

from Idaho that the cattle raisers of New Mexico have decided that they would offer to the Senator from Idaho half a beef as a part of this challenge. I say that with some reluctance, because it seems to me that I am getting the worse end of the bargain. I hope we get the potatoes. I had hoped I would get the beef. But since I am not getting it, I am telling the Senator that our cattle growers will give the Senator from Idaho half a beef.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLURE. I yield.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. With all the acrimony that seems to be developing in this heated discussion, I hope that the Chair will insist that the rules be followed and that the Senators address each other in the third person—not in the second person.

Mr. DOMENICI. We thank the Senator.

Mr. McCLURE. I thank the Senator for interjecting that comment because the comments of the Senator from New Mexico really did raise my blood pressure for just a minute when he suggested that New Mexico beef was worthy of comparison with Idaho potatoes. We have been resisting the impulse of a number of people in New Mexico to export Idaho beef to them. We had to adopt an antibusing provision to prevent that a few years ago.

While the challenge is equal, the wager is not equal. The J. R. Simplot of Boise, Idaho, agreed to provide the potatoes in the unlikely event that Idaho State should lose, and I do regard that as an unlikely event. We will accept the unequal offer the Senator has made, but I want to make one other suggestion. In spite of the fact that New Mexico cattle are thought by most people in Idaho to be inferior, not only to Idaho potatoes but also to our Idaho cattle, the other half of the beef might be sent to the State of Texas. I hear the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) is in desperate need of some Hamburger Helper to hold up that so-called Texas chili he is bragging about, but maybe that would give Senator GOLDWATER too much of an advantage in that contest that is brewing.

Mr. DOMENICI. The Senator from New Mexico wants to tell the Senator from Idaho that there is only one reason that New Mexicans would consider eat-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ing Idaho potatoes, and that came about because the price of pinto beans has gone to \$60 to \$70 a hundredweight.

I would like to share the dilemma in which I find myself which would make the potatoes so welcome. It will be remembered that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK) led the fight for Senators not to get a pay raise. I am reporting today to the Senator from Idaho that I may deal with him. I told him I would support his measure, but if he prevailed I would give him six of my children to support. He prevailed and he then showed the sense of a good lawyer and found our deal was unenforceable.

I am met now with a very serious problem that I share with the Senator from Idaho because even though we are not accustomed to eating Idaho potatoes in New Mexico, the potatoes will be welcomed by Nancy and PETE DOMENICI.

Mr. McCLURE. I look forward to accepting the substandard beef of New Mexico that may come my way. I am sure the Senator will find the hospitality of the people of Idaho is unmatched, except when your team will submit to Idaho State University tomorrow night in Pocatello, Idaho.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLURE. I yield.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. What will happen in cases of a tie?

Mr. McCLURE. I would say to the Senator from West Virginia I think it is very unlikely that it will be even close to a tie.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. In the event of a tie I would invite the two Senators to participate in one of West Virginia's ramp festivals. The delicacy is most delectable—as well as memorable.

Mr. DOMENICI. In the event of a tie I will keep the beef.

PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senate will convene on Monday at 12 o'clock noon. After the two leaders or their designees have been recognized under the standing order there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to exceed 30 minutes, with statements limited therein to 5 minutes each.

At the conclusion of routine morning business the Senate will resume consid-

eration of the bill (S. 3066), the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974. Any record votes on amendments to that bill will occur no earlier than 2:30 p.m., with a vote on final passage to occur at not later than 5 p.m. on Monday.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 11, 1974

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if the distinguished assistant Republican leader has no further business, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and at 3:25 p.m., the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 11, 1974, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 8, 1974:

INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION

The following-named persons to be Members of the Board of Directors of the Inter-American Foundation for the terms indicated:

For the remainder of the term expiring September 20, 1976

Jack B. Kubisch, of Michigan, vice Charles A. Meyer.

