

Although we have not had another depression of the magnitude of that which followed 1929, we have since suffered regular recessions. Each of these has followed a period in which the Federal Reserve tromped down hard on the money accelerator and then slammed on the brakes. Since 1929 the following recessions have been created by such manipulation:

1936-1937—Stock Prices fell fifty percent;  
1948—Stock prices dropped sixteen percent;

1953—Stock declined thirteen percent;  
1956-1957—The market dipped thirteen percent;

1957—Late in the year the market plunged nineteen percent;

1960—The market was off seventeen percent;

1966—Stock prices plummeted twenty-five percent;

1970—The market plunged over twenty-five percent.

Chart 5, based on one appearing in the highly respected financial publication, *Indicator Digest* of June 24, 1969, shows the effects on the Dow-Jones Industrial Average of Federal Reserve policies of expanding or restricting the monetary supply. This is how the stock market is manipulated and how depression or recessions are scientifically created. If you have inside knowledge as to which way the Federal Reserve policy is going to go, you can make a ton of money. (Chart 5 not printed.)

The members of the Federal Reserve Board are appointed by the President for fourteen year terms. Since these positions control the entire economy of the country they are far more important than cabinet positions, but who has ever heard of any of them except possibly Chairman Arthur Burns? These appointments which should be extensively debated by the Senate are routinely approved. But, here, as in Europe, these men are mere figureheads, put in their positions at the behest of the international bankers who finance the Presidential campaigns of both political parties.

And, Professor Quigley reveals that these international bankers who owned and controlled the Banks of England and France maintained their power even after those banks were theoretically socialized. The American system is slightly different, but the net effect is the same—ever-increasing debt requiring ever-increasing interest payments, inflation and periodic scientifically created depressions and recessions.

The end result, if the *Insiders* have their way, will be the dream of Montagu Norman of the Bank of England "that the Hegemony of World Finance should reign supreme over everyone, everywhere, as one whole supernatural control mechanism." (*Montagu Norman* by John Hargrave, Greystone Press, N.Y., 1942.)

#### CHAPTER 4—BANKROLLING THE BOLSHEVIK REVOLUTION

The establishing of the Federal Reserve System provided the "conspiracy" with an instrument whereby the international bankers could run the national debt up to the sky, thereby collecting enormous amounts of interest and also gaining control over the borrower. During the Wilson Administration alone, the national debt expanded 800 percent.

Two months prior to the passage of the Federal Reserve Act, the conspirators had created the mechanism to collect the funds to pay the interest on the national debt. That mechanism was the progressive income tax, the second plank of Karl Marx' *Communist Manifesto* which contained ten planks for socializing a country.

One quite naturally assumes that the graduated income tax would be opposed by the wealthy. The fact is that many of the wealthiest Americans supported it. Some, no doubt, out of altruism and because, at first, the taxes were very small. But others backed the scheme because they already had a plan for permanently avoiding both the income tax and the subsequent inheritance tax.

What happened was this: At the turn of the century the Populists, a group of rural socialists, were gaining strength and challenging the power of the New York bankers and monopolist industrialists. While the Populists had the wrong answers, they asked many of the right questions. Unfortunately, they were led to believe that the banker-monopolist control over government, which they opposed, was a product of free enterprise.

Since the Populist threat to the cartellists was from the Left (there being no orga-

nized political movement for *laissez-faire*), the *Insiders* moved to capture the Left. Professor Quigley discloses that over fifty years ago the Morgan firm decided to infiltrate the Leftwing political movement in the United States. This was not difficult to do since these Left groups needed funds and were eager for help to get their message to the public. Wall Street supplied both. There was nothing new about this decision, says Quigley, since other financiers had talked about it and even attempted it earlier. He continues:

"What made it decisively important this time was the combination of its adoption by the dominant Wall Street financier, at a time when tax policy was driving all financiers to seek tax-exempt refuges for their fortunes..." (Page 938)

Radical movements are never successful unless they attract big money and/or outside support. The great historian of the Twentieth Century, Oswald Spengler, was one of those who saw what American Liberals refuse to see—that the Left is controlled by its alleged enemy, the malefactors of great wealth. He wrote in his monumental *Decline of the West* (Modern Library, New York, 1945):

"There is no proletarian, not even a Communist, movement, that has not operated in the interests of money, in the direction indicated by money, and for the time being permitted by money—and that without the idealists among its leaders having the slightest suspicion of the fact."

While the Populist movement was basically non-conspiratorial, its Leftist ideology and platform were made to order for the elitist *Insiders* because it aimed at concentrating power in government. The *Insiders* knew they could control that power and use it to their own purposes. They were not, of course, interested in promoting competition but in restricting it. Professor Gabriel Kolko has prepared a lengthy volume presenting the undeniable proof that the giant corporate manipulators promoted much of the so-called "progressive legislation" of the Roosevelt and Wilson eras—legislation which ostensibly was aimed at controlling their abuses, but which was so written as to suit their interests. In *The Triumph of Conservatism* (by which Kolko mistakably means big business), he notes:

"... the significant reason for many businessmen welcoming and working to increase federal intervention into their affairs has been virtually ignored by historians and economists. The oversight was due to the illusion that American industry was centralized and monopolized to such an extent that it could rationalize the activity [regulate production and prices] in its various branches voluntarily. Quite the opposite was true. Despite the large numbers of mergers, and the growth in the absolute size of many corporations, the dominant tendency in the American economy at the beginning of this century was toward growing competition. Competition was unacceptable to many key business and financial interests..."

The best way for the *Insiders* to eliminate this growing competition was to impose a progressive income tax on their competitors while writing the laws so as to include built-in escape hatches for themselves. Actually, very few of the proponents of the graduated income tax realized they were playing into the hands of those they were seeking to control. As Ferdinand Lundberg notes in *The Rich And The Super Rich*:

"What it [the income tax] became, finally, was a siphon gradually inserted into the pocketbooks of the general public. Imposed to popular huzzas as a class tax, the income tax was gradually turned into a mass tax in a jiu-jitsu turnaround..."

The *Insiders'* principal mouthpiece in the Senate during this period was Nelson Aldrich, one of the conspirators involved in engineering the creation of the Federal Reserve

and the maternal grandfather of Nelson Aldrich Rockefeller. Lundberg says that "When Aldrich spoke, newsmen understood that although the words were his, the dramatic line was surely approved by 'Big John' [D. Rockefeller]. . . ." In earlier years Aldrich had denounced the income tax as "communistic and socialistic," but in 1909 he pulled a dramatic and stunning reversal. *The American Biographical Dictionary* comments:

"Just when the opposition had become formidable he [Aldrich] took the wind out of its sails by bringing forward, with the support of the President [Taft], a proposed amendment to the Constitution empowering Congress to lay income taxes."

Howard Hinton records in his biography of Cordell Hull that Congressman Hull, who had been pushing in the House for the income tax, wrote this stunned observation:

"During the past few weeks the unexpected spectacle of certain so-called 'old-line conservative' [sic] Republican leaders in Congress suddenly reversing their attitude of a lifetime and seemingly espousing, through ill-concealed reluctance, the proposed income-tax amendment to the Constitution has been the occasion of universal surprise and wonder."

The escape hatch for the *Insiders* to avoid paying taxes was ready. By the time the Amendment had been approved by the states (even before the income-tax was passed), the Rockefellers and Carnegie foundations were in full operation.

One must remember that it was to break up the Standard Oil (Rockefeller) and U. S. Steel (Carnegie) monopolies that the various anti-trust acts were ostensibly passed. These monopolists could now compound their wealth tax-free while competitors had to face a graduated income tax which made it difficult to amass capital. As we have said, socialism is not a share-the-wealth program, as the socialists would like you to believe, but a consolidate-and-control-the-wealth program for the *Insiders*. The Reece Committee which investigated foundations for Congress in 1953 proved with an overwhelming amount of evidence that the various Rockefeller and Carnegie foundations have been promoting socialism since their inception. (See *Rene Wormser's Foundations: Their Power and Influence*, Devin Adair, New York, 1958.)

The conspirators now had created the mechanisms to run up the debt, to collect the debt, and (for themselves) to avoid the taxes required to pay the yearly interest on the debt. Then all that was needed was a reason to escalate the debt. Nothing runs up a national debt like a war. And World War I was being brewed in Europe.

In 1916, Woodrow Wilson was re-elected by a hair. He had based his campaign on the slogan: "He Kept Us Out of War!" The American public was extremely opposed to America's getting involved in a European war. Staying out of the perennial foreign quarrels had been an American tradition since George Washington. But as Wilson was stumping the country giving his solemn word that American soldiers would not be sent into a foreign war, he was preparing to do just the opposite. His "alter ego," as he called "Colonel" House, was making behind-the-scenes agreements with England which committed America to entering the war. Just five months later we were in it. The same crowd which manipulated the passage of the income tax and the Federal Reserve System wanted America in the war. J. P. Morgan, John D. Rockefeller, "Colonel" House, Jacob Schiff, Paul Warburg and the rest of the Jekyll Island conspirators were all deeply involved in getting us involved. Many of these financiers had loaned England large sums of money. In fact, J. P. Morgan & Co. served as British financial agents in this country during World War I.

While all of the standard reasons given for the outbreak of World War I in Europe doubtless were factors, there were also other

more important causes. The conspiracy had been planning the war for over two decades. The assassination of an Austrian Archduke was merely an incident providing an excuse for starting a chain reaction.

After years of fighting, the war was a complete stalemate and would have ended almost immediately in a negotiated settlement (as had most other European conflicts) had not the U.S. declared war on Germany.

