

Manning, George, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Marsteller, Clyde C., XXX-XX-XXXX
 McKinstry, Earl R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 McLain, Frederick R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mertel, Paul T., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Meyer, Dennis E., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Michels, George N., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Miller, Allan J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Miller, Dewey R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mitten, Alan K., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mooney, Darrel L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Moore, Reginald G., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Morris, Harold B., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Morton, Ward D., III, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Munnell, Thomas C., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nalepa, Thomas F., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nardozza, Anthony J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Neptune, Calvin, III, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Odell, Thomas E., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ohara, Kerry L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ortiz, Teofilo, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Parker, John S., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Parr, Thomas J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Partin, Daniel H., II, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Peacock, Clayton W., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pender, Robert W., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Peterson, Lawrence, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Philbrick, Jon D., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pitts, Walter G., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pleasant Richard H., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Polk, Anthony J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pollok, James L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Potter, Laurence A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pozniak, Thomas B., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Prather, Ted W., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pryor, William L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rodman, Terrell L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rogers, Jack A., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Savory, Carlton G., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schaefer, Ken M., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schmuck, Dale A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schulz, Jeffrey B., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Seyfer, Alan E., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Slayton, Jack R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, Jack R., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Specht, William T., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Steen, David B., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Stockard, David B., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Stripling, Verlon, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Strobel, Fred H., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sullivan, Michael F., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Swallow, Gary L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tansor, James R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Taveau, Horatio S., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Taylor, Harvey G., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Taylor, James A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Thomas, William G., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Thompson, Jerry F., XXX-XX-XXXX

Touchard, George H., XXXX
 Tyler, James M., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Urban, Dennis E., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Vinson, William W., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Visnick, Allan D., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wadsworth, Thomas S., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wall, Henry G., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Warren, Stephen F., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Weed, Roger I., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wiener, Michael L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Williams, James N., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Williams, Robert K., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Woodward, Ronald L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wortham, James T., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wright, William A., XXX-XX-XXXX

ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS
 To be captain

Bell, Clyde H., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Chee, Francis K., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ford, Daniel T., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Guy, David P., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hassett, Robert B., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jesse, Norris F., II, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kirkman, Elaine M., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Linton, Judith S., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Martino, Louis A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pennell, Clifford R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schofield, Grant A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sorenson, Allan M., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wheeler, Thomas H., XXX-XX-XXXX

DENTAL CORPS

To be captain

Cheek, Jack Watt, XXX-XX-XXXX

ARMY NURSE CORPS
 To be captain

Adams, Gearl V., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Arrowsmith, David R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Babson, Beverlyrae, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Basta, Patricia J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Blake, Nelson A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bombard, Charles F., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bowlyow, Ronald G., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Brown, Dorothy N., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Defazio, Vincent G., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Desrosiers, Henri, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dollander, Lowell T., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Drummond, William F., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Eberlin, Lawrence J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Eckman, Mary K., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Froat, Edward F., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gunnell, Kenneth M., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Heston, James V., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hoffelt, Donald J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Houser, Oscar S., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hutcheson, Margueri, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jacques, Stanley H., XXX-XX-XXXX

Kraemer, William J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lang, Frank J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lawyer, Robert H., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Layman, Frances K., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lenig, Richard C., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Likens, Wilbur D., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Markarian, Clement, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McCarthy, Mary M., XXX-XX-XXXX
 McManus, John G., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Miller, Thomas E., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Minahan, Sue P., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mitten, John N., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Oakley, Catherine M., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Oatway, David M., XXX-XX-XXXX
 O'Sullivan, Eileen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Paul, Joseph J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Person, Rodney M., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pfaehler, Karl H., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Phelps, Fredrick O., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Poduszcak, Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Price, Barbara J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rexrode, Janet S., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Riley, Ellen E., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Roscoe, Ronald R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ryan, Elizabeth G., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schultz, Elsie M., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Seymour, Richard S., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Shovar, George P., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sinclair, Allen L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, Charles L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sollenberger, Karen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Spencer, Joanne M., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Steel, Virginia M., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Stegura, Frank H., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Steib, Mary E., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Strieper, Sarah S., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sylvester, Marilyn, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tassinari, Anthony, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Teno, James M., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Thompson, Charles R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Touron, Francis L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tranel, David A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Trover, Robert M., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Truscott, Alma P., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Urick, George M., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Vail, James D., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Watters, Thomas S., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Welch, Alfred C., XXX-XX-XXXX
 White, John T., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wilson, Margaret E., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wolf, Richard C., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ziacik, John E., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX

VETERINARY CORPS
 To be captain

Lewis, George E., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Peterson, Clarence, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sagartz, John W., XXX-XX-XXXX

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FISCAL INTEGRITY

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 9, 1973

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, an editorial, entitled "Fiscal Illiteracy," appeared in the June 24 issue of the Sunday Chronicle-Herald newspaper in Augusta, Ga.

This editorial points out the importance of correcting our Nation's spending policies by eliminating or reducing unworthy social programs. President Nixon has cited inflation as our No. 1 problem and it is disturbing to me that some Members of Congress fail to recognize this fact by favoring high expenditures in these domestic programs.

The author of this article takes note that many of these social programs could be tightened in order that those truly in

need would derive greater benefits while at the same time waste in these areas might also be reduced.

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

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

FISCAL ILLITERACY

The ignorance of congressmen as to the economic facts of life—or possibly their indifference, which would be even worse—is well illustrated in contrasting news stories.

On the same day in which a May cost-of-living report showed inflation continuing at would be—if projected—a 7.2 per cent annual increase, the newspapers also carried a story saying that the House Appropriations Committee voted to inflate President Nixon's budget by \$1.2 billion by restoring social program cuts in the budgets of the Labor Department and the Health, Education and Welfare Department.

This callous disregard of the welfare of the American people flies in the face of an

elementary fact: that the resulting inflation reduces the buying power of the dollar. This spending increase would finance a vast bureaucracy of social workers and politicians ostensibly for the benefit of the poor people, who themselves never seem to get significantly more money in their own pockets as a result of the bureaucratic wheel-spinning. Their inflation's ravages take away what little might have been gained by social programs.

After well over a decade of socialistic programs, the fact is that more persons are below the poverty line than at the start. With government-created inflation robbing blind the persons who are supposed to be helped by the bureaucratic directors, coordinators, supervisors, researchers and all the rest of that crew, is it any wonder at all that persons who formerly were poor but self-supporting are now in dire need?

One thing which at least for the time being will halt the rising tide of living costs is the Nixon-ordered 60-day freeze on prices. Fiscal moves may help, such as the Federal Reserve Board's increase in the discount rate to 6.5 per cent—the highest level in more than 50 years—and action by several major

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

July 9, 1973

banks to raise their prime lending rate to 7 1/4 per cent.

These fiscal moves however, will cut back on legitimate business whose expansion could have provided jobs for those in poverty—a factor which partially cancels out the prospective effect on inflation.

If the Congress goes along with the House committee's irresponsible federal spending program, it can further dilute any and all such attempts to keep living costs down. These attempts, as Sen. Herman Talmadge said in a recent statement, "will be only temporary relief until the Administration and the Congress come face to face with a simple economic fact of life:

"In the final analysis, the principal cause of inflation is continued and constant deficits . . . We need to correct our spending policies. Our government for too long has tried to act as banker, Santa Claus and policeman for the world. We cannot continue this policy."

Those who would permit our great Nation to bankrupt itself by assuming a nursemaid role for once-self-reliant Americans do the people—all of them—the gravest sort of injustice. They are on the level of the housewife who spends all her household budget for nice but unnecessary candy, then sees the grocer cut off her credit while the children suffer from malnutrition.

President Nixon, who has recognized that "the No. 1 problem facing the Nation" is inflation, vetoed last year's Health, Education and Welfare bill twice, and has wisely declined to spend all the current money appropriated under the special procedure being followed in the absence of a regular bill.

If the committee's recommendation is adopted, citizens concerned for the welfare of all Americans will hope the President again exercises the veto.

FIXED TERMS FOR FEDERAL JUDGES

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 9, 1973

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, sentiment for fixed terms for Federal judges, including the Supreme Court, is gaining ground.

Federal judges now are appointed for life and, once confirmed by the Senate, are accountable to no one.

Why should anyone in a democracy have lifetime appointment?

In this modern world only kings, queens, emperors—and U.S. Federal judges—have life terms.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the Extensions of Remarks an editorial

from the Baton Rouge, La., State-Times.

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

CURB POWER OF FEDERAL JUDGES?

A new voice from the Midlands has sounded in support of Sen. Harry Byrd's (Va.) proposed constitutional amendment which would curb the substantially limitless power of federal judges at all levels of that judiciary.

That the voice is that of a distinguished jurist adds to its weight.

Chief Justice Norman Arterburn of the Indiana Supreme Court is the new ally of the senator in the latter proposal that the Constitution require all federal judges to be reconfirmed by the Senate every eight years. This would, in effect, provide an eight-year term for this judiciary.

The Indiana jurist outspokenly attributed the change in his thinking, from opposition to the Byrd proposal to support of it, to what he has termed extremities of the United States Supreme court. He asserted it was his view that this tribunal had overstepped the bounds of constitutional law, got into the legislative field, imposing their ideas as to public policy and good legislation on the people of the country."

On the state level, 47 of the 50 states have fixed terms for the state judges. Only Rhode Island has life tenure for its judiciary. Massachusetts and New Hampshire mandatorily retire their judges at age 70.

Judicial restraint once was a hallmark of the U.S. Supreme Court. It was given its best expressions in the words of eminent justices, among them Oliver Wendell Holmes, Justice Brandeis, Justices Stone, Hughes and Frankfurter. Such restraint was almost an unwritten canon which endured well beyond the first century of the republic.