For a term expiring September 20, 1978

John Michael Hennessy, of Massachusetts, vice John A. Hannah.

For a term expiring October 6, 1978

Charles A. Meyer, of Illinois, vice Luis A. Ferre, term expired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 8, 1974:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Martin R. Hoffmann, of Virginia, to be General Counsel of the Department of Defense.

M. David Lowe, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Jack Franklin Bennett, of Connecticut, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury.

Allan Stephen Ryan, of New York, to be assayer of the U.S. Assay Office at New York, N.Y.

(The above nominations were approved subject to the nominees's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

LETTER TO SOVIET LEADERS

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 8, 1974

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, there was published in the March 3 issue of the London Sunday Times an interesting letter addressed to the men who rule Russia written by Alexander Solzhenitsyn.

In view of the considerable interest in the writer of this letter by several Members of this body I believe it is appro-

priate to have it inserted in the appendix of the RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

LETTER TO THE SOVIET LEADERS—SOLZHENITSYN SPEAKS: WORLD EXCLUSIVE

Today we print one of the most remarkable and eloquent documents of our time: an impassioned letter from Alexander Solzhenitsyn to the men who rule Russia. It was dispatched six months ago and still awaits an answer. It is published now in full with the writer's complete approval and for the first time. It is his first public state-

ment since his exile: a testament of astonishing power, with uncanny relevance to our own problems in the West. In it Solzhenitsyn denounces the cardinal folly of pursuing an expansionist foreign policy when there is nothing to fear from Europe and America. He calls for an accommodation with China. He deplores the mindless policy of economic growth which has despoiled the beauty of Russia's cities and ruined the tranquillity of her countryside. He reiterates that the real wealth of Russia lies in her own soil. He pours scorn on the dead creed of Marxism. He claims that the Russians drink far too much vodka. He advocates the end of national service, and says promotion should not depend on party membership. He pleads for kindness from Russia's rulers and peace for its citizen.

March 8, 1974

I do not hold out much hope that you will be well disposed to examine ideas not formally solicited by you, although they come from a fellow-countryman of a rare kind. He is one who does not stand on a ladder subordinate to your command, who can be neither dismissed from his post, nor demoted, nor promoted, nor rewarded by you. He is therefore one from whom you are almost certain to hear an opinion sincerely voiced, without any careerist calculations, such as you are unlikely to hear from even the finest experts in your bureaucracy. I do not hold out much hope, but I shall try to say what is most important in a short space, namely, to set out what I hold to be for the good and salvation of our people, to which all of you—and I myself—belong.

That was no slip of the tongue. I wish all peoples well, and the closer they are to us and the more dependent upon us, the more fervent is my wish. But it is the fate of the Russian and Ukrainian peoples that preoccupies me above all, for, as the proverb says: It's where you're born that you can be most useful. And there is a deeper reason, too: the incomparable sufferings of our people.

I am writing this letter on the SUPPOSITION that you too are swayed by this primary concern, that you are not alien to your origins, to your fathers, grandfathers, and great-grandfathers, to the expanse of your homeland; and that you are conscious of your nationality. If I am mistaken, there is no point in your reading the rest of this letter.

I am not about to plunge into the harrowing details of the last sixty years. I try to explain the slow course of our history and what sort of one it has been in my books, which I doubt if you have read or will ever read. But it is to you in particular that I address this letter, in order to set out my view of the future, which seems to me correct, and perhaps to convince you all the same. And to suggest to you what is, for the moment at least, still a timely way out of the chief dangers facing our country in the next ten to thirty years.

These dangers are: war with China, and our destruction together with Western civilisation in the crush and stench of a fouled earth.