As soon as Wilson's re-election had been engineered through the "he kept us out of war" slogan, a complete reversal of propaganda was instituted. In those days before radio and television, public opinion was controlled almost exclusively by newspapers. Many of the major newspapers were controlled by the Federal Reserve crowd. Now they began beating the drums over the "inevitability of war." Arthur Ponsonby, a member of the British parliament, admitted in his book *Falsehood In War Time* (E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., New York, 1928): "There must have been more deliberate lying in the world from 1914 to 1918 than in any other period of the world's history." Propaganda concerning the war was heavily one-sided. Although after the war many historians admitted that one side was as guilty as the other in starting the war, Germany was pictured as a militaristic monster which wanted to rule the world. Remember, this picture was painted by Britain which had its soldiers in more countries around the world than all other nations put together. So-called "Prussian militarism" did exist, but it was no threat to conquer the world. Meanwhile, the sun never set on the British Empire! Actually, the Germans were proving to be tough business competitors in the world's markets and the British did not approve.

In order to generate war fever, the sinking of the *Lusitania*—a British ship torpedoed two years earlier—was revived and given renewed headlines. German submarine warfare was turned into a major issue by the newspapers.

Submarine warfare was a phony issue. Germany and England were at war. Each was blockading the other country. J. P. Morgan and other financiers were selling munitions to Britain. The Germans could not allow those supplies to be delivered any more than the English would have allowed them to be delivered to Germany. If Morgan wanted to take the risks and reap the rewards (or suffer the consequences) of selling munitions to England, that was his business. It was certainly nothing over which the entire nation should have been dragged into war.

The *Lusitania*, at the time it was sunk, was carrying six million pounds of ammunition. It was actually illegal for American passengers to be aboard a ship carrying munitions to belligerents. Almost two years before the liner was sunk, the *New York Tribune* (June 19, 1913) carried a squib which stated: "Cunard officials acknowledged to the *Tribune* correspondent today that the greyhound [Lusitania] is being equipped with high power naval rifles. . . ." In fact, the *Lusitania* was registered in the British navy as an auxiliary cruiser. (Barnes, Harry E., *The Genesis of the War*, Alfred Knopf, New York, 1926, p. 611.) In addition, the German government took out large ads in all the New York papers warning potential passengers that the ship was carrying munitions and telling them not to cross the Atlantic on it. Those who chose to make the trip knew the risk they were taking. Yet the sinking of the *Lusitania* was used by clever propagandists to portray the Germans as inhuman slaughtering of innocents. Submarine warfare was manufactured into a *cause célèbre* to push us into war. On April 6, 1917, Congress declared war. The American people acquiesced on the basis that it would be a "war to end all wars."

During the "war to end all wars," *Insider*



banker Bernard Baruch was made absolute dictator over American business when President Wilson appointed him Chairman of the War Industries Board, where he had control of all domestic contracts for Allied war materials. Bauch made lots of friends while placing tens of billions in government contracts, and it was widely rumored on Wall Street that out of the war to make the world safe for international bankers he netted \$200 million for himself.

While *Insider* banker Paul Warburg controlled the Federal Reserve, and international banker Bernard Baruch placed government contracts, international banker Eugene Meyer, a former partner of Baruch and the son of a partner in the Rothschilds' international banking house of Lazard Frères, was Wilson's choice to head the War Finance Corporation, where he too made a little money.—(Myer later gained control of the highly influential Washington Post which became known as the "Washington Daily Worker.")

It should be noted that Sir William Wiseman, the man sent by British Intelligence to help bring the United States into the war, was amply rewarded for his services. He stayed in this country after WWI as a new partner in the Jacob Schiff-Paul Warburg-controlled Kuhn, Loeb bank.

World War I was a financial bonanza for the international bankers. But it was a catastrophe of such magnitude for the United States that few even today grasp its importance. The war reversed our traditional foreign policy of non-involvement and we have been enmeshed almost constantly ever since in perpetual wars for perpetual peace. Winston Churchill once observed that all nations would have been better off had the U.S. minded its own business. Had we done so, he said, "peace would have been made with Germany; and there would have been no collapse in Russia leading to Communism; no breakdown of government in Italy followed by Fascism; and Nazism never would have gained ascendancy in Germany." (*Social Justice Magazine*, July 3, 1939, p. 4.)

The Bolshevik Revolution in Russia was obviously one of the great turning points in world history. It is an event over which misinformation abounds. The myth-makers and re-writers of history have done their landscape painting jobs well. The establishing of Communism in Russia is a classic example of the second "big lie" of Communism, i.e., that it is the movement of the downtrodden masses rising up against exploiting bosses. This cunning deception has been fostered since before the first French Revolution in 1789.

Most people today believe the Communists were successful in Russia because they were able to rally behind them the sympathy and frustration of the Russian people who were sick of the tyranny of the Czars. This is to ignore the history of what actually happened. While almost everybody is reminded that the Bolshevik Revolution took place in November of 1917, few know that the Czar had abdicated seven months earlier in March. When Czar Nicholas II abdicated, a provisional government was established by Prince Lvov who wanted to pattern the new Russian government after our own. But, unfortunately, the Lvov government gave way to the Kerensky regime. Kerensky, a so-called democratic socialist, may have been running a caretaker government for the Communists. He kept the war going against Germany and the other Central Powers, but he issued a general amnesty for Communists and other revolutionaries, many of whom had been exiled after the abortive Red Revolution of 1905. Back to mother Russia came 250,000 dedicated revolutionaries, and Kerensky's own government's doom was sealed.

In the Soviet Union, as in every Communist country (or as they call themselves—the Socialist countries), the power has not

come to the Communists' hands because the downtrodden masses willed it so. The power has come from the top down in every instance. Let us briefly reconstruct the sequences of the Communist takeover.

The year is 1917. The Allies are fighting the Central Powers. The Allies include Russia, the British Commonwealth, France and by April 1917, the United States. In March of 1917, purposeful planners set in motion the forces to compel Czar Nicholas II to abdicate. He did so under pressure from the Allies after severe riots in the Czarist capital of Petrograd, riots that were caused by the breakdowns in the transportation system which cut the city off from food supplies and led to the closing of factories.

But where were Lenin and Trotsky when all this was taking place? Lenin was in Switzerland and had been in Western Europe since 1905 when he was exiled for trying to topple the Czar in the abortive Communist revolution of that year. Trotsky also was in exile, a reporter for a Communist newspaper on the lower east side of New York City. The Bolsheviks were not a visible political force at the time the Czar abdicated. And they came to power not because the downtrodden masses of Russia called them back, but because very powerful men in Europe and the United States sent them in.

Lenin was sent across Europe-at-war on the famous "sealed train." With him Lenin took some \$5 to \$6 million in gold. The whole thing was arranged by the German high command and Max Warburg, through another very wealthy and life-long socialist by the name of Alexander Helphand alias "Parvus." When Trotsky left New York aboard the S.S. Christiania, on March 27, 1917, with his entourage of 275 revolutionaries, the first port of call was Halifax, Nova Scotia. There the Canadians grabbed Trotsky and his money and impounded them both. This was a very logical thing for the Canadian government to do for Trotsky had said many times that if he were successful in coming to power in Russia he would immediately stop what he called the "imperialist war" and sue for a separate peace with Germany. This would free millions of German troops for transfer from the Eastern front to the Western front where they could kill Canadians. So Trotsky cooled his heels in a Canadian prison—for five days. Then all of a sudden the British (through future Kuhn, Loeb partner Sir William Wiseman) and the United States (through none other than the ubiquitous "Colonel" House) pressured the Canadian government. And, despite the fact we were now in the war, said, in so many words, "Let Trotsky go." Thus, with an American passport, Trotsky went back to meet Lenin. They joined up, and by November, through bribery, cunning, brutality and deception, they were able (not to bring the masses rallying to their cause, but) to hire enough thugs and make enough deals to impose out of the gun barrel what Lenin called "all power to the Soviets." The Communists came to power by seizing a mere handful of key cities. In fact, practically the whole Bolshevik Revolution took place in one city—Petrograd. It was as if the whole United States became Communist because a Communist-led mob seized Washington, D.C. It was years before the Soviets solidified power throughout Russia.

The Germans, on the face of it, had a plausible excuse for financing Lenin and Trotsky. The two Germans most responsible for the financing of Lenin were Max Warburg and a displaced Russian named Alexander Helphand. They could claim that they were serving their country's cause by helping and financing Lenin. However, these two German "patriots" neglected to mention to the Kaiser their plan to foment a Communist revolution in Russia. The picture takes on another dimension when you consider that the brother

of Max Warburg was Paul Warburg, prime mover in establishing the Federal Reserve System and who from his position on the Federal Reserve Board of Directors, played a key role in financing the American war effort. (When news leaked out in American papers about brother Max running the German finances, Paul resigned from his Federal Reserve post without a whimper.) From here on the plot thickens.

For the father-in-law of Max Warburg's brother, Felix, was Jacob Schiff, senior partner in Kuhn, Loeb & Co. (Paul and Felix Warburg, you will recall, were also partners in Kuhn, Loeb & Co. while Max ran the Rothschild-allied family bank of Frankfurt.) Jacob Schiff also helped finance Leon Trotsky. According to the *New York Journal-American* of February 3, 1949: "Today it is estimated by Jacob's grandson, John Schiff, that the old man sank about 20,000,000 dollars for the final triumph of Bolshevism in Russia."

