

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## THE PRESIDENT'S NATIONAL COMMISSION ON FIRE PREVENTION AND CONTROL

## HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES  
Tuesday, February 15, 1972

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, I am delighted that the President's National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control is now in full operation. This Commission established by title II of the Fire Research and Safety Act, Public Law 90-259, is to do a 2-year study of the Nation's fire problem. It will submit its findings and recommendations to President Nixon and the Congress in July 1973.

I am personally pleased that a Pennsylvanian, Mr. Richard E. Bland, is the chairman of this important Commission. Mr. Bland is associate professor of engineering research of the Institute for Science and Engineering, Pennsylvania State University. He is also special assistant to the director of the Ordinance Research Laboratory and head of operations of the laboratory. He has been working with volunteer fire services since 1943.

The Commission will be holding hearings February 15-17 in the Old Senate Office Building which will focus on a variety of fire problems.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a press release describing the National Commission be printed in the RECORD.

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

## AN INTRODUCTION TO THE PRESIDENT'S NATIONAL COMMISSION ON FIRE AND CONTROL

The National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control is a Presidential Commission charged to do a two-year study of the nation's fire problem. The Commission in July 1973, will submit to President Richard Nixon and to the United States Congress a Report of its findings and recommendations.

Richard E. Bland, Commission Chairman, said, "I am shocked as all Americans are that approximately 12,000 of our countrymen died by destructive fire in 1970. In 1970 an estimated 210 firemen died (paid and volunteer) in the line of duty in the United States. Property damage from fire totalled more than 2½ billion dollars in spite of the heroic efforts of the nation's one million volunteer firemen and 195,000 fire fighters who render a fine public service at great personal risk. It is the responsibility of everyone to do the maximum to prevent this tremendous waste of life and property by fire."

The Commission is making a comprehensive study and investigation to determine practicable and effect measures to reduce the destruction of life and property by fire caused by fire in the cities, suburbs, communities and non-metropolitan areas of our country.

The Commission investigation includes:

1. A consideration of ways in which fires can be more effectively prevented through technological advances, construction techniques and improved inspection procedures;
2. An analysis of existing programs administered or supported by the Departments

and agencies of the Federal Government and of ways in which such programs could be strengthened so as to lessen the danger of destructive fires in Government-assisted housing and in the redevelopment of the nation's cities and communities;

3. An evaluation of existing fire suppression methods and of ways for improving the same, including procedures for recruiting and soliciting the necessary personnel;

4. An evaluation of present and future needs (including long term needs) of training and education for fire service personnel;

5. A consideration of the adequacy of current fire communication techniques and suggestions for the standardization and improvement of the apparatus and equipment used in controlling fires;

6. An analysis of the administrative problems affecting the efficiency or capabilities of local fire departments or organizations; and

7. An assessment of local, State and Federal responsibilities in the development of practicable and effective solutions for reducing fire losses.

## HEARINGS

The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of Title II, hold hearings, take testimony, and administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or any subcommittee thereof.

Under provisions of Public Law 90-259, each Department, agency or instrumentality of the Executive Branch of Government, including an Independent Agency, is authorized to furnish to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman, such information as the Commission deems necessary to carry out its functions.

There are 20 members of the Commission.

Richard E. Bland, Chairman, is Associate Professor of Engineering Research of the Institute for Science and Engineering, of Pennsylvania State University in State College, Pennsylvania. He is also Special Assistant to the Director of the Ordinance Research Laboratory and Head of Operations of the Laboratory. Mr. Bland's fire training and work have been with the volunteer sector of the fire service since 1943. He is Assistant Fire Chief of the Borough of State College, Pennsylvania. The Chairman is 46 years old.

W. Howard McClellan is Vice Chairman of the Commission. He is President of the International Association of Fire Fighters, Washington, D.C. Born September 11, 1907, Mr. McClellan has spent most of his adult life as a fire fighter and as an official of the I.A.F.F. The union has approximately 156,000 members.

Commissioners are: The Honourable Maurice H. Stans, Secretary of Commerce; and The Honourable George Romney, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development;

Louis Amabil, Director, Delaware State Fire School, Dover, Delaware; Lieutenant Tomy Arevalo, Fire Lieutenant, El Paso Fire Department, El Paso, Texas; Percy Bugbee, Honorary Chairman, National Fire Protection Association, Boston, Massachusetts; Mrs. Dorothy S. Duke of Lorain, Ohio, Consultant to Secretary George Romney of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and Housing Specialist, National Council of Negro Women, Washington, D.C.; Dr. Ernst R. G. Eckert, Professor of Mechanical Engineering and Aerospace Engineering, Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota; Roger M. Freeman, Jr., President, Allendale Mutual Insurance Company, Providence, Rhode Island;

Peter Hackes, Correspondent, National Broadcasting Company, Washington, D.C.; Dr. Robert Hechtman, President, R. E. Hechtman and Associates, Reston, Virginia; Albert Hole, California Fire Marshal, Sacramento, California; John F. Hurley, Fire Commissioner for the City of Rochester, New York; John L. Jablonsky, Director, Codes and Standards, American Insurance Association, New York City; Keith Klinger, Fire Chief Emeritus, San Clemente, California; Anne W. Phillips, M.D., Brookline, Massachusetts; John Proven, Executive Secretary, Fire Equipment Manufacturers Association, Inc., Evanston, Illinois; H. Baron Whitaker, President, Underwriters' Laboratories, Inc., Chicago, Illinois; and William J. Young, Chief of the Newington, New Hampshire Fire Department.

Advisory Members of the Commission are: U.S. Senator Warren G. Magnuson of Washington; U.S. Senator Caleb J. Boggs of Delaware; U.S. Representative George P. Miller from the Eighth District in California; and U.S. Representative Jerry L. Pettis from the Thirty-Third District in California.

Howard D. Tipton is Executive Director of the Commission. He is a resident of Glendora, California which he served as City Manager. Mr. Tipton, who is 35 years old, also was a consultant to various cities in California before assuming his duties at this Presidential Commission in September, 1971.

The United States Congress established the Commission by Title II of the Fire Research and Safety Act. This is Public Law 90-259.

## PENSION PROPOSALS

## HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1972

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, in order to further the dialog and exchange of ideas on the subject of private pension reform, I insert in the RECORD the remarks of Mr. Gabriel G. Rudney, Assistant Director of the Office of Tax Analysis of the Treasury Department before the Tax Seminar of the Machinery and Allied Products Institute.

As indicated in his speech, the research currently being conducted by the Treasury Department gives us a clearer understanding of the dimensions of this most difficult problem. I think it important that this important material be brought to the attention of my fellow members.

Mr. Rudney's table is the best explanation and analysis I have yet read of the President's pension reform bill. I think it incumbent on every person engaged in the pension reform debate to be informed about all proposals:

THE ADMINISTRATION'S PENSION PROPOSALS  
(By Gabriel G. Rudney)

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of MAPI, we at the Treasury welcome the opportunity this afternoon to discuss with you the Administration's pension proposals, and it is a personal pleasure for me to appear here. In fact, the MAPI staff has made it even more pleasurable because they have prepared and distributed to you an excellent summary of the proposals. This affords me

the opportunity to treat rather briefly a description of the proposals and to spend more time on why the proposals were made and what are the expected results. I shall confine my talk to proposals which come under the tax statutes.

The Administration's fiduciary responsibility and reporting and disclosure proposals which are largely the responsibility of another Federal agency are much the same as legislation which has been introduced before, and many of you who have particular interest in fiduciary responsibility have no doubt a good working knowledge of that legislation.

My talk will focus on the Administration's proposals for a pension vesting rule, the income tax deduction for employee contributions, and the increase in limits of deductible contributions to self-employed retirement plans.

As a preface, however, and an important one, I want to indicate that it is the conviction of this Administration that a healthy growing private retirement system is essential as a supplement to social security. President Nixon in his pension message described the outstanding achievements of the private pension system to date and the creative roles of American management and labor. The private retirement system offers us, more than social security, a greater degree of flexibility in meeting individual retirement needs, private investment discretion, and opportunities for efficiencies in administration. The system also offers us an opportunity to set aside private resources for investment in the private sector of the economy.

But it is essential that the health and growth of the private system be sustained. The President stated that there is still room for expanding and strengthening the system. When the system is viewed from a more global perspective there are shortcomings which need to be corrected. In this way we can safeguard the total system from more regulation than is necessary.

The Administration's proposals evolve from findings which indicate:

- (1) That for many workers in plans the benefits which accumulate for them will not be available to them when they retire,
- (2) That for many workers in plans, the benefits which accumulate for them and which are paid on retirement are insufficient to meet retirement needs,
- (3) That many workers for a variety of reasons are not covered by plans, their prospects for plan participation are dim, and therefore they must depend on social security, and
- (4) That the self-employed are limited in providing for their retirement needs much more so than corporate employees and corporate executives.

Each of these areas received intensive study in this Administration, and the need for solutions is well established. The areas have also been studied by others, but in some cases the solutions offered impose such rules which could endanger the private pension system itself.

Allow me to address my remarks to the first problem: The forfeiture of rights to benefits accumulated for workers under certain circumstances. This is a matter of qualification for vesting which is a nonforfeitable right of an employee to receive his accrued benefits under a plan whether his employment is terminated voluntarily or by discharge. Under present law there generally is no minimum vesting standard in corporate plans except in the case of discrimination in favor of officers, stockholders, supervisory employees, and highly compensated employees. However, the law does require plans of unincorporated businesses in which an owner-employee participates to provide full and immediate vesting of contributions on behalf of covered employees. In effect then, we have regulation now which varies widely

simply because of legal form of business organization. This diversity in application of vesting rules is a separate problem area. But irrespective of such diversity, improvement in vesting itself is an objective of great importance because it goes to the heart of the private pension system—retirement security. We want an expanding, healthy private retirement system as an alternative to the ever-increasing level of social security taxes and benefits which deprive persons of the flexibility in managing their retirement savings which the private system allows. The private system will not be healthy, however, so long as a substantial percentage of the work force, particularly older workers, are subject to forfeiture of their accrued benefits as a result of conditions over which they may have no control and which are inherent in an economy as dynamic and a work force as mobile as our own.

The magnitude of the problem may be illustrated as follows: Almost 70 percent of participants in all corporate pension plans today are not vested. Granted this percentage includes young workers with short service. A portion of them will have the opportunity to obtain vested rights if they stick with their current employment. A portion of them because they are young will have the opportunity to obtain vested rights if they move on to other employment and participate in other plans. We should look more properly at older and long service workers. Looking first at age:

40 percent of participants age 45 or more are not vested.

34 percent of participants age 50 or more are not vested.

26 percent of participants age 55 or more are not vested.

It is this nonvesting experience among older workers that is critical. These workers do not have the opportunities available to younger workers to obtain vested rights to benefits.

Looking at years of service, 13 percent of participants are in plans which provide no vesting before retirement and more than one-half of plan participants are subject to requirements of both 15 years or more of service and minimum age of 45 or more before at least 50 percent vesting occurs. A long service requirement and a high minimum age requirement are in a sense substitutes for each other. For a 25-year old employee, a 15-year service requirement and a minimum age requirement of 40 are equivalent. Thus one would expect that plans with long service requirements would make relatively less use of high minimum age requirements and vice versa. We find however that long service and high minimum age requirements tend to be used together. This combination in effect restricts the vesting prospects of younger long-service workers and older short-service workers.

This lack of adequate vesting in employee pension plans, and the consequent hardships from forfeitures, particularly by older workers who may have shaped their savings plans by depending on such future benefits, have led to strong pressures for a minimum vesting standard, either within or outside the tax law. Some proposals go further and call for portability of pension credits under which an employee would carry his accrued pension credits from job to job. Consider the consequences of such a drastic proposal; all plans would necessarily have to be forced into an almost uniform mold to make portability work properly. This would deprive the private pension system of its greatest advantage—flexibility in developing a plan which provides for contributions and benefit plans, as well as investment policies, determined by the individual employer and employee group to best suit their own needs. Consider also that portability has far less importance if adequate vesting is provided, because the employee accrues and retains permanently

his pension credits with the several employers by whom he may have been employed over his work life.

The solution then is a simple minimum vesting standard which would not impose unreasonable cost burdens on employers by focusing on the most sensitive element of the problem—assurance to older workers that they will in fact have rights to what they have worked for. The Administration has developed this standard known as the "Rule of 50" under which 50 percent vesting would be required whenever any combination of age and years of covered service equals 50, with vesting of an additional 10 percent each year for five years thereafter. Thus, a worker who begins to participate in a plan at 30 would at age 40 with 10 years of covered service become 50 percent vested; a worker age 45 with 5 years of covered service would also achieve this level.

To complement the vesting proposal, the proposed legislation has minimum service and age standards for eligibility to participate in a plan. An employer would not be required to cover an employee with 3 years or less of service who has not attained an age in excess of 30 years. Moreover, an employer would not be required to cover an employee who has attained an age within 5 years preceding normal retirement age under the plan.

These reasonable eligibility minimums are needed on one hand to prevent the dissipation of plan assets on benefits earned by employees with short periods of service. On the other hand, the eligibility minimums are needed to prevent possibilities of arbitrary exclusion of employees from participation in private retirement plans.

In addition, to avoid making employment of older workers less attractive because of the vesting standard, a maximum waiting period would be provided which is three years of participation reduced by years of service before participation. Thus, if a plan requires one year of service to participate, the "Rule of 50" may be made operative only after two years of participation. For example, if a plan requires one year of service to participate, an employee hired at age 50 would become eligible to participate at age 51 but would not be eligible to become 50 percent vested until age 53. He would not become fully vested until he attained age 58.

As indicated a moment ago, a plan would not be required to cover a worker who had attained an age within 5 years of normal retirement age under the plan. If normal retirement age is 65, then a plan would not be required to cover a worker hired at age 60 and over.

It is noteworthy that the cost of bringing an older worker into a plan and vesting him under the "Rule of 50" is not very different from the costs of bringing an older worker into a plan which has no vesting until normal retirement age. To provide a \$100 pension at 65 to a worker participating at age 55 the cost is \$570 in a plan without vesting and \$585 in a plan under the "Rule of 50". This is determined on the basis of a straight life annuity for males, with assets invested at 5 percent, and the typical turnover assumption that 3 percent of participants age 55 will leave before retirement.

The "Rule of 50" would not be costly and would be a major step in assuring pensions, particularly among older and long-service workers. Although it would raise the number of participants vested in their plans from 31 percent of all participants to 46 percent of all participants, more importantly, among participants age 45 and over, the percentage with vesting would rise from 60 percent to 92 percent. The number of employees with vested rights would increase by 3.6 million, of whom 3 million would be age 45 or more. Thus the "Rule of 50" would assure retirement benefit rights for virtually all older plan participants.



The rule would apply to all plans established after November 30, 1971. But for existing plans on that date the rule generally would apply to benefits accrued beginning in 1974. However, plan participation prior to 1974 would be considered in meeting the age and participation test.

Because the rule would apply only prospectively as far as accrued benefits are concerned, the cost impact of the "Rule of 50" would be modest. It would raise over-all pension costs by an average of 5 percent, or about 0.3 percent of covered payroll. For plans currently providing *no vesting before retirement* the "Rule of 50" would increase plan costs by an average of 8 percent or about 0.4 percent of covered payroll. The average cost increase for all plans would amount to about 1.5 cents per hour for each covered employee. For plans with *no vesting* the average cost increase would be 1.8 cents per hour for each covered employee.

Adequate vesting as provided by the "Rule of 50" would largely answer the claims for need for portability of pension credits. Older employees with adequate vesting would earn and realize their pension benefits from one or more employers and portability would be unnecessary.

Under present law a plan benefiting a self-employed person must provide an employee immediate and full vesting after 3 years of service when he is eligible to participate. The vesting and participation rules result in vested rights for many young workers who have short periods of service. Their benefits are very small, and the administrative costs of handling these are relatively high.

The proposed legislation would provide that in self-employed retirement plans an employee would attain 50 percent vested rights when he qualified under a rule of 35. As a condition to participate, an employee would have to be at least 35 with no more than one year service, or between 30 and 35 with no more than two years service, or under 30 with no more than 3 years service. Thus, under present law, an employee employed at 20 participates and becomes fully vested at 23. Under the legislation, he would participate at 23, but would become 50 percent vested at 29, and fully vested at 34. Under the legislation, an employee hired at 35 would become 50 percent vested at 36 when he participates and fully vested at 41.

There is now uncertainty and variation in administrative practice with respect to vesting and eligibility requirements in determining whether a plan of a closely held firm satisfies the nondiscrimination requirements. The proposed legislation would authorize the setting forth by regulation of the circumstances by which a plan would qualify with respect to participation and vesting. Such regulations could not be more restrictive than requirements imposed on plans benefitting self-employed who are owner-employees. Plans so treated would be the case of a covered partner with more than a 5 percent interest in capital or income, or would be the case of a group of covered partners having relatively smaller interests (that is, more than one percent but no more than 5 percent) for which the total interest of the group represents more than half of the interest in capital or income. Similarly, corporate plans would be so treated under the regulations with respect to ownership in the corporation.

Let me go on to the next two problems: Lack of plan coverage for many workers and the inadequacy of benefits. About half of the full-time nonagricultural adult work force is covered by existing plans, and the average annual pension benefits for retired couples is about \$1,600. This Administration considers it of paramount importance to move in the direction of remedying the fact that millions of employees are not covered or are inadequately covered by employer

plans. It proposes to do this by encouraging employees to invest in retirement savings.