1. THE WEST ON ITS KNEES

Neither after the Crimean War, nor, more recently, after the war with Japan, nor in 1916, 1931 or 1941, would even the most unbridled patriotic soothsayer have dared to set forth so arrogant a prospect: that the time was approaching, indeed, was close at hand, when all the great European powers taken together would cease to exist as a serious physical force; that their rulers would resort to all manner of concessions simply to win the favour of the rulers of the future Russia, would even vie with one another to gain that favour, just so long as the Russian Press would stop abusing them; and that they would grow so weak, without losing a single war; that countries proclaiming themselves "neutral" would seek every opportunity to gratify us and pander to us; that our eternal dream of controlling straits, although never realised, would in the event be made irrelevant by the giant strides that Russia took into the Mediterranean and the oceans; that fear of economic losses and extra administrative chores would become the arguments against Russian expansion to the West; and that even that mightiest transatlantic power, having emerged all-victorious from two world wars as the leader and provider for all mankind, would suddenly lose to a tiny, distant Asiatic country and show internal dissension and spiritual weakness.

Truly the foreign policy of Tsarist Russia never had any successes to compare with these. Even after she had won the great European war against Napoleon, she did not extend her power over eastern Europe in any way. She undertook to crush the Hungarian revolution—to help the Hapsburgs. She cov-

ered the Prussian rear in 1866 and 1870 without gaining anything in exchange—that is, she disinterestedly advance the power of the German states. They, on the other hand, entangled her in a series of Balkan and Turkish wars, where she lost repeatedly, and despite her enormous resources and threatening gestures, she never did succeed in realizing the dreams of her leading circles to acquire the straits, although she entered her last (and for herself fatal) war with precisely this as her chief aim. Tsarist Russia often found herself carrying out other people's missions quite unconnected with her own. Many of her foreign policy blunders were the result of a lack of practical calculation at the top and a cumbersome, bureaucratic diplomatic service, but they also seem at times to have been connected with a certain streak of idealism in the thinking of her rulers, which hindered them from taking a consistent line in defence of the national self-interest.

Soviet diplomacy has rid itself of all these weaknesses root and branch. It knows how to make demands, exact concessions, simply get things, in ways that Tsarism never knew. In terms of its actual achievements it might even be regarded as brilliant; in fifty years, with only one large-scale war, which it won from a position no whit more advantageous than that of the other participants, it rose from a country riven by civil strife to a super-power before which the entire world trembles. There have been some particularly striking moments when success was piled on success. For instance, at the end of the Second World War, when Stalin, who had always easily outplayed Roosevelt, outplayed Churchill, too, and not only got all he wanted in Europe and Asia, but also got back (probably to his own surprise) the hundreds of thousands of Soviet citizens in Austria and Italy who were determined not to return home but who were betrayed by the Western allies through a combination of deceit and force. No less an achievement than Stalin's have been the successes of Soviet diplomacy in recent years: for the Western world, as a single, clearly united force, no longer counterbalances the Soviet Union, indeed has almost ceased to exist. In finding the unity, steadfastness and courage to face the Second World War, and then the reserves of strength to pull itself out of postwar ruin, Europe appears to have exhausted itself for a long time to come. For no external reasons, the victorious powers have grown weak and effete.

At the peak of such staggering successes, the last thing a person wants to hear are other people's opinions and doubts. This, of course, is the worst possible time I could have chosen to approach you with advice or exhortations. For when outward successes come thick and fast, it is the hardest thing in the world to desist from piling up more, to place limitations on oneself and to change one's whole outlook.

But this is where the wise differ from the unwise: they heed advice and counsels of caution long before the need becomes overwhelming.

Furthermore, there is much about these successes that gives little cause for self-admiration. The catastrophic weakening of the Western world and the whole of Western civilisation is by no means solely due to the success of an irresistible, persistent Soviet foreign policy. It is, rather, the result of an historical, psychological and moral crisis affecting the entire culture and world outlook which were conceived at the time of the Renaissance and attained the acme of their expression with the eighteenth-century Enlightenment. An analysis of that crisis is beyond the scope of this letter.