But, in the present century and especially as it reached its midpoint, first the Supreme Court and later lower courts diverged from the doctrine of judicial restraint and clearly began to legislate.

It is this divergence to which Sen. Byrd and others take exception, to a point of seeking limited tenure for the federal judiciary. That their position now gains support from distinguished jurists, the chief justice of the Indiana Supreme Court notable among them, is significant.

THE OFFICE OF EDUCATION'S ILLEGAL BACKDATING OF CONTRACTS

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1973

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Education's admitted illegal back-

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
PLAN FOR ABSORBING 1973 IMPACT OF BACKDATING OF EDUCATION DIVISION GRANTS AND CONTRACTS

Appropriation/activity affected	Original 1973 operating level	Total amount contracted after June 30, 1972	Effect of Backdating Action						Revised 1973 plan
			Loss in base		Loss in expansion or new projects		Funding from 1974	Reprogramming	
Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Reprogramming	Other				
Elementary and secondary education: Supplementary services (discretionary)	\$20,088,000	\$1,481,109	\$554,555	17	\$926,554	10			\$18,606,891
Education for the handicapped: Deaf-blind centers	10,000,000	5,795,000	—	—	1,162,000	46	\$4,633,000		4,205,000
Early childhood projects	12,000,000	5,871,020	—	—	4,353,557	97	+\$1,517,463		7,646,443
Regional resource centers	7,243,000	2,112,652	—	—	3,130,115	84	-1,017,463		4,112,885
Innovation and development	9,916,000	3,223,539	—	—	3,223,539	33			6,692,461
Media services and captioned films	13,000,000	848,332	—	—	1,012,332	34	-164,000		11,987,668
Recruitment and information	500,000	363,095	—	—	199,095	89	+\$164,000		300,905
Special education and manpower development	37,610,000	8,471,562	—	—	5,471,562	27		3,000,000	29,138,438

Appropriation/activity affected	Original 1973 operating level	Total amount contracted after June 30, 1972	Effect of Backdating Action						Revised 1973 plan
			Loss in base		Loss in expansion or new projects		Reprogramming	Funding from 1974 appropriation	
			Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent			
Specific learning disabilities	3,250,000				500,000		-500,000		2,750,000
Total, education for the handicapped	93,519,000	26,685,200			19,052,200		7,633,000		66,833,800
Vocation and adult educational:									
National advisory council, vocational education	330,000	(23,000)					+23,000		330,000
Curriculum development	4,000,000	413,082					413,082		3,586,918
Innovation (discretionary)	13,741,917	23,000			23,000		-23,000		13,718,917
Total, vocational and adult education	18,071,917	436,082			23,000		413,082		17,635,835
Educational renewal:									
Follow through	57,700,000	6,432,775					2,459,323	¹ \$3,973,452	51,267,225
Bilingual education	35,130,000	1,852,149	1,624,149	5	228,000	100			33,277,851
Dropout prevention	8,500,000	2,549,867	2,549,867	30					5,950,133
Environmental education	3,180,000	2,025,500			2,025,500	66			1,154,500
Educational statistics	4,250,000	1,774,938			218,000	16			2,475,062
Planning and evaluation	10,205,000	30,478			30,478	1			10,174,522
Adult education, special projects	7,000,000	257,256			257,256	3			6,472,744
Right to read	12,000,000	1,072,342						1,072,342	10,927,658
Education professions development—Pt.D, Urban/rural program	53,660,000	1,078,797						³ 1,078,797	52,581,203
Total, educational renewal	191,625,000	17,074,102	4,174,016		2,759,234		4,744,665	5,396,187	174,550,898
National Institute of Education:									
Experimental schools		4,739,618			4,739,618				
Basic research	103,180,000	1,422,494			1,422,494				96,253,310
District of Columbia school project		764,578			764,578				
Other R. & D.					6,926,690		-6,926,690		
Total, National Institute of Education	103,180,000	6,926,690			6,926,690				96,253,310
Transfer from Department of Labor:									
Manpower training services	9,200,000	2,331,253						⁴ 2,331,253	6,868,747
Grand total	435,683,917	54,934,436	4,728,571		29,687,678		12,790,747	7,727,440	380,749,481

¹ Prior year unexpended balances (\$3,223,452) and savings from limiting project funding period to 12 months (\$750,000).

² Early completion of 12 projects.

³ Prior year unobligated balances.

² Savings associated with reduced computer and printing requirements.

STATEMENT CONCERNING SUPREME COURT PORNOGRAPHY DECISION

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 30, 1973

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, in its recent decision in the case of *Miller against California*, the U.S. Supreme Court handed down a new set of guidelines on pornography that will enable States to ban books, magazines, plays, and motion pictures that are offensive to local standards, even if they might be acceptable in other places.

Speaking through Chief Justice Burger the Court declared that States may punish the printing or sale of works "which appeal to the prurient interest in sex, which portray sexual conduct in a patently offensive way and which, taken as a whole, do not have serious literary, artistic, political, or scientific value."

The Court also declared that it will no longer be a defense to a prosecution for obscenity that the work involved had "some redeeming social value," as it has been since a 1966 Supreme Court decision.

This decision should be welcomed by all Americans who are concerned with the moral state of their society and with the spread in recent years of the most

objectionable kinds of material, portraying sadism, masochism, and a variety of other kinds of sexual depravity.

There are many who hold that pornography is essentially harmless, and that a free society should permit all forms of published material, movies, and other means of communication, no matter how degrading, lest it lose its freedom of speech and of publication.

The fact is, however, that pornography should no more be permitted license than should the distribution of narcotics and dangerous drugs. Its effect upon the lives of individuals is, in many respects, the same.

There has been much discussion in recent years about the question of whether pornography has led to acts of violence. Discussing this question, Prof. Ernest Van Den Haag, professor of social philosophy at New York University, expresses the view that—

The possibility of sadism is in all of us.

He notes that—

Reading of the fantasies of others may lead to actions no less than other external stimuli. From the fact that not all readers of the Bible become Christians or act as such, and that some non-readers do, few people would conclude that the Bible has no influence. . . . Actions are influenced by ideas; even emotions—such as love or hate—are often shaped by ideas and idea models. Else why write about them, or about anything?

To those who argue that reading pornography does not, in fact, have any ef-

fect upon those who do it, Dr. Van Den Haag notes that—

It is odd (as well as wrong) to defend the freedom of literature by pretending that it has no influence. . . . It is strange that the criminal rampage of, say, a deprived Negro in the U.S.A. is easily ascribed to his deprivation. We are told that we are guilty of failing to remedy it, and thus of his acts (and that he is not). But why are we not guilty then of failing to restrict literature, no less logically connected with the rampage of the sadist who reads it? In neither case can a direct causal connection be established, or such matters as disposition discounted. In both cases, a causal connection of some sort seems quite likely.

What pornography does, in its basic formulation, is make man less human. Dr. Van Den Haag suggests that were literature—

Directed against a specific human group—e.g. Jews or Negroes—the same libertarian ideologues who now oppose censorship might advocate it. Should we find a little Negro or Jewish girl tortured to death . . . and should we find the murderers imbued with sadistic anti-Semitic or anti-Negro literature—certainly most liberals would advocate that the circulation of such literature be prohibited. But why should humanity as such be less protected than any of the specific groups that compose it? That the hate articulated is directed against people in general rather than against only Jews or Negroes makes it no less dangerous; on the contrary, it makes it dangerous to more people.

As pornography has become more widespread, as crime has grown as the inci-

July 9, 1973

dence of abortion and venereal disease has increased, we are forced to come to grips with an American society in a serious state of moral decay.

In his essay, "Pornography versus Democracy," Prof. Walter Berns argues that no society can be utterly indifferent to the ways its citizens publicly entertain themselves.

Discussing this subject, Prof. Irving Kristol, Henry Luce Professor of Urban Values at New York University, notes that—

Bearbaiting and cockfighting are prohibited only in part out of compassion for the suffering animals; the main reason they were abolished was that it was felt they debased and brutalized the citizenry who flocked to witness such spectacles. The question we face with regard to pornography and obscenity is whether, now that they have such strong legal protection . . . they can or will brutalize or debase our citizenry.

What is at stake in our discussion of pornography may be the very basis of our civilization. The idea that "everything is permitted," as Nietzsche put it, rests on the premise of nihilism and has serious nihilistic implications for the future of democratic government and a free society.

Is it a contradiction to both support a free society and also support a ban upon pornography material? Irving Kristol responds to that charge in these terms:

I don't think so. In the U.S. we have no problem in contrasting repressive laws governing alcohol and drugs and tobacco with laws regulating (i.e. discouraging the sale of) alcohol and drugs and tobacco. Laws encouraging temperance are not the same thing as laws that have as their goal prohibition or abolition. We have not made the smoking of cigarettes a criminal offense. We have, however . . . prohibited cigarette advertising on television.

The Supreme Court has acted wisely in making it clear that our society has had enough of the pornography wave to which it has been subjected in recent years. Perhaps the centers of our large cities will once again become pleasant places in which families may feel free to pursue decent forms of entertainment. Perhaps those who advocate pornography on the basis of free speech will rethink their position, with the full understanding of the very real harm such literature and movies have done and are now doing to Americans, particularly young Americans.

It is no challenge to freedom to make it illegal to kill and rape. It should be no challenge to freedom to eliminate those who have laid the groundwork for a dehumanized society in which such crimes become acceptable and commonplace. This, the Supreme Court understands and has affirmed.

AVERAGE AMERICAN WORKS ONE-THIRD OF 8-HOUR DAY FOR UNCLE SAM

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 30, 1973

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, a recent speech by the Secretary of the Treasury,

George Shultz, in which he raised the possibility of an increase in taxes on gasoline and other items, has caused grave concern among those of us who put great store by the President's pledge not to raise taxes during his second term.

Now is the time for all opponents of higher taxes to make their voices heard; we must remind the administration that in his acceptance speech at the Republican Convention in Miami, the President very forthrightly declared:

I oppose any new spending programs which would add to the tax burden of American wage earners.