Under present law, employer contributions on behalf of an employee to a private qualified retirement plan and the investment earnings on these contributions are generally not subject to tax until paid to the employee or his beneficiaries, even though the employee's rights to receive these amounts become nonforfeitable before the payment is made. Employee contributions are currently subject to tax as made (that is, no deduction is allowed), but tax on investment earnings on such contributions is deferred. But amounts saved independently for retirement by an individual and investment earnings on such savings are taxed currently.

As a consequence, present law discriminates substantially against those who do not participate in qualified plans or who participate in plans providing small benefits.

This Administration proposes that non-participants be allowed an annual income tax deduction for computing adjusted gross income for a limited annual contribution to an individual retirement plan. Similarly, the deduction should also be available to participants in low-benefit employer-financed plans. Investment earnings on these contributions should be tax deferred. There would be restrictions on withdrawals.

The proposed deduction would be limited to the lesser of 20 percent of earnings or \$1,500.

If an individual participates in an employer-financed plan with inadequate benefits, the extent of the employee deduction would be limited by the fact that the employer contributes. In such case, the 20 percent limitation would be reduced to reflect pension plan contributions by the employer. Under the proposal, the employee may assume that employer contributions on his behalf are either 7 percent of earnings or a lesser amount, in which case the employee would under regulations have to provide evidence of that circumstance.

In the case of public retirement systems where employees are not covered by social security (as in the case of the Civil Service) the deduction should be further limited by the assumed amount of social security tax that would be imposed.

The limitations are proposed to direct the tax benefit primarily to low and moderate earners. The limitations also preserve the incentive to establish employer-financed plans. The limits are high enough nevertheless so that older workers will be able to finance a substantial retirement income. For example, a \$1,500 contribution to an individual retirement plan beginning at age 40 will generate at retirement age of 65 an annual pension of \$7,500 in addition to social security benefits.

Present law places limitations upon contributions on behalf of self-employed individuals. While the self-employed are subject to a limit of the lesser of 10 percent of earned income or \$2,500 on deductions for retirement saving, no such limits apply to employer contributions on behalf of corporate employees. As a consequence, corporate executives and corporate-owner managers have substantial tax benefits as compared with self-employed persons. Yet corporate owner-managers and self-employed typically perform the same economic function. This situation has discouraged the formation of self-employed plans and encouraged many self-employed to incorporate their businesses simply to avoid these limitations. Incorporations for retirement tax advantages have created a serious inequity with respect to the self-employed who are unwilling or unable to incorporate.

To reduce this inequity, this Administration proposes to raise the deduction limit for the self-employed to 15 percent of earned income, or \$7,500 whichever is less. It would also reduce considerably the tax motivation to in-

corporate. In addition, it would promote the growth of self-employed plans and have a beneficial impact on the coverage of employees in unincorporated enterprise and on their level of benefits.

This concludes my remarks. I will be happy to answer any questions you may have.

#### AIR DEFENSE GAP

### HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 15, 1972

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, an editorial of February 8, 1972, published in the Aiken, S.C., Standard, has called attention to a serious defense problem.

The editorial, entitled "Air Defense Gap Alarming," comments on the findings of the House Armed Services Committee that the southern part of the Nation is naked to an enemy air attack.

It should also be noted that industry and cities in the southern part of the Nation are defenseless against a missile attack. The Soviets have had cruise range missile submarines in the southern waters.

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

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

#### AIR DEFENSE GAP ALARMING

The House Armed Services Committee has shown more concern than the Defense Department that a defecting Cuban pilot flew a MIG-17 fighter to a Florida air base in 1969 and a Russian-built transport flew from Havana to New Orleans last year carrying some uninvited delegates to a sugar conference. How were these unannounced flights made without triggering an air defense alert?

Rep. F. Edward Hebert, chairman of the committee, now provides the answer. There is virtually no air defense system to be triggered along our southern border and the Gulf Coast. It is that simple.

A Defense Department spokesman offers us some reassurance, pointing out that the Soviet Union could not launch a major manned bomber attack without the United States knowing it. Besides, many defense strategists believe manned bombers are not worth worrying about in this age of far more formidable nuclear missiles.

Perhaps so. Still it is hardly alarmist to recall that most of the American people and their leaders were convinced in 1941 that the Japanese either would not or could not carry out an attack on Pearl Harbor. Nevertheless, it happened, and with devastating results.

The glaring gap in defense of our southern approaches has gone unmentioned in a period of sustained hostility toward the United States by the Castro government in Cuba. During the same period there has been a bid by the Soviet Union to establish a naval presence in the Caribbean, and there have been visible efforts by both the Russians and Chinese Communists to cultivate friends among Latin American governments.

It may be a remote possibility that any government, either a major power or a lesser one subject to the will or persuasion of our enemies, would embark on the reckless adventure of a bombing attack on any part of the United States. This is no reason, however, to invite one by leaving the door wide open.

The commander of the North American Air Defense Command has told the Hebert committee that even the radar screen protecting the north, east and west approaches to North America is vulnerable to a low-level bomber attack. Our radar coverage is ineffective below 2,000 feet. With Canada hinting that it might pull out of its NORAD commitment, we might well question whether it is only our "southern exposure" that needs attention.

The Russians maintain a fleet of 900 long-range bombers and are investing heavily in their new "Backfire" supersonic bomber. This swing-wing plane is said to be capable of flying at the speed of sound at an altitude of 500 feet, carrying parachute-dropped hydrogen bombs. It could fly from Soviet bases to the United States and back without refueling and may be operational by next year.

While some of our strategists may believe that bombers are obsolete, the Russians obviously do not.

#### DECISION FOR DISASTER: THE TRUTH ABOUT THE BAY OF PIGS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, turning points in history are not always recognized at the time of their occurrence. Their significance is determined not by the extent of the movement or the size of the forces involved but by the magnitude of their consequences.

One such turning point in recent U.S. history was the attempted liberation of Cuba by Cuban patriots in April 1961 that ended in the tragic defeat of the liberators at the Bay of Pigs.

What are some of the major consequences? It prevented the removal of the first overt Soviet beachhead in the Americas, enabled the capture by the Castro Communist Cuban Government of future leadership of a free Cuba, facilitated the construction of Soviet missile and submarine bases close to the United States, contributed toward killing the Monroe Doctrine, and served as a prelude to the 1962 Cuban missile crisis, all at a time when the United States had a superiority in modern weaponry over its strongest potential enemy.

Moreover, the takeover of Cuba places Soviet power on the northern flank of the Atlantic approaches to the Panama Canal and was the first specific step in the long-range Red plan for wresting control of the canal from the United States and thus separating the Americas. Recent actions of the pro-Communist revolutionary government of Panama increase the danger of our losing the canal.

So inept and always against the interests of our country have been some of the moves of our Government in regard to the Panama Canal that it has made some discerning observers wonder if there has been an agreement between suspect elements in the State Department and Soviet power to surrender U.S. control of the vital waterway.

Writings about the Bay of Pigs disaster at the time and subsequently have been voluminous. Unfortunately, most of them

were aimed at defending those responsible, were conjectural or inaccurate, thus adding to the confusion and causing knowledgeable persons to ask embarrassing questions. President Kennedy's public acceptance of full responsibility for the fiasco was not an adequate explanation but a ploy apparently designed to stop public discussion.

It remained for an able and distinguished Cuban, Dr. Mario Lazo, who narrowly escaped execution following the Bay of Pigs catastrophe but was able to reach the United States, to make it his purpose in life to find out why the carefully planned liberation attempt failed.

Devoting 7 years to the task, he applied the investigative skills of a gifted and respected lawyer and produced an authoritative book that should be studied by every concerned policymaker of our Government, especially those in higher echelons charged with the responsibility of decision.

Appropriately named "Dagger in the Heart: American Policy Failures in Cuba," this volume, published in 1968 by Funk & Wagnalls of New York, is must reading for all who seek the truth concerning the Bay of Pigs tragedy and who should be held accountable. In addition, it gives a comprehensive account of the subsequent missile crisis of 1962 thus uncovering the masks that have obscured both the 1961 and 1962 failures.

Mr. Speaker, the United States seems verging toward another period of cataclysmic historical involvement. I know of no better way to judge the future except by the past. The Reader's Digest in a special feature in September 1964 by Dr. Lazo published his condensation of the story of the Bay of Pigs defeat under the telling title, "Decision for Disaster," which I quote as part of my remarks along with a biographical sketch of its author.

[From the Reader's Digest, September 1964]

DECISION FOR DISASTER: THE TRUTH ABOUT THE BAY OF PIGS

(By Mario Lazo)

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

On the morning of April 17, 1961, Dr. Mario Lazo, one of Cuba's most distinguished international lawyers, waited at his beach house in Varadero, 80 miles east of Havana. He was aware that the invasion of Castro's Cuba had begun. He was aware, too, that he had not much time left as a free man.

There were many reasons why Fidel Castro wanted Mario Lazo. Dr. Lazo had, in effect, enjoyed dual citizenship: a Cuban since birth, he had been, for a while, a U.S. citizen by naturalization. He was educated in the United States, with a law degree from Cornell. During World War I, he served with the American Expeditionary Forces as a captain of infantry in France. Then, for 35 years, in partnership with Dr. Jorge E. deCubas, he headed one of the outstanding law firms in Latin America, representing many foreign corporations as well as the U.S. government and an impressive Cuban clientele. Finally, like many other patriotic Cubans, he had collaborated with the anti-Castro underground. His arrest was inevitable.

Several weeks later, Dr. Lazo managed to escape from the island. Arrived in the United States, he made a vow: "Even if it takes the rest of my life, I will find out why the invasion of Cuba failed."

The account that follows is the result of three solid years of investigation by Dr. Lazo.

To talk with Cuban survivors of the abortive expedition, he went first to Spain, then around the Caribbean, finally back to the United States. When he had learned the key facts from these men, he tackled the more difficult job of reaching into high places in Washington. Here Dr. Lazo's international connections as a lawyer served him well. He was able to speak in confidence with those who knew, at firsthand, what happened in Washington during those critical April days in 1961.

#### Operation Pluto as planned originally

##### Air Strike 1

Scheduled for Saturday a.m., April 15. Objective: Free Cuban Air Squadron (16 B-26's) to attack airfields and destroy all or most of Castro's aircraft on the ground.

##### Air Strike 2

Scheduled for Sunday a.m., April 16. Objective: Destroy any remaining aircraft; bomb anti-aircraft and other military installations.

##### Air Strike 3

Scheduled for Monday a.m., April 17. Objective: Provide final assurance that every Castro plane has been destroyed. Hit tank, mobile-gun and truck concentrations and sink warship anchored near Cienfuegos. Return to base, refuel and fly support missions over beachhead.

First landing party to make the Giron airstrip operative as base for Free Cuban planes. Their missions: to block roads leading from Havana to beachhead; knock out Havana power plant, oil refineries; strike at Castro's troops, tanks, trucks, tractor-drawn artillery concentrated around Havana.

#### Why Operation Pluto Failed

Strike 1 was scaled down to eight planes—by White House order.

Strike 2 was canceled entirely—by White House order.

Strike 3 was canceled—by White House order—only a few hours before Bay of Pigs landing.

The Giron airstrip was captured but never occupied as an operating base. The Free Cuban planes that reached the invasion area, like the men ashore, were at the mercy of Castro's remaining jets, which, according to the plan, should have been destroyed by the three air strikes.

#### DECISION FOR DISASTER

Almost 3½ years have passed since the tragedy of the Bay of Pigs in April 1961 shocked the American people and damaged U.S. prestige and leadership throughout the free world. Yet the circumstances behind the fiasco are still cloaked in official secrecy. Recent attempts to get the facts have resulted in stories which have only added to the confusion. People everywhere are still puzzled and unsatisfied, because these basic questions remain unanswered:

Why were 1500 men sent to "invade" an island defended by more than 200,000 troops and militia bearing modern Soviet-bloc arms and equipment?

Why was the landing left vulnerable to Castro's small but nonetheless jet-equipped air force, which decimated the attacking planes and sank ships loaded with arms, munitions, fuel, food, electronic equipment and other essentials?

What role was assigned to the Free Cuban Air Squadron of obsolete U.S. planes flown by Cuban pilots, which all together were no match for Castro's T-33 jets?

What happened to the air strikes that were supposed to have been made by the Free Cuban Air Squadron to destroy Castro's air force prior to the landings?

Why were the isolated beaches of the Bay of Pigs, which allowed no means of escape if the invasion failed, chosen as the landing site?

Was the seemingly risky invasion plan re-



viewed—and approved—by America's highest military experts, the Joint Chiefs of Staff?

The general opinion (which, I confess, I once shared) is that the Bay of Pigs invasion failed either because the operation was bungled by the Central Intelligence Agency, or because the plan of invasion was inadequate.

*Both these suppositions are wrong.*

The operation was directed brilliantly and executed heroically. The plan was a masterful one, as Castro himself later admitted; if it had been carried out as designed, it should have succeeded.

The military plan was approved by the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff. But changes were made in it later, at the insistence of President Kennedy's political advisers—without consulting the Joint Chiefs or the CIA, and, when they heard of the changes, against their wishes.

*These changes doomed the invasion to disaster before it even got under way.*

The decision to help anti-Castro Cubans liberate their homeland was made by President Dwight D. Eisenhower early in 1960. The task was assigned to the Central Intelligence Agency, with Deputy Director Richard M. Bissell in charge of the operation. The Pentagon was to provide military supplies and assistance. The plans were to be reviewed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. And, finally, the whole operation would have to be approved by the President.

By the time of the November 1960 Presidential elections, a number of tentative plans were under consideration by the CIA, but none had reached the stage where it was ready for consideration by the Joint Chiefs. Air drops to the anti-Castro freedom fighters in Cuba's Escambray mountains were being attempted. In isolated camps in Louisiana, Florida and Central America, Cuban volunteers were receiving ground-fighting instruction. Cuban pilots were being trained in planes provided by the U.S. government.

The morale of the freedom fighters was high. Their American instructors exuded confidence, based largely on the conviction that any operation approved by President Eisenhower would not be allowed to fail, even if final victory required the unconcealed support of U.S. troops, ships and planes. "We knew damn well," one American officer said, "that Ike would never undertake a military operation except with the determination to win."

This was the situation that confronted President John F. Kennedy when he entered the White House in January 1961. Shortly before the inauguration, President Eisenhower, in reviewing international affairs with his successor, had warned that the situation in Cuba was grim and growing ever more dangerous, especially in view of mounting Soviet military aid. "There is no time to lose," he is reported to have told Kennedy. "You may have to send troops in."

The invasion site in the first plan submitted to President Kennedy in February 1961 was not the Bay of Pigs but Trinidad, a city of 20,000 about 100 miles farther east on the south coast of Cuba, at the foot of the Escambray mountains. Trinidad was chosen because it offered a number of advantages. It was a substantial distance from Havana, where Castro troops and armor were concentrated. The population was strongly anti-Castro. It had a suitable airfield. But, most important, the site provided an alternative if things went wrong: invaders could escape into the nearby mountains and conduct guerrilla operations.

When this first plan came up for consideration, President Kennedy was reminded by his State Department and White House advisers that U.S. participation in the invasion was supposed to be secret and undercover. An amphibious landing that had all the recognizable evidence of a U.S.-mounted

operation at a coastal town as large as Trinidad would give the whole thing away. As a result, the President, yielding to his advisers, ordered the CIA to find a less conspicuous landing site.

The CIA and the Joint Chiefs abandoned the Trinidad site only after vigorous protest. After considering a number of alternatives, they finally chose Playa Girón, near the Bay of Pigs. This beach did have several points in its favor. The latest American U-2 and F-101 reconnaissance photos showed that there was no concentration of Castro troops in the vicinity. The airstrip at Girón was more suitable for B-26 operations. The area between the beach and the mainland was an immense, alligator-infested swamp connected by four highways that could be cut or controlled from the air.

The military men, however, saw that Girón had one big disadvantage. The area was not suited to prolonged guerrilla operations; if things went wrong, there would be no alternative to fall back on. Still, the fact that, at this stage, the CIA and the Joint Chiefs were willing to accept Girón is evidence in itself that the operation as then planned was almost certain to succeed.

The essential element of the plan—called Operation Pluto—was the use of air power. Castro's small air force was to be destroyed on the ground via three air strikes by the Free Cuban Air Squadron based at Puerto Cabezas, Nicaragua. There were to be two strikes prior to the invasion, and one to coincide with the landings at the Bay of Pigs. *Only after every Castro plane had been destroyed was the invasion force to hit the beaches.* Then the invaders' main objective was to seize the airfield near the beachhead and hold it until the Free Cuban Air Squadron could move over from Nicaragua. Thenceforth, with complete control of the air over the entire island, the liberators could expect Castro's collapse in a matter of days.

The Free Cuban squadron consisted of 16 B-26 medium bombers, 4 four-engine C-54's and 5 twin-engine C-46's (the two latter groups being unarmed transports for paratroopers and supplies). More aircraft of the same types were to be available as replacements for losses. True, these planes were of World War II and Korean War vintage; and the B-26's had been stripped of tail guns to enable them to carry needed fuel for the seven-hour (1300-mile) flight from Nicaragua to Cuba and back, with approximately 45 minutes over the target. Nevertheless, U.S. military advisers considered them entirely adequate for the air requirements of Operation Pluto.