And something else one notices—and cannot fail to notice—about our successes is two astonishing failures: at the same time as achieving all these successes we ourselves bred two ferocious enemies, one for the last

war and the other for the next year—the German Wehrmacht, and Mao Tse-tung's China. Circumventing the Treaty of Versailles, we helped the German Wehrmacht train their first officers on Soviet training grounds, where they received their first experience of the theory of modern warfare, tank thrusts and airborne landings, all of which later proved very useful to them when Hitler accelerated his military preparations. And the story of how we bred Mao Tse-tung in place of a peaceable neighbour such as Chiang Kai-shek and helped him in the atomic race, is recent history, and very well known (Are we not heading for a similar failure with the Arabs also?)

And here we come to the crux of the matter we are discussing: these failures stemmed not from mistakes committed by our diplomats, nor from the miscalculations of our generals, but from an exact adherence to the precepts of Marxism-Leninism—i.e. in the first instance to harm the cause of world imperialism and in the second, to support communist movements abroad. In both cases national considerations were completely lacking.

I am well aware that I am talking to total realists and I shall not waste my breath on appeals such as: oh, if only we could retrieve just a little of the bumbling idealism of the old Russian diplomacy! Or: Let's do the world a favour and keep our nose out of its business. Or: Let's take a closer look at the moral foundations of our victorious foreign policy—it brings the Soviet Union power abroad, but does it bring any real benefit to our peoples?

I am talking to total realists and the simplest thing is to name the danger of which you have a much more detailed knowledge than I, for you have been looking uneasily in its direction (and rightly so) for a long time already: China.

As our proverb has it as the forest grew, so the axe handle grew with it.

In this case, 900 million axe handles.

2. WAR WITH CHINA

I hope you will not repeat the mistakes made by many of the world's rulers before you. Don't reckon on any triumphant blitzkrieg. You will have against you a country of almost a thousand million people, the like of which has never yet gone to war in the history of the world. The time since 1949 has evidently not been enough for the population to lose its high degree of fundamental industriousness (which is higher than ours is today), its tenacity and submissiveness; and it is firmly in the grip of a totalitarian system no whit less vigilant than ours. Its army and population will not surrender *en masse* with Western good sense, even when surrounded and beaten. Every soldier and every civilian will fight to the last bullet, the last breath. We shall have no ally in that war, none, at least, the size of, say, India. You will not, of course, be the first to use nuclear weapons; that would do irreparable damage to your reputation, which you cannot disregard, and anyway from a practical point of view still wouldn't bring you a quick victory.

The opposing side is even less likely to use them, being more poorly equipped. And in general, fortunately, mankind is able to hold itself back from the ultimate brink of destruction by virtue of its simple instinct for self-preservation. Thus it was after the First World War no one dared to use chemical warfare, and thus it is, I believe, that now after the Second, no one will use nuclear weapons. So all the ruinously extravagant superstockpiling that is going on is senseless and gratifies only the boffins and the generals—this is the hard fate of those countries who have elected to be in the front ranks of the nuclear Powers. (The stockpiled weapons will never be of any use; and by the time conflict erupts they will be obsolete.)

A conventional war, on the other hand, would be the longest and bloodiest of all the

wars mankind has ever fought. Like the Vietnam War at the very least (to which it will be similar in many ways) it will certainly last a minimum of ten to fifteen years—and incidentally will run almost exactly along the lines forecast by Amalrik, who was sent to his destruction for what he wrote instead of being invited to join the inner circle of our advisers. If Russia lost up to one and a half million people in the First World War and (according to Khruschev's figures) 20 million in the Second, then war with China is bound to cost us 60 million souls at the very least, and, as always in wars, they will be the best souls—all our finest and purest people are bound to perish there. As for the Russian people, our very last root will be extirpated. And this will be the climax of a long line of extirpations, beginning in the seventeenth-century with the extermination of the Old Believers, carrying on with Peter the Great and a string of successors (which I will also leave to one side in this letter) and ending with this, the ultimate one. After this war, the Russian people will virtually cease to exist on this planet. And that alone will mean the war has been lost utterly, irrespective of all its other consequences (for the most part dismal, including the consequences for your power, as you realise). One's heart bleeds at the thought of our young men and our entire middle generation, the finest generation, marching and riding off to die in a war. To die in an ideological war! And mainly for a dead Ideology! I think even you are not able to take such an awesome responsibility upon yourselves!