This statement was confirmed by Press Secretary Ronald Ziegler last September 7th when he said:

We contemplate and plan no tax increase—period—in the next term.

In his first published interview after his reelection, President Nixon himself put it very well when he said:

I am convinced that the total tax burden of the American people, federal, state and local, has reached a breaking point. It can go no higher. If it does go higher, I believe it will do much to destroy the incentives which produce the progress we want.

One of the main reasons for President Nixon's landslide victory last fall was undoubtedly this firm promise not to raise taxes in his second term. Mr. Speaker, all of us in this Chamber know very well what a burden the average American taxpayer already carries; to increase it would seriously endanger the proper functioning of the economy.

According to the Tax Foundation, Inc., the average American works 2 hours and 39 minutes out of a typical 8-hour day just to pay his taxes; he works 1 hour to pay for his housing, and 58 minutes for food and drink. Taxes, therefore, are the largest single item in the budget of almost every American family.

The President should take the initiative to implement his pledge of last year. He should drastically slash unnecessary Government expenditures—now swollen to an all-time high—and thereby pave the way to reduce taxes at the earliest possible moment. Those of us who supported the President for reelection have a special responsibility to remind him again and again of his own often-repeated pledge not to raise taxes for 4 more years.

KINSLEY S. BINGHAM

HON. GARRY BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 30, 1973

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, as part of a recently initiated effort on the part of my former district representative, Jerry D. Roe, executive director of the Republican Party in Michigan and a member of the Michigan State Historical Commission, on Saturday, July 7, 1973, an official State of Michigan historical marker was dedicated at the former home in Brighton, Mich., of the late Kinsley S. Bingham, the first Gov-

ernor of Michigan to be elected as a "Republican" and a former Member of this body and the U.S. Senate.

This dedication was highlighted by special remarks provided by Michigan's Lt. Gov. James H. Brickley; my colleague in the House, Representative WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD; State Senator Gilbert Bursley; State Representative Thomas Sharpe; and myself. The official dedication of the marker was performed by Mr. Hudson Mead of Grosse Pointe, Mich., president of the Michigan State Historical Commission, and various dignitaries and guests throughout the State were in attendance.

The dedication ceremony and related program were conducted under the auspices of the Kinsley S. Bingham Society, the Michigan Republican Party, the Livingston County Republican Committee, the Livingston County Historical Society, and the Green Oak Township Republican Club.

The Kinsley S. Bingham Society is the second organization of its type founded by Mr. Roe, and he serves as chairman of the board of the society. The other similar organization, also created to memorialize a former leading Republican and founded by Mr. Roe, is the "Friends of Chester A. Arthur." In addition, Roe created the "Twelve-Fifty Club" which was responsible for the purchase and dedication of a similar marker at the site of the famous "Under the Oaks" first Republican convention which was held in this country, such dedication ceremonies having been held in Jackson, Mich., on July 8, 1972.

Inasmuch as many of my colleagues may not be familiar with this prominent Michigan, I am providing a brief biographical sketch of his life:

GOVERNOR BINGHAM

Kinsley Scott Bingham was born in Camillus, New York, December 16, 1808, the son of Calvin and Betsy (Scott) Bingham. Calvin Bingham was a farmer who had emigrated from Bennington, Vermont. The son's early life was also devoted to agricultural pursuits. He early obtained a good education in his native State and studied law in the office of General James R. Lawrence, of Syracuse, New York. In the spring of 1833 he married Miss Warden, who had recently arrived from Scotland, and obeying the impulse of a naturally energetic and enterprising disposition he immediately emigrated to Michigan. He purchased a new farm, in company with his brother-in-law, Mr. Robert Warden, in Green Oak, Livingston County, where on the border of civilization, buried in the primeval forest, the late law student commenced the arduous task of preparing a future home, clearing and fencing, putting up buildings, at such a rate that the land chosen was soon reduced to a high state of cultivation.

Becoming deservedly prominent, Mr. Bingham was elected to the office of justice of the peace, and postmaster, under the Territorial government, and was the first judge of probate in the county. He was elected to the first Michigan Legislature, was four times re-elected, and was Speaker of the House of Representatives three years. In 1846 he was elected, on the Democratic ticket, Representative in Congress. He was re-elected to Congress in 1848, during which time he strongly opposed the extension of slavery in the territories of the United States, and voted for the Wilmot Proviso. In 1854 he was nominated as the candidate of the Free Soilers for Governor. At the great mass convention at Jackson, July 6, 1854, the Whigs and the Free Soilers united on a state ticket and he was placed at the head of it for Governor,

as the nominee of the new Republican Party, which then and there sprang into existence and received its name. Sanguine of success, he addressed the people in all parts of the State and the entire ticket was elected; he was again elected Governor in 1856 by a largely increased majority.

During his administration much important legislation was enacted. On the slavery issue, the most significant act was that popularly known as the "Personal Liberty Law," providing that all prosecuting attorneys "diligently and faithfully use all lawful means to protect and defend all persons arrested as a fugitive slave." Another act absolutely prohibited the use of county jails for the detention of persons claimed as fugitive slaves. Of social and educational importance were the prohibitory liquor law, a general law to provide for the organization of charitable societies, a general college act, an act to provide for the holding of teachers' institutes, an act to remit the interest on the University loan, an act establishing a House of Correction for juvenile offenders, and an act to incorporate the State Teachers' Association. Two acts mark the rise of the great lumber industry, presently to grow to gigantic proportions and for a time to make Michigan the foremost lumbering state in the Union, namely, the act "to provide for the formation of companies, for the running, booming and rafting of logs," and the act "to provide for the inspection of lumber." A number of laws were enacted bearing upon the great industrial interests of the State, relating to mining, railroads, canals, building, and lighting. Many new county organizations were provided and villages incorporated. It was during Bingham's first administration that the Michigan Legislature passed, and the Governor approved, the famous "Joint Resolutions respecting slavery in the Territories of the United States" which were to be of far-reaching influence.

Mr. Bingham's was a comparatively short life, of remarkable promise and public activity. Attacked with apoplexy, he died suddenly at his residence in Green Oak, October 5, 1861.

(Bingham was elected to the United States Senate in 1858.)

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS FILES PETITION WITH THE FCC

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 30, 1973

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the attention of my colleagues a petition, filed with the Federal Communications Commission by the Polish American Congress, to force the ABC-TV network to give them equal time for a response to the vicious slurs and sick jokes aired in the last few months by that network which demean and degrade millions of Americans of Polish descent.

The Polish American Congress is a fine and resolute organization which represents over 10 million industrious and hardworking Polish-Americans who have contributed mightily to the growth and development of our country and without whose dedication America would not be the bulwark of democracy and the leader among nations that she is today.

As the Representative of the 11th Illinois Congressional District, and as an American of Italian descent, I rise today to express my wholehearted support for the Polish American Congress' effort against this contemptible defamation of the Polish people. The members of our minority and ethnic groups have every right to be free from the harm directed at them by thoughtless panderers of hatred and discord. Each minority group is justifiably proud of its ancestry, its accomplishments, and its contributions to the advancement of world civilization. When we destroy this pride in "self"—we destroy the very quality Americans possess that has made America great. The mingling of traditions, temperament, and cultures has come to personify the American Union.

Mr. Speaker, I again appeal to my colleagues and urge their strong support for my bill, House Concurrent Resolution 19, cosponsored by over 50 House Members, which would put the U.S. Congress on record in opposition to motion pictures, television, and radio broadcasts which stereotype, ridicule, or defame any ethnic, racial, or religious group.

The press, radio, and television have been derelict in their responsibility to help create a society in which people are proud to make a contribution to their country, and are proud to respect their own heritage and their institutions. The Congress must take a stand against this abuse.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I wish to insert a newsclipping from the July 3 issue of the Washington Post which summarizes the recent action taken by the Polish American Congress:

POLISH JOKES, TELEVISION AND THE FCC

Polish Americans, stung by what they called a barrage of demeaning "Polack jokes" on ABC-TV, petitioned the government yesterday to force the network to give them equal time to respond.

The Polish American Congress, in filing the petition with the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), said it spoke for 10 million Polish Americans.

Attorney Thaddeus L. Kowalski, chairman

of the Anti-Defamation Commission of the Polish American Congress said, "We intend to fight the increasing bigotry in the media."

"If necessary, this will be the first of several suits," he said. "ABC-TV is not alone in its responsibility for presenting a negative and insulting image of the Polish American in its national programming."

The petition mentioned several shows but singled out an ABC broadcast of the Aug. 10, 1972, Dick Cavett Show hosted by Steve Allen.

"An alleged 'apology' was made by Steve Allen on Aug. 11, 1972," the petition said. "This statement was not an apology at all, but was surrounded by a comic setting and was the basis for more demeaning humor, rather than a serious expression of regret."

The Polish American Congress said Kowalski made several requests to ABC for equal time but was turned down each time.

Other shows mentioned in the petition were the "Salute to Howard Cosell" on May 21, 1973, and "The Burns and Schreiber Show," June 22, 1973.

ABC was accused of a "consistent policy" of portraying the "dumb Polack" image, i.e., lack of intelligence, lack of personal hygiene, comic apparel and obnoxious physical features."

Kowalski said Polish Americans want an "opportunity to show the true character of their culture and heritage and not the false and insulting stereotype that the networks now portray."

"The current barrage of allegedly humorous jokes, skits and monologues is anything but funny to the victims and only encourages prejudice and discrimination," Kowalski said. At this point in history, respect for cultural diversity should be a primary concern of the media."

The FCC was asked to rule that the "Polack jokes" on the Dick Cavett show "constitute a controversial issue of public importance because such jokes in and of themselves belittle a large segment of the population, both young and old."

"Only the application of the Fairness Doctrine, by allowing the presentation of a contrary view, will afford some relief to Polish Americans," the petition said.