Castro's air force was made up of 16 operable aircraft: six T-33 jets, six fast British Sea Fury propeller-driven fighters, and four B-26's.

Finally, a handpicked group of Cuban civilians was to be flown in to set up a provisional government at the town of Girón, and to call for recognition and military assistance. It was known that most of the nations of the Caribbean area were ready to respond to such a plea. Under such circumstances, the temper of the Cuban people would inevitably have ended the Castro regime with a minimum of bloodshed.

Everything, however, hinged on the three planned air strikes. Strike No. 1, on the morning of Saturday, April 15, was to be a surprise attack which would knock out the major portion of Castro's planes on the ground, chiefly at Camp Columbia in Havana and at San Antonio de los Baños, about 20 miles away. Strike No. 2, on Sunday, was to mop up what was left, if any, of Castro's planes, and to take out anti-aircraft and other installations.

Strike No. 3, on Monday morning, April 17 (D-Day), guided by reconnaissance photographs, would give final assurance that every Castro plane had been destroyed on the

ground. It would also hit tank, mobile-gun and truck concentrations and sink a warship at anchor near Cienfuegos. Other bombers would interdict the beachhead.

The first landing party would clear the Girón runways while a freighter in the invasion fleet unloaded gasoline, bombs, ammunition, supplies and a group of aircraft mechanics. Girón henceforth would be the operating base of the Free Cuban Air Squadron.

With control of the air, the squadron's B-26's could then block the main highways leading toward the beachhead, and blast Castro's tanks, trucks and tractor-drawn artillery. Another primary target was the Havana power plant (and possibly a few subsidiary stations), which generated 90 percent of Cuba's electricity. Bombing the plant would black out much of the island, silence communications (telephone, telegraph, radio, television), and bring all major industries and rail transportation to a standstill. Cuba's water supply, dependent on electrical pumping, would be reduced to a trickle.

There was never any intention of attacking Fidel Castro's well-armed troops with a brigade of 1,500 men. Nor was the small brigade intended to "invade and occupy" the whole of Cuba. Operation Pluto was meant to be *essentially an air operation.*

That, briefly, was the plan evolved by the CIA and approved by the Joint Chiefs. On April 4, the plan came up for final review at a dramatic meeting in the State Department over which President Kennedy presided. Among those present were: Secretary of State Dean Rusk; Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon; Sen. J. William Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; Gen. Lyman Lemnitzer, chairman of the Joint Chiefs; Adm. Arleigh Burke, Chief of Naval Operations; Allen W. Dulles, Director of the CIA; Gen. Charles P. Cabell, Deputy Director of the CIA; Paul Nitze, Assistant Secretary of Defense; Thomas Mann, Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs; Presidential assistants McGeorge Bundy, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., and Richard Goodwin; Presidential consultant Adolf Berle; and Richard M. Bissell, of the CIA, charged with supervising Operation Pluto on a day-to-day basis.

Bissell spoke forcefully and lucidly, explaining that the essential element of the proposed operation was the destruction of Castro's small air force on the ground by pre-invasion air strikes. This, he said, could be accomplished easily by the Cuban-manned bombers guided by U.S. reconnaissance photographs. The crowded conference room gave Bissell respectful attention; he was the man mainly responsible for the CIA's share in the extraordinarily successful U.S. reconnaissance program, which, in mid-1960, finally opened the closed society of the Soviet Union to U.S. intelligence inspection. As a result of the U-2 air squadron's activities, supplemented by certain remarkable U.S. scientific techniques, for both of which Bissell was largely responsible, the United States knew for a fact that at the time of the Bay of Pigs invasion any Soviet threat to support Castro with intercontinental ballistic missiles would be an empty threat. Only one launching complex was nearing completion.

The sole voice raised against Operation Pluto at the meeting was that of Senator Fulbright, who denounced the plan as immoral. In view of what developed in the next few days, it is significant that Secretary of State Dean Rusk, at that time, did not oppose the plan.

The following day, April 5, President Kennedy made his decision to proceed with Operation Pluto. D-Day was to be Monday, April 17.

The go-ahead was flashed to the Free Cuban air case, called "Happy Valley," in

Puerto Cabezas, and preparations for the three air strikes were speeded up. Morale was high, even though the removal of the tail guns from the B-26's had caused some uneasiness. The Cuban airmen asked their U.S. superiors whether the stripped planes, defenseless from the rear, would not be easy prey for Castro's jets. The answer from the American officer in command was reassuring: "Don't worry about Castro's jet fighters—they won't get into the air." He was echoing the Washington strategists who counted on the complete destruction of Castro's air force on the ground.

By April 11, newspaper reports indicated that there was serious disagreement within the Kennedy administration about how far the United States should go in helping Cuban refugees to overthrow Castro. These reports disclosed that some of those who had participated in the April 4 meeting, notably Secretary of State Dean Rusk, had veered away from their first positions. Presidential consultant Adolf Berle and Assistant Secretary of State Thomas Mann stood firm, however, foreseeing that purely political decisions could destroy a skillfully devised military operation.

Torn between the opposing factions—the CIA, Joint Chiefs and their supporters on the one hand, and the politicians on the other—the new and youthful President Kennedy wavered. Finally, he agreed to further compromises suggested by his political advisers. These compromises radically changed the original plan. They were made *without consulting the CIA or the Joint Chiefs*, who, when they learned of them, used every means at their disposal to have them countermanded by the President.

The next compromise was in Air Strike No. 1 against Castro's airports, scheduled for dawn Saturday, April 15. The plan called for a strike in full force, using all 16 of the B-26 bombers the Free Cubans then had at their disposal. The State Department argued that the attacking group would look too numerous to be consistent with the pretense that the air strike was conducted by defecting Castro pilots. So, on an order from the White House, the first strike force was whittled down to eight planes.

On April 7, the second of the three planned strikes (scheduled for Sunday, April 16) was canceled entirely! The reason given was the insistence of the State Department (and some of the President's other advisers) upon preserving the "non-involvement image" of the United States. The President's political advisers also decided that two air strikes (really one and a half) should be sufficient to destroy Castro's planes on the ground.

When they heard of these changes, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the CIA considered recommending cancellation of the entire invasion plan. After further review, however, they decided that the *third* air strike, scheduled for Monday, April 17, could be counted on to take care of whatever air force Castro had left.

On April 12, uneasiness mounted at the CIA and the Pentagon when President Kennedy stated at his press conference: "There will not under any circumstances be an intervention in Cuba by United States armed forces." The government, he said, would make sure that "there are no Americans involved." This statement, when repeated by Secretary Rusk five days later, was to be a contributing factor in the disaster, as we shall see.

The "point of no return," beyond which the operation could not be called off, was set for noon on Sunday, April 16.

The eight planes authorized to take part in Strike 1 reached the south coast of Cuba at dawn on Saturday, April 15, on three different courses. Coming in at low altitude, the planes crossed the island northward without being picked up on Castro's primitive radar. The attack achieved complete surprise. Three planes hit the field at San

Antonio de los Baños; three more struck at Camp Columbia in Havana; two others attacked the airport at Santiago de Cuba. The Free Cuban squadron's losses were three planes; one B-26 was hit by anti-aircraft fire, crashed at sea, and both pilots were lost; another, returning toward Nicaragua, made a crash landing on Grand Cayman, a small British island; a third cracked up as it barely reached a U.S. base near Key West.

The Cubans and their American supervisors considered the limited strike a success. Fidel Castro's air force had been reduced by half—but he still had three T-33 jets, three Sea Furies, and two B-26's.

I have talked to a number of pilots who flew on Strike No. 1. Their major worry when they returned to base at Happy Valley, they told me, was the threat posed by Castro's remaining jets and Sea Furies. They also thought of what might have been accomplished if the squadron had struck in full force, as originally planned. Their concern was more than matched by the chagrin of the pilots who did not fly the scheduled mission because their planes remained grounded in Nicaragua—by orders. Yet both groups, I have been convinced, were confident that Strike No. 3 (still scheduled for takeoff at 1:40 Monday morning) could mop up Castro's remaining aircraft and also perform assigned missions over the beachheads. A new and unexpected development was to occur, however.

At 3 p.m. on Sunday the pilots at Happy Valley were called together in the rear of the operations shack. For the next four hours the Monday-morning mission was explained in detail by U.S. intelligence officers, who displayed remarkable aerial photographs taken by U.S. reconnaissance planes. These photos showed where each Castro plane and anti-aircraft battery was located; tank, gun and truck concentrations; and a warship at anchor off Cienfuegos. Again stress was placed on the top-priority objective: *destroy Castro's remaining aircraft.*

At 7:30 p.m., when the individual briefings of the Cuban pilots had been completed, an American adviser named Gregory Bell, instructor of the C-46 pilots, entered the room. Glancing at a paper in his hand, he told the Cubans that it might not be necessary for them to fly the scheduled Monday mission. Apparently other planes would take care of Castro's aircraft. However, the pilots and crews were ordered to stand by until the base confirmed the Washington order. At midnight, Bell returned with confirmation that the third strike had indeed been officially canceled.

The Cuban pilots assumed that some important decision had been made in Washington. They believed, however, that it was a decision favorable to their cause. Since there was no other Free Cuban air base in operation, the change of orders, they felt, could mean but one thing: U.S. military aircraft had been assigned to wipe out the Castro planes.

That night all hands were more confident than ever of the invasion's success.

Their confidence was unjustified. On the preceding day—Saturday, April 15—news of the first air strike against Castro's airfields had loud repercussions at the United Nations. Raul Roa, Castro's foreign minister, appeared before the General Assembly's Political Committee. He charged that the bombing was the prelude to an invasion planned, financed and directed by the United States. Adlai Stevenson, the U.S. representative, rejected Roa's accusations out of hand with force and eloquence—and stepped into an embarrassing trap.

As part of Operation Pluto, a B-26 bomber, painted to resemble the B-26's in Castro's air force, had flown from Nicaragua directly to Miami, where the Free Cuban pilot declared that the morning's raid was the work of Castro's own pilots who, like himself, were

revolting against the communist regime. Pilot and plane were photographed, and the pictures were immediately distributed by the wire services. Apparently unaware that a ruse was involved, Adlai Stevenson accepted the story at face value and, in his rebuttal of Roa's charges, stated flatly that the raiding planes were Castro's own and that the pilots were defectors. He pointed to the Miami photographs as evidence.

Roa had no trouble in exploding the story. The B-26 flown to Miami by the "defecting" pilot was recognizably different from Castro's B-26's. The Cuban delegate went on to charge that "mercenaries hired by the United States" were about to bomb Cuba again. Stevenson could only answer that "steps have been taken to impound the Cuban planes which have landed in Florida, and they will not be permitted to take off for Cuba."

In the confusion that followed, there is one certainty: When Stevenson learned of the blunder that had placed him in such an embarrassing position before the United Nations, he was understandably furious. Other facts have become lost in a thicket of contradictions and denials.

However, the actions that climaxed the hectic weekend are undeniable. At 7 p.m. Sunday, an order was issued from the White House canceling the final and crucial air strike scheduled for dawn the next day—D-Day. The order was transmitted to Cabell and Bissell, of the CIA, by Presidential aide McGeorge Bundy, who then made a hurried trip to New York to confer with Stevenson. Said Hanson Baldwin, military analyst of the New York Times, some three months after the invasion: "That cancellation was apparently the result of representations by Secretary of State Dean Rusk, and through him by Mr. Stevenson."

*That decision sealed the doom of the invasion and marked it for disaster.*

The cancellation order was a staggering blow to the CIA. Deputy Director Cabell, a U.S. Air Force general with a brilliant combat record, saw the handwriting of disaster on the wall. He and Bissell went at once to the State Department.

Secretary Rusk listened to their arguments and pleas, but was not impressed. The invasion force was at sea and only a few hours from the Bay of Pigs. Rusk was reminded that the Free Cubans' slow propeller-driven B-26's were no match for the Castro jets that were still operable. These jets could control the air, sink ships with rockets and decimate the landing force. Still, the Secretary was unmoved. The ships could unload under cover of darkness and retire before daybreak, he said, adding that the CIA was overstressing the danger of enemy planes; political considerations were more important.

Finally, however, Rusk agreed to telephone President Kennedy, who was at Glen Ora, his country place in Middleburg, Va. He repeated the pleas of the CIA representatives, and expressed his own opposition. The President's answer: The cancellation order stands. Stunned and dismayed, Bissell and Cabell returned to CIA headquarters and complied with the President's order.

That was the order that Gregory Bell confirmed to the pilots at Happy Valley at midnight on Sunday. These men had no way of knowing it, but, at that instant, Cuba's dream of liberation was shattered and Fidel Castro was handed a smashing victory—only a few hours before the first blood was shed at the Bay of Pigs.

At 4 a.m. Monday, while frogmen were marking the channels for landing craft through the reefs off the Bay of Pigs, and with some assault troops already ashore, Cabell returned to Rusk to plead for air cover from the U.S. carriers lying over the horizon. With the Secretary of State still opposed, Cabell himself phoned President Kennedy in Virginia. The President supported Rusk. The answer, still: No.



So, during that fateful night and early morning the invasion fleet steamed slowly toward disaster—five small freighters escorted by U.S. destroyers and two radar-equipped LCI's of World War II vintage. Nearby were the U.S. aircraft carriers *Essex* and *Bozert*, with destroyer escorts. The *Bozert* carried a battalion of Marines.

At 10 p.m., one of the LCI's led a freighter onto the beach at Girón. Some 20 miles to the west another LCI escorted a second freighter into the Bay of Pigs. Now another freighter appeared out of the night, and the clank and clash of its gear told that landing craft were being lowered. As the noise of landingcraft diesel engines was added to the din, the lights at Girón began to go out. A single machine-gun emplacement opened fire. An LCI quickly wiped it out with its 50-caliber guns. The doomed invasion was under way.

Soon the first assault troops were leaping ashore and streaking for their objectives. Before dawn, many of the invaders had reached the town of Girón, where they went from house to house reassuring the citizens: "We are Cubans. We have come to liberate Cuba!" Before long they had control of the airport and, with a bulldozer, went to work clearing away sandpiles from a not quite completed runway. That very morning, they thought, their own bombers would be arriving.

Then, with the first invaders ashore, and with others approaching in small boats and still others struggling to unload the freighters, Castro's planes came roaring in, guns and rockets blazing. The men on the beaches were virtually defenseless.

By 8 a.m., one freighter, struck by a rocket, had to be beached on an offshore reef. The men swam ashore without guns or ammunition. Later, a Castro Sea Fury dived out of the sun and made a direct hit on a second freighter with a rocket. The ship, carrying a precious cargo of anti-tank road mines, ammunition, food, gasoline and radio equipment, blew up in a tremendous blast and sank quickly. Supplies for a week's fighting were lost. Castro's remaining three T-33 jets, three Sea Furies and two B-26's commanded the skies.

At 3 p.m. the three freighters left afloat were ordered to leave the invasion area; the word came from the American officer who was directing the landings from the LCI *Blagar*, lying 12 miles away. The armed LCI's landed five medium tanks and a few trucks and departed. The withdrawal left the landing forces stranded on the beaches with less than ten percent of their ammunition and other critically needed equipment. But, as the Castro troops closed in on them over the unobstructed highways, they put up a fight and inflicted heavy losses. Also, surprisingly—in view of the desperate circumstances—many militiamen and citizens in the Girón area joined the liberation forces.

The Free Cuban commander on the beach asked repeatedly for the air support that the American advisers at the training camp had promised. By radio he pleaded: "Where is the promised air cover? Do you back us or quit?" Several times he was told that air support was coming, and once that air cover would be over the beachhead in a matter of minutes.

U.S. Navy jets did, in fact, fly over the invasion area on several occasions, usually in pairs, once in a close formation of six. When they first appeared, Castro's jets vanished from the air. The cheering invaders on the beaches watched as the American planes dipped their wings in salute and flew inland. They were sure that the turning point had come. But soon the Navy jets headed out to sea again. Castro's planes then returned and brazenly remained over the beachhead during subsequent U.S. flights.

What happened, I learned later, was that when Secretary of State Rusk, at his Monday press conference, repeated with empha-

sis President Kennedy's earlier statement that U.S. forces would not intervene in any way, Castro assured his pilots that the U.S. Navy jets posed no threat—they were merely taking photographs. Thus, after the first flight, Castro's jets renewed their devastating attacks, ignoring the occasional appearance of the powerful U.S. jets, which took no part in the fighting at any time.

The Free Cuban Air Squadron, although no match for Castro's jets and Sea Furies, engaged in the unequal combat, and lost half its planes the first day. The pilots, some of them wounded, continued flying the long seven-hour missions between Nicaragua and the beachheads even after the task was clearly hopeless. With machine guns and rockets, they sprayed the advancing Castro columns, blew up tanks and trucks loaded with militiamen. They sank a gunboat and coast-guard cutter approaching Girón Beach.

Of the original 16 bombers, only three survived the whole action. Tuesday night American pilots flew ten additional bombers into the Nicaragua staging base to replace those lost or damaged. What gave out finally was the squadron's manpower.

The earliest reports from the Bay of Pigs, reaching Washington over U.S. Navy radio circuits, confirmed the worst fears of the CIA and the Joint Chiefs. When the President learned of the air squadron's decimation by Castro's jets and the loss of two freighters, he became alarmed. On Monday afternoon, he countermanded his Sunday-evening order forbidding strikes against the airports. This resulted in a mission dispatched to bomb the San Antonio de los Baños base near Havana on Monday night. But this so-called "air strike," as we shall see later, was in reality no strike at all.