One of the best sources of information on the financing of the Bolshevik Revolution is *Czarism and the Revolution* by an important White Russian General named Arsene de Goulevitch who was founder in France of the Union of Oppressed Peoples. In this volume, written in French and subsequently translated into English, de Goulevitch notes:

"The main purveyors of funds for the revolution, however, were neither the crackpot Russian millionaires nor the armed bandits of Lenin. The 'real' money primarily came from certain British and American circles which for a long time past had lent their support to the Russian revolutionary cause. . . ."

De Goulevitch continues:

"The important part played by the wealthy American banker, Jacob Schiff, in the events in Russia, though as yet only partially revealed, is no longer a secret."

General Alexander Nechovolodov is quoted by de Goulevitch as stating in his book on the Bolshevik Revolution:

"In April 1917, Jacob Schiff publicly declared that it was thanks to his financial support that the revolution in Russia had succeeded."

"In the Spring of the same year, Schiff commenced to subsidize Trotsky. . . ."

"Simultaneously Trotsky and Co. were also being subsidized by Max Warburg and Olaf Aschberg of the Nye Banken of Stockholm . . . The Rhine Westphalian Syndicate and Jivotovsky, . . . whose daughter later married Trotsky."

Schiff spent millions to overthrow the Czar and more millions to overthrow Kerensky. He was sending money to Russia long after the true character of the Bolsheviks was known to the world. Schiff raised \$10 million, supposedly for Jewish war relief in Russia, but later events revealed it to be a good business investment. (Forbes, B. C., *Men Who Are Making America*, pp. 334-5.)

According to de Goulevitch:

"Mr. Bakhmetiev, the late Russian Imperial Ambassador to the United States, tells us that the Bolsheviks, after victory, transferred 600 million roubles in gold between the years 1918 and 1922 to Kuhn, Loeb & Company [Schiff's firm]."

Schiff's participation in the Bolshevik Revolution, though quite naturally now denied, was well known among Allied intelligence services at the time. This led to much talk about Bolshevism being a Jewish plot. The result was that the subject of financing the Communist takeover of Russia became taboo. Later evidence indicates that the bank-rolling of the Bolsheviks was handled by a syndicate of international bankers, which in addition to the Schiff-Warburg clique, included Morgan and Rockefeller interests. Documents show that the Morgan organization put at least \$1 million in the Red revolutionary kitty.—(Hagadorn, Herman, *The Magnate*, John Day, N.Y. See also *Washington Post*, Feb. 2, 1918, p. 195.)

Still another important financier of the Bolshevik Revolution was an extremely wealthy Englishman named Lord Alfred Milner, the organizer and head of a secret organization called "The Round Table" Group which was backed by Lord Rothschild (discussed in the next chapter).

De Goulevitch notes further:

"On April 7, 1917, General Janin made the following entry in his diary ('Au G.Q.G. Russe'—At Russian G.H.Q.—Le Monde Slave, Vol. 2, 1927, pp. 296-297): Long interview with R., who confirmed what I have previously been told by M. After referring to the German hatred of himself and his family, he turned to the subject of the Revolution which he claimed, was engineered by the English and, more precisely, by Sir George Buchanan and Lord [Alfred] Milner. Petrograd at the time was teeming with English. . . . He could, he asserted, name the streets and the numbers of the houses in which British agents were quartered. They were reported, during the rising, to have distributed money to the soldiers and incited them to mutiny."

De Goulevitch goes on to reveal: "In private interviews I have been told that over 21 million rubles were spent by Lord Milner in financing the Russian Revolution."

It should be noted parenthetically that Lord Milner, Paul, Felix and Max Warburg represented "their" respective countries at the Paris Peace Conference at the conclusion of World War I.

If we can somehow ascribe Max Warburg's financing of Lenin to German "patriotism," is was certainly not "patriotism" which inspired Schiff, Morgan, Rockefeller and Milner to bankroll the Bolsheviks. Both Britain and America were at war with Germany and were allies of Czarist Russia. To free dozens of German divisions to switch from the Eastern front to France and kill hundreds of thousands of American and British soldiers was nothing short of treason.

In the Bolshevik Revolution we see many of the same old faces that were responsible for creating the Federal Reserve System, initiating the graduated income tax, setting up the tax-free foundations and pushing us into WWI. However, if you conclude that this is anything but coincidental, your name will be immediately expunged from the Social Register.

No revolution can be successful without organization and money. "The downtrodden masses" usually provided little of the former and none of the latter. But *Insiders* at the top can arrange for both.

What did these people possibly have to gain in financing the Russian Revolution? What did they have to gain by keeping it alive and afloat, or, during the 1920's by pouring millions of dollars into what Lenin called his New Economic Program, thus saving the Soviets from collapse?

Why would these "capitalists" do all this? If your goal is global conquest, you have to start somewhere. It may or may not have been coincidental, but Russia was the one major European country without a central bank. In Russia, for the first time, the Communist conspiracy gained a geographical homeland from which to launch assaults against the other nations of the world. The West now had an enemy.

In the Bolshevik Revolution we have some of the world's richest and most powerful men financing a movement which claims its very existence is based on the concept of stripping of their wealth men like the Rothschilds, Rockefellers, Schiffs, Warburgs, Morgans, Harrimans, and Milners. But obviously these men have no fear of international Communism. It is only logical to assume that if they financed it and do not fear it, it must be because they control it. Can there be any other explanation that makes sense? Remember that for over 150 years it has been standard operating procedure of the Rothschilds and their allies to control both sides of every con-

flict. You must have an "enemy" if you are going to collect from the King. The East-West balance-of-power politics is used as one of the main excuses for the socialization of America. Although it was not their main purpose, by nationalization of Russia the *Insiders* bought themselves an enormous piece of real estate, complete with mineral rights, for somewhere between \$30 and \$40 million.

We can only theorize on the manner in which Moscow is controlled from New York, London and Paris. Undoubtedly much of the control is economic, but certainly the international bankers have an enforcer arm within Russia to keep the Soviet leaders in line. The organization may be SMERSH, the international Communist murder organization described in testimony before Congressional Committees and by Ian Fleming in his James Bond books. For although the Bond novels were wildly imaginative, Fleming had been in British Navy intelligence, maintained excellent intelligence contacts around the world and was reputedly a keen student of the international conspiracy.

We do know this, however. A clique of American financiers not only helped establish Communism in Russia, but has striven mightily ever since to keep it alive. Ever since 1918 this clique has been engaged in transferring money and, probably more important, technical information, to the Soviet Union. This is made abundantly clear in the three volume history *Western Technology and Soviet Economic Development* by scholar Antony Sutton of Stanford University's Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace. Using, for the most part, official State Department documents, Sutton shows conclusively that virtually everything the Soviets possess has been acquired from the West. It is not much of an exaggeration to say that the U.S.S.R. was made in the U.S.A. The landscape painters, unable to refute Sutton's monumental scholarship, simply paint him out of the picture.

At Versailles, this same clique carved up Europe and set the stage for World War II. As Lord Curzon commented: "It is not a peace treaty, it is simply a break in hostilities." In 1933, the same *Insiders* pushed FDR into recognizing the Soviet Union, thus saving it from financial collapse, while at the same time they were underwriting huge loans on both sides of the Atlantic for the new regime of Adolph Hitler. In so doing they assisted greatly in setting the stage for World War II, and the events that followed. In 1941 the same *Insiders* rushed to the aid of our "noble ally," Stalin, after his break with Hitler. In 1943, these same *Insiders* marched off to the Teheran Conference and proceeded to start the carving up of Europe after the second great "war to end war." Again at Yalta and Potsdam in 1945, they established the China policy . . . later summarized by Owen Lattimore: "The problem was how to allow them [China] to fall without making it look as if the United States had pushed them." The facts are inescapable. In one country after another Communism had been imposed on the local population from the top down. The most prominent forces for the imposition of that tyranny came from the United States and Great Britain. Here is a charge that no American enjoys making, but the facts lead to no other possible conclusion. The idea that Communism is a movement of the downtrodden masses is a fraud.

None of the foregoing makes sense if Communism really is what the Communists and the Establishment tell us it is. But if Communism is an arm of a bigger conspiracy to control the world by power-mad billionaires (and brilliant but ruthless academicians who have shown them how to use their power) it all becomes perfectly logical.

It is at this point that we should again make it clear that this conspiracy is not made up solely of bankers and international cartels, but includes every field of human

endeavor. Starting with Voltaire and Adam Weishaupt and running through John Ruskin, Sidney Webb, Nicholas Murray Butler, and on to the present with Henry Kissinger and John Kenneth Galbraith, it has always been the scholar looking for avenues of power who has shown the "sons of the very powerful" how their wealth could be used to rule the world.

We cannot stress too greatly the importance of the reader keeping in mind that this book is discussing only one segment of the conspiracy, certain international bankers. Other equally important segments which work to foment labor, religious and racial strife in order to promote socialism have been described in numerous other books. These other divisions of the conspiracy operate independently of the international bankers in most cases and it would certainly be disastrous to ignore the danger to our freedom they represent.

It would be equally disastrous to lump all businessmen and bankers into the conspiracy. One must draw the distinction between competitive free enterprise, the most moral and productive system ever devised, and cartel capitalism dominated by industrial monopolists and international bankers. The difference is the private enterpriser operates by offering products and services in a competitive free market while the cartel capitalist uses the government to force the public to do business with him. These corporate socialists are the deadly enemies of competitive private enterprise.

Liberals are willing to believe that these "robber barons" will fix prices, rig markets, establish monopolies, buy politicians, exploit employees and fire them the day before they are eligible for pensions, but they absolutely will not believe that these same men would want to rule the world or would use Communism as the striking edge of their conspiracy. When one discusses the machinations of these men, Liberals usually respond by saying, "But don't you think they mean well?"