Kowalski said the networks should police themselves under the National Association of Broadcasters' Television Code, which states that no group shall be ridiculed or demeaned on the basis of race, religion or national origin.

PROPOSAL TO INCREASE TAX ON CORPORATE PROFITS

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 30, 1973

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, on May 16 Mr. Frank Burgert, president of Interlake Corp., of Chicago, addressed 225 people in Steubenville, Ohio on the subject of proposals to increase the effective rate of taxation on corporate profits. Mr. Burgert presents a strong case against such ill-advised proposals. I join him in opposition to any such tax changes and ask unanimous consent to have his remarks reprinted in the RECORD.

The remarks follow:

PROPOSAL TO INCREASE TAX ON CORPORATE PROFITS

My text this evening was provided by the AFL-CIO. Recently their Executive Council

EXPLANATION

This amendment would exclude casein and caseinates from the definition of dairy products for purposes of the provision in the bill dealing with dairy import licenses.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

July 9, 1973

and Mr. George Meany have been claiming that business profits:

Are jeopardizing government efforts to control inflation.

Are unfair to workers.

Are increasing prices to consumers.

And are setting the stage for a new recession.

In addition to these incredible observations and—I might add—vicious and destructive criticism of our private enterprise system, they are further attacking our profit system by demanding, among other things, that Congress:

Eliminate tax credits and accelerated depreciation.

Kill tax subsidies for corporations investing and profiting abroad.

Kill tax exemptions for interest income from state and local bonds.

Tax excess profits.

Control prices, and

Establish profit ceilings.

In other words, they seem to want to further undermine the only real creators of general wealth—Commerce and Industry.

At the same time, they want wage controls removed. Union economists further suggest that instead of larger profits, the national economy needs balanced expansion . . . rather than short-lived, one-sided profit and investment booms. Their implication, of course, is that only industry and investors earn a profit . . . and workers get nothing.

Unfortunately, such irresponsible statements mislead millions of Americans about profits . . . and give further exposure to the myth that in order to get more for themselves . . . the government and workers must take more from the industrial goose that lays golden profit eggs.

What I'm trying to say isn't intended to be a blast against organized labor. Time for that is long past. Though management and labor may never become the happiest of bedfellows, we can and must make needed and fruitful progress together.

The "experimental negotiating agreement" reached recently between several of the major steel producers and the Steelworkers Union is just one example that we can work together for mutual benefit of customers, employees, shareholders and all American people. But even though we're sharing more common ground than in recent memory, the fact remains that there's still a vast abyss between us on certain issues. Of these, basic economics is perhaps the most obvious and significant. This is why I feel compelled tonight to comment on—and publicly refute—the AFL-CIO's statements I've just reviewed:

First, on the matter of inflation. Profits, soaring or otherwise, don't cause inflation or hamper a government's efforts to control inflation. Government is the major cause of inflation when it incurs large budget deficits and prints cheap dollars to cover. Last year alone the money supply grew 8.3%. Why? Excessive Government Spending. Almost \$20 billion worth.

Second, let's look at the claim that high business profits are unfair to workers and are setting the stage for a new recession. Now . . . about unfairness. Probably the biggest misconception today is a delusion held by the average employee that he is not getting a fair share of a company's profits. Recent polls show Americans believe that workers get only 25% of income divided between gross wages and net profits. In fact, employees receive 90.7% of the income divided between them and net profit. And they receive 94.6% of income divided between them and dividends to stockholders.

Workers in the U.S. also receive 76.5% of total national income.

Next . . . about profits and recessions. Business profits aren't soaring. There has been a recent profit rise, but this must be compared against an historical background and other growth areas of the economy.

The most recent era of inflation in the U.S. began in the mid 60's. It was fired by peak military outlays during Vietnam . . . and, at the same time, by large government expenditures in our domestic economy. To get a true picture of how profits and workers have fared, let's compare profit performance with that of total personal income.

Commerce Department figures show corporate profits rose only 14% in the eight years 1965-1972. Personal income rose 68%. If that's a soaring profit spiral, it's lopsided. Personal income rose more than four times as rapidly as profits.

Another point. Even during the '69-'70 recession, personal income kept right on marching upward . . . but profits staged a special spiral of their own—downward. Thus, the current profit climb is merely one of recovery. In fact, '72 industrial profit climb is merely one of recovery. In fact, '72 industrial profits are only 6.4% above those in 1966 . . . and in 1972 represented a little over 4¢ on sales of \$1.00.

Before I leave this point, I want to look at the recent recession more closely . . . and parallel the movement of profit and hourly compensation rates. Our recent recession began in '69 . . . after profits had already been falling for three years. The recession ended in late 1970. During this time, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, corporate profits dropped 21%. Hourly compensation rose 13%. With the figures I've cited on the nation's records, I don't see how the union can claim either unreasonable corporate profits . . . or unfairness to workers.

Now, let's look at the claim that rising profits are increasing prices. What nonsense.

A couple more numbers. The Bureau of Labor Statistics Index measures wholesale prices on all finished manufactured goods. Between 1965 and 1972, when profits rose only 14%, the wholesale price of all finished manufactured goods climbed only 22%. But the Index also showed that average hourly employee compensation jumped 56%—two and a half times as much. It would seem, therefore, that rising employee costs—not profits—had the major impact on rising prices.

Speaking of rising prices . . . there's a popular theory that U.S. manufacturers simply "pass along" all higher wage costs through higher prices. What a myth this is! We can pass along some. But not nearly all. No way. If this were so, a producer would pass along every cent . . . if he's permitted by customers in the marketplace. But we can't. Market competition blocks us. And that's part of the checks and balances of our competitive enterprise system.

Thus . . . when previously negotiated wage increases become effective this summer, we'll not be able to pass along all the increases through price adjustments . . . any more than we've been able to do so in the past. As before, the heavy bite will come out of profits, at a time when profits are already too low for the proper support of business.

This is one reason I get up tight when I hear demands for profit ceilings and profit controls . . . and when people urge more expanded tax programs whose prime target is industry's profit base. Profit is not only the incentive to stay in business, profit is the ability to stay in business. Without profit, businesses fail and everyone loses, especially workers . . . union members or not.

Let's look more closely at some of the AFL-CIO urgings. First, their program of "tax loophole closing." Their economists say this would generate another \$20 billion annually in tax revenues. What they're after is immediate elimination of what they term "three business tax give-aways" in the Revenue Act of '71. Here they're talking about

investment credit, accelerated depreciation and DISC . . . or the Domestic International Sales Corporation. The claim is that these "give-aways" cost the Treasury and the American taxpayer \$7 billion a year.

This is a perfect example of how to talk out of both sides of your mouth. If industry doesn't gain the cash flow provided by investment credits and accelerated depreciation provisions . . . business cannot expand properly. Without them, we wouldn't have been able to expand capacity and employment. And obviously, this would have been a damaging blow to all levels of workers in business—and their families!

What AFL-CIO obviously overlooks is a basic fundamental about our profit system: profits require investment . . . and investment requires profits.

Prosperity for every American worker comes essentially from production. Production comes from tools. Tools come from invested money . . . which usually comes from profit. Thus, the real heroes of our private enterprise system are 31 million investor stockholders and many more million indirect owners of business and insurance policies. In their search for profits, they've helped create companies, provided tools, provided jobs, built towns, built our nation.

Thus, capital spending is a key to economic growth, and this is why capital investment is so important. When the AFL-CIO asks our government to eliminate capital investment incentives for business, they're cutting off the life blood of business, which produces 77% of the gross national product and generates 87% of personal and corporate incomes taxes.

We know very well that low profits slow down our ability to improve our economy. Private investments are not made in those companies or industries who can't provide investors with a good return on their investment. Father Hogan, noted steel economist from Fordham University, recently discussed the imminent danger of our industry losing our market mechanisms . . . particularly if our government fails to let prices determine the balance between steel supply and demand.

If companies in our industry don't begin planning new additions within the next year, demand could well outstrip supply as early as '76. Father Hogan says. But, in order for us to invest in the facilities we need, we must be able to achieve today at least a 5 1/2 to 6% return on sales.

Stu Cort of Bethlehem Steel recently noted it would take years and billions of dollars to duplicate the expansion American mills undertook during the mid-60's.

But, he said, and I certainly agree with him, "Unless our industry gets two or three profitable years under its belt, it's not going to have the capital capability to take advantage of the growth in the domestic market."

The AFL-CIO is also after Congress to "eliminate tax subsidies for corporations investing and profiting overseas." They claimed that "these loopholes cost over \$3 billion in annual tax revenues . . . are contributing to export of U.S. jobs . . . erosion of America's industrial base . . . and the blighting of American communities." It takes pure gall to suggest these things.

The AFL-CIO has not produced any studies backing up these contentions. Nor do I know of anyone else who has, either. But a Business International Survey of 125 U.S. manufacturing companies categorically refutes AFL-CIO's contentions. Their recently completed study clearly shows that foreign investment creates jobs at home . . . permits overall sales volume . . . increases U.S. exports . . . stimulates investments at home . . . and produces chiefly for overseas markets those products that couldn't be sold profitably from the U.S.

More important, foreign investment im-

proves our balance of trade, as clearly shown in the Department of Commerce recent Survey of Current Business report.

Another action the AFL-CIO recommends is for Congress to kill the tax exemption for interest income from state and local bonds. They claim this provision benefits only banks and the very wealthy. They say nothing about the fact that this is perhaps the best possible way for states and municipalities to generate funds. And they say nothing about the fact that banks are often repositories for pension and profit sharing trusts . . . designed as retirement aids to workers.

And, as many of you in the room know, banks are extending programs of living trusts to moderate-income individuals . . . many of whom pay regular union dues.

Therefore, any action that reduces bank income from its investments will ultimately also have a great impact on those whose funds are being managed by banks.