On Tuesday the dispatches reaching Washington grew grimmer by the hour. That evening, Bissell realized that his warnings could no longer be disregarded without peril. Facts of the impending collapse, he was convinced, armed him for one last effort to save Operation Pluto. He sent word to the President that he must see him urgently.

President Kennedy was holding a reception at the White House for his Cabinet and members of Congress and their wives. But the President left the party and joined Bissell in a tense meeting to which Secretaries Rusk and McNamara, General Lemnitzer and Admiral Burke, among others, had been summoned. I have been privileged to hear several accounts of that meeting, and each bears out the others in every detail.

Strongly supported by Burke and Lemnitzer, Bissell made a fervent appeal for the only thing that could now save the Cuban invasion: use of the U.S. military power available on the ships just over the horizon. Rusk was unalterably opposed.

Next, Bissell and Burke asked that a detachment of Marines be permitted to go into action. This, too was refused. All these proposals, they were reminded, would amount to U.S. "involvement."

The last request made by Admiral Burke was for the use of one U.S. destroyer, to lay down a barrage on Castro's forces. The President asked: What if Castro's forces return the fire and hit the destroyer? Burke answered emphatically: "Then we'll knock hell out of them!"

The President said that then the United States would be involved. My informants quote, with obvious admiration, Burke's answer:

"We are involved, sir. We trained and armed these Cubans. We helped land them on the beaches. God-dammit, Mr. President, we can't let those boys be slaughtered there!"

The outcome of that meeting was perhaps the most timid compromise of all: the President agreed that Navy fighter planes, with their U.S. markings painted out, could fly "reconnaissance" over the beachhead, but

there should be not more than two planes, and they could fly for one hour only, from 6:30 to 7:30 a.m.! That was the extent of the "support" authorized. The United States could not afford to "compromise the American image" before the rest of the world.

Several accounts have claimed that President Kennedy, in response to the final plea of the CIA and Joint Chiefs, authorized a U.S. "air umbrella" over the invasion perimeter to permit the Free Cuban squadron to "attack in force." Actually, on Wednesday morning, April 19, the number of Free Cubans able to fly was pitifully small. But a final air mission was pieced together in Nicaragua; it was composed of one unarmed C-46 transport plane piloted by two Cubans, and two B-26 bombers, each piloted by two American instructors. The Americans had volunteered to provide "fighter escort" for the C-46. The purpose of the mission: the C-46 was to leave supplies at the Girón airstrip and pick up a youthful Free Cuban pilot, Matias Farias, who, with maps and a ground report of the invaders' plight, might be able to support Bissell in the fight he was waging in Washington.

During the opening air battles over the beaches on Monday, Farias, flying a B-26, had put a Sea Fury out of action and destroyed a Castro B-26 before his co-pilot, Eddie Gonzalez, was killed and his own plane was forced to crash-land near Girón. With his left arm splintered and his face torn by a bullet, Farias made his way to field headquarters. Now he would be brought back to the Nicaraguan base.

The two bombers were shot down, however, and all four Americans died. The C-46 landed at Girón—the only invader plane to use the airport—and then made it back to Happy Valley with Farias aboard. Farias tape-recorded a vivid account of the disaster unfolding on the beaches, which was flown to Washington by a U.S. jet. But it was too late. The "battle of Washington" had been lost.

By nightfall on Wednesday, April 19, the fighting on the beaches was over. For three days the men had fought without rest and with little food or water. The promised "continuing" supplies had never reached the invaders. Now they had run out of ammunition and food. Almost to a man, they were captured or killed. A few put out to sea in tiny fishing boats found along the beach. One of these, with 22 men aboard, drifted for 15 days; when it was picked up by an American freighter, there were only 12 survivors.

Shortly before 5 p.m. on Wednesday, the Free Cubans' beach commander sent his final message to the American vessels standing off the Bay of Pigs. "I am destroying all my equipment," he said. "I have nothing left to fight with. The enemy tanks are already in my position. Farewell, friends!"

Gathering their remaining strength, the men crawled into the swamps. There some survived for two weeks before they died or were captured.

Castro's planes, spared by the cancellation of the air strikes, had been in the air continually. They operated in pairs, while others reloaded and refueled nearby. Flying at twice the speed of the Free Cuban bombers, the remaining jets had turned the tide of the battle, just as Bissell, Cabell, Burke and Lemnitzer had foreseen.

But the invasion was over. Castro's boasts of how little Cuba had, in three days, defeated mighty Uncle Sam were now heard round the world, relayed triumphantly by Moscow and Peking. U.S. prestige dropped to a new low in Latin America, the Far East, Southeast Asia and even among its European allies. Fidel Castro was raised to a pinnacle of prestige. There was no doubt anywhere about the U.S. "involvement"—as there never could have been in an open society—but it was involvement in failure.

Was there, at any time, a substitute opera-

tion for the crucial third air strike that was canceled?

Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, in a curious interview published in *U.S. News & World Report* of January 28, 1963, explained: "There was supposed to be another attack on the airports on Monday morning. . . . There had been a flurry at the United Nations and elsewhere. . . . The President was called about whether [the attack] should take place. As there was this stir . . . he gave instructions that it should not take place at that time. . . . And, in fact, the attack on the airports took place later that day." (The italics are mine.)

What was the "attack on the airports" that Robert Kennedy said "took place later that day" [Monday]?

On Monday, two Free Cuban bombers were authorized to hit the San Antonio airfield where Castro planes were based. The pilots were warned, however, to avoid any risk to civilian lives or property. The planes took off from Nicaragua at 7:30 p.m. They arrived over the target four hours later, on a moonless night, with both the base and the nearby town blacked-out and hidden by a low cloud ceiling. Unable to distinguish the target, the pilots obeyed their orders and returned to Nicaragua without firing a shot or dropping a bomb!

To call this Monday-night flight an "attack on the airports," and to equate it with the original air strike planned for Monday dawn (and then canceled), which was to have been carried out by eight bombers manned by fresh pilots who had been briefed for hours with U-2 target photographs before them, is not exactly an exercise of candor.

Robert Kennedy was a member of the committee appointed by the President to investigate the fiasco, and he helped write the committee's secret report—which has never been published. Certainly he had access to all the facts, including those related to the air strikes that were planned and then canceled. He must know it is not a "fact" that the original Monday "attack on the airports" . . . took place later that day—or at any time thereafter.

Robert Kennedy's allusion to the "flurry at the United Nations and elsewhere" also raises questions. We know that part of the flurry on that Saturday afternoon was caused by fear of Khrushchev and his threat to support Castro, with the implication that intercontinental ballistic missiles would be used if necessary. This solemn warning of nuclear retaliation might have given pause to people who were incompletely informed. But is it conceivable that Stevenson and Rusk, and some of the White House advisers, were unaware of the solid proof then in the President's possession that the U.S.S.R. had no operational ICBM's in firing position at that time?

Volumes have been written about the reasons for the failure of Operation Pluto. Some accounts have apparently been devised to whitewash the advisers who influenced President Kennedy's decisions and, at the same time, to vilify those Americans who honestly tried to plan and execute—according to their orders—a Cuban invasion of Cuba which should have succeeded.

My findings, I believe, refute the slanders of the CIA, the favorite "whipping boy" of the Kennedy administration's apologists. Yet it would be absurd to imply that the CIA's performance was flawless. Why, for example, was not the anti-Castro underground alerted? Many reasons have been given: the fact that its units had been infiltrated by Castro agents and some of its U.S.-trained leaders had been executed; the disunity among the early Cuban exiles, which in turn prevented cohesion among the underground groups inside Cuba. It has even been said that when the CIA became convinced that

the invasion was doomed as a consequence of White House orders canceling the air strikes, it elected not to launch the Cuban underground on an adventure that would increase the death toll. Allen Dulles said that the underground was not alerted "for reasons of security." This is unacceptable to the Cuban people. Why could not the active anti-Castroites inside Cuba have been alerted at the moment of the invasion without a security risk? I and thousands of others in the Matanzas area, for instance, were not arrested until 11 hours after the first landings.

Today, however, with the facts known at last, the time has come for all Free Cubans to turn away from past failures and to concentrate on the future. Our sole concern now must be the liberation of our homeland, on our own. We are aware, of course, that this fight for freedom has implications that go far beyond Cuba. For the free world will be lost if its people ever accept the idea that communist revolutions are irreversible. We Cubans know that if there is one country where communism can be reversed, it is Cuba. That is something we must demonstrate to the world.

We welcome the aid of those individual Americans who wish to help us in our struggle. But, in view of the experience at the Bay of Pigs, we can never again accept aid as subordinates of U.S. policy.

Cubans-in-exile know that the real impetus of the liberation movement will come from the Cubans who are still suffering Castro's tyranny. The true liberators are in Cuba now; the future governors of a free Cuba will come out of Castro's prisons and from his disillusioned army and militia. The underground is reforming, discovering new leaders, recovering from the disaster of 1961. The leaders are dedicated, selfless patriots who are working without thought of personal gain or political reward.

Our task, in exile, is to spark the coming revolt and to support it with our funds, our faith and, if necessary, our lives.

## YOUTH FOR UNDERSTANDING

### HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to join with my many colleagues in commending the over 2,500 American teenagers who are participating in this year's Youth for Understanding program. At a time when international understanding and good will is more important than ever, it is encouraging to see the number of American and foreign youth that are interested in getting to know each other and each other's culture. Since all exchange students have a chance to live with a family, the possibility for learning about a different culture is very great.

Thousands of enduring friendships have been created by this people-to-people program. Understanding and good will have been quietly established with the beneficial consequences which cannot be readily measured.

This program has had and will continue to have my full support. I commend those who are involved in this program for their efforts in behalf of international understanding.

SENATOR CARL T. HAYDEN

### HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 15, 1972

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the recent death of former Senator Carl Hayden brought back fond memories to many persons, including one of my fellow New Hampshireites, Bob Monahan, who is a former member of our State's legislature as well as a friend. Bob now writes a column for the *Granite State Gazette*, whose circulation is mainly in the Lebanon-Hanover area of New Hampshire. In his column of February 3 he recounted the memorable meeting he had with Senator Hayden during World War II.

I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed in the *RECORD*, so that the interesting incident described by Bob can be brought to the attention of the late Carl Hayden's friends and admirers throughout the entire Nation.

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

SENATOR CARL T. HAYDEN

(By Bob Monahan)

The Portland-Oakland sleeper was crowded, as it always was during the hectic years of World War II. We were returning alone to San Francisco from a trip into Oregon to check the latest Jap balloon-bomb discovery in the National Forests of that tinder-dry State.

Because we had to hop off about midnight at Shasta City, where the headquarters of the Shasta National Forest was located, we had not tried to reserve a berth, preferring to doze in one of the coaches. Beside us, also dozing, was an elderly gentleman who looked remarkably familiar.

On a hunch, we asked him if he knew Senator Carl Hayden of Arizona. He not only knew him but was he. Then, he explained that he was heading for the Bay Area but wanted very much to see Shasta Dam near Redding, where we were due about 3 a.m. How could he get from the station to the gigantic dam across the Sacramento River at that time of night?

We took a chance, explaining that we were disembarking at a whistle stop in about an hour, that a furnished U.S. Forest Service guest house which my key would unlock was within a block of the station, and that I'd get him over to the dam the next morning. That looked good to him, and so it proved to be, especially as he was having a bad night.

The next day I commandeered the Forest Supervisor's car, drove the Senator to the dam, where his visit was a complete surprise but the red carpet was not long in being rolled out. After all, Hayden was then chairman of the Senate Committee in charge of all irrigation, reclamation and related projects in the entire country.

The Senator insisted that I accompany him as we passed thru the heavily guarded entrance and were shown the insides of the tremendous dam. We even had a substantial lunch together at the special table reserved for the general contractor and his associates. True to my promise, I managed to get him back to the Southern Pacific to connect with the next southbound train.

They buried Senator Hayden last week in his beloved Arizona, four years after retirement. At the age of 94 he had served more years in Congress than any other man. During those 56 years he spent 41 in the Senate,



where a colleague named Truman is reported as calling him "the silent senator."

The UPI lead paragraph in its obituary referred to him as "laconic." That he may have been, but when we parted company in Shasta City, he minced no words in urging me to get in touch with him, if I ever needed help. It developed that he had been a sick man when we talked him off that crowded train, that he had very much wanted to see for the first time the largest dam then under construction, and was one not to forget personal assistance.

During his 14 years as chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, there were times when I was tempted to play my trump card, but I never did and am glad I never had to.

## CROWN OF ST. STEPHEN: U.S. ASSURES ITS SAFETY

**HON. JOHN R. RARICK**

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in an extension of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 2, 1971, along with those of other Members of the Congress I urged our Government not to surrender the Crown of St. Stephen, the symbol of Hungarian nationhood, to the Communist regime now in control of Hungary.

Those efforts seem to have been productive for President Nixon has been reported as having sent assurances to Cardinal Mindszenty, primate of Hungary now in exile in Austria, that the crown would remain in the United States for safe keeping for the time being.

In order that the story of the present statue of the crown as told in a news article by Paul Hofmann may be recorded in the annals of the Congress and thus become known to responsible officials of our Government, I quote it as part of my remarks:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 9, 1972]

UNITED STATES ASSURES MINDSZENTY IT WILL SAFEGUARD CROWN

(By Paul Hofmann)

VIENNA, February 6.—President Nixon is understood to have sent assurances to Jozsef Cardinal Mindszenty that the Crown of St. Stephen, the thousand-year-old symbol of Hungarian nationhood, would remain in United States safekeeping for the time being.

To many Hungarians the crown has mythical and deeply emotional significance. Cardinal Mindszenty is fearful that it will fall into Communist hands.

The message from Washington, recently relayed here of the exiled Roman Catholic Primate of Hungary by a go-between, somewhat allayed his fears that the United States might turn the crown over to the Government in Budapest.

However, the 79-year-old Cardinal believes that after the Presidential election in November the United States may yield to continuing pressure from Budapest for the return of the national treasure.

Newspapers in Britain and elsewhere have been predicting that the United States would send the crown back soon. Representative William J. Scherle, Republican of Iowa, said last year that he was afraid that it would be given back to Hungary in return for the release of Cardinal Mindszenty and he warned that he and others in Congress would seek to block such action.

The crown, delivered to the United States Army for safekeeping at the end of World War II, has been in a place known only to the United States President, the Pope and a handful of officials.

Cardinal Mindszenty believes that, for religious, historical and constitutional reasons, he should have a say in its final disposition.

"The world is in very bad shape," he told an American newsmen who inquired last week about the status of the crown. "Better not speak about it."

Members of his small entourage indicate that the Vatican does not want him to see reporters, although they deny that he promised Pope Paul VI not to give interviews. But the fact is that he does not speak substantively for publication.

Cardinal Mindszenty left Hungary last September after nearly 15 years in asylum in the United States mission in Budapest. He stayed at the Vatican as a guest of the Pope for a few days and moved to Vienna in October.

He occupies a rather gloomy second-floor suite at the Pazmaneum, a Hungarian church institution named after Petrus Cardinal Pazmany, who was primate in the 17th century, when a large part of Hungary was occupied by the Turks.

The Cardinal's routine here resembles his life in the American mission in Budapest. He starts his day by saying mass at the Pazmaneum chapel, then spends many hours in his study, interrupted by an hour's stroll in the garden. He rarely goes out and has no car.

The most notable differences from the refuge in Budapest are that the quarters are less cramped and that the Cardinal can see any visitors he wants. Many Hungarians ask for an audience and receive his blessings.

### VISITORS ARE SCREENED

Callers are carefully screened by the Cardinal's staff. "The Communists try to spy on the Primate or agitate against him," an aide asserted.

Groups of Hungarian-American Roman Catholics have invited the Cardinal to visit the United States, which he plans to do this spring or summer.

For many years Cardinal Mindszenty has been writing his memoirs and a history of the church in Hungary. With both works near completion, he is negotiating with publishers in Europe and the United States.

The Cardinal, who will be 80 years old on March 29, looks sallow but less fatigued than when he arrived in Rome. His aides say he is in satisfactory health. "His Eminence is, I'd say, tough," a member of his entourage remarked.

The Cardinal's "definitive" departure from Hungary on Sept. 28 was the result of long negotiations between the Budapest Government and the Vatican. Vatican officials said in September that the Crown of St. Stephen was not mentioned in the negotiations. However, Budapest has long been pressing Washington through diplomatic channels to return it to Hungary.

The crown is one of three national treasures handed to American officers in May, 1945, under circumstances that have never been fully disclosed. The others, known as crown jewels, are a gold scepter and orb and a gold-encrusted royal mantle.

According to legend Pope Sylvester II sent the crown to Stephen as a sign of appreciation of his country's conversion to Christianity. The crown, in Byzantine style, is studded with gems, decorated with inset miniatures depicting religious scenes and surmounted by an inclined cross.

Every Hungarian king is said to have been crowned with the relic, which was considered an essential expression of national sovereignty.

Churchmen here say that the Budapest Government's repeated requests for the

crown betray a desire to add an aura of historical legitimacy to its domination. To Cardinal Mindszenty and his followers the Communist rulers are usurpers.

American spokesmen have said repeatedly that the eventual return of the crown to Hungary should take place at a time marked by an improvement in relations.

Cardinal Mindszenty's interest in the crown is based on a Hungarian constitutional provision that assigns to the Primate a role as regent during vacancies on the throne. In the Cardinal's view, such a vacancy exists now.