However, if you think with logic, reason and precision in this field and try to expose these power seekers, the Establishment's mass media will accuse you of being a dangerous paranoid who is "dividing" our people. In every other area, of course, they encourage dissent as being healthy in a "democracy."

## WHAT MINIMUM WAGES DO NOT DO

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1972

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, during the recent debates on the minimum wage legislation, I expressed my opinion against the principle of establishing Federal minimum wages—particularly as this legislation affects young citizens and part-time employees.

The counterproductive implications of this popular political issue are becoming daily more apparent. Minimum wage laws are causing the welfare rolls to swell, increasing the unemployment ranks, reducing the motivation to work and to earn money for one's own self-support and self-respect—and producing other harmful consequences.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to read a most enlightening editorial confirming my position which appeared in yesterday's—Chicago Tribune—Sunday, July 30, 1972.

I direct the following editorial to the attention of my colleagues:



## WHAT MINIMUM WAGES DON'T DO

Illinois Rep. Roman Pucinski, who is running for the Senate and is a member of the House-Senate conference committee considering the minimum wage bill, supports the more generous Senate version of the bill. He also thinks the \$2.20 rate should be effective next year instead of in 1974.

"This nation could save billions of dollars in welfare costs," he said the other day, "the sooner we crack the \$2-an-hour minimum. . . . There is a direct correlation between the minimum wage and the cost of public welfare."

There is indeed a correlation, as the accompanying graph shows, but it isn't quite the relationship Mr. Pucinski has in mind. With every increase in the minimum wage, welfare costs have soared.

Of course there are a great many factors that affects welfare costs, and the minimum wage is only one of them. Mr. Pucinski says that giving more money to the lowest paid workers will reduce their need for public aid. To some extent it will. But the higher minimum wage also eliminates a good many marginal jobs which aren't worth the higher pay—and those who lose these jobs or can't get them often end up on relief. Higher minimum wages also tend to push wages up all along the line and are thus a factor in the inflation which raises the level of public aid payments.

The record suggests that higher minimum wages do more to increase public aid costs than to reduce them, and that the chief value of minimum wages is in campaign oratory. We are glad to offer Mr. Pucinski this graph for whatever use he cares to make of it.

## FLEXIBLE PROGRAM

## HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under Governor Ogilvie, Illinois has made great strides in expanding higher education. One of the most progressive universities in the State is Governors State University in Park Forest South. The student body will to a substantial degree be drawn from residents of my congressional district.

An editorial in the Homewood-Flossmoor Star of Sunday, July 23, points out the great progress being made in practical, innovative educational programs in Illinois.

The editorial follows:

## FLEXIBLE PROGRAM

A new program of higher education that credits success without punishing failure is expected to make its debut in Illinois in the fall.

Designed primarily for adults, the baccalaureate degree program has sufficient flexibility in residency and academic requirements to enable a person to graduate without long attendance at one institution. It was developed by the five institutions administered by the Illinois board of governors of state institutions and colleges, among which is Governors State university in Park Forest South.

Highly innovative, the program provides for "life experience" credit toward academic requirements and also has a novel "no-fail" policy. It requires 120 semester credits, but only 15 need to be taken at board of governors institutions, and they may be taken in any order.

A total of 40 semester credits must be at

CXVIII—1647—Part 20

the junior-senior level, and 12 semester credits each from the social sciences, natural sciences and humanities must be earned. Persons who complete the requirements will receive a "board of governors" bachelor of arts degree.

Salient features of the novel degree program are that it is directed primarily toward the mature populace and persons "on the move," and that it has only minimal residency requirements. There is no set timetable for degree completion and no declared major is necessary. Students may pool credits from several institutions and also receive credit for knowledge acquired informally. In addition, instruction in non-traditional forms—television, independent study, correspondence schools, programmed instruction—is encouraged.

Among the chief beneficiaries of the program are residents whose jobs cause them to relocate frequently, such as construction workers, and U.S. servicemen stationed in Illinois. Airmen at Chanute Air Force base in Rantoul, for instance, are expected to be among the first participants, enrolling at nearby Eastern Illinois university.

It wasn't so many years ago that the concept of adult education—programmed instruction for mature persons beyond college-age—finally managed to find public acceptance. Now the board of governor's "flexible" degree program gives another dimension to efforts to provide every resident with an education consistent with his abilities and his needs. This is a refreshing step forward.

## RECOMPUTATION IS A MORAL ISSUE

## HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1972

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, last week one of my constituents, Colonel Haefner, USAR, Retired, sent the following letter to the Wall Street Journal editor. I wish to bring this to the attention of everyone who might have missed it:

KOREAN RESERVE SERVICE  
PRESCOTT, ARIZ.

Editor, The Wall Street Journal:

Your story concerning "Fighting Mad" retired military personnel whose pensions have not been tied to the active duty pay scale since 1958 may indeed raise a moral issue.

On the other hand, what about the "moral issue" related to a very small group of loyal reserve officers who served during both World Wars and the Korean war and remained active reserve officers until age 60, and retired without any pension whatsoever, not even with a gold watch?

I know one officer who served over eight years on extended active duty in both World Wars and the Korean war. He was recalled during the Korean war at the age of 51. In those eight years his military pay was substantially less than his corresponding civilian income. Moreover, this officer with 18½ years reserve service is neither eligible for an adjusted pension nor to receive military hospital benefits and other prerequisites granted to pensioned officers.

The only recompense for reserve officers in the above category is to be listed in the Officers Honorary Retired List of the U.S. Army Register and to take some solace in the inaugural address of President John Kennedy, "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country."

EARL W. HAEFNER,  
Colonel, USAR-Ret.

## HON. EDITH GREEN WRITES ON THE "EDUCATION-POVERTY-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX"

## HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1972

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the following article by our distinguished and respected colleague from Oregon, Congresswoman EDITH GREEN, appeared in the summer 1972 edition of the quarterly magazine the Public Interest.

For some years she has given her attention to what she so aptly terms the "education-poverty-industrial complex," which she defines as "people and companies devoted to reaping profit from the Nation's legitimate interest in education and welfare." This "study for hire" syndrome has badly infected the bureaucracy; her article, a case history of just one study, is a valuable contribution to the problem:

THE EDUCATIONAL ENTREPRENEUR—A PORTRAIT  
(By Hon. EDITH GREEN)

During the past decade, the federal government has made many new attempts to aid in the solution of the country's major problems. Great hopes and high ideals underlay these attempts. For the most part, the motives of those who championed new programs were good, and the people supporting these programs were truly representative of a national will to do something about many of the larger problems that plague our times.

As plans turned to realities, in attempting to find solutions to our country's pressing ills, we have set up a monstrous apparatus that can no longer be supervised or controlled by even the best of men. This tremendous proliferation of programs and activities is leading to a major collapse of rational management. We are becoming ever more aware of the pitfalls we were warned about by former President Lyndon Johnson, when he said that "legislation should not be examined in the light of benefits it will convey if properly administered—but by wrongs it would cause if improperly administered."

What is true of Government in general is true as well of the federal presence in education. The Office of Education will supervise the expenditure of over five billion dollars in fiscal 1972, through programs that take over seven printed pages to list. Other federal agencies and departments will pour additional billions from federal coffers into educational enterprises. The duplication, complexity, and sheer weight of these efforts is becoming unbearable to taxpayers and officials alike. Thus, the first major problem we have to face today is how to restore a rational form to our government, and keep it in a manageable form.

Closely related to this problem is a second one, namely, the extent to which education is becoming allied with business and industry. It might be useful to place this problem in the perspective of history. Educators have always wanted to have a decent income; in this respect, they have never been different from the rest of humanity. But it has been customary to realize that financial benefits were simply means to greater ends, and the ends were clear: the pursuit of knowledge, the discovery of truth, and the transmission of our cultural heritage. Only recently have the means become ends in themselves. It is a very modern phenomenon to find educators busily at work accumulating wealth as an academic pursuit in its own right. We have entered the era of the large-scale edu-

cation industry, complete with all the excesses that so often appear in a burgeoning big business.

It is sad to say that a well-meaning governmental policy has probably been largely responsible for this development. During the past decade, Congress has supported education more generously and vigorously than ever before. Very large sums of money, funding innumerable new programs, have been made available at every level of the educational ladder, from preschool to post-doctoral. Whether the result has been an improvement in education is not entirely clear; only time will tell, and only serious evaluations will help us find out. But one thing has become evident: The result of all this federal funding has been, directly and indirectly, the personal enrichment of some, and the runaway growth of a great many educational institutions and private corporations.

For several years now I have been particularly interested in what I have come to call the "education-poverty-industrial complex"—people and companies devoted to reaping profit from the nation's legitimate interest in education and welfare. What I have learned has not been encouraging. Studies made at my request by my staff and by the General Accounting Office have revealed serious irregularities in numerous areas. Over and over again, we have found educators enriching themselves at public expense through sizable consulting fees, often for work of which there is no record at all. Over and over again, we have found educational organizations taking money for work not done, for studies not performed, for analyses not prepared, for results not produced. Over and over again, we have found educators using public funds for research projects that have turned out to be esoteric, irrelevant, and often not even research.

Perhaps the precise nature of the problems we face today will be illuminated by a specific example of a case study from my office files. The example I have chosen is neither the best nor the worst of those studied to date; rather, it is quite average in many respects, and for this reason it serves quite well to help underline the deep systemic problems, not the unusual and extraordinary failures.