And, now, for one of my final points, let's look at the AFL-CIO's call for a tax on excess profits . . . whatever excess profits are. As far as I'm concerned, there's no such things. How in goodness name could you define what excess is? For several decades now, the idea of "excess profits" has been growing in American economic thought . . . particularly on campuses and in labor unions. Evidently, the false concept has now gained a foothold on AFL-CIO thinking. Since this labor organization represents a sizeable portion of American workers, the situation has become serious enough to challenge. When they adopt the false premise of "taxing excess profits" . . . whatever this might be . . . they betray the very system upon which workers and all consumers depend. We must set the record straight.

Obviously, someone doesn't understand that the consumer is the only source of business revenues . . . any tax is a business expense . . . just as wages and raw materials are a business expense. The customer and the worker pay tax costs through higher prices.

Somehow, we in America have to convince the consumer that every action he takes to make business a tax collection agency ups the cost of his or her new car, TV set, or utility bill—and is directly related to the decline in the number of jobs.

Thus, an excess profit tax is just another way of taxing consumers. Last year Interlake paid \$9,398,000 in state, Federal, and foreign income taxes. Our other tax payments in the U.S. alone amounted to another \$10.8 million. Our net earnings were \$13 million, equal to a profit of 3.2% on sales and 6.2% on shareholders' equity. Wages and benefit expenses took 33¢ of our revenue dollar.

Wheeling-Pittsburgh paid in federal, state and local taxes \$15,442,000, and net income was \$15,197,000. In other words, Wheeling's taxes were more than its income.

Then, if you take a look at National Steel . . . it paid \$89,888,513 in taxes, while its net income was \$71,176,529 . . . that's \$8.7 million more in taxes than income.

Obviously, the companies hardly seem opportune places to begin a search for excess profits.

Looked at more broadly, the average American corporation earned about 4.2¢ on every dollar of sales in 1972 . . . about 1/10 of a cent more than in 1971 and about 2/10 of a cent more than in 1970.

By contrast, personal income in the first quarter of 1973 amounted to slightly more than \$1 trillion—roughly 28% higher than \$785 billion in the first quarter of '70. Average factory workers' pay in March, 1973 amounted to \$162.38—about 25% higher than the comparable level three years earlier.

Surely the 5% increase in corporate earnings over the last three years is not out of

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

line with the 28% growth in personal income and the 25% rise in factory pay.

It seems obvious that if we could hold factory pay increases and overall consumer income growth in line with the piddling progress in corporate earnings, we'd take a giant step toward harnessing inflation.

This brings me to my final point for the evening . . . the foolish recommendation that a ceiling be placed on profits. Nothing could be farther from national interest than to restrict the profit incentive.

Nothing contributes so much to the prosperity and happiness of America as high profits.

Generally, the man who improves his skill or works harder and thereby gets a better wage is—somehow—regarded as having a noble aspiration . . . and is encouraged to go to it. However, even this type of enterprise has its critics today.

Yet, on the other hand, the same man who risks his own dollars and sets up a business enterprise, in order to earn profit, is often viewed as motivated by a lower, or even an evil, motive.

Actually, they are both self-gain motives. The man. And the man with his company. Thus the profit system is, indeed, a two-profit system . . . Not one-sided as the AFL-CIO suggests. Employee and employer both gain. There must be a mutual reward at the end for effort.

That's what it should be all about.

But it isn't anymore. Security is becoming a paramount value in our way of life. Serious discussion and legislation is underway around the proposition that income should be divorced from work . . . that everyone should have a guaranteed and comfortable income . . . regardless of whether or not he chooses to work.

If anything else, this is a headlong flight from adult responsibility . . . straight into the arms of an all-mothering state or all-paternalistic government.

Apart from diminishing the dignity of man . . . one of the unhappy aspects from such a flight from responsibility is that it's only a delusion. At best, such a Day of Dreaming will only lead to a shocking Day of Reality.

In our world, no one and nothing can guarantee security or wash away sorrows or difficulties. People can't be sheltered from the abrasive realities of personal economic and moral imperatives. Food stamps, poverty programs and government hand-outs will never get it done in the long run.

People must do it themselves if they want to be free . . .

CONGRESSIONAL ATTITUDES ON WATERGATE

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 30, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the results of a recent poll taken by the Washington Post which appeared in that paper on Sunday, July 8, 1973. This poll concerns congressional attitudes toward the personal involvement of the President in the Watergate affair, and tabulates House and Senate responses regarding various proposed Presidential sanctions.

I hope my colleagues find the following results as interesting as I have.

CONGRESS AND THE WATERGATE

(By Haynes Johnson)

Congress, at this point in the Watergate affair, appears sharply divided along party

lines both on the question of President Nixon's personal involvement in the scandal and on whether he should remain in office.

Of 218 members of Congress who responded to a special Washington Post survey, 56 per cent said they believe President Nixon participated in the Watergate cover-up and thus, by implication, that he has lied on this point. Forty-nine per cent said they believed Mr. Nixon knew of espionage-sabotage plans for his 1972 presidential campaign. And 28 per cent said they think the President knew in advance of plans for the Watergate break-in itself.

But the 41 per cent of the lawmakers who responded not only followed party lines but showed significant hesitation to act against the President.

Most Democrats responding, for example, said they believe Mr. Nixon was personally involved in the cover-up and knew of the 1972 espionage-sabotage plans carried out on his behalf. But they show great reluctance to consider impeachment. Republicans overwhelmingly said they didn't believe President Nixon was involved in the Watergate scandal and therefore were even more strongly opposed to impeachment.

On the Senate side alone, almost 100 per cent of the responding Democrats said they believe the President was aware of the 1972 espionage-sabotage plans, and all said they think he participated in the Watergate cover-up. But 56 per cent of these Democratic senators said they did not think impeachment proceedings should be brought against him.

Senate Republicans, meanwhile, expressed strong faith in the President. Of all Republican senators responding, 90 per cent said they didn't think Mr. Nixon knew of the sabotage-espionage plans, and 81 per cent said they didn't believe the President knew of the Watergate cover-up. When asked if they thought impeachment proceedings should be brought against the President, 62 per cent of the Senate Republicans answered "No."

In the House, similar party-line divisions were evident. Among House Democrats, nearly half of those responding said they believed the President knew in advance of plans for the Watergate break-in, 76 per cent thought he knew of the espionage-sabotage plans, and 88 per cent believed that he was personally involved in the cover-up.

Despite such strong views, 46 per cent of the House Democrats said they did not favor impeachment.

House Republicans, like their Senate party colleagues, lined up solidly behind the President. Of those responding to the survey, 95 per cent said they didn't believe Mr. Nixon knew of the break-in plans in advance, 81 per cent that he knew nothing about the espionage-sabotage campaign, and 71 per cent said he was unaware of the cover-up. When asked about impeachment, 81 per cent of those responding said they were opposed.

CURRENT OF BITTERNESS

The congressional portrait that emerges from the survey shows strong emotions and doubts coupled with a general recognition that all the facts are not yet known and that the final Watergate chapter is far from written. A striking number of Senate and House members from both parties carefully qualified their answers to questions by saying that either their opinions could change as more evidence is made public, or that it is simply too early to begin to judge the question of presidential involvement.

In addition, an undercurrent of bitterness ran through many of the comments. Some vented their bitterness by attacking the President, others by assailing his critics, notably those in the press and specifically this newspaper. "Many of your reporters are members of the lynch mob with only one objective in mind—destroy the President," a Republican congressman wrote. "With nothing di-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

rect you resort to inference, innuendo, hearsay and incestuous reporting [of] each other. And you want shield. Indeed!"

A Democratic congressman who said he was "not sure" whether the President should remain in office, whether he should resign, or whether impeachment proceedings should be brought, went on to explain his answer this way:

"Beyond any doubt I believe the President not only guilty of criminal acts, but guilty also of attempting to undermine the very structure of the American political system, and the Constitution, and I believe his motive was greed—for both power and money. Additionally, I doubt his mental stability. Despite this I am not sure if his removal at this time would be good for the country."

The Post survey, containing a questionnaire listing seven basic questions, was mailed to all members of Congress. In every case where possible, the questionnaires were sent to home addresses. The lawmakers were asked to answer the questions and, if they wished, to provide additional comments. They were asked not to sign their names, but merely to indicate their party and whether they were members of the House or Senate.

Questionnaires were mailed in the middle of John Dean's testimony before the Senate Select Committee investigating the Watergate scandal. The answers thus reflect congressional sentiment as of Dean's testimony but before the scheduled public appearances of former Attorney General John N. Mitchell and former presidential aides H. R. Haldeman, John Ehrlichman and Charles W. Colson later this month.

Of the 535 members of Congress, 218 responded to the survey. The party breakdown was: among Republicans, 50 per cent of the senators and 30 per cent of the House members; among Democrats, 29 per cent of the senators and 46 per cent of the House members. Thirteen of the responses were in the form of letters or incomplete questionnaires that couldn't be tabulated.

Some lawmakers thought the survey itself was an act of journalistic irresponsibility. Rep. Frank Horton, a New York Republican, called the survey "a heinous overstepping of the bounds of responsible journalism." He suggested that publishing the findings would "serve no useful purpose whatsoever and in fact would severely damage and distort the difficult and painstaking process of sorting fact from opinion in this entire sordid chapter of American history."

Sen. Ernest F. Hollings, a South Carolina Democrat, also questioned the wisdom of the survey. "I am not prudish enough to believe that off-the-record views are not frequently given but on such a sensitive and critical issue as the President's guilt or non-guilt and whether or not he should be put out of office, it doesn't serve any good purpose to obtain an off-the-record poll of the Congress. What remaining stability of the system there is is further destroyed by such a survey. It gives substance to the impression that The Washington Post is out to get the President and is doing so by bugging the minds of members who haven't got guts enough to stand up and speak their minds."

But such views were in a distinct minority. Indeed, the personal comments offered by so many Republicans and Democrats in many ways provided greater insight into present congressional attitudes than all the statistical complications of the responses, as the accompanying samples of those remarks indicate.