## WHO IS UNEMPLOYED AND WHY: UNEMPLOYMENT HEARINGS IN MINNEAPOLIS

**HON. DONALD M. FRASER**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1972

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in January, I held hearings on the unemployment and economic problems of my district. I submit for the RECORD the following summary of the testimony presented during those hearings. Because of the number of witnesses and the length of testimony presented over the 2 days of hearings, it is difficult to do justice to all the testimony. The following summary pulls together a few of the main themes presented which I feel might be useful for other Members of Congress.

The following is a list of individuals and organizations who testified:

R. Pinola, Director, Research and Planning, State of Minnesota Manpower Services.

Thomas Cook, Hennepin County Medical Society.

Donald Jackman, Minneapolis Central Union Labor Council.

Bettina Blank, Minnesota Council of Churches and Minnesota Catholic Conference—Chairman, Economic Conversion Task Force.

Scotty Stone, People's Church.

Charles Pillsbury, Council for Corporate Review.

Geraldine Wedel, Minnesota Nurses Association.

William E. English, Control Data (Equal Opportunity Planning).

James Rude, student.

Rosemary Chapin, Minnesota Resource Center for Social Work.

Stuart Walker, Walker Employment Service.

John Cosgrove, Minneapolis Planning Department.

Gary Berg, United Auto Workers, Community Action Program Council.

Paul Wallace, Metro VEST.

Walter Carlson, Minnesota Unemployed Workers.

Wallace Schrade, unemployed veteran.

Edward Lambert, Jobs for Vets.

Robert Anderson, Co-chairman, Governor's Jobs for Vets.

Donald Banghart, Vietnam Vets Against the War and Jobs for Vets.

Ron Edwards.

Charles Swenson, Operating Engineers Local No. 49.

H. D. Emswiler, VEST Research and Development.

Tollie Flippen, President NAACP.

David Yale, private citizen.

Stan Fure, President, City of Minneapolis Education Association.

Frank Adams, Director, State of Minnesota Office of Emergency Planning.

Ed Bolstad, President, Minnesota Federation of Teachers.

Harvey Wickman, President, United Auto Workers Local #932.

Bea Kersten, AFL-CIO Community Services.

Walfred Pedersen, University of Minnesota Counseling Service.

Ellen Dresselhuus, Legal Aid Lawyer.

Stan Kano, Bill Kennedy, Wally Short, HIRE (Helping Industry Recruit Ex-offenders).

Ron Vagemast, Minnesota Society of Professional Engineers.

Clarence Johnson, Construction and Laborers Union Local #563.

David Roe, President, Minnesota AFL-CIO Federation of Labor.

Arnold Storer, Minneapolis Relief Department.

D. C. Deering, United Transportation Union.

Max Goldberg, Unemployed Engineers.

Matt Johnson, Urban League Employment Specialist.

Miriam Almquist, Minnesota Teachers Service.

Tom Mason, Ronald Carr, Upper Midwest Indian Center.

E. M. Hendrickson, Philip Johnson, American Red Cross, Service to Military Families.

John Martinson, Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Eugene Elphick, private citizen.

James Carter, student.

#### SUMMARY OF MANPOWER HEARINGS HELD BY CONGRESSMAN DONALD M. FRASER

On January 21 and 22, I conducted hearings in Minneapolis on the unemployment problems of Minneapolis residents. The purpose of the hearings was to determine who the unemployed are in the Twin Cities area and why they are out of work. The answers relate to nationwide problems of the labor force and structural problems of the economy.

Forty-five witnesses appeared to give testimony during the 2 days of hearings. Others who were not able to appear submitted written statements. The witnesses represented unemployed Vietnam veterans, students, workers from the Moline plant, engineers, teachers, Indians, blacks, nurses, and women. Representatives of labor unions and both State and local manpower services also appeared.

The picture that emerged from the hearings is one of great waste of human talent and energy. As a result of the hearings, I will offer suggestions and amendments to the present manpower legislation before Congress.

Meaningful employment is a fundamental requirement of a healthy society. To undertake constructive measures in the training, referring, and creation of jobs is one of the primary tasks confronting us at this time. As several witnesses pointed out, one of the great failures of the present administration has been the concentration of tax breaks for industry which have encouraged relocating or automation and have directly contributed to the shrinking market for jobs.

#### UNEMPLOYMENT PICTURE IN MINNESOTA

R. Pinola, director of research and planning for the Minnesota Manpower Services Department gave an excellent description of the State's unemployment problem.

Traditionally the unemployment rate for Minnesota has been consistently lower than the overall rate for the country. Since 1969 the Minnesota rate has continued to be lower but the rate of in-

crease has been much higher than that for the whole country.

In 1969, 21 Minnesota counties had an unemployment rate of 6 percent or more. By 1971, 41 counties had an unemployment rate of 6 percent or more. In 1969, 25 States had a higher unemployment rate than Minnesota. By 1970, 20 States had higher rates and 24 had a lower rate of unemployment. These figures indicate that Minnesota's economy is more volatile than that of many States and has thus been more susceptible to the effects of the recession.

Unemployment compensation figures give an idea of the impact of the recession. In 1969 with an unemployment rate of 2.9 percent, \$24 million in benefits were paid. In 1970, the unemployment rate went to 4.2 percent and \$53 million in benefits were paid. By 1971 the unemployment rate had grown to 5.3 percent and \$70 million in benefits were paid.

The number of individuals who exhausted their unemployment benefits also increased: In 1969, 11,600 individuals exhausted their U.S. benefits; in 1970, 23,000; by 1971, this number increased to 37,000. In summing up, Mr. Pinola concluded that Minnesota had been hit harder than the United States as a whole by the current recession. While he predicted some improvement in the Minnesota economic picture for 1972, he was not optimistic about the likelihood of a recovery.

Other testimony presented during the 2 days of hearings provided a personalized picture of the unemployment problem in Minneapolis. Individual witnesses discussed the unemployment situation as it affected them directly. Unions and professional associations described the situation as it affected their members. Organizations who traditionally provide services to the unemployed talked about the effect of the rising unemployment rate on their work.

#### RELIEF PROGRAMS

One agency whose workload has increased substantially in the past 3 years is the Minneapolis Relief Department. Arnold Storer testified that the welfare caseload has increased 16 percent during each of the last 3 years—1969-71. This increase is directly related to the deteriorating economic situation. Over 90 percent of the present caseload of 2,437 individuals are single men and women. This reflects a change in State law which provided aid to families with dependent children aimed at families where the father was out of work. This took these families off the local relief program. Most of these single individuals are willing and able to work but there are no jobs to employ them. The agency ran out of funds in 1971 and will most likely do the same in 1972. In 1971, \$600,000 had to be obtained from the city council to provide for the increased caseload.

#### AFL-CIO COMMUNITY SERVICES

Bea Kersten representing the AFL-CIO community services reported that more individuals had been referred to her for services in the last year than in the past 20 years. She found that many individuals when confronted with unemployment apply for early retirement or disability benefits. As a result, they suffer a

substantial loss in the benefits they would have received if they had been able to continue working until age 65. She recommended liberalization of the social security disability benefits program and new regulations to prevent reductions in benefits when early retirement is necessary. The act prohibiting discrimination on the basis of age should also be strictly enforced.

#### STUDENTS

Walfred Pedersen of the University of Minnesota counseling service testified that there has been a 20-percent decrease in the number of part-time jobs available for students. These part-time jobs are essential for students because 38.7 percent of students currently enrolled receive no financial help from their parents. This rate compares to 24.3 percent just 5 years ago. The failure of students to find part-time work results in many more applications for bank loans to pay for their education. Even more significant is the fact that placements of students have decreased by about 9½ percent, from 15,000 last year to about 13,000 this year.

Mr. Pedersen recommended that work-study programs be expanded and that universities receive direct funding to create jobs for students.

#### ORGANIZED LABOR

Representatives of organized labor testified on the hardships of many of their members. Harvey Wickman of UAW Local No. 932 described the effects of the projected closing of the Minneapolis Moline plants in the Twin Cities area. Over 1,300 workers will be affected by the shutdown and 800 of this number are close to retirement.

He analyzed the shutdown as a reflection of Nixon economic policies. Low farm prices have meant that farms are unable to buy the company's product, farm machinery. And the administration's tax breaks for industry have encouraged relocation and automation.

Mr. Wickman described the problems facing a worker who is 48 years old, and has been with the company for 30 years or one who has only an eighth grade education, but who has been doing a good job. For these individuals retraining is not a possibility. No one will hire them because of their age. Unemployment compensation and welfare are the only alternatives and these can be very degrading. These layoffs have a terrible economic and social impact on the entire community.

The United States is the only civilized industrial country in the world that allows a company to close down without taking care of its workers, Mr. Wickman said. Labor has been fighting for years for a pension reinsurance bill to guarantee that when a company goes out of business the pensions will still be paid. He asked for the support of legislators at all levels to deal with these problems.

Gary Berg, representing the UAW community action program endorsed legislation introduced by Congressman HENRY REUSS, H.R. 10769, which would prohibit exemptions from industrial development bond provisions if any portion of the proceeds were to be used to assist the relocation of an industry from one area to another.



Mr. Berg also supported an Industrial Fair Standards Act and a bill to provide Federal standards for unemployment compensation and workman's compensation. At present there is no way to insure that corporate expansion of relocation does not take place at the expense of one group of employees.

Donald Jackman of the Minneapolis Central Labor Union Council endorsed the position of the AFL-CIO that every American willing to work has the right to the dignity of a productive job. If necessary, the Government must provide jobs to meet this objective.

Dave Roe, president of the Minnesota AFL-CIO, urged the spending of \$12 billion that Congress has appropriated but the President refuses to release. He said that these funds could provide numerous jobs in the construction of public facilities, in conservation and environmental programs. He also called for concrete planning for conversion to a peacetime economy. Workers are always willing to learn new skills but companies refuse to provide that opportunity by starting alternative production.

D. C. Diering of the United Transportation Union testified to the growing unemployment among railroad workers in Minnesota. In addition to generally depressed economic conditions, it also reveals the decline in the importance of railroads as a means of transportation. Between 1956 and 1969 Minnesota lost approximately 110 passenger trains. In 1971 Amtrak took all but four of the remaining passenger trains. Mergers of railroads have meant the loss of numerous jobs for railroad workers. In addition rail freight service has declined and stations have been abandoned.

Mr. Diering concluded that in spite of all the negative indicators he is still optimistic about the future of the railroads if they are given good management.

Clarence Johnson, representing the Construction and Laborers Union Local No. 563 and Charles Swenson of Local No. 29 of the Operating Engineers discussed the problems of seasonal employment facing workers in the building trades. Approximately 6,000 workers are currently unemployed due to seasonal layoffs. Over half the individuals employed in the trades worked less than 1,000 hours in 1971. Many are not eligible for unemployment benefits and others encounter administrative difficulties and delays in collecting their benefits.

#### MINORITY UNEMPLOYMENT

Several witnesses testified on the unemployment problems of Minneapolis' black and Indian communities.

Matt Johnson, deputy director of the Minneapolis Urban League, testified that while the overall population of Minneapolis had declined by 9 percent according to the last census, the black population of the city has grown by 60 percent. This growth has meant increased difficulties for blacks in finding employment. Unemployment among blacks is approximately 12 percent; among young blacks under 20 it is 30 percent or more. There are serious underemployment problems. Sixty-seven percent of employed blacks work in service or laboring occupations which offer no upward mobility or do not pay adequate salaries.

The problems are getting worse. Blacks are still the last hired and the first fired. The movement of industry to the suburbs makes commuting very difficult for blacks.

Scotty Stone of the Peoples' Church criticized the current manpower programs because they train the participants for low-wage, dead-end jobs. He called for involvement of the community in the programs designed to help them because residents are the people who know their problems best. Existing programs should be consolidated and put into community hands and any jobs that are created should be tied to the development of the community.

Tollie Flippen, president of the Minneapolis branch of the NAACP criticized the implementation of the Emergency Employment Act in Minnesota, saying it did little for the jobless in Minnesota and nothing for the black unemployed in Minneapolis. He urged the implementation of the Full Employment Act of 1946 with the Government creating the jobs necessary to provide work for the unemployed.

William English—Equal Opportunity Planning for Control Data—observed that a 4-percent unemployment for the country means too high a rate for blacks and other minorities. The reason involves the failure of Government agencies to enforce compliance laws governing the hiring of minorities in projects financed with Federal funds. The public sector sets the example for private industry. If public agencies are not forced to comply with the law, it is impossible to force private industry to hire minorities.

#### INDIANS

The Indian population in Minneapolis faces problems similar to those experienced by residents of the black community. John Martinson—employment specialist with the Bureau of Indian Affairs—discussed some of the difficulties Indians have in obtaining employment. Eighty-one percent of Indians in the Twin Cities are blue-collar workers and 40 percent of this group are unskilled. Many Indians have difficulty in communicating; and thus, they perform poorly in job interviews. The Indian job applicant often lacks adequate transportation and, therefore, does not have access to the higher paying jobs in the suburbs.

The recession has further complicated the employment situation for the Indian: Competition is keen and the length of time required to place an Indian, either skilled or unskilled, has increased significantly. Two years ago the majority of Indian jobseekers were placed in 3 days. Today it takes anywhere from 5 to 21 days to place the applicant, depending on his skill level.

Tom Mason of the Upper Midwest Indian Center, confirmed Mr. Martinson's findings.

#### VIETNAM VETERANS

Several witnesses testified on the difficulties returning Vietnam veterans are having in finding employment. N. Philip Johnson and E. M. Hendrickson, of the Red Cross service to military families program gave the results of a survey conducted to determine what had happened

to veterans who had returned to Minneapolis. Of the 300 veterans questioned, 17 percent returned information. Of that 17 percent, over one-third were employed, over half were attending school, and the remaining 15 percent were unemployed. Many of these unemployed veterans went into the service right out of high school or without completing high school; thus, they had very little in the way of marketable skills.

Three members of the Governor's Jobs for Vets Commission—Ed Lambert, Bob Anderson, and Don Bungart—testified on the problems of motivation, alienation, and inadequate veterans' benefits.

Mr. Lambert advocated setting up a street agency that would provide motivational counseling.

Bob Anderson, who serves as cochairman of the Governor's Jobs for Vets, felt that the present Federal employment programs and education benefits are not adequate and should be expanded. World War II and Korean veterans could live on the income provided in the GI bill but it is no longer sufficient. The proportion of veterans using these benefits is lower than for either World War II or Korea.

Wallace Schrade, a young Vietnam veteran, recounted his personal experience in attempting to find a job after his tour of duty with the Army. A draftee, Mr. Schrade was an accountant at Dow Chemical Co. As a veteran, Mr. Schrade has reinstatement rights, and after leaving the service, he contacted Dow about returning to the company. While Dow agreed to rehire him, they made it very clear that they were only doing so because of their legal obligation. The correspondence stated:

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 9 of the Military Selective Act of 1967, we are offering you a position as an accountant... but that his future with the company would not be promising.

Mr. Schrade decided against returning to Dow under these circumstances and has continued to search for employment. He is still unemployed.

#### SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS

Scientists and engineers have been hard hit by the recession and members of these professions can be counted among the growing number of unemployed in the Twin Cities.

Ron Vegamast of the Minnesota Society of Professional Engineers testified that since 1968, technical employment in the prime contractors and first tier subcontractors has been reduced by about one-third. The second and third tier subcontractors have been even more adversely affected.

The result has been mass layoffs of about 17 percent of the engineers and scientists in the United States during the last 2 years. About one-half of them have found employment in their fields; the remaining 100,000 are unemployed or seriously underemployed. The individuals having the most difficulty finding work are those individuals who have a specialized background in aerospace or defense, those over 45 years of age and those with backgrounds in aeronautical and electrical engineering. The total unemployment rate for engineers, scien-

tists, and technicians is 5.5 percent for the metropolitan area. Of the 13,000 engineers in the Minneapolis area, 660 are unemployed or seriously underemployed; of the 3,200 scientists in the area, about 100 are unemployed; of the 10,000 technicians and draftsmen, about 660 are unemployed.

Of this unemployed group, one in five have their masters degrees and one in 40 have their Ph. D. Twenty-seven percent are over 45 years old and 58 percent are over 35. Fifty-three percent have been unemployed or underemployed for 6 months or longer. About three of every four are willing to relocate if they can find work.

The prospects of improvement are not good. The economy would have to grow by 16.8 percent in the next year to absorb the currently unemployed engineers and to take care of the new graduates. Among the difficulties inherent in current programs is the mistaken orientation of finding technical work for the unemployed scientists, rather than non-technical work. There are not enough technical jobs to go around.

Max Goldberg, an engineer who has been out of work for the last 16 months, testified that the U.S. Department of Labor has failed to provide adequate data on technical employment and has failed to enforce the Age Discrimination Act.

He emphasized the need for a new approach by industry and organized labor to stem the exportation of our technological superiority and jobs. He advocated policies aimed at continued capital growth, R. & D. efforts that would recognize the oneness of the world market, and innovative efforts in Government-industry cooperation.

James Rude, a Ph. D. candidate in computer sciences at the University of Minnesota placed the blame for the high unemployment rate among scientists on organized labor, the Nixon administration, management of large corporations and members of the science and engineering profession themselves.