The case study outlined in the next section represents a total governmental outlay of some \$60,000. This may seem a trivial amount by comparison with the billions spent by the Office of Education (OE), but in fact contracts of this size are typical of OE's operation. Consider the projects being funded by OE's National Center for Educational Research and Development (NCERD, formerly the Bureau of Research) in 1970. There was a total of 1,151 projects, as recorded in NCERD's massive directory for July 1970. This total broke down as follows: 368 projects in the under \$10,000 range; 404 projects in the \$10,000-\$100,000 range; 318 projects in the \$100,000-\$1,000,000 range; and 61 projects in the over \$1,000,000 range. From this it can be seen that a contract in the amount of \$60,000 typifies a category of OE activity that is representative of OE-funded projects—a category that is, when added up, quite significant fiscally in the overall picture. Although the names of all parties concerned in the case have been protected, all the details of the following story are true, and are based on data preserved in the NCERD files.

In the spring of 1968, what appears to have been an unsolicited project proposal was received by OE. It was submitted by Professor A. of New York through S.R., a private firm based in Washington, where the work was to be done. The idea was to study in a thorough and extensive manner the sociological aspects of one particular facet of higher education policy. The project was to extend from July 1968 to September 1969.

The basic point of the proposed study is

explained in the opening paragraph of the proposal. Immediately thereafter, the basic weakness of the proposal is candidly exposed—to wit, the absence of a concrete plan:

We would like to stress at this point that many of the details of the following outline are necessarily tentative. They illustrate what we are after and the ways we shall proceed; many additional details, though, will have to be developed and others revised as our study progresses.

The proposal contains no background information at all, no context, no reference to other work, no methodology or plan, no curriculum vitae of the principal investigator (or anyone else). At the end, A. writes:

Our ultimate purpose is to provide information and analysis to serve the needs of policy makers. . . .

#### Products:

1. A report . . . including background data and reasons for conclusions reached.
2. The training of a sociologist in educational research. . . .

The aim is to give the government advice, via a report. The exact meaning of product 2, "the training of a sociologist in educational research," is nowhere explained or even referred to in the body of the proposal.

The total funds requested for the study come to about \$70,000. (All figures are approximate.) Of this, \$21,000 is for overhead, \$3,000 for a fee. Salaries and benefits are to total \$42,000, according to the following breakdown of effort: half time for the director (at a rate of \$30,000/yr. for full time) and half time for a research associate (at a rate of \$17,000/yr. for full time) for the period September 1968–September 1969, and consultant status for these two (sic) for July and August 1968; half time for a secretary; full time for a junior research assistant. A., the director, is the only person identified by name.

The first reaction to this proposal must be one of puzzlement. There is a lot of broadly descriptive (and fairly simple-minded and obvious) material, but virtually no specifics, yet there is quite a price tag. What is it all about? The first reaction on file came from B.N. of OE, in a hastily written memorandum to D.O. It reads in full: "B. and P. feel that the A. proposal is too expensive and see it in the \$40-\$50,000 range and not \$70,000. Will you look it over to see how we can pare it down." B. and P. are OE officials. They clearly have no problem at all with the product being bought, just a bit of a complaint about the price.

On that day, requests for evaluation were sent to two outside readers. The evaluations were returned within a few days. One recommended flat disapproval. The summary stated the case plainly:

"I do not feel that this is a good study; nor is it a good proposal. Reason: The proposal does not specify the methodology, other than a broad and unbounded discussion of the several levels that may be influenced by a specific type of policy to assist higher education. . . . At best it is wordy, not focused, unspecific, and carries no measure of effectiveness as to how policy makers may choose. I can not approve a research proposal on the basis of hope. . . . I am not sure that the author is fully acquainted with the world of education. . . ."

Under "Educational Significance," the evaluator writes "Negative" and goes on to complain that "the proposal does not suggest any real familiarity with educational literature or recent experience with ESEA or HEA." The comment on "Personnel and Facilities" reads: "No resume of personnel resources was attached. I have no way of knowing if the author is capable except on the basis of the proposal—which is very weak." He finds the research design "very poor," and the economic efficiency "extremely poor."

The second evaluation came back with a

recommendation for provision approval. The summary is not too encouraging:

"The applicant has identified an area of great importance to the future of American higher education, and is a highly creative investigator who can be expected to generate valuable insights. However, there are several areas of vagueness in the proposal—possibly due to necessary shortness of time in its preparation—which ought to be remedied before a formal award is made. I would propose the following modification to be negotiated:

"1. The applicant should satisfy the OE staff of his knowledge of existing materials in the area of inquiry. . . ."

"2. The caliber of the 'Research Associate' should be specified on the satisfaction of the USOE staff. (Note, on p. 11, that one 'product' is to be the 'training of a sociologist in educational research.' At a salary of \$17,000/yr., one would expect to hire someone who was already well trained.)

"3. The 'Fee' . . . should be eliminated from the budget or justified to the satisfaction of OE staff. . . ."

"The evaluator goes on to note that 'the work envisioned here parallels recent developments within the Bureau of the Budget and the planning offices of the several federal agencies.' He finds the proposal 'very vague on methodology.' He is concerned that 'duplication of effort is to be avoided,' and notes that the proposal is silent on this question, since 'the applicant fails to relate his proposed study to similar work, in any explicit manner.' And again, he comments that the research design is 'the weakest part of the proposal,' and that 'the budget total strikes me as somewhat high.'

"In light of all these criticisms, how could he recommend provisional approval? The answer lies in his comments under 'Personnel and Facilities.' So great is the evaluator's regard for A. that this outweighs his concern about the rest of the background support:

"A. is an outstanding sociologist, highly imaginative, and a prolific worker. There should be some specification of the qualifications of the proposed Research Associate. The S.R. probably lacks library resources which would be required to relate the proposed work to relevant literature in the field. I would hope that creative computer people would be available within the S.R. to experiment with system simulation, but this hope isn't directly justified by the contents of the proposal."

In mid-June, D.O. provided his opinion of the proposal, in an "inhouse review." As we learn from the various official forms, D.O. had been designated project officer for this study. On the question of educational significance, he had this to say:

"The problem of policies for federal support of higher education is of top priority (see President's Education Message); but I am not sure how much hard data this project would furnish on the problem as distinguished from intuitive and informed guesses."

He notes candidly that there is "no clear research design . . . no hypothesis, no experimental procedures, no reference to related research, no procedures described." Also, he writes, under "Economic Efficiency":

"Cost higher than necessary. Do we need to 'train a sociologist in educational research' at \$17,000 a year? The 'fee' . . . is unjustified when indirect costs . . . are incurred."

But despite these faults, he recommended approval. His reasoning is presented at the outset of the review:

"This is not really a research proposal but a proposal to engage the services of a competent and inventive sociologist to forecast the 'futures' of American higher education and patterns of federal support. It should be coordinated with the Secretary's task force on strategies of support (e.g., Bob



Berk) and Clark Kerr's Commission on the Future of Higher Education."

And again, later, "This is a proposal essentially to fund a well-known sociologist to think about higher education."

The sequence of events leading to the actual contract award bordered on comic opera. The Funding Approval Request originated by D.O. in mid-June—just two weeks before the end of the fiscal year deadline—obtained its final signature within a week; it called for Fiscal Year 1968 funding in the total of \$45,000 for this project. Where did the figure \$45,000 come from? We shall never know. It certainly is not the amount requested by A., and there is no other document presenting a budget in that amount. The only plausible explanation relates to the memo from B.N. quoted above, calling for something "in the \$40-\$50,000 range"—\$45,000 being right in the middle of the range. At any rate, for the time being, \$45,000 was the magic figure. The Procurement Action Request executed in the last week of June also carried that figure, as did D.O.'s Schedule of Negotiable Items, which was entirely blank except for the total project cost, listed as \$45,000, without any indication of how OE wanted S.R. to cut their proposal to that figure.

Apparently, despite all the effort, Fiscal 1968 was missed, so the procedure had to start all over again in July. A new Procurement Action Request was issued in early July, calling again for \$45,000, but this time in Fiscal 1969 funds. Meanwhile, mid-July saw some negotiations between OE and S.R. We have some handwritten memos from that period discussing several issues, among which were the following: (1) The size of S.R.'s overhead rate; (2) the propriety of a fee (which, in the end, S.R. received); (3) the propriety of hiring a \$17,000-a-year man for "training," an objection raised, as we saw, during the evaluations; (4) the propriety of paying the director in a consultant status during the summer; and (5) the "need for clerk and sec'y for 1 person."

Whatever the mechanism that finally did the trick, S.R. got the message, and produced a slightly reduced budget—a "revised cost estimate"—at the end of July. The covering letter explains that two reductions were involved: (1) the provisional overhead rate was dropped to 50 percent; (2) the junior research assistant's time was cut back drastically, from full time for the whole 15 months, to approximately one-fourth time. In this way, the budget was brought down to \$55,000. Actually, the first reduction was a pure fiction, because a final overhead rate was to be established later, quite apart from the provisional rate, and the government would end up paying in full whatever the final overhead rate would turn out to be.

The end of July thus saw a \$10,000 discrepancy between the \$45,000 asked for in OE's Procurement Action Request and the revision downward to \$55,000 offered by S.R. What was OE to do? It apparently never occurred to anybody to say to S.R., "Take the \$45,000 or leave it." Instead, with no justification, the \$10,000 was added, with the aid of a subterfuge. D.O. sent a memo to the Chief of the Contracts Division asking for the additional funds, with the following explanation: "Reason for the increase over amount authorized in original Procurement Action Request is that the overhead rate was inadvertently left out in the proposed budget when [NCERD] approved the proposal."

The absurdity of this explanation could have been revealed at a glance, since the sum requested had no relation at all to any overhead shown on any version of the proposal.