A STATE OF AMBIGUITY

One of the most intriguing aspects of the survey results centers on whether Congress thinks President Nixon should stay in office. When asked that question, 43 per cent of

House Republicans who responded said "Yes." But the remaining 57 per cent gave no answer. Many said it was too early to tell, and others presumably did not answer because the question was addressed only to those who believed the President was involved.

On the Senate side, a similar state of ambiguity was evident among Republicans. Fifty-seven per cent of the responding Republican senators gave no answer to that question, for the same reason.

Democratic opinion also showed some uncertainty about that crucial question. Almost a quarter of the responding House Democrats and 13 per cent of the senators gave no answer to the question.

The Post also attempted to gauge congressional attitudes toward alternative actions—whether Congress thinks the President should be censured because of Watergate, or whether he should resign. Here, again, party positions figured largely in the answers.

On the question of censure, 71 per cent of the responding House Republicans were opposed, but 24 per cent of the House Republicans gave no answer. Among Senate GOP members, 52 per cent opposed censure, but 38 per cent of them gave no answer. For the Democrats, 30 per cent in the House favored censure, with more than half giving no answer. And in the Senate, 37 per cent of the Democrats thought censure appropriate, while more than one-third had no answer.

The question of presidential resignation brought a different response. While 71 per cent of House Republicans had opposed censure, only 45 per cent were against Mr. Nixon resigning. And nearly half of the House Republicans gave no answer to that question. In the Senate, 52 per cent of responding Republicans had no answer, while nearly 10 per cent of the GOP senators said they thought Mr. Nixon should resign.

On the Democratic side, 37 per cent of the senators said he should resign, with nearly 44 per cent giving no answer. Almost half of all House Democrats responding said they believe the President should resign while nearly one-third had no answer.

GRAVE DOUBTS

The Post survey, taken at this interim point in the unfolding Watergate episode, does not answer the critical question before the country—whether Congress is prepared to impeach President Nixon. Under the Constitution, once a member of the House has introduced an impeachment resolution the customary procedure is to hold a committee investigation. If the charges are supported by the investigation, and the committee reports to the floor an impeachment resolution, the House then votes on whether to send the case to the Senate. A majority House vote is required to do so. In the Senate, a two-thirds vote of the members present is required for conviction.

But The Post survey does show that the President's congressional standing has been damaged, that opinions are volatile, that grave doubts do exist, and that the crucial point in the Watergate affair has not yet been reached.

COMPUTERIZED WATER DELIVERY SYSTEM SET FOR PHILADELPHIA

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 30, 1973

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, Philadelphia is well on the way to becoming the

July 9, 1973

first city in the world to control the treatment and delivery of water by computer.

Water Commissioner Carmen F. Guarino has announced the appointment of a "highly experienced" consulting team to develop a comprehensive automation plan for the city's water treatment plants and distribution system.

The team, which will include the local General Electric, Hercules Powder, and Foxboro companies, will be headed by Black, Crow, and Eildness, consulting engineers, of Gainesville, Fla. All of these have extensive experience in the planning and development of automation.

The consultants will, first, prepare a general automation plan; second, survey existing controls and equipment in the treatment plants for adaptation to automation; and

third design contract plans and specifications for initial automation of the Queen Lane plant and the East Park and Oak Lane Reservoirs in Philadelphia.

Computer control will be first used at the Queen Lane plant in order to gain experience. Later, automation will be extended to the Torresdale and Belmont plants, and to the microwave systems which control water delivery.

The Water Department has been studying automation for several years because it is believed to reduce operating costs, improve efficiency, and upgrade water quality.

Preliminary automation studies were made for the department by General Electric Co. between 1967 and 1972. These studies showed that computer control of water treatment was feasible.

The current consultants—working under a \$628,000 contract—will have up to 15 months to turn out "the most effective, practicable, and economical automation plan possible."

This is a pioneering effort, never done before in the waterworks field. No one firm in the country has all the skills needed for it; that is why an unusually qualified team was selected from more than a dozen applicants.

Control of water treatment and distribution by computer has not been adopted anywhere else in the world. Although computers have been used by some water systems—most notably Chicago—these merely log data on treatment and distribution. They do not regulate processes.

Automation in Philadelphia will provide for full "process control." This means that the computer will monitor water conditions flows, chemical applications, et cetera, analyze information transmitted to it by monitoring devices located in the plants and on streams, and then issue "orders" to plant equipment. All of this will be done without intervention of a human operator.

The water department's treatment plants and microwave system are already highly automated, with many "push-button" controls. Employees are required, however, to read panels, operate switches, analyze water samples, and make judgments on treatment. The computer will take over such employee activities for the most part.

COMMUNIST CHINA: ALMOST TOO GOOD TO BE TRUE

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 30, 1973

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, American newspapers have a somewhat negative tradition of overlooking the depredations of dictatorship. During the 1930's, for example, Walter Duranty was the New York Times correspondent in Moscow. He was there during Stalin's purge trials, during the forced collectivization campaign, and during the famine in the Ukraine. Yet he reported none of these things accurately to Times readers.

Instead, he became an apologist for Stalin. One example, in the Times of July 19, 1936, described the Soviet Constitution as "an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual change in the Russian people and its leaders. . . . In this 19th year of the Soviet state, there is introduced a new constitution, under which the Russian masses merge their tutelage and are called upon to receive their rights and undertake their duties as a free and democratic people."

This came to Times readers during what Eugene Lyons, in his volume, *The Red Decade*, calls ". . . the eve of the bloodiest period in Russia's history and the final confirmation of Russia's emergence as a totalitarian state. . . . Confessions were being extorted in G.P.U. cells while Duranty indited these words."

Unfortunately, during the past year, many members of the press have been having a similar romance with Communist China.

In a thoughtful article Sheila K. Johnson, a journalist and anthropologist who has lived in Hong Kong and Japan, analyzes some of the things which have been written about Communist China in recent days.

Writing in the June, 1973 issue of *Commentary*, Miss Johnson notes that:

James Reston, for instance, seems to have found in China the perfect vehicle for his nostalgia. After describing the Chinese as "engaged in one vast cooperative barn-raising," he goes on to observe that "they do it against a background of sights and sounds that tend to make Americans outrageously nostalgic and even sentimental. For example, they have plain old-fashioned steam-engine railroads. . . ." Even the normally tough-minded Barbara Tuchman is moved to note at one point: "One could almost indulge in the dream that the Chinese might close themselves off from advancing history. . . . and having got rid of the oppression of landlords and taxes and the cruelty of real want, might remain, despite the hard life, an agricultural people, for the world's sake and their own. It somehow suits them."

Miss Johnson laments that:

The whole scene is painfully reminiscent of the 1930s responses by journalists, scholars and others to Soviet Russia.

Why do American liberal intellectuals tend to overlook the millions of men and women murdered by the Chinese Communists, and the brutal tyranny they have inflicted upon China?

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

In attempting to answer this question Miss Johnson writes that:

Among scholars with a predilection for planning, the elitist tendency to identify with a country's leadership seems to be a part of their analytical equipment. . . . economists such as Wassily Leontief and John K. Galbraith favor planned economies and see any malfunctioning that results as easily remedied by still further planning. Leontief acknowledges that China is too large to be successfully administered entirely from the center. . . . He . . . approves of various manpower policies (such as sending students to live in the countryside and drafting large numbers of men and women into the army) which are then brought in to counteract "the undesirable tendencies toward inequalities. . . ."

It is shocking to see American journalists and intellectuals heaping praise upon one of the most ruthless tyrannies in the history of the world. Many, Miss Johnson suggests, have "made a career out of denouncing Asian dictatorships" only to "have come away vastly impressed by the biggest one of them all."

I wish to share with my colleagues an abridged version of Sheila K. Johnson's article from the June 1973 issue of *Commentary Magazine*, published by the American Jewish Committee, as it was reprinted in the June 10, 1973, issue of the *Washington Star-News*, and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

[From the *Sunday Star and Daily News*, June 10, 1973]

CHINA: ALMOST TOO GOOD TO BE TRUE

(By Sheila K. Johnson)

"Thronging the streets in Canton and bugging pedestrians to distraction was once the most scabrous passel of beggars this side of Calcutta. There are no beggars now. None . . . Rickshaws are gone . . . (but) if there are—as alleged—600 million people in the Middle Kingdom, then there are at least that many bikes, with all of them in action along about seven in the morning on Canton's main street.

The local hospital in Canton is as modern an institution as could be found in New York, London, or anywhere. . . . Doctors are produced after three years of medical training. There are also great numbers of medical functionaries called by a phrase that translates into 'barefoot doctor,' pretty much what are called 'para-medicals' in the Western world. . . . I presented myself to the acupuncturist. My problem (a sore hip) was explained through an interpreter. I was placed prone on a surgical table and the doctor—an intent 30-year-old type with thick-thick glasses—probed my sitting department with his finger ends."

These descriptions all appeared in a series of five articles published on the front page of the *San Francisco Examiner*, June 12-16, 1972, by Robert Patterson, a reporter who was last in China during the late 1930s. Mr. Patterson's language may have struck some of his readers as a little slangy—no doubt one reporter's attempt to jazz up what were already familiar observations—but otherwise his reports were certainly no more skeptical or uncritical than many published elsewhere by the growing tide of Americans (more than 1,000 since President Nixon's trip in February 1972) who have visited Communist China.

There was only one small defect in Mr. Patterson's articles: in August 1972, an enterprising journalist from San Francisco's rival newspaper, the *Chronicle* discovered that Mr. Patterson had, in fact, not been granted a visa to China and that he had fled his first-

hand reports from the comfort of a Hong Kong hotel room.

I raise this case not to embarrass Mr. Patterson, who was summarily fired by his newspaper, but to ask whether his easily perpetrated hoax does not contain a moral for the consumer of other, genuine reports by visitors to Communist China.

What, precisely, is it that this endless flow of books and articles has to tell us, aside from noting that there are no files or dogs in China today, that beggars are gone, the streets are clean, the fields tilled, the peasants well-fed, and the children looked-after—all impressive, but hardly news. The fact is that beyond these surface observations, most visitors are offering us a heady mixture of their personal reactions and enthusiasms.