One aches with sympathy for the ordinary Chinese too, because it is they who will be the most helpless victims of the war. They are held in such a strait-jacket that not only can they not change their fate or discuss it in any way, they dare not even wiggle their ears.

This calamitous future, which is just around the corner at the current rate of development, weighs heavily on us creatures of the present—on those who wield power, on those who have the power of influence and on those who have only a voice to cry: there must never be such a war. This war must not happen, ever! Our task must be not to win the war, for no one can possibly win it, but to avoid it!

I think I can see a way. And that is why I have undertaken to write this letter today.

Why are we veering towards this war? For two reasons. One is the dynamic pressure of a China 1,000 million strong on our as yet unexploited Siberian lands—not the strip that is now being disputed on the basis of past treaties, but the whole of Siberia—to which, in our scramble for great social and even cosmic transformations, we haven't yet bent our energies. And this pressure will increase as the earth becomes increasingly overpopulated. But the main reason for this impending war, a reason that is far more powerful and indeed is the chief and insuperable one, is ideological. This should not surprise us: throughout history there have been no crueler wars and periods of civil strife than those provoked by ideological (including, alas, religious) dissensions. For fifteen years now a dispute has been going on between yourselves and the Chinese leaders over which of you best understands, expounds and propagates the doctrines of the Fathers of the Progressive World-View. And in addition to a fierce power-struggle, there is this global rivalry developing between you, this claim to be the sole true exponent of Communist doctrine and this ambition to be the one to lead all the peoples of the world after you in carrying it out.

And what do you think will happen? That when war breaks out, both the belligerents will simply fly the purity of their ideology on their flags? And that 60 million of our fellow-countrymen will allow themselves to be killed because the sacred truth is written on page 533 of Lenin and not on page 335

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

as our adversary claims? Surely only the very first of them will die for that...

When war with Hitler began, Stalin, who had omitted and bungled so much in the way of military preparation, did not neglect that side, the ideological side. And although the ideological grounds for that war seemed more indisputable than those that face you now (the war was waged against what appeared on the surface to be a diametrically opposed ideology), from the very first days of the war, Stalin refused to rely on the putrid, decaying prop of ideology. He wisely discarded it, all but ceased to mention it and unfurled instead the old Russian banner—sometimes indeed, the standard or Orthodoxy—and we conquered! (Only towards the end of the war and after the victory was the Progressive Doctrine taken out of its mothballs.)

So do you really think that in a conflict between similar, closely related ideologies, differing only in nuances, you will not have to make the same re-orientation? But by then it will be too late—military tension alone makes it very difficult.

How much wiser it would be to make this same turnabout today as a preventive measure. If it has to be done anyway for a war, wouldn't it be more sensible to do it much earlier, to avoid going to war at all?

Give them their ideology! Let the Chinese leaders glory in it for a while. And for that matter, let them shoulder the whole sackful of unfulfillable international obligations, let them grunt and heave and instruct humanity, and foot all the bills for their absurd economics (a million rubles a day just to Cuba), and let them support terrorists and guerrillas in the southern hemisphere, too, if they like.

The main source of the savage feuding between us will then melt away, a great many points of today's contention and conflict all over the world will also melt away, and a military clash will become a much remoter possibility and perhaps won't take place at all.