But no matter; it was an unimportant detail. A new request for the additional amount went out, and by the beginning of September, a contract was ready. Five days later, A. wrote OE the happy news that he was now in Washington at S.R., although the letter

had to be signed by someone else "in Dr. A.'s absence"!

A disturbing note disrupts the peaceful progress of A.'s cogitation at OE expense. In September, one Dr. J. B. wrote OE asking for help and information regarding a study he had begun with OE funds on the same subject! There was obviously considerable overlap with A.'s work, although not one person involved with either project—in or out of OE—knew that the other was taking place! When the two projects had been funded, no one had checked to see whether there might be others doing the same thing! D.O.'s reply asked J.B. for a copy of his proposal and the names of his OE project officers. Apparently D.O. knew that he could get the information from J.B. more rapidly than he could extract it from the OE bureaucracy of which he himself was a part.

Such duplication, unfortunately, is far from unusual. Part of the problem is OE's abysmal record system, which is virtually useless. Thus, it is almost impossible to obtain accurate information—or even sketchy information, for that matter—on such questions as what projects are currently being funded, what projects have recently been completed, what contractors or grantees hold which contracts or grants, etc. Part of the problem is OE's incredibly complex—and ever-changing!—internal organization, which allows for numerous overlaps in authority and which seems to encourage random duplication in various fields.

To return to our narrative: The first progress report was submitted around the beginning of the new year and was quickly accepted by D.O. The report covered the first four months of work, about one third the total length of the project. The first paragraph told it all:

"In line with our study design the first period of our research has largely involved 1) a preliminary survey of the literature, especially works which attempt to give an overall view of the higher education system, 2) acquaintance with the data base, and 3) refinement of the research design."

The word "preliminary" in (1) really meant just that, as we are told that "in the months that have elapsed . . . we have only been able to cover a small fraction of the literature on higher education. . . . We are increasingly focusing on literature that reports specific empirical findings relevant to our problem."

Thus, very little had been accomplished, and most of the time had been spent in highly electric reading. What the staff was doing was not clear. Since there had been no research design in the first place, no one at OE could complain. But by the time a few months had passed, it had already become clear that A. was not necessarily a good choice even as a consultant, since he was barely acquainted with the field—something that the proposal evaluators had warned about. It appears that the sociologist who was being "trained" in education research was A. himself!

The end of March 1969 brought the second progress report; the half-way point had already been reached. The three-page report repeatedly stressed how complex the problems are. The first paragraph again tells the essential story of what was going on:

Since the last progress report we have focused primarily on two tasks:

(1) A relatively detailed survey of the current programs of federal assistance to higher education and the proposals for additional assistance, and the development of conceptual tools to facilitate their analysis.

(2) Determining the probable consequences of "ideal-type" forms of aid for educational opportunity, and more generally social stratification.

It must have heartened OE personnel to learn that A. was at last becoming acquainted with the existing federal programs. But

we do not find out very much about the kinds of "conceptual tools" that were being developed, or the "probable consequences" that were being looked at.

This report was so loose and chatty that it obviously got on D.O.'s nerves. By the end of April he had worked up the determination to do something; not, of course, anything substantive, because A. was being paid to do exactly what he was doing, as D.O. himself had pointed out in his evaluation of the proposal; but rather, something *formal*, to make things look better. D.O. sent A. a letter asking, in effect, that the format be cleaned up and formalized!

A. was, of course, happy to comply, and a week later the "new look" report was mailed back, prettier than the old one but containing the same information. A few new touches were added, as for example the assurance that "no special difficulties have been encountered. The project is well on its way, as planned." We also learn the following good news:

"Professor A. will visit with Professor K., world renowned authority on higher education, [in Great Britain] to consult about our findings. No consulting fee is being charged by Professor K. and Professor A. will pay his own travel expenses."

This is an incredible paragraph "Findings" that have never been revealed are alluded to; and we are assured that K. will not charge a fee for chatting with A., and that A. will not charge OE for this junk—as if this had been considered a possibility!

In mid-June of 1969, A. wrote a letter to OE containing two requests. The first of these was for an additional \$6,000—"a small amount of supplementary funds"—to analyze data in the American Council on Education's newly operational data bank. Basically, the money was to pay for five weeks of a research analyst's time and two weeks of a programmer's time; for data processing; and for overhead and fee. There is no hint as to what kind of analysis is to be performed, nor is there any research plan at all. The second request is for more time:

Secondly, it seems advisable to extend the period of analysis for three months. This would mean that the final report would be submitted December 31, 1969. This additional time is required primarily because of two factors. First of all the relevant empirical relationships already encountered are more complex than originally anticipated. Secondly, researchers have been much more active in this field in the last year than it was possible to anticipate when the proposal was submitted. To cite only two examples, both the Carnegie Commission (under Clark Kerr) and HEW (under Alice Rivlin) have conducted extensive studies in this area and presented far-ranging policy proposals. It has been necessary to spend a considerable amount of time analyzing and evaluating these and other efforts, and relating them to our own work. Finally the analysis of the additional data from the ACE discussed in point one will require some extra time, though the additional three months of analysis seems required, however, even if supplemental funds are not available for analysis of the ACE data.

The reasoning is ingenious. As we had already found out in the progress reports, A. was discovering the problems to be rather complex, something he just might have been expected to have known in advance. Also, as OE had been forewarned from the outset, A.'s study was not the only one in the field, to put it delicately, and his acquaintance with other work was minimal; so OE was paying him to find out what other people were doing, and now OE was being asked to extend the contract because A. had discovered that other people were doing a lot.

The June 30 progress report—mailed on June 27 (but in a project like this it could have been written almost any time)—re-

peated the substance of the above-cited letter, and reported a few developments. First, A. was slowly becoming more confident in his "tentative finding" that "federal aid—regardless of the form—aimed at enabling more lower-class high school graduates to attend college would generally have less impact on the societal stratification structure (in terms of social mobility roles) than is generally assumed." This hazy and almost meaningless platitude could hardly have left OE gasping with amazement at A.'s powers of analysis and insight.

Second, the report tells what A. had been doing with most of his time: He had, during the April 1-June 30 period, "focused primarily on estimating the effects of federal aid on stimulating racial equality." When one compares A.'s sweeping plans, as outlined in his proposal, with this rather limited perspective, it becomes very evident that he was not doing anything near what he had originally said he would do. By now, OE would probably have had no trouble cutting off further support of this abortive project, even given OE's loose management of it up to this point. But this was not to be.

A.'s request for more money and time must have rattled OE. D.O. took his time and asked for more explanation of the proposed "analysis" of ACE's data, as well as for a breakdown of two budget items: the salary item of \$1600 and the "data processing" item of \$2800. A. replied to this inquiry in a letter giving no details at all about the analysis, but carrying on at some length about how important the analysis is. As for the budget items, which cover \$4400 of the \$6000 asked for, A. broke them down into line form without explaining why each item was actually necessary.

Apparently it never occurred to anyone at OE to turn down A.'s request, so the extension and additional funds were granted. Another *opera-bouffe*-style series of errors ensued in the course of this "small" additional award, which, by the time it was over, must have cost a few thousand dollars in wasted man-hours. We will omit the minute details, which are spelled out in the documents.

Even this was not yet the end. In December, A. wrote for another extension, to March 31, 1970. The delay was entirely due to the slowness of receiving the ACE data, according to A.; he expected everything to be done by February at "the latest," but he was "asking for a delay until the end of March just to be on the safe side." The request was duly processed and granted by OE "at no additional cost to the government."

The report finally arrived in March 1970. It is authored by A. and his associate M. The Office of Education is nowhere mentioned; a reader would not know that OE funds had supported the project. The "Acknowledgments" page does not mention OE or a single person associated with OE or with the government.

What OE got was a very, very long (and wordy) essay, very, very short on hard data. At first sight, it looks as if OE got what it paid for: the thoughts of A. on the subject at hand. A closer look, however, reveals something very different. To begin with, we find out that Part I was written by M., not A. (although we are assured that A. "freely exchanged ideas" with M., whatever that means). Now, Part I of the report is 191 pages long, more than half of the whole. It is to be questioned whether OE would have spent the money had it known that half the product was to be, after all, M.'s thoughts on the subject.

But at least M.'s thoughts are on the subject of the study! A.'s thoughts, on the other hand, as presented in the last 146 pages—some of which happened to be written by other people—are not on the subject of the contract at all. As it turned out, OE was subsidizing A., and a regal support staff, to do whatever A. pleased during—and quite a bit

after—the year 1968-1969. There is no record of any evaluation of the final report. A form letter from D.O., sent in June, accepted the report and approved final payment.

This relatively modest case points up many of the specific problems we have earlier mentioned in general terms. On the government side, no one was really clear where the proposed study belonged, whether it should be made, or what program it properly fitted into. Over a dozen OE officials were involved at one point or another, but they were not in contact with each other on a regular basis and could not coordinate their activities. Errors and oversights were frequent. There were no clear guidelines concerning proper budgetary supervision or technical supervision, nor were there policies governing use of whatever findings might be produced. All in all, one gets the feeling that the Office of Education was hopelessly unaware of what the project was really all about, and had no mechanisms for keeping abreast of what was going on.

On the contractor's side, all the dilemmas are in evidence, albeit in miniature. What overhead and fee, if any, are appropriate? How is the value of thinking power to be measured? What is the line between flexibility and misrepresentation? When is a company performing a service, and when is it taking the government for a ride?