James Reston, for instance, seems to have found in China the perfect vehicle for his nostalgia. After describing the Chinese as "engaged in one vast cooperative barn-raising," he goes on to observe that "they do it against a background of sights and sounds that tend to make Americans outrageously nostalgic and even sentimental. For example, they have plain old-fashioned steam-engine railroads—what Tom Wicker would call the real thing—with big red wheels and red cow catchers, and engines that pant and snort in station and run with a red glow through the night, and dining cars where the cook comes back and negotiates your dinner, and compartments with fans and lace antimacassars on the seats, and long lonely whistles that trouble your sleep."

Other visitors evidently see in China a perfect example of the well-planned, well-run socialist society that eluded them in Russia. Writes Harrison Salisbury: "It seemed to me that Russia had lost the spark of its Revolution. That it had been overtaken by materialism. The young people chased Western fads like butterfiles—the latest song, the latest dance, the latest style. Hippie clothing. Hippie haircuts. Drugs. They were trying to ape the Western drug culture. It was hard to see what remnants of the Revolution were left. Soviet foreign policy differed hardly an iota from Czarist foreign policy. I could not but feel that when the Chinese called the Soviet rulers the 'new Czars' they had touched a very elemental truth. But in China, there was something new. I agreed with those who said that the greatest change in China was in the spirit of the people."

When not engaged in making invidious comparisons between China and the Soviet Union, some visitors delight in pointing out how much better China is run than the United States or other capitalist societies. Wassily Leontief was so inspired by the large, neat fields of the communes that he contrasts them to the messy villages and fields of Hong Kong's New Territories, which he describes as "typical examples of the rural squalor one is accustomed to seeing in India and Puerto Rico, or closer to home, in poor backward areas of the old South." (Actually, these New Territories villages are extraordinarily prosperous, most of the farmers having turned their rice paddies into truck farms, orchards, and fish hatcheries to supply the urban markets of Hong Kong.)

John K. Galbraith notes that in China "medicines have become very cheap. Common antibiotics are available without prescription. Our highly organized extortion being absent, their cost is nominal. The Pill is free. Frank (Tobin) said, 'It's too bad Estes Kefauver (who made cheaper drugs a crusade) never lived to get to China.'"

Still another group of economists is asked by a barefoot doctor to describe medical care in the United States and responds with a recital about "long medical training; not enough medical people to serve the people; charging high prices; emergency treatment without prevention; crisis in rural areas es-

pecially; most doctors are in big cities; few women MD's, primarily (doing) only 'women's work' of obstetrics, gynecology or pediatrics; male nurses called 'sissies'; social disease rampant (i.e.) VD, drug addiction, environmental-respiratory ailments, lead poisoning." The barefoot doctor is so shocked that she comments, "This account of U.S. medicine today reminds us of Chinese medicine before Liberation!"

Finally, still other visitors to China seem to be overcome by a new-found sense of revolutionary camaraderie. For example, Prof. Arthur Galston, a biologist at Yale who together with his wife and daughter spent a few weeks working on a commune, writes that "Our reaction to this hard work regimen surprises us. We are exhilarated by it; we enjoy working together with a group engaged in a mutual, productive effort. We find our appreciation for small things, like tomatoes and cucumbers, heightened by our familiarity with the problems associated with their production. We also feel that the distressing problems of the world, in which we were so recently immersed, have receded and that what is really important is getting the wheat harvested before the rains come, getting the vegetables irrigated before the drought damages them, and increasing the welfare and happiness of our friends on the commune."

What is one to make of this sudden burst of enthusiasm for China? David Caute, in his recent book "The Fellow-Travelers: A Postscript to the Enlightenment," has explored the similar wave of euphoric visitors' reports that came out of the Soviet Union during the 1920s and 30s. He attributes the visitors' admiration for Soviet social planning and their readiness to ignore purges, forced labor, and the political control of all aspects of the society to their infatuation with the ideals of the Enlightenment: "It signified a return to the 18th-century vision of a rational, educated, and scientific society based on the maximization of resources and the steady improvement (if not perfection) of human nature as visualized by objective, unprejudiced brains."

However, Caute also notes that most of these enthusiasts for Russia were true believers in the doctrine of socialism in one country—that is, a country other than their own. Thus Lincoln Steffens, while comfortably ensconced on the Riviera, wrote that "I am for them to the last drop, I am a patriot for Russia; the future is there. . . . But I don't want to live there. It is too much like serving in an army at war with no mercy for the weak."

In a similar vein, John G. Galbraith recently pronounced that "The Chinese economy isn't the American or the European future. But it is the Chinese future. And let there be no doubt: For the Chinese, it works." Caute calls this fellow-traveling, which he defines as "commitment at a distance which is not only geographical but also emotional and intellectual . . . remote-control radicalism."

It would, of course, be unfair to label all current visitors to China as fellow-travelers, for their reactions are often highly personal and complex. This is particularly true of Chinese-Americans, who constitute the largest and most knowledgeable group of current visitors to China but who are almost never heard from in the mass media.

There are various reasons for their silence. Some have gone primarily with business interests in mind; if trade with the mainland is to be resumed they hope to be among the first to import foodstuffs, antiques, and handicrafts. Others have gone to see relatives and are unwilling to air publicly what their relatives may have said to them, both for fear of harming them and because they themselves may wish to pay a return visit.

Still other, often older, Chinese-Americans come away tongue-tied as a result of their ambivalence toward the new China. On the one hand they are impressed; things look so

much better than they did during the civil war, when most of them left. On the other hand, there are many disquieting signs, such as the reticence or "unavailability" of their former friends, usually intellectuals or members of the "bourgeois" class.

Among the reporters currently visiting and writing about China there is also a great diversity of outlook. The most perceptive and sensible have been men with long years of experience reporting Asian, particularly Chinese, events—men such as Tillman Durdin, Seymour Topping, Stanley Karnow, and Theodore White.

Joseph Alsop claims status as an "old China hand" by virtue of his World War II experience in China, but he seems to have spent the last 20 years in a set of ideological blinders of his own making, with the paradoxical result that when he finally removed them reality did not enlighten but totally dazzled him. It is rather odd, at all events, to see a man who 10 years ago called China "an internment camp" and who compared the Communist regime to "the Ch'in and Sui dynasties, both police regimes, both regimes which reintegrated and remade China, and both doomed to early extinction because the burdens they imposed on the Chinese people were grossly excessive," argue today that if the Soviets start a war with China, the United States should intervene on the Chinese side.

By a strange path of convergence, no doubt connected with his years as a Russian correspondent, Harrison Salisbury also returned from China wildly pro-Chinese and anti-Soviet. And James Reston, who has made a career out of denouncing Asian dictatorships, seems to have come away vastly impressed by the biggest one of them all.

While it is disturbing to find evidence of bias, naivete, or opportunism in the journalistic world, the situation among academics is much worse, partly because of a conscious policy by Peking. Scholars who are ethnically Chinese have been freely granted visas, regardless of their previous Kuomintang connections or present political opinions, because Peking is trying to woo all Overseas Chinese away from their support for Taiwan.

But when it comes to "white" American scholars, China has made a definite policy of favoring scholars known to be "friendly" to the regime. Among the friendlies has been a group that calls itself the Committee of Concerned Asian Scholars (CCAS), which has so far sent two delegations to China, the first of which was granted a long interview with Chou En-lai.

The CCAS was formed in 1968 by graduate students and young faculty members specializing in Chinese studies chiefly at those few universities that have major China centers: Harvard, Columbia, the University of California at Berkeley, Stanford, and the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor. Their stated purpose was to oppose the "brutal aggression of the United States in Vietnam and . . . the complicity or silence of our profession with regard to that policy." Since their founding they have devoted themselves to research designed to demonstrate that the United States is an imperialist power in Asia and that it started the Korean, as well as the Vietnamese war; that modern Japan is once again a militarist nation posing a grave threat to China; and that in contemporary China we see the best of all possible societies.

Aside from radical scholars such as those affiliated with the CCAS a few politically nonaligned China specialists have been allowed to visit China; they include Professors John K. Fairbank and Jerry Cohen (Harvard), Michael Oksenberg (Columbia), Doak Barnett (Brookings Institution), Alexander Eckstein (Michigan), Lucian Fye (MIT), John Lewis (Stanford), and Robert Scalapino (California).

What scholars such as Doak Barnett and others like him are beginning to publish about their visits to China is a good deal more balanced and better informed than anything we have yet read in the mass media. Nevertheless, many of them privately concede that their visits did not provide any major new insights in Communist China as a society.

Prof. Rhoads Murphey, a Sinologist at the University of Michigan who visited China in May 1972 as a member of an American Friends Service Committee delegation (and who also served as a member of a Friends Ambulance Unit in China from 1942 until 1946), has written that "virtually everything I saw and heard was in effect like 'China Reconstructs' (a glossy Chinese propaganda magazine) come to life . . . I do not come away feeling that American scholars of China are missing an enormous dimension by not being able to visit the country themselves under the conditions which appear to govern virtually all foreign visitors. . . . One sees only the surface, and it is extremely difficult if not impossible to get beyond it except in terms of visual details, which of course do have some importance, but hardly constitute an important new dimension of intellectual understanding."

Part of the reason why many travelers to China end up identifying themselves with the current leadership and reflecting its viewpoints lies in the nature of the trip itself. Foreign visitors are kept in separate hotels, whisked from place to place in curtained limousines, briefed by high officials, and wined and dined by government and party leaders.

I do not mean to imply that experienced journalists such as Reston, Salisbury, and Alsop, who have interviewed many famous world figures, are necessarily swept off their feet by such treatment, but in China they have no opportunity to gather other sorts of data independently either from private citizens or dissident government factions. (It is often pointed out that Westerners learned very little about the inner workings of Soviet Russia until Trotsky went into exile.)