According to Mr. Rude, labor's insistence on high wages meant that management did away with R. & D. programs in favor of production. The Nixon administration failed to provide alternate research projects to take the place of cutbacks in aerospace and defense. Corporate management failed to stand up to the wage demands of organized labor, and demanded too much specialization from their technical employees. And engineers and others skilled in high technology are at fault for becoming too specialized and not remaining versatile or flexible in their interests.

Paul Wallace represented Metro VEST, a self-help voluntary organization, composed of unemployed scientists, engineers, and technicians. Metro VEST attempts to find jobs for its members.

A sample of the 450 members indicates that about 240 are employed or unemployed and 70 percent of these are earning less than they had previously. The average age of active members is 44.9 years and of the inactive members 42.2 years. Mr. Wallace concluded that the average unemployment period of 13

months is too long and the average age indicates the severity of the problem for people past 40. The prospects for new jobs developing in the area of social improvements—housing, mass transit, and so forth—are not good. The projects are either too long range or the jobs created will not offset the loss of jobs in other fields.

Mr. Wallace recommended: Broadening and reassessing the TMRP program; maintaining the space shuttle program; provision for national analysis of the unemployment statistics for scientists and engineers to make a better determination of the extent of the problem; and support for metric conversion.

Dr. D. H. Emswiler discussed his efforts to establish a research and development company, VEST R. & D. Association, Inc., to put the talents of the unemployed technical personnel in the Minneapolis area to work. To date the company has received one contract from the Navy that will employ three Metro VEST members, and hopes to receive additional funding from other Government agencies. They are also interested in providing consulting services to businesses in the Twin Cities area.

#### TEACHERS

Representatives of the Minneapolis teaching community discussed the current oversupply of professionals in the education field:

Ed Bolstad and Dale Holstrom, representing the Minnesota Federation of Teachers, testified that the surplus of teachers is really a "contrived oversupply" designed to benefit school districts. Many districts are using half-time teachers and teacher aides are being misused.

The teacher surplus could be used to great advantage by reducing the class size and improving the teacher student ratio. Major innovations in education are now possible because there are sufficient qualified personnel. Funds should be made available to take advantage of the present opportunities.

Miriam Almquist, manager of the Minnesota Teachers Service supported their testimony and emphasized the need to cut class sizes and to channel students interested in teaching into counseling and remedial education.

Stan Fure's—president of the Minneapolis Education Association—statement for the record provided a statistical analysis of the teacher surplus for both the country and the State of Minnesota.

In the fall of 1971 approximately 120,700 teachers could not find work. He projects a surplus of 145,300 elementary and secondary teachers by 1974 and an oversupply of 195,700 teachers by 1979.

In Minnesota only 71.4 percent of the 1971 graduates of the teacher training institutions in the State found jobs. The remaining 1,600 had to find jobs elsewhere or did not use their college training. In the Minneapolis Public School System, the ratio of applicants to teachers hired was 11 to 1.

#### NURSING AND SOCIAL WORK

Representatives of two other professions, nursing and social work, presented statements on the employment problems

faced by many in their fields as a result of the recession. Geraldine Wedel—Minnesota Nurses Association—reported that many part-time and full-time nurses have been asked to take days off without compensation. Over the past year—1971—five hospitals in the State have laid nurses off. Three of those hospitals have recalled the nurses but two hospitals in Minneapolis are continuing to lay off staff.

Several factors account for these layoffs—low hospital occupancy due to the fact that the unemployed cannot afford medical care; decline in the birth rate; return of many inactive nurses to work because their husbands are unemployed and the decrease in the average stay in the hospital.

There are three positions available for every 10 newly licensed nurses. The data also shows that considerably fewer positions have been budgeted in both hospitals and nursing homes than in the past.

Rosemary Chapin—Minnesota Resource Center for Social Work Education—discussed social workers currently employed and recent college graduates in social work who are looking for employment.

The AFDC caseload in Hennepin County has risen in the last 4 years from 5,000 families to 15,000 families. In the Minneapolis Relief Department the caseload per worker has increased by 20 percent in the past year. Volunteer and privately financed agencies report the same trend. At the same time, however, staffs are not only remaining at past levels in many cases they are decreasing in size.

Social work is one of the three most elected majors in the Minnesota college system, but placements do not come close to equaling the number of interested applicants. From January to November 1971 Hennepin County received a total of 1,449 social service job applications to fill 153 positions.

Unemployment among social service personnel has a double adverse affect in the community: It deprives workers of normal income, and deprives other unemployed persons of needed assistance with the financial and social problems they experience as a result of unemployment.

#### WOMEN

Problems of women were also discussed at the hearings. Ellen Dresselhuus, who works as a legal aid lawyer in Minneapolis and also serves as president of the Minnesota Women's Equity Action League, testified that about 50 percent of her clients are unemployed and that 70 to 80 percent of that number are women.

She cited the lack of adequate and inexpensive child care as the single most important factor in the problem of female unemployment. The majority of welfare mothers would prefer to be employed but have found it economically unfeasible to work because of the high costs of child care. Ms. Dresselhuus also discussed the problems encountered by many women who seek unemployment compensation benefits. She pointed out the discriminatory nature of a State statute which prohibits an individual from claiming benefits when the reason for terminating employment is to assume



household duties or to live with one's spouse. The vast majority of individuals affected by this law are women.

The application of the unemployment compensation laws also discriminate against women with respect to wages. Women are expected to take jobs at wages lower than they had previously received and are disqualified for benefits if they do not. Men, however, are seen to have good reason to quit if their employer offers them wages lower than their previous earnings and are found eligible for unemployment compensation.

Stan Kano of HIRE discussed the employment problems of exoffenders. The majority are poor and have less than a high school education. Almost 77 percent of exoffenders are unskilled and 18.2 percent are semiskilled. Almost half are unemployed when convicted and the consistent unemployment rate for exoffenders is about 40.8 percent.

The majority of employers consider the ex offender a high risk and are unwilling to hire him. There are also severe discrimination problems resulting from civil service laws and the interpretation of these laws.

Many individuals discussed their personal experiences among the ranks of the unemployed. One, David Yale, was unemployed for a year until he was finally hired by the PEP program. He has a B.A. in English and an M.A. in American Studies but there were no jobs available in his field. During the course of his search for a permanent job he worked as a cleaning man in a restaurant and collected food stamps. He also learned printing in a Manpower training program. A year after his search began he was hired by the city as a recreation aide and thinks it will be a career. He feels that 10,000 public service jobs are needed for the Twin Cities alone.

#### CONVERSION

Representatives of two groups stressed the need for post-war planning to deal with the problem caused by winding down the war Bettina Blank of the Joint Religious Legislative Committee, stressed obligation of the Federal Government to assist those sectors of society adversely affected by shifts in national policy such as military spending. The three areas where assistance is needed are first, the worker who loses his job because of spending cutbacks, second, the corporation which must find alternate products to manufacture and third, the community which can no longer support its population with jobs and services.

We feel that the Federal Government has an obligation to those individuals, corporations and communities wounded by defense cutbacks. The Government, by letting contracts for military goods is, in effect, employing the individuals who become involved through their employer holding the contract.

Emphasis was given to the importance of good planning to anticipate the problems of dislocation and deal with them before they become critical.

Thomas Cook of the Hennepin County Medical Society described the many projects that could be developed to utilize the skills of the unemployed or to train the

unskilled. The environment and medicine are two fields where large numbers of people are badly needed.

Two individuals responsible for administering the Emergency Employment Act testified on the operation of the new program. Frank Adams, director of the State Office of Emergency Planning, stressed the need for seven to eight times the amount of money currently available to Minnesota for EEA. The State has 2,500 federally funded jobs to use in 65 counties and 30 State agencies. In some Minnesota counties 16 percent of the workforce is unemployed.

John Cosgrove, director of manpower planning for the city of Minneapolis, gave a status report on the city's EEA program. He indicated that the three major groups to be served by the program were unemployed veterans, the disadvantaged and unemployed technical personnel. One hundred and ten of the 141 funded positions have been filled. An additional 78 jobs have been created for the areas of the city with over 6 percent unemployment. The target areas actually have a 10-percent jobless rate. The concept of EEA is good but the program needs to be expanded and it should be longer term.

Charles Pillsbury of the Council for Corporate Review discussed the need for a grass roots effort to deal with dislocation, arguing that programs offered by the Federal Government did not offer much relief. He suggested that the initiatives should come from private industry and organized labor.

A group of members of the Council for Corporate Review sang their concluding remarks to the tune of "Joe Hill." It was a song entitled "The Ballad of Reconversion" and the last two stanzas went as follows:

Congress saw the mess they'd made  
And said let's reconvert  
We'll take the money from the planes  
And let the people work.  
And let the people work.

I dreamed I had a job last night  
As strange as that may seem  
A job to help my fellow man  
Fulfill our highest dream.  
Fulfill our highest dream.

E. GUY WARREN

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1972

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, California, and the Eighth Congressional District in particular, has lost one of its most distinguished citizens in the passing of E. Guy Warren.

Guy Warren served as chairman of the California State College Board of Trustees. He graduated from the University of California, Berkeley, and did postgraduate work at Harvard School of Engineering in Boston.

The Warren family has made many contributions to California education. Guy Warren was intensely interested in all things that contributed to the welfare of the State and district. He was a mov-

ing force who had a keen sense of humor, and was always ready and prepared to help his fellowman. He will be missed in our community.

#### THE RUSSIAN OPPRESSION OF UKRAINIANS INTENSIFIES

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, from information provided the people by the established news media, the conclusion could be rightfully drawn that the Soviet Jews are the only people whose rights are being violated in the Soviet Union. The plight of the 47 million Ukrainians behind the Iron Curtain goes relatively unnoticed.

For some strange reason, blatant disregard by the Soviet leaders for the basic human rights of minority groups in Russia is rarely reported by the national wire services. Information reaches me frequently of such transgressions and injustices perpetrated by Soviet leaders on the oppressed Christians and other minorities as well as Jews within the Soviet Union. Especially is this so with regard to the Ukrainians. Reports from several Ukrainian sources indicate that injustices against individuals, groups and nations in the U.S.S.R. are increasing and that the Soviet regime is eliminating dissent by eliminating people in the Soviet Union who are making an effort to advance the basic human rights of people—freedom of speech, thought, and freedom for their own nations. These reports reveal that thousands of people in the U.S.S.R. of all nationalities among which the Ukrainians are dominant are presently in prisons and concentration camps. Among those in Ukraine who reportedly are in the vanguard in speaking out for the rights of individual Ukrainians and the Ukrainian Nation and who have either been eliminated or isolated are the following:

Bishop Wasyl Velyckowshkyj—head of the Ukrainian Catholic Church—which is operating secretly—was sentenced to 4 years imprisonment in 1969 and is presently in hard labor in a concentration camp.

Valentyn Moroz—historian and writer, sentenced a second time in 1970, and is now serving a 14-year sentence in a concentration camp in Mordovia protesting the Russification of Ukraine.

Alla Horshka—artist and defender of the protests against the Soviet regime, was under observation and later killed by the KGB November 28, 1970.

Michael Soroka—a well-known political figure who died in a Soviet concentration camp June 16, 1971, serving his 25-year sentence.

Today in the Soviet Union hundreds and thousands of innocent people are reportedly on the road to extermination only because they have the courage to stand up for freedom and human rights and are demanding justice in their country.

Ukrainians in non-Communist countries took the occasion of the January 22 observance of the 54th anniversary of the independence of the Ukrainian Republic to protest a new wave of oppression of Ukrainians in the U.S.S.R. in which 19 intellectuals in Ukraine were arrested by the KGB for alleged "anti-Soviet propaganda and agitation." In reality, this "crime" amounted to calling on Soviet leaders to abide by the promises of their own laws.

The crime of Valentyn Moroz, who is now serving a 14-year prison sentence, was that he dared to write essays stating that he was proud to be a Ukrainian.

So that our colleagues may have a better understanding of "justice" Soviet style, I include the document "Instead of a Last Plea" by Valentyn Moroz and other pertinent articles following my remarks along with my bills to place the question of human rights violations of Ukrainians and the Jewish minority in the Soviet Union on the agenda of the U.N.O.:

[From Svoboda, the Ukrainian Weekly, Jan. 29, 1972]

#### INSTEAD OF A LAST PLEA

(A new document is being widely circulated in Ukraine. Written by Valentyn Moroz and titled "Instead of a Last Plea," the statement was given to the judges by Moroz at the beginning of his trial in 1970. A copy of the document has reached the West. The following information was added by the person who copied the letter: "At the time of his second illegal trial Valentyn Moroz decided to boycott the proceedings and to remain silent not answering any questions put to him. For this reason he turned this statement over to the judges at the beginning of the trial, which took place behind closed doors.")

The following is a translation from Ukrainian by Askold Skalsky:

I will not cite the Criminal Code and try to prove my innocence. I am not being tried for any guilt and you know this very well. We are tried for the part we are taking in processes that are undesirable to you. There are people whom you have more reasons for arresting on formal and legal grounds than me. But it is convenient for you to let these people remain free since they dampen the intensity of the national revival in Ukraine and curb its speed, usually not even understanding this. You will never touch these people, and even if they should accidentally fall into your hands you would try to free them immediately. You have reached the conclusion that V. Moroz raises the temperature of processes in Ukraine that are undesirable to you; therefore, better to separate him from his surroundings with prison bars. Well, this would be completely logical if not for one thing . . .

#### FUEL TO FLAMES

Beginning with 1965 you have put scores of people behind prison bars. What has this brought you? I will not bother to speak about the current trend—no one has yet been able to stop it. But have you at least been able to liquidate its real and material manifestations? Have you stopped, for example, the stream of unofficial, uncensored literature which is now called "Samvydav." No. This proved to be beyond your strength. Samvydav is growing, enriched by new forms and genres and creating new authors and readers. And most important, it has spread its roots so widely and deeply that no number of state informers or Japanese tape recorders will be of any help. Your might has accomplished nothing, and what you are doing could be labeled as simply wasted effort. But the point is not that such effort leaves no one

hot or cold, or has no result. One cannot say that about your work, for it already has produced a noticeable effect. But this effect is the very opposite of what you had expected. It seems that you have not frightened, but rather interested people. You wanted to put out the fire; instead you have added fuel to the flames. Nothing has contributed more to the revival of national life in Ukraine than your repressions. Nothing has so turned people's attention to the process of Ukraine's rebirth as your trials. As a matter of fact, these very trials have shown great many people that community life has revived in Ukraine. You wanted to hide people in Mordovian forests; instead you have placed them on a vast arena and the whole world saw them. Most of the activists in the national rebirth of Ukraine became activists in an atmosphere of reawakening that was evoked by your very repressions. In a word, it is high time that you finally understood: repressions hurt you first of all. But you go on with your trials. . . . For what? To fulfill a quota? To pacify your sense of official duty? To unburden your anger? More than likely—from inertia. Into the present post-Stalin stage of Ukraine's national rebirth you have introduced that without which it would have remained immature and unripe: you introduced the element of sacrifice. Faith appears when there are martyrs. You gave them to us.

#### BOOMERANG

Every time that there appeared something living on the Ukrainian horizon, you threw stones at it. And every time it was not a stone you threw but a boomerang. It returned and struck—you! What happened? Why do your repressions fail to produce the usual result? Why did the usually reliable ammunition turn into a boomerang? The times have changed—that is the whole answer. Stalin had enough water to put out the fire. But you are in a totally different situation. You live in a period when the reserves have been exhausted. And when there is little water, it is better not to tease the fire with it. For then it burns more strongly. Every child knows this. You took a stick into your hands in order to scatter the flames, but instead only stirred them up more. There is no strength for anything else. This means that the social organism in which you live has entered into a phase of development where repressions produce only a backlash. And every new repression will now become a new boomerang.

When you put me in prison on June 1st (1970) you again set a boomerang into motion. You have already seen what will happen next. Five years ago I was put in a prisoner's dock and the result was an arrow. Afterwards I was put behind a barbed wire fence in Mordovia and the result was a bomb. Now, once again, having understood nothing and learned nothing, you are beginning all over again. Only this time the momentum of the boomerang will be much stronger. In 1965 Moroz was an obscure instructor of history. Now he is known . . .

And so Moroz feeds on prison fare. Let's put it this way: What will you get out of it? The only kind of Moroz who would be of any value to you would be a submissive Moroz who wrote a declaration of guilt. This would truly be a stunning blow to all informed Ukrainians. But you will never live to see such a Moroz. If you think that by putting me in prison you will produce some kind of vacuum in the Ukrainian national revival then you are being unrealistic. Understand at last: there will no more be a vacuum. The abundance of Ukraine's spiritual potential already suffices to fill any vacuum and to provide socially active people to take the place of those in prisons and those who have left public activity. The 1960's brought a marked revival in Ukrainian life; the 1970's also will not be a vacuum in Ukrainian history. The golden days when

all life was squeezed into official compartments have passed; they have passed irrevocably. There now exists a culture independent of the Ministry of Culture, and a philosophy independent of the journal "Voprosy Filosofii." Now social phenomena that have come into the world without official permission will continue to exist and will increase with every year.

The court will try me behind closed doors. But it will turn into a boomerang anyway, even if no one hears me, even if I stay silent in an isolated cell in Vladimir prison. There is a silence that is louder than shouting. And even if you will destroy me, you will not be able to stifle that silence. It is easy to destroy, but consider this truth: Those who are destroyed sometimes count for more than the living. The destroyed become a banner. They are the rock from which fortresses of crystal are built in pure souls.