What we want is not eternal progress but zero growth

Take an unbiased look: the murky whirlwind kind of progressive ideology swept in on us from the West at the end of the last century, and has tormented and ravaged our soul quite enough; and if it is now veering away further east of its own accord, then let it veer away, don't try to stop it. (This doesn't mean I wish for the spiritual destruction of China, I believe that our people will soon be cured of this disease, and the Chinese too, given time; and it will not be too late, I hope, to save their country and protect humanity. But after all we have endured, it is enough for the time being for us to worry about how to save our own people.)

Ideological dissension will melt away—and there will probably never be a Sino-Soviet war. And if there should be, then it will be in the remote future and a truly defensive, truly patriotic one. At the end of the twentieth century we cannot give up Siberian territory, that's beyond all question. But to give up an ideology can only mean relief and recovery for us.

A CIVILISATION IN AN IMPASSE

A second danger is the multiple impasse in which Western civilisation (which Russia long ago chose the honour of belonging to) finds itself, but it is not so imminent; there are still two or three decades in reserve. We share this impasse with all the advanced countries, which are in an even worse and more perilous predicament than we are, although people keep hoping for new scientific loopholes and inventions to stave off the day of retribution. I would not have mentioned this danger in this letter if the solutions to both problems were not identical in many respects, if one and the same turnabout, a single decision would not deliver us from both dangers. Such a happy coincidence is rare. Let

us value history's gift and not miss these opportunities.

And all this has so "suddenly" come tumbling out at mankind's feet, and at Russia's!! How fond our progressive publicists were both before and after the revolution, of ridiculing those *retrogrades* (there were always so many of them in Russia): people who called upon us to cherish and have pity on our past, even on the most god-forsaken hamlet with a couple of hovels, even on the paths that run alongside the railway track; who called upon us to keep horses even after the advent of the motor-car, not to abandon small factories for enormous plants and combines, not to discard organic manure in favour of chemical fertilisers, not to mass by the million in cities, not to clamber on top of one another in multi-storey blocks. How they laughed, how they tormented those reactionary "Slavophiles" (the jibe became the accepted term, the simpletons never managed to think up another name for themselves). They hounded the men who said that it was perfectly feasible for a colossus like Russia, with all its spiritual peculiarities and folk traditions, to find its own particular path; and that it could not be that the whole of mankind should follow a single, absolutely identical pattern of development.

No, we had to be dragged along the whole of the Western bourgeois-industrial and Marxist path in order to discover, at the end of the twentieth-century, and again from progressive Western scholars, what any village greybeard in the Ukraine or Russia had understood from time immemorial and could have explained to the progressive commentators ages ago, had the commentators ever found the time in the dizzy fever of theirs to consult him: that a dozen maggots can't go on and on gnawing the same apple *forever*; that if the earth is a *finite* object, then its expanses and resources are finite also, and the *endless, infinite* progress dinned into our heads by the dreamers of the Enlightenment cannot be accomplished on it. No, we had to shuffle on and on behind other people, without knowing what lay ahead of us, until suddenly we now hear the scouts calling to one another, we've blundered into a blind alley, we'll have to turn back. All that "endless progress" turned out to be an insane, ill-considered, furious dash into a blind alley. A civilisation greedy for "perpetual progress" has now choked and is on its last legs.

And it is not "convergence" that faces us and the Western world now, but total renewal and reconstruction in both East and West, for both are in the same impasse. All this has been widely publicised and explained in the West thanks to the efforts of the Tellhard de Chardin Society and the Club of Rome. Here, in very condensed form, are their conclusions.

Society must cease to look upon "progress" as something desirable. "Eternal progress" is a nonsensical myth. What must be implemented is not a "steadily expanding economy", but a zero growth economy, a stable economy, economic growth is not only unnecessary but ruinous. We must set ourselves the aim not of increasing national resources, but merely of conserving them. We must renounce, as a matter of urgency, the gigantic scale of modern technology in industry, agriculture and urban development (the cities of today are cancerous tumours). The chief aim of technology will now be to eradicate the lamentable results of previous technologies. The "Third World," which has not yet started on the fatal path of Western civilisation, can be saved only by "small-scale technology" which requires an increase, not a reduction, in manual labour, uses the simplest of machinery and is based purely local materials.