Thus there is a strangely sycophantic tone to many of the books and articles currently being written about China—viz. Alsop: "(Chou En-lai) moves like a young man, and the years have failed to blur the remarkable bold, yet fine-cut lines of his face. It is a face, too, with more expression than most Chinese permit themselves. By turns, he is genial or stern, wryly amused or deeply serious. Overall, he conveys a memorable impression of inner strength combined with lucid intelligence."

Or Harrison Salisbury: "I was fortunate enough to spend evenings with two of this remarkable company (of Chinese leaders), Premier Chou En-lai and Mme. Soong, and I concluded that if all of China's leadership was as vigorous, as sparkling and sharp-witted, China was not ill-served by relying on age rather than youth. . . . As each course was served, Mme. Soong rose in her chair . . . and insisted on serving me, as is the Chinese custom. . . . Soon we were eating enormous prawns, and then a Peking fish. . . . The dinner went on and on, from one delight to another."

Only Barbara Tuchman seems to have been driven to the point of churlishness by all of this care and attention lavished on her by China's upper-crust. She writes: "We made the acquaintance of five or six of these comrades (Vice-Chairmen of Provincial Revolutionary Committees) at dinners which the Association for Friendship with Foreign Countries, our sponsoring escorts, insisted on giving in each city to welcome visiting 'foreign friends' (the new official designation for all foreigners). In the presence of the local commissar as presiding host, subordinates hardly venture a word; conversational attempts are left to the guests through an interpreter. The commissar, genial but bored,

confines himself to the toast-drinking routine and suavely avoids any conversation above the level of 'How long have you been in China?' and 'How long will you stay?' These men, at least those we met, do not convey an impression of quality above the union-boss level."

Among scholars with a predilection for planning, the elitist tendency to identify with a country's leadership seems to be a part of their analytical equipment. Lewis Feuer has commented on this phenomenon in connection with the appeal that Soviet Russia held for social workers: "At the very outset, Jane Addams called the Russian Revolution 'the greatest social experiment in history.' This enthusiasm became universal among her colleagues during the next years. In the new Soviet society, as they saw it, the social worker was not the 'do-gooder' condescendingly tolerated by a selfish world but was rather the foremost participant and definer of the society's goals".

In a similar vein, economists such as Wassily Leontief and John K. Galbraith favor planned economies and see any malfunctioning that results as easily remedied by still further planning. Leontief acknowledges that China is too large to be successfully administered entirely from the center, and so he approves of the current emphasis on making regions and communes more self-sufficient. He equally approves of various manpower policies (such as sending students to live in the countryside and drafting large numbers of men and women into the army) which are then brought into play to counteract "the undesirable tendencies toward inequalities which a single-minded emphasis on self-help might bring about."

John K. Galbraith is aware that in a highly organized economy, "organization is by its nature hierarchical—it is a built-in class system in which some command, many comply. The officer class has also a tendency to harden into a privileged and self-perpetuating caste which invites the next revolt." But fortunately, he says, the Chinese leaders have found a solution to this problem; the Cultural Revolution; and "there is a hint in the thought of Mao Tse-tung that a periodic churning-up is necessary."

Although such attitudes are clearly elitist—"I, in my wisdom (in concert with the Chinese leadership), know what is best for the Chinese masses"—they are often defended as being anti-elitist. Thus the CCAS finds nothing disturbing about the disappearance of short stories, poetry, and other kinds of creative writing in China today, because "as long as there are millions of partly educated peasants and workers and some highly educated people at the top of a cultural and educational bureaucracy, a culture based on literature will continue to be an elite culture."

And when Ross Terrill expresses some concern over the fate of Chinese intellectuals, Neville Maxwell chides him for being a bourgeois intellectual whose "sympathy [is] that of a member of one elite for those of an elite deprived or an elite *manque*." One must remember, in dealing with such terminological reversals, that Maxwell and other members of the CCAS are indulging in a remote-control radicalism and that they might not be nearly so sanguine were the locomotive of history running over their own young bodies.

In the case of China, perhaps the most depressing illustration has been the praise lavished by so many Western intellectuals on the so-called May 7th Schools. These institutions, created during the Cultural Revolution, are labor camps where party officials, intellectuals, and bureaucrats are sent to learn the value of working with their hands and to reform their thoughts.

Many foreign visitors have been taken to a model May 7th School in the eastern out-

skirts of Peking, which Harrison Salisbury has cheerfully described as "a combination of a YMCA Camp and a Catholic retreat." Here, according to other sanguine reports, "The work is certainly hard, though probably not intolerable. Only three days a week are spent in the field . . . The other two days are spent in collective discussion and self-criticisms." (There is something wrong here on the surface, since no one in China adheres to the five-day week.)

The CCAS is convinced that doing time in a May 7th School is not a form of punishment and writes that soon all Chinese officials, intellectuals, and bureaucrats will be sent there periodically for what they placidly refer to as "a revolutionary sabbatical." They also think it would be a wonderful idea for American bureaucrats—"Can you imagine bureaucrats who administer the American government's poverty program ever leaving their isolation in Washington and going to live for even a few months in Appalachia?"—though they say nothing about the desirability of rusticating American students and intellectuals to, say, Utah and Wyoming.

However, John K. Galbraith thinks that "rotating a few professors [of economics] through General Motors, Young and Rubicam, Procter and Gamble, and ITT would be a wonderful corrective of the myths of the stalwart individual entrepreneur, the sovereign unmanaged consumer, and a government superior to all economic interest—all these being thoughts which we now perpetuate. A spell in the factory might consolidate relations between student supporters of George McGovern and the minions of George Meany."

Harrison Salisbury claims to have met one Chinese official who described his stint in a May 7th School as "the great experience of my life" and praised it for having rid him of selfishness and his tendency to think of his life in individual terms. Salisbury goes on to comment, "And it was true. I knew it had to be true from the emotion in his voice, the reverence with which he spoke." Again, evidently only Barbara Tuchman, visiting a May 7th School in Shensi, noticed "the sad, subdued look and remote eyes of a gray-haired surgeon from the leading hospital of the provincial capital, suggest[ing] that the process does not always work."

At least in part fellow-traveling reports about China appear to be identical in motive and message to those emanating from the Soviet Union during the 1930s. There is the same yearning to see—even if it takes rose-colored spectacles and some selective blind-spots—the perfect society leading, in turn to the perfection of man himself. (Marxist-Leninists do not believe in any intrinsic human nature apart from its shaping by society; Maoists are a little less clear on this point since according to Mao "bourgeois elements" may emerge even when there is no bourgeois class to nurture them.)

This search for a better society is usually given impetus by a profound disillusionment or disgust with one's own. During the 30's, the Depression convinced many people that democratic capitalism was a hopelessly inadequate form of social organization. Today, the Vietnam war, crime, drug addiction, and other social problems serve much the same function. One sees this in the writings of many of the current visitors to China. Salisbury writes that "I had convinced myself that there was in China a new spirit among men, a contagious spirit, one on which China could build. But could America match it? . . . When would the New American Man and the New American Woman walk the earth, proud and confident, making the oceans boil and the continents shake?"

And John Fairbank concludes, "If their [the people of China] highly organized and moralistic efforts at regeneration are to be

stigmatized as regimentation, then we must ask whether our own unregimented efforts are equally adequate to our far different needs and circumstances." Even Henry Kissinger is recently quoted as saying that he likes the Chinese because they have a *Weltanschauung*. The rest of us have lost our way."

One senses, in such musings, a yearning for complete national unity and perfect order—aspects of totalitarianism that have long attracted intellectuals as diverse as Ezra Pound, George Bernard Shaw, and Herbert Marcuse. It may be that the stresses and ambivalences of modern American life have produced on the Left of the political spectrum impulses similar to those now popular on the Right, and that, since it would not be politically acceptable for leftists to couch such impulses in Agnewish calls for law and order, or Wallaceite attacks on bureaucrats and "pointy-headed" intellectuals, they find respectable expression through an admiration for Chinese society.

China is neat, clean, orderly, China has no drug or crime problem, no pornography, no shoddy consumer goods; Chinese bureaucrats and intellectuals know how to work with their hands. The appeal of China to members of the American Left also coincides with the rural commune movement in this country and the strong desire of many college dropouts to return to the land and live a simpler life.

It is, of course, ironic that many of the measures that would bring about a more Chinese-like society in our own country—the social control of promiscuity, the banning of pornographic literature, the arrest of drug users, and the putting of all personal choices about career, work place, or life-style into the hands of the state—are things to which the Left is violently opposed.

Finally, the current enthusiasm for China also draws on a much older, religious strand in American thought which dates back to the missionary movement of the 19th century, when Americans heard in church every Sunday about the industrious, long-suffering Chinese and were encouraged to help save this "Niagara of souls passing into the dark in China." This missionary-inspired idealization of the Chinese peasant—formerly so prominent in the works of writers such as Pearl Buck and Alice Tisdale Hobart—can once again be found in much of the current writing.

Unfortunately, as Harold Isaacs long ago pointed out in his excellent study "Images of Asia," such one-sided stereotypes are less dependent on facts than on the predispositions of the viewer; hence they can change almost overnight.

The Chinese went from being regarded as hard-working, honest, and frugal during the pre-war and World War II years to being thought of as sneaky, arrogant, and cruel during the 50s and 60s and war years; whereas as the postwar period brought about their redefinition as hard-working, honest, and frugal.

It is even possible that these two polar-opposite stereotypes of East Asians are somehow linked in our minds and that when China is up, Japan will be down, and vice versa. Certainly many Asian specialists are disturbed once again to catch a distinctly anti-Japanese tone in the voices of many recent visitors to China, including Richard Nixon and Henry Kissinger. Thus the euphoria over China is not merely misleading in and of itself, but is also likely to have repercussions in our relations with Japan and the Soviet Union.

No one wishes to suggest that improved relations with China are not desirable and long overdue, but to mistake a marriage of convenience for a love-match may lead to much unhappiness for everyone in the future.