I know what you will say to this: Moroz thinks too much of himself. But the point here is not Moroz. The point is every honest man in my place. Besides, in a place like Vladimir prison where people are prepared for a lingering death from some kind of secretly administered drug, there is no place for petty ambitions.

#### MOST PROFOUND

National rebirth is the most profound of all spiritual processes. It is a many-faceted, many-layered phenomenon. And it can reveal itself in a thousand forms. No one can foresee all of them and weave a net wide enough to encompass this process in all of its dimensions. Your dams are strong and sure, but they are built on land. The spring waters have simply gone around them and found new river beds. Your toll roads are closed. But they will stop no one, for new routes have been built beside them a long time ago. The rebirth of a nation is a process which has practically unlimited resources, for national sentiments live in the soul of every person, even that person who, it would seem, has long ago died spiritually. This was seen, for example, during the debates in the Writers' Union when people from whom one would have least expected it voted against the expulsion of I. Dzyuba.

You persist in repeating that those who are in prison are just criminals. You close your eyes and act as though there were no problem. Very well. With such unwise assumption you might be able to last for perhaps ten years. And then? The new processes in Ukraine and in all of the Soviet Union are just beginning. The rebirth of Ukraine is not yet a mass phenomenon. But do not rejoice; it will not be that way always. In an era of total literacy, when there are 800,000 students in Ukraine and everyone owns a radio, in such an era every social phenomenon becomes a mass phenomenon. Is it possible that you do not understand that soon you will have to deal with social trends on a mass scale? The new processes are only beginning, and your repressions have ceased to be effective. What will happen next?

There is only one way out: renounce the outdated politics of repression and find new forms of coexistence with the new trends which have already anchored themselves irrevocably in our life. Such is the reality. It has appeared without asking permission and it has generated new circumstances which demand a new approach. For people who are called upon to handle government matters there is enough to think about. But you go on playing with boomerangs. . . .

#### WE SHALL FIGHT!

There will be a trial. Well, we shall fight. At this very time when one man has written a recantation and another has turned into a translator at this very time it is necessary for someone to provide an example of firmness and erase the depressing impression which arose after the withdrawal of



certain people from active public life. The lot has fallen on me. . . . It is a difficult mission. To sit behind prison bars is easy for no one. But not to respect one's self is even harder. And that is why we shall fight!

The trial will come and everything will begin anew: new protests and petitions new material for newspapers and radios of the whole world. The interest in what Moroz wrote will grow tenfold. In a word, another heap of wood will be thrown on the fire which you want to put out.

Indeed, this is subversive activity. But don't look for my guilt in this—I didn't put Moroz behind bars, I didn't throw a boom-rang.

[Translation published by ABN in Munich, Germany]

Another document from Ukraine, which is currently being circulated there in mimeographed form, has been channelled through to the West. This is the protest declaration of Vyacheslav Chornovil, against the barbarous destruction of the graves of Ukrainian soldiers at the Yanyivskiy cemetery in Lviv by local authorities. Below, we reproduce the complete text of the declaration.

Kyiv  
To the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr. SSR, Com. Lyashko the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine, Com. Ovcharenko, First Vice-President of the Council of Ministers of the Ukr. SSR, Com. Tronko:

#### DECLARATION

It is difficult to imagine anything more savage, more inhuman, or more dreadful than to dishonour the dead. It would probably be more compassionate to shoot a person outright, than to demolish his grave with a bull-dozer later and to cast out his bones from the ground. . . .

That, which is now taking place at the Yanyivskiy cemetery in Lviv, almost in the center of Europe, can be gauged only by the most brutal Asiatic Middle-Age standards. Under the direction of specially appointed persons, a bull-dozer levels the graves of the Striltsi (Ukrainian Sich Riflemen during World War I—trans. note) and the navy's shovel turns over the human remains. They say that this is being done under the sanction of the head of the Iviv Oblast Executive Committee, Telishevskiy. I do not know what administrative qualities this person has, that he was entrusted with such a responsible position, but just one of these absurdities is sufficient to demote this barbarous functionary to a swine-herd.

Let us consider what is happening. Firstly, the dishonouring of the graves by a direct enemy is a blasphemy rejected by the civilized world. Death levels opinions and ideologies. And death demands respect. In the Criminal Code of the Ukr.SSR, there is Article 212, which anticipates criminal sanctions for the desecration of graves. Secondly, these youths from Halychyna, who lived at the end of 1918 and laid down their lives in the struggle with Polish legionnaires, defended Halychyna from colonial enslavement by feudal Poland—are they the enemies of the Soviet government? It is not known where they would be found now, if they had not died in those days. They would perhaps be in the army of the UNR (Ukrainian National Republic) or perhaps in Ch.U.H.A. (Red Ukrainian Army of Halychyna). To the point, those who appreciate quotations will discover positive words about the Striltsi in Lenin's works. Why should they, who died over 50 years ago, be taken vengeance upon now? For the fact that they saved Halychyna from Polish oppression? We, who do not acknowledge solidarity with the Pilsudski followers,<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Polish chauvinists, followers of Joseph Pilsudski, premier and virtual dictator of Poland until 1935.

with pacification, with Bereza Kartuzka,<sup>2</sup> see that even the Poles, having occupied Halychyna and hating their enemies, the Striltsi, did not scoff at their graves. Even during Stalin's time, no thoughts of the outright destruction of these graves came to mind, although they did ridicule them. What apex have we now reached with you?

Currently, there is much talk of the infiltration of bourgeois ideology. I do not think that all the bourgeois publications and radio stations combined could master such strong anti-Soviet propaganda as did one bull-dozer in Lviv, which cut down the heads of the Striltsi crosses.

After the burning of the State Library of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukr. SSR in 1964 and the political arrests for the open expression of convictions, it is difficult to name an act in the future, which would so greatly undermine the authority of Soviet government, as this current outrage in Lviv. The results are already evident. Thousands of Halychyna residents, during the past few days, have passed by the desecrated and devastated graves. Confusion and indignation has arisen among the population. Rumours are being spread about the intentions (also far from humane and perhaps even provocative)—to respond by destroying the graves of the leaders of parties, armies and so on. Will we stoop so low, as to introduce a state of siege in cemeteries?

I refrained from individual appeals to Party and Soviet leaders after the incident in 1967, when for honest remarks about the violations of the norms of socialist legality, I was first thrown behind bars, and then transformed from a critic and journalist into a railroad worker. But today, I cannot be silent. In the name of humaneness, I appeal to you to intervene in the acts of the provincial petty despots and stop this destruction of the graves of the Striltsi, to restore that portion of graves that were demolished, and transfer the corpses of people buried on their bones. By doing so, disassociate yourselves from this crime which is presently occurring in Lviv.

CITY OF LVIV, August 16, 1971.

VYACHESLAV CHORNOVIL.

#### ORGANIZATION FOR THE DEFENSE OF FOUR FREEDOMS FOR UKRAINE, INC. AGAINST THE SUPPRESSION OF FREE THOUGHT AND THE PERSECUTION OF WRITERS AND ARTISTS

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Beginning Wednesday, January 13, 1972, members of our organization will picket the Soviet exhibit in the Corcoran Gallery of Art at 17th Street, N.W. The demonstration is in behalf of the thousands of Ukrainian intellectuals who have been subjected to mass arrests, secret and "kangaroo" trials, illegal incarceration and cruel and severe sentences by the Russian Communist Government, and also to protest Moscow's suppression of free thought, violation of human rights and forced russification in Ukraine. Ukrainians constitute 65% of all political prisoners in the U.S.S.R.

One should note that Ukrainians as well as other non-Russian people in the U.S.S.R. (about 125,000,000) are subjected to programs engineered by Russian behavioral scientists that are aimed at the total destruction of their religious, cultural and ethnic identity. Accompanying these Russian programs are religious persecution and assassinations of Ukrainian leaders, economic exploitation and physical mass genocide of the Ukrainian people; cultural persecution and forced Russification; and wanton destruction of Ukrainian ancient and historical buildings and archives. It is because of the resistance of the Ukrainian intellectuals to Russian repressive policies that they are being subjected to mass arrest and

<sup>2</sup> Renowned Polish concentration camp for political prisoners.

incarceration by the Russian Communist Government. Although the Russian policy of political, cultural and religious genocide toward Ukrainians and other non-Russian people in the U.S.S.R. is a flagrant violation of the UN charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the UN and other proper authorities are curiously silent about this.

To cover up the political, religious, cultural and economic genocide toward Ukrainians and other non-Russian nations in the USSR, Moscow has exported many performing groups and organized many exhibits to divert the attention of the West from the tragic situation in Ukraine. One of these exhibits is "Soviet Union: Arts and Crafts in Ancient Times and Today" currently in the Corcoran Gallery of Art. This Soviet exhibit is a glaring example of the Russification, the suppression of achievement and a wanton plunder of the art treasures of the non-Russian nations in the USSR by the Russians, from the time of the Czars up to the present rulers in the Kremlin. One should note that the slogan of the Soviet show "Art belongs to the people" was used not only by Lenin but also by A. Hitler and other dictators throughout history in order to cover up their ruthless denial of power to the people.

It is hoped that sufficient world public opinion could be generated to persuade the Russian Communist Government to free Ukrainian intellectuals and to terminate its harsh political, religious and cultural policy toward Ukrainians and other non-Russian nations in the USSR.

#### SUPPORTERS OF HUMAN RIGHTS! FRIENDS OF FREEDOM!

(1) Support "International Human Rights Year" by exposing and denouncing Communist Russia's Violation of the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights in Ukraine!

(2) Support the cause of freedom of Ukraine and all other captive nations.

(3) Condemn Communist Russia for its ruthless suppression of Orthodox, Catholic, Protestant, Judaic and Islamic religions in the USSR!

(4) Ask your Congressman and Senator to denounce continued Russian Communist enslavement of Ukraine, and their support for national self-determination of all the captive nations!

[From the Svoboda, the Ukrainian Weekly, Jan. 29, 1972]

#### SCORE INHUMAN TREATMENT

JERSEY CITY, N.J.—An angry mood of protest in the wake of recent arrests in Ukraine pervaded the traditional observances of the 54th anniversary of Ukrainian independence proclamation held last weekend in the vast majority of Ukrainian communities in this and other countries of the free world.

#### CONCERN, INDIGNATION

The arrests of 19 Ukrainian intellectuals by the KGB for alleged "anti-Soviet propaganda and agitation" set in motion a series of protest actions in every center of Ukrainian life as the commemorative events departed from the traditional pattern in the light of new repressions in Ukraine.

Some of the Ukrainian communities have scheduled their programs for the week-end with an even more intense spirit of protest against the arrests in Ukraine, which included the incarceration of such noted dissidents as Vyacheslav Chornovil, Ivan Dzyuba, Ivan Svitlychny, and Evhen Sverstiuk, in addition to the young historian Valentyn Moroz, sentenced in 1970 to nine years at hard labor and five years of exile.

All major Ukrainian institutions and civic organizations are seeking ways to alleviate the plight of the arrested intellectuals, some by taking appropriate procedural steps on the national and international levels, others by staging demonstrations and conducting

letter-writing campaigns to President Nixon and American legislators.

Last Sunday, New York community's traditional observance of the January 22nd anniversary turned into a mass demonstration of concern and indignation over the acts of Soviet repressions in Ukraine. Ukrainian churches were filled to capacity by veterans, youth, civic and women's groups during the morning services.

The same was true of Chicago, Newark, Jersey City, Brooklyn, Washington, Passaic, Detroit, Cleveland, Boston, Syracuse, Philadelphia, Hartford, New Haven, and many other cities.

The gubernatorial and mayoral proclamations, designating January 22nd as "Ukrainian Independence Day," contained strong statements against the persecution of Ukrainian intellectuals in Ukraine. The sermons by the clergy in churches and the speeches at the commemorative programs in halls filled to capacity were attuned to the recent developments in Ukraine.

In Chicago, where a capacity throng assembled for the Sunday afternoon concert at Chopin High School auditorium, a resolution was adopted to start immediately a letter-writing campaign to President Nixon and other American officials appraising them of the situation in Ukraine and asking for their intercession.

#### N.Y. DEMONSTRATION

The Ukrainian Student Organization of Michnowsky, which had earlier announced a series of protest actions for the week beginning January 22 through January 29, was the sponsor of a demonstration Friday, January 28, in New York at the UN building and at the Soviet Mission. The demonstration was endorsed by the UCCA, SUMA, SUSTA and others. Auxiliary Bishop Basil H. Losten of the Philadelphia Catholic Archeparchy called on the clergy and faithful to support the action.

Assembled for the weekend in New York were members of the World Congress of Free Ukrainians for the fifth plenary session in the course of which a number of steps were contemplated to alleviate the plight of the arrested. The UCCA, in its turn, sent special memoranda to President Nixon and to Mrs. Rita Hauser, U.S. representative at the UN Human Rights Commission.

Also, a number of protest actions were staged in conjunction with the arrival here of Russian poet Yevgeni Yevtushenko.

[From the Svoboda, The Ukrainian Weekly, Jan. 29, 1972]

#### FREE THEM NOW

No single news in the new year has aroused the Ukrainian community in the free world as much as the recent arrests of 19 intellectuals in Ukraine, among them men noted for their courageous stand in the past in defense of human and constitutional rights.

The names of Chornovil, Svitlychny, Dzyuba and Sverstiuk, just to name four of the 19 arrested during the week of January 10 in Kiev and Lviv, have now been added to the role of present-day martyrs incarcerated in Russo-Communist prisons, their only "crime"—demanding that the Soviet regime abide by its own laws. Arrested and persecuted in the past for no more than daring to speak out, they have thrown the gauntlet of challenge to the oppressive regime in the Kremlin and its equally callous puppets in Kiev and other public capitals of the USSR.

"I can no longer remain silent," wrote Chornovil last September in an impassioned plea to the authorities to stop the savage desecration of the Ukrainian soldiers' graves at the famed Yaniv cemetery in Lviv. "In the name of humanity, I appeal to you to intervene in the actions of stupid provincial cited article 213 of the Criminal Code which prohibits desecration of graves under severe penalties can hardly be construed as 'anti-

Soviet agitation and propaganda. "Yet five months after he had written the letter, Chornovil was accused of that "crime" and arrested by the KGB. It appears that in the Soviet Union one may not even defend the memory of the dead.

But there is more to it than meets the eye. The regime has an all too long history of attempting to eradicate a people's past. Some of the world's best manipulators, assembled and trained in various "institutes," are constantly preoccupied with the unabashed re-writing of history, twisting and eliminating facts according to the dictates of the party. Apparently to no avail. For Moroz, Chornovil, Dzyuba and scores of others either muzzled or thrown behind bars are supposedly the products of the Soviet machine: they are men and women born and raised under the Communist system that was to be mankind's panacea. Yes, there's the rub.

And there is double hypocrisy in the Kremlin's facade. At the very time that the KGB is raiding homes across the vast empire and hauling people off to prisons, Moscow's "boy wonder" Yevtushenko is sent to these shores, parading as a "liberal," pontificating on America's involvement in Vietnam, telling us of "crime in the streets," and reading what passes for poetry. Not a word about his professional colleagues languishing in Mordovia or in insane asylums.

No less a personage than comrade Furtseva, Moscow's minister of culture, comes here at this very time to show off "Soviet culture" at exhibits. She speaks not of destroyed churches, of monasteries turned into warehouses, of Hutsul icons carted off to Moscow, of monuments razed by bulldozers. Perhaps she did not read Moroz. Or did she?

That the Ukrainian community in the free world is in an uproar is understandable. From the oldest to the youngest, our people are protesting as much against these inhuman acts in Ukraine as against the passivity of supposedly humanitarian institutions in the West. And protest we must—peacefully, without violence—while seeking ways to alleviate the plight of Chornovils, Dzyubas, Sverstiuks and all of our people held in captivity. Their struggle is our cause, their striving for justice and freedom is our mission.

(ABN Correspondence, Bulletin of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations, Nov.-Dec. 1971)

#### TO THE CONSCIENCE OF THE FREE WORLD

Horrifying news about the perfidious, intensified terror in Ukraine and other subjugated countries and in the concentration camps of Siberia with respect to prisoners—fighters for the rights of the individual and nation—is reaching us through various channels. The underground of the revolutionary OUN (Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists) is sounding an alarm in the face of plans prepared by the KGB to liquidate young creators of culture and defenders of freedom of speech and conscience, who are in no way connected with the revolutionary OUN. The revolutionary OUN which acts in extreme secrecy, is conscious of all dangers and threats which confront its members. The revolutionary liberation organizations do not recognize any constitution of the USSR or the so-called "union republics" and uncompromisingly combat everything which has any relation to the occupying power, and are invariably ready to make sacrifices. But they are troubled by the unusually barbarous attacks of Moscow upon the fighters and patriots, the noble creators of cultural values, who courageously and openly stand up in defense of eternal values of their countries, without being members of any underground organization, just being honest and high-principled patriots of their homelands and individuals who do not want to degrade their own dignity and the worthiness of man.

The unprecedented murder of an artist—

the heroine and martyr Alla Horskha, who was treacherously murdered by the KGB, having allegedly arranged a quarrel with her father-in-law, the obvious murder of the prisoner Mykhailo Soroka, who spent nearly 30 years in prisons and concentration camps, but who did not want to deny his own self and his native land, the now confirmed murder of Vasyl Symonenko, who was given an injection of poison after which he died suddenly, the death "in freedom" of numerous Ukrainian patriots, who having been in hospitals, have received injections of poison . . . Their names shall be made public in due time.