The problems encountered in the case I have just presented are by no means unusual. One company we have studied, a well-known private educational consulting firm, received over a million dollars' worth of contracts from the Office of Education and other federal agencies in about two years' time. What makes this statistic so significant is the fact that at the outset of this period, the company was doing business at a total rate of only \$250,000 a year from all sources and had only one full-time professional employee! Naturally, this firm expanded rapidly and was helped in the process by an ingenious device: several proposals would be filed simultaneously, and the same names would appear on the various proposals as the investigators and researchers. As the proposals were funded, money became available to hire new staff—with the excess over 100 per cent of any given person's time when the contributions from the various projects were added up.

Another firm we have looked into made a practice of submitting proposals with virtually no research design. This would make it difficult for OE personnel to know exactly what was to be expected in the project, and hence impossible for the government to monitor what was going on. Another regular practice of this firm was to promise mountains of data and accompanying analyses, and then to submit only the raw data, in the form of thousands and thousands of sheets of computer printouts. Since data in this form are virtually useless, the firm was then in a position to ask for additional funds for the analyses, and these funds would invariably be granted by a helpless and gullible OE. Although this happened repeatedly, no one at OE caught on to the pattern, and the firm enjoyed, and still enjoys, an excellent reputation.

Time and time again, firms have displayed a total disregard of deadlines and complete indifference to the importance of delivering result on time. In instance after instance, firms have asked for, and received, fees in addition to overhead charges, on the pretext that these fees were necessary to stimulate corporate stability and growth—as if these considerations are relevant to OE contracts and grants. Over and over, a project would be escalated into a far bigger activity than originally proposed or planned, with vast additional funds being allocated by OE through a non-competitive, non-reviewed amendment procedure rather than through the normal process of funding approval. In one case we

have studied, a project that OE thought might cost \$75,000 was funded at \$140,135 and was escalated through a series of amendments to \$416,743—and it is still alive!

All the problems are by no means concentrated on the side of the contractor or grantee. The Office of Education, as provider of the funds and as the public agent responsible for their proper use, has plenty of its own problems. Our case studies are beginning to uncover a broad pattern of defective management throughout all phases of OE's activities—a dismal pattern that has been glimpsed in part by other study panels, but is only now being revealed in its full impact. Consider, for example, the following partial list of defects that we have uncovered in OE's handling of contracts and grants during the pre-award period alone:

(1) Pre-arrangement seems to be the rule rather than the exception, in consideration of potential contractors and grantees. However an idea originates, it is apparently common practice for OE to discuss a project extensively with a favored award recipient, and to work out some sort of plan for proceeding. When this is done, the formalities are then instituted as an afterthought.

(2) The intent of Congress is often disregarded by OE. Awards are often made with hardly a glance at the legislative intent of the program that has been authorized by Congress. It sometimes seems as if OE considers the total funds appropriated by Congress in any fiscal year as a big pool on which OE can draw at will for whatever programs it sees fit to fund.

(3) Another failing prevalent in the early states of OE projects is the absence of carefully conceived specifications, work plans, or research designs. This failing is evidence both in OE-originated projects, where it is a critical flaw, and in outside-originated projects which have been discussed in advance with OE personnel.

(4) Yet another virtually universal problem in proposals is the unavailability of solid budget information, a lack which OE does nothing to remedy. It is as if the very concept of budget justification is entirely alien to OE. The budgets are almost always descriptive line-item affairs presenting totals, with hardly a thought given to explaining why the particular item is necessary or how the money will be used to further the project. Indeed, we have seen many instances where the line-item description does not even correspond to the verbal description given in the text of the proposal! OE virtually never attempts to clarify the budget or force an adequate explanation prior to the award.

(5) Evaluation procedures are slipshod and erratic. Sometimes there is no evaluation at all. Sometimes there are a few in-house evaluations. Sometimes there are a few outside evaluations. There seems to be no rhyme or reason to the process, no pattern at all. But worst of all, OE has no discernible policy concerning what ought to be done with an evaluation once they get it. There seems to be no connection at all between the content of evaluations and further subsequent actions by OE.

(6) A particularly disturbing feature of the award procedure is the seeming determination of OE to spend all the money that has been appropriated. In the few cases where contracts are put for bids, it is a foregone conclusion that someone will get the award, even if no one has submitted a really satisfactory proposal. Similarly, when pre-arranged proposals come in, there is an almost inexorable drive to fund them, regardless of their defects. All this becomes even more evident as the end of the fiscal year approaches, when more and more projects are frenetically rushed through in order to commit all available funds. No one at OE seems to feel that Congressional appropriations are (except where otherwise indicated, in explicit language) upper ceilings on permissible ex-



penditures, and that public moneys should not be spent on unworthy projects.

The defects listed above form but a small part of the whole picture. Many additional problems arise during the award period and after the project is completed. What we are finding is the simple absence of good management, or virtually any management at all, at OE. The implications of this situation are truly staggering when one contemplates the important, indeed central, role that OE plays in the educational affairs of virtually every community in the nation.

The first major set of questions must relate to the structure of the federal government. We must ask candidly and repeatedly: What form of agency and departmental organization can best serve the needs of our government today? What overlapping jurisdictions need to be separated, what conflicting authorities have to be resolved? What principles of management must be introduced to insure that public funds are being spent in a reasonable manner? These questions are only beginning to be asked now, and they are scarcely being posed with the sense of urgency that the situation calls for. Unless they are asked and answered soon, we will be engulfed and overburdened with a runaway federal program—a diverse, overlapping, unplanned, confusing array of governmental efforts whose faults are beyond remedy and whose abuses are beyond belief.

The second major set of questions centers upon the rampant commercialism that threatens to dominate the educational scene. Will the lucrative contract or grant become the new mark of academic success, to replace the traditional measures of teaching skill, scholarship, and humanity? Will the high fee be tomorrow's school prize? Will the wisdom of educators be turned to outfoxing government agencies and finding ways to make short deliveries on long promises, instead of being turned to shortening the path to truth? Will the educator devote his energies to luring the government into surrendering funds, instead of pursuing his scholarly and pedagogical interests? The whole question of the relation of profits to social betterment must be examined. It is not simply, "Are profits in this area bad?" but, "What should profits in this area look like? Which are acceptable and which are not acceptable? What are we getting for our money?"

There is no doubt that much value can be realized by the efforts of private companies and individual investigators. The private sector is richly populated with those who honestly offer the service of their companies in the solution of social problems feeling that they can do it better because they know better, and feeling also that they can make a legitimate profit and feel comfortable about it because the results *really* have produced a better society in some respect, no matter how small.

We should not allow ourselves to be deluded by the categorization of companies into "profit-making" and "non-profit." Some times we act as if "non-profit" organizations are morally superior because somehow they are doing the job out of some high moral ideal—as if somehow it were immoral to make a profit. In fact, any organization has to receive enough income to cover its outgo, or it goes out of business. The only real difference between corporations usually classified as "profit-making" and those classified as "non-profit" is that the former require a profit as a return on equity advanced by stockholders in the form of money, while the latter require a "profit" as return on equity advanced by members in the form of skills. In a corporation a profit is distributed as dividends to the stockholders; in a non-profit association a profit is distributed to the controlling members as increased salaries,

or in the form of other fringe benefits and improvements.

To summarize, then, there are two central concepts involved here: (1) the inefficiency, confusion, waste, breakdown, and corruption (active or passive) of the federal bureaucracy; (2) the inefficiency, confusion, waste, breakdown and corruption (active or passive) of the private technocratic bureaucracy. And the big questions before us are the following:

1. What can Congress and the people honestly expect from big business, or from the federal agencies, in answering social needs?
2. What price are we willing to pay private industry for its expertise?
3. How richly are we willing to subsidize the development of expertise? How do we gauge what is fair here?
4. How do we identify industrial parasites when they surface and how might we control their growth?
5. What are some parallels in the development of the "rampant rise in commercialism" on the part of professional educators and the rise of the profiteers in the poverty-education arena who are in private industry? Is there a connection between the two?

These questions cry for answers. Soon. Before education is taken irreversibly out of the hands of educators and placed in the hands of managers and entrepreneurs.

#### IN MEMORIAM TO THE HONORABLE PAUL L. TROAST, "MR. NEW JERSEY"

#### HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1972

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, July 21, 1972, the most distinguished citizen of my congressional district, the State of New Jersey and our Nation—the Honorable Paul L. Troast of Clifton—went to his eternal rest. We deeply mourn his passing. He was a close personal friend and a most capable and adroit business leader and statesman.

I will never forget his greatness and will particularly hold dear our fine association working together for the State of New Jersey as well as his good counsel and judgment that he bestowed on behalf of our people and the quality of his leadership in encouraging the domestic and international preeminence and economic vitality of the State of New Jersey as chairman of the New Jersey State Economic Council during my tenure as commissioner of the New Jersey State Department of Conservation and Economic Development. He also achieved an exceptional reputation and standards of excellence in the business world as chairman of the board of the New Jersey Manufacturers Association and the Mahony-Troast Construction Co.

Mr. Speaker, there is much that can be said for his outstanding public service and his lifetime of contribution to our community, State, and Nation in seeking a better world for all mankind. I would like to call your attention to the following editorial that appeared in the July 24, 1972, issue of one of our most prestigious newspapers in New Jersey, the

Herald News of Passaic, which will provide you with a brief profile of his endowment to our people in helping to shape the destiny of our State and Nation. The editorial reads as follows:

#### PAUL L. TROAST, "MR. NEW JERSEY"

Paul L. Troast was a distinguished citizen of New Jersey and more. He was a good citizen. He freely used the talents with which he was endowed for the benefit of his fellow citizens. Hospitals, colleges and other worthy causes benefited from his aid.

Mr. Troast early impressed those who knew him. In the 1920s acquaintances marked him as a man most likely to succeed. During the long depression of the 1930s, he served as the first secretary-treasurer of the Passaic Valley Water Commission, which had been organized by Passaic, Clifton and Paterson to take over and operate a water system.