We received the following confirmed, horrifying report: prisoners who are due to be released by their executioners from the Mordovian and other concentration camps and prisons are taken to the camp infirmary several months prior to their release (approx. three months) because of this or that minor or major illness and are given a slow-acting poisonous injection of some disease (most likely leukemia). After his release the prisoner dies a "natural" death . . .

What is the purpose of all this? Stashynskyi had already testified that the Russians are aware of the importance of the symbols of inflexibility in the struggle for liberation, in particular among the Ukrainian people and therefore their aim is to destroy these symbols physically, in order that they do not appear among the people, in order to extinguish the aspirations and faith of the people, in order to oppress the people.

Therefore, in line with Moscow's plans, Mykhailo Soroka had to die, for he had grown into a symbol of firmness and indestructibility, into a symbol of a disciple of truth, freedom, justice, whose name was echoed throughout Ukraine and across the USSR, in all prisons and concentration camps, as a man of firm character, as a patriot of his unsubdued Ukraine. On June 15, 1971 news had been received from him, and on June 16th he no longer lived.

[ABN Correspondence, Bulletin of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations, November-December 1971]

#### UKRAINIANS IN GREAT BRITAIN APPEAL TO THE WORLD SYNOD OF BISHOPS

To the Fathers of the World Synod of Bishops,

The Vatican, Rome.

Your Beatitudes,

Your Eminences,

Your Excellencies,

The entire Christian World places great hopes and expectations on the World Synod of Bishops. These days, in response to the Holy Father's call, prayers are offered to the Lord that your synodal deliberations and decisions bring beneficial results for the entire Christian Church. Among this ecumenical offering of prayers, prayers of the Ukrainian People of God are not lacking. This people of God, apart from reasons common with all the Christians in the world, has in addition its own reasons, filled with pains and sufferings, to regard hopefully the Synod of Bishops as "one of the important hours for the Church", as was termed by the Holy Father.

We know that the Synod has chosen two themes for its deliberations and decisions, namely: "De Sacerdotio ministeriali" (the priestly ministry) and "De iustitia in mundi" (justice in the world). The first theme, undoubtedly, is essentially an internal Church problem, and as such is considered in accordance with the criteria of the Christian Revelation, Church Tradition and pastoral needs. On the other hand, the second subject, "justice in the world", in our humble opinion, or more precisely the attitude which the Synod will take towards it in its conferences, and above all in its decisions, will also overstep the boundaries of the Synod, the Church, and will concern all men to a greater or lesser degree. From



the declaration of the principles, and even more so from the practical instructions regarding the achievement of justice in the world, they will recognize the spirit of the Church.

We, representatives of the organized Ukrainian community, believe that the Synod will profoundly and from all possible aspects consider the real situation of justice in the world, its comprehension in the light of Christ's Gospel and the doctrine of the Church, will issue instructions for practical action in its realization, and will certainly emphasize the appropriate places of the encyclicals: "Mater et Magistra", "Pacem in Terris", "Gaudium et Spes", and "Populorum Progressio".

We also believe that the world will hear the voice of the Synod of Bishops in this matter, as the voice of the authentic Church which the Divine Founder has made the "sign" and source of God's presence among the people. The following prophecy has been said about Messiah: "I have put my Spirit up on him, he will bring forth justice to the nations . . . He will not fail, or be discouraged, till he has established justice in the earth" (Is., 42, 1-4 RSV). Yes, Christ came into the world to free men from any enslavement. His Church has to and must continue to carry on this cause. In our times, in particular, she must be a "sign", visible to everyone, of the realization of justice in accordance with the principle, "give to each his own".

Sympathizing with all the wronged, enslaved and humiliated people and peoples in the world, we feel it our special duty to ask the Synod to take a clear position, in accordance with the principles of Christian teaching, with regard to that terrible total enslavement of man and peoples, which had been established by the Soviet Union, and in fact by the godless Russian empire. According to our deepest conviction we admit that, if in discussing various forms of political, class, racial, religious and cultural enslavement and injustice in the world, the Synod would fail to condemn all these forms of oppression in the most modern slave-owning empire in the world, Russia, the Synod would show that it fears people more (blackmail, intimidation, provocations, etc.), than it fears God. Here we are reminded of the words said by Christ's disciples, Peter and John: "Whether it is right in the sight of God to listen to you (people) rather than to God?" (Acts, 4, 19).

We remind the Synod of Bishops that, having enslaved Ukraine, Soviet Russia has surpassed in its perfidy the most cruel tsarist oppression of the Ukrainian people and its Church. In the 1930s Stalin and his henchmen have murdered (starved to death) about 7 million Ukrainians, and the present-day Kremlin potentates, to whom, at present, unfortunately, the officially recognized Russian Orthodox Church serves as a tool, have resorted to spiritual genocide—by means of a "diabolic alchemy." They are trying to mutilate spiritually the entire nation, that is to create "homo sovieticus" from a Ukrainian, a human being without the feeling of personality, a man-slave. This man, however, like all men, has been created in God's image! On their own land, God-given to them, the Ukrainian people are forbidden to speak their own language, they are forbidden even with a word to state publicly that which is "formally" allegedly guaranteed by the Soviet Constitution, i.e. the right to independent State life within its own ethnic frontiers; a Ukrainian is not even permitted to say loudly that he loves his Ukraine, because this, in the opinion of the Russian occupier, is a crime, "bourgeois nationalism," a Ukrainian may and must only love Moscow! The powers in the rest of the world know well what is happening in Ukraine but keep silent,

because this is demanded by "practical politics."

Have the Fathers of the Synod kept silent about it, too, those who deliberate on justice in the world? We pray to God that He give you, Most Reverend Fathers, Princes of the Church, the courage of Christ's Apostles. Do not be silent, we beg you, for "qui tacet consentire videtur"! Speak your authoritative word, that Christ's Church stands up in defence of all the peoples, that she desires peace in the world, but that peace must not be the fruit of violence, but a fruit of justice. Issue your appeal to the world forum demanding that the Russian empire, the most cruel in the world, be dismembered in the spirit of justice for every nation enslaved in it. If such a dismemberment does not take place, Russia will always remain a great danger to the world.

Last year, Ukrainian Catholics throughout the world marked the sad 25th anniversary of the arrest of their entire hierarchy in their native country. It was carried out by the Russian secret police whose agencies are, as a matter of fact, undermining all the countries of the world. This was the first cruel step in the plan to force the Ukrainian Catholics under the supremacy of the state-sponsored Moscow patriarch. The subsequent fate of our Catholic Church is known to the entire world. A living witness of its sufferings and its living symbol is its Primate, His Beatitude Metropolitan Archbishop Major Joseph Cardinal Slipyi Confessor of Faith.

A similar fate befell earlier the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church whose hierarchs, headed by the Metropolitan Archbishop Lypkivskiy and Boreckiy, were killed by the atheistic Russian regime.

May we remind you, Most Reverend Fathers, that since 1955 the Ukrainian Catholic Church united with the Apostolic See has been the strongest part of Eastern Christianity in union with the successors of the Apostle Peter. Many martyrs and confessors of faith have given their lives for this unity. Cardinal Joseph Slipyi spent 18 years in Russian prisons for this unity. Archbishop Vasyl Velychkovskiy, hundreds of priests and thousands of faithful are suffering in prisons for this unity which nevertheless is preserved in modern catacombs throughout Ukraine. It is known in the Church circles that the Russian Orthodox Church, at its Synod in Zagorsk, "legalized" the crime she committed together with the secret police when they destroyed the visible structure of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Western Ukraine, by "abolishing" in a brazen manner, the Union of the Ukrainian Catholic Church with Rome. But, to our great regret, we have not heard so far of any condemnation of this illegal criminal act by the Apostolic See. Therefore we appeal to you, Fathers of the Synod: condemn before the world this injustice inflicted on the Ukrainian Catholic Church!

Some people explain that "ecumenism demands caution with Moscow so as not to upset her". However, we state with deepest conviction before God that ecumenism cannot be created by tolerating lawlessness, crimes and all that derives from them. Yes, they can be pardoned in the name of Christian love, but first there must be repentance and satisfaction of justice.

It is painful for us to state the fact that ecumenism is not understood in the sense of seeking unity with the catacomb Churches including the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church.

The word knows that although our Church is persecuted, and humiliated, it is alive and militant. Nevertheless, it needs sympathy, understanding and concrete help from the entire Christian world. In particular, at the present moment the Apostolic See ought to come with an all-out assistance to the Ukrainian Catholic Church. In the spirit of traditions of the Eastern Churches, in the

spirit of decisions of the Ecumenical Council Vatican II, in view of the wishes of the entire hierarchy and the People of God, the time has come to complete the structure of the Ukrainian Catholic Church with a patriarchate, because everything points to the fact that only a patriarchate can preserve the Ukrainian Catholic Church in diaspora and to prepare it for the great mission in our enslaved country. We address you, Most Reverend Fathers of the Synod: kindly beg the Holy Father to listen to our pleas to erect the Ukrainian Catholic Patriarchate.

We know that the difficulties, possible in this case, do not concern the essence of the matter, because there is a legal basis for the erection of the Ukrainian Catholic Patriarchate and justifications commensurable with it. It is true that we are alarmed because we know that Moscow is taking many direct and indirect steps in order not to permit the erection of the Ukrainian Patriarchate. The world knows, however, that Moscow is always against everything which does not agree with its imperial interests, and in the religious sphere—which does not agree with the interests of the "Third Rome". If this is so, then should its spirit of violence also be active in the Catholic Church, too, from the positions of the "Third Rome"? We are reluctant to believe that. We believe, however, that the Synod of Bishops, assisted by the prayers of millions of Christians, will be a genuine voice of the Church of Christ, and that not politics, not diplomacy or other human methods and factors, will be its strength, but her Divine Founder who said: "I am the way, the truth and the life".

We remain with the expressions of our filial devotion,

Yours faithfully,

THE COMMITTEE FOR THE PATRIARCHATE.

[ABN Correspondence, Bulletin of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations, Nov.-Dec. 1971]

#### AGAINST THE RUSSIFICATION OF UKRAINE

The recently announced results of the census of the Soviet Union conducted in 1970 reveal a decisive threat to the Ukrainian nation of a long-range change in the ethnical composition of the population of the Ukr. SSR. In eleven years, that is since the 1959 census until 1970, the number of Russians in Ukraine has grown from 7 million to 9.1 million. Today the Russians constitute 19.4% of the population of Ukraine as against 16.9% in 1959 and 9.2% in 1926. In that same time the percentage of Ukrainians among the population of the Ukr.SSR is constantly falling: 80% in 1926, 76.8% in 1959, 74.9% in 1970. Thus in the Ukr.SSR for every 1,000 Ukrainians there were 106 Russians in 1926, 220 in 1959 and 258 in 1970.

A constant increase in the number of Russians in Ukraine is to a decisive extent the result of the planned settlement of Russians and Russified elements of other nations on Ukrainian territories. Russia is channelling non-Ukrainians to Ukraine in the capacity of workers at new construction sites or for work in party and state apparatus. Foreign bureaucrats, settled in Ukraine, together with Russified Ukrainians are the spokesmen not only of the national and political subjugation of Ukraine, but also play the role of the exploiting, designated elite which enjoys special material privileges of the USSR's ruling caste.

The colonization of Ukraine by Russian and Russified elements of other peoples of the USSR is primarily directed at the industrial oblasts (provinces) of Ukraine, particularly important for development of a modern nation. To the oblasts in which the number of Russians increased since the previous census belong: Voroshylivograd, in which the Russians now constitute 41.7% of the population, Donetsk—40.6%, Kharkiv—29.4%, Zaporizhia—29%, Dnipropetrovsk—20.9%. The aim of this colonization policy

can only be an attempt to continue to transform these oblasts into the mixed Ukrainian-Russian territories, and later to cut them off from the Ukrainian mainland. The number of Russians has considerably grown in the Odessa oblast as well, where they constitute 24.2% of the population.

At the time when Ukraine is being colonized by foreigners, the leaders of the empire are organizing deportations of Ukrainians outside the borders of the Ukr.SSR or are purposely creating conditions which force Ukrainians to search for work in other "republics" of the USSR. In such a way Ukraine is losing a part of her peasants, chiefly from the western oblasts, from the Forest-Steppe Belt, as well as a part of workers, students and professional intelligentsia. Finding themselves outside their native land, the Ukrainian emigrants do not enjoy any rights of a national minority and therefore do not have a possibility to preserve in the long-run their native language, culture and ties to their homeland. When they are deported to other non-Russian "republics", they very often become, although against their will, an instrument of Russification of the local peoples, at a time when other non-Russians, settled in Ukraine, largely perform a similar role there. The process of Russification of Ukrainians is in particular strong on the territories of the Russian SFSR, in the Kursk, Voronezh and Bilhorod oblasts, bordering on the Ukr.SSR, and in the Krasnodar and Stavropol' region, in Kazakhstan and in the south-western Siberia. The result of this Russification policy is such that when according to the 1926 census 6,871,000 Ukrainians were registered in the RSFSR, in 1970 there were only 3,346,000. Even if the official data of the census are in part purposely falsified, they do not change the clear-cut tendency of Russia's policy in relation to the Ukrainian people.

The last and the next-to-the-last census of the USSR reveal phenomena which seriously threaten the biological and this spiritual substance of the Ukrainian nation. If the colonization of Ukrainian territories by the Russians and the Russified settlers of the non-Russian peoples of the USSR con-

tinues at the present rate in the nearest decades, and the Ukrainian self-defense against it and against deportations and migration of Ukrainians outside the borders of the Ukr.SSR will not be adequate, the territory historically inhabited by the Ukrainian people, which has seriously decreased in the time of Soviet rule, will continue to decrease.

The Russification course is being intensified in various phases of life of the Ukrainian people, including universities (with insignificant exceptions in Lviv and Kyiv) and other higher and special secondary schools. In secondary schools with Ukrainian language of instructions Russian classes are being introduced for children of local party and military bureaucrats. In practice the Ukrainian language has been driven out of public usage or has been maimed beyond recognition, turning into a strange Ukrainian-Russian slang.

Theories of the so-called merger or drawing closer or consolidation of nations of the Soviet Union, which in practice lead to the denial of national, cultural and historic identity of the Ukrainians and their inclusion, together with other non-Russian peoples, in a single so-called Soviet people, which in reality is to be the Russian people, are forcefully imposed upon the Ukrainian people.

The policy of forced change in the makeup of the population of Ukraine and the Russification of the Ukrainian people, which are conducted by Russian imperialists, should be considered as planned political genocide. Ukrainians who are forced to leave Ukraine whether by way of organized recruitment or on other pretexts, should fight for the right to live and work in the land of their fathers. This is an inalienable right of every nation. The two greatest tyrants of the 20th century—Stalin and Hitler—wanted to deprive the Ukrainian people of this right by means of deportations and settlement of foreigners in Ukraine.

The policy of Russia in relation to Ukraine, the indicators of which are the results of the census, calls for intensified self-defense of the Ukrainian people not only against deportations and migration of Ukrainians and settlement of foreigners, as well as for a struggle

for other natural rights of the nation. In particular, the Ukrainian people have the right to demand that all schools in the Ukr.SSR, with the exception of schools for national minorities, conduct instructions in the Ukrainian language and that the Ukrainian language be used publicly in various branches of life. Outside the borders of the Ukr.SSR, Ukrainians should enjoy the rights of national minorities. In the struggle for their existence, the Ukrainians should cultivate the spirit of national solidarity and mutual assistance, the feeling of historic and spiritual community. A member of every nation is first of all bound by loyalty to his brother in blood, tradition, language, culture and history.

In the free world, a special task faces Ukrainian scholars and educational institutions, which can bring to the international forum the question of defense of the biological substance of the Ukrainian nation and the territory which it historically inhabits. It is the duty of the emigres to influence various circles in the free world to condemn the attempts by Russian imperialists to continue to conduct Stalinist and Hitlerite experiments with Ukrainian and other subjugated people.

#### H. CON. RES. 64

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President, acting through the United States Ambassador to the United Nations Organization, take such steps as may be necessary to place the question of human rights violations in the Soviet-occupied Ukraine on the agenda of the United Nations Organization.*

#### H. CON. RES. 161

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President, acting through the United States Ambassador to the United Nations Organization, take such steps as may be necessary to place the question of human rights violations of the Jewish minority in the Soviet Union on the agenda of the United Nations Organization.*

## SENATE—Wednesday, February 16, 1972

The Senate met at 12 meridian and was called to order by Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD, a Senator from the State of West Virginia.

#### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, as today men begin again their pilgrimage to the cross, repenting of sin and contemplating the cost of man's salvation, we beseech Thee to guide us by the wisdom of the cross, that we may learn once more that it is only in the surrender of the lower self that the higher self is born, that in the giving of life that life is found, and that death is the way to resurrection power.

Remove from us all that obscures Thy presence—the careless habit, the indifferent attitude, the disobedience of divine law, the rejection of Thy guiding light. May this penitential period bring redemptive grace to all the people. In days burdened with duties, may we ever keep our hearts open to the divine spirit and to worship while we work. Here and

elsewhere, may we daily "offer unto Thee ourselves—a reasonable and living sacrifice, beseeching Thee to accept our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving—and in the unity of Thy Holy Spirit may we ascribe all honor and glory unto Thee, world without end." Amen.

#### DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, D.C., February 16, 1972.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD, a Senator from the State of West Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 15, 1972, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNEY). Without objection, it is so ordered.