World War II brought the opportunity to demonstrate his ability. His fledgling construction company, Mahony-Troast, received the contract to build a giant airplane engine factory on a Wood-Ridge farm. Using novel construction methods, his company built the plant in record time, and Wright Aeronautical produced in Wood Ridge the engines that helped to defeat Nazi Germany and Japan.

After the war, his reputation and the pent-up demand made Mahony-Troast a leader in the construction field in this part of the nation. Firms, institutions and individuals had such confidence in his integrity and ability that they sought him out. It was inevitable then that when Gov. Driscoll envisioned a turnpike in the corridor between New York City and Philadelphia, he picked Mr. Troast to translate the dream into reality as head of the turnpike authority. The turnpike was built in the amazing time of 23 months. The authority Mr. Troast headed enlisted local help to acquire the right of way. Steel was in short supply but the authority got the steel it needed in time for the numerous superhighway bridges. It was a magnificent accomplishment.

This led Mr. Troast to try for high elective office. He became the Republican candidate for governor in 1953. His opponent was a virtually unknown state senator from Warren County named Robert B. Meyner, a tough political foe. The Republican party had controlled the governorship, with one interruption, for decades and the voters felt it was time for a change. Mr. Troast lost the election but Jersey gained. Mr. Troast and Gov. Meyner became fast friends. The new governor kept Mr. Troast as turnpike chief and made him a fixture in the state government. Mr. Troast served as chairman of the New Jersey Tercentenary Commission, which conducted a year-long observance in 1964 that required several years of planning and preparation. When Gov. Hughes succeeded Gov. Meyner, Mr. Troast continued his unpaid public service, becoming chairman of the New Jersey Economic Development Council, and in effect New Jersey's chief economic ambassador. All the while Mr. Troast attended to business and served in other capacities.

Mr. Troast was truly, as former Gov. Hughes said, "Mr. New Jersey." Few have been as successful and at the same time done so much for their fellow citizens. His life was one of extraordinary usefulness and service.

I ask my colleagues here in the Congress to join with me in silent prayer to his memory. May his family soon find abiding comfort in the faith that God has given them and in the knowledge that the Honorable Paul L. Troast is now under His eternal care. May he rest in peace.

## EIGHT MYTHS ABOUT GUN CONTROL IN THE UNITED STATES

## HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1972

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, as the congressional debate on firearms legislation continues, the following article from the Christian Science Monitor is useful in examining the merits and flaws of the arguments advanced by each side and should be useful in reaching a sound position on this problem:

## EIGHT MYTHS ABOUT GUN CONTROL IN THE UNITED STATES

(By Franklin E. Zimring)

CHICAGO.—At times of violence or assassination, Americans tune in to the hopeful optimism of those who see the end of violence around the next corner of gun legislation. Even more regularly, gun-owning groups assure us that the 80 million handguns in the nation have nothing to do with violent crime in the United States. Each side is convinced that it is absolutely right, and nobody bothers to get his facts straight. Sadly, our national debate over gun control is often a battle of empty slogans.

Before we get suitably serious about the gun problem in this country, it will be necessary to clear away some of the rhetorical excesses that have marked the gun-control debate. The first step is a few basic facts.

There are about 100 million guns in this country—more than two-thirds of them shotguns and rifles, the traditional sporting weapons in American life. The other 30 million or so are handguns owned more in cities than in rural areas, rarely used in sport and nine times as likely as long guns to be involved in crime.

The vast majority of all guns are not violently misused, but guns are involved in a quarter of a million violent episodes each year, and our millions of guns—again particularly handguns—contribute to the crime problem by making robbery easy and serious assault more deadly. The real difficulty in the present debate over gun laws is that half of the participants underestimate the problem while the other half underestimate the time, money, and loss of liberty that will probably be necessary to solve it. The best way to illustrate this theme is by examining eight myths about guns—four from each side.

Myth No. 1: "We have a crime problem, not a gun problem."

This refrain, often heard from anti-gun control groups is true to the extent that 100 million guns would pose no problem in this country if nobody fired one. The problem is that robbers, angry husbands, and barroom debaters use them hundreds of thousands of times each year.

And when guns are used, they increase the chance that death will result by a factor of four. We have both a crime problem and a gun problem, and each makes the other worse.

Myth No. 2: "The handgun is a useful tool of household self-defense."

Millions of Americans (myself included) live in some fear of robbers and burglars invading their homes. About 25 percent of all households have acquired handguns in the belief that they provide an effective defense against the criminal stranger, and this is why we have 30 million privately owned handguns.

Yet the homeowner's gun rarely protects

him against burglars, who seek to elude him, or the occasional robber, who counts on surprise and a weapon of his own to render the homeowner helpless. The loaded handgun in your home is much more likely to accidentally kill someone in the family than to save his life.

Perhaps if this were fully understood, most domestic handguns, and most of our gun problems, would go away by themselves. But that is unlikely.

People seek guns for a sense of security and will resist heeding any information that undermines that sense of security.

Myth No. 3: "Legitimate citizens are not part of our gun problem."

Since crime is caused by criminals, many people argue that our many million gun-owning families have nothing to do with the gun problem.

Yet the truth is that the majority of all gun homicides are committed by persons without serious prior criminal records. And even more important, without registration and license laws it is very difficult to keep 30 million handguns in legitimate hands while still preventing potential criminals from buying guns secondhand or stealing them.

Even registration of guns and licensing of their owners might not stem the flow from legitimate to illegitimate owners with so many millions of guns in circulation.

So it appears that we will have to bring many millions of guns under control to get at the violent quarter of a million gun episodes.

Myth No. 4: "Gun laws can't work since criminals don't obey laws."

There is a grain of truth to this argument, but it is nonetheless a dangerous oversimplification.

In fact, the argument proves a bit too much since it suggests that all criminal laws are futile, because all the people who violate them are, indeed, criminal. The more complicated truth is that laws do not work automatically. They must be enforced and they must deal with the reality of gun use in this country. But laws that cut down the transfer of guns from legitimate to illegitimate owners, or dramatically reduce our domestic handgun supply, can cut down on the role of guns in violence.

Myth No. 5: "Gun laws can reduce crime in the United States to the same levels experienced in countries like Britain and Japan."

If the anti-control partisans tend to forget the gun part of our crime problem, some of the pro-control people seem to forget that guns are only a part of the set of special problems that make violent-crime rates higher in this country than in the rest of modern Western society.

We often hear that the United States has a gun-killing rate 38 times as high as England, which presumably means that we could reduce killing to the English rate if we adopted stern gun controls. Unfortunately, our violent crime rate will remain much higher than that of other developed countries no matter how much we do about guns, because Americans rob and attack one another with all weapons at greater rates than do the English or Japanese.

Reducing the proportion of attacks by guns will reduce the death toll from attack because other weapons are less dangerous. But it is not a cure for crime, and those who oversell gun control in this way only add to our profound national confusion over guns and violence.

Myth No. 6: "Gun laws would not result in much cost or inconvenience to law-abiding citizens."

There are, to be sure, some gun-control laws that won't cost much—the problem is that they might not achieve much either.

If we really want to keep guns out of the hands of the irresponsible, we must put all owners to the inconvenience of getting licenses and registering guns. If we want to dramatically reduce handgun violence, we probably have to reduce the total number of such guns.

There is really a simple corollary to Myth No. 3, because if legitimate gun ownership is part of the problem, loss of freedom and inconvenience to legitimate gun owners is part of the solution.

Myth No. 7: "Only the National Rifle Association stands between this country and effective gun laws."

Just as gun-owning groups see the call for more controls as an evil conspiracy, many pro-control citizens think that the only real opposition to gun regulation is the National Rifle Association. But opposition to compulsory licensing and schemes to cut down on handgun ownership has its roots much deeper in American culture.

People in this country are afraid of crime, and having guns makes them feel better. It is also difficult for legitimate gun owners to see themselves as any part of the problem, since 99 percent of all our guns are used responsibly and everyone sees himself as part of that 99 percent. It is thus difficult to convince him that there should be gun laws that inconvenience him.

Myth No. 8: "All that is needed to solve our gun problem is strict legislation."

American experience with prohibition of alcoholic beverages suggests that new laws, alone, are not any guarantee of significant social change.

Public support for law must be high for if a law cuts against the grain of public sentiment, too many people will disobey it. Police and court support are necessary if legislation is to be more than a hollow shell. Also, it should be clear by now, with as many thousand gun laws scattered around this country as gun deaths, that passing the right laws under the right conditions is much more important than passing another law.

We need to know more than we do about guns and the effect of gun laws. We need to change attitudes and values.

Clearing away a few of the myths surrounding the gun debate is only a first step in choosing the appropriate national gun policy. Once it is known that gun controls will be expensive, might take many years to accomplish, and are not the final solution to the crime problem, we must address the question of whether various types of control are worth their costs.

In relation to mild steps such as firearm registration, the answer is easy to find. Even if the effect of such laws is modest, the failure to try them can only mean that we are not serious about curbing violence.

A campaign to remove the handgun from civilian ownership raises harder questions. In a nation dedicated to individual freedom, in an era when we are finding that the criminal prohibition of things like marijuana and abortion may not be worth the cost, there is a special irony in hearing liberal politicians urge a criminal prohibition of handguns.

Yet the handgun is a special problem.

With the possible exception of heroin, never has a product cost so much and given so little to the quality of American urban life.

A strategy as unstylish as prohibition may be the appropriate solution to the handgun problem. It may not. But before we can make intelligent choices in this area, we must face the real issues.