All the unrestrained industrial growth has taken place not over thousands or hundreds of years (from Adam to 1945) but only over the last twenty-eight years (from 1945

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

onwards). It is this rapidity of growth in recent years that is most dangerous for mankind. The groups of scientists I mentioned have done computer calculations based on various possible courses of economic development, and all these courses turned out to be hopeless and pointed ominously to the catastrophic destruction of mankind some time between the years 2020 and 2070 if it did not relinquish economic progress. These calculations took into consideration five main factors: population, natural resources, agricultural production, industry and environmental pollution. If the available information is to be believed, some of the earth's resources are rapidly running out: there will be no more oil in twenty years, no more copper in nineteen, no more mercury in twelve; many other resources are nearly exhausted; and energy and fresh water are very limited. But even if future prospecting uncovers reserves twice or even three times as big as those we now know about, and even if agricultural output doubles and man succeeds in harnessing unlimited nuclear energy in all cases the population will be overtaken by mass destruction in the first decades of the twenty first century; if not because of production grinding to a halt (end of resources), then because of a production surplus (destruction of the environment)—and this whatever course we take.

When everything is staked on "progress," as it is now, it is impossible to find a joint optimum solution to all five of the problems referred to above. Unless mankind renounces the notion of economic progress, the biosphere will become unfit for life even during our lifetime. And if mankind is to be saved, technology has to be adapted to a stable economy in the next twenty to thirty years, and to do that the process must be started now, immediately.

Actually, though, it is more than likely that Western civilisation will not perish. It is so dynamic and so inventive that it will ride out even this impending crisis, will break up all its age-old misconceptions and in a few years set about the necessary reconstruction. And the "Third World" will heed the warnings in good time and not take the Western path at all. This is still perfectly feasible for most of the African and many of the Asian countries (and nobody will sneer at them and call them "Negro-philes").

But what about us? Us, with our unwieldiness and our inertia, us with our flinching and inability to change even a single letter, a single syllable of what Marx said in 1848 about industrial development? Economically and physically we are perfectly capable of saving ourselves. But there is a road-block on the path to our salvation—the sole Progressive World-View. If we renounce industrial development, what about the working class, socialism, communism, unlimited increase in productivity and all the rest? Marx is not to be corrected, that's revisionism. . . . Let's leave the Arabs to their fate—they have Islam

But you are already being called "revisionists" anyway, whatever you may do in the future. So wouldn't it be better to do your duty soberly, responsibly and firmly and give up the dead letter for the sake of a living people who are utterly dependent on your power and your decisions? And you must do it without delay. Why dawdle, if we shall have to snap out of it sometime anyway? Why repeat what others have done and loop the agonising loop right to the end, when we are not too far in it to turn back? If the man at the head of the column cries "I have lost my way," do we absolutely have to plough right on to the spot where he realised his mistake and only then turn back? Why not turn and start on the right course from wherever we happen to be?

As it is we have followed Western technology too long and too faithfully. We are supposed to be the "first socialist country in the world," one which sets an example

to other people, in both the East and West and we are supposed to have been so "original" in following various monstrous doctrines—on the peasantry, on small tradesmen—so why, then, have we been so dolefully unoriginal in technology, and why have we so unthinkingly, so blindly copied Western civilisation? ("Why?" From military haste, of course, and the haste stem from our immense "international responsibilities," and all this because of Marxism again).

One might have thought that, with the central planning of which we are so proud, we of all people had the chance not to spoil Russia's natural beauty, not to create anti-human, multi-million concentration of people. But we've done everything the other way round: we have dirtied and defiled the wide Russian spaces and disfigured the heart of Russia, our beloved Moscow (what crazed, unfilial hand bulldozed the boulevards so that you can't go along them now without diving down into degrading tunnels of stone? What evil, alien axe broke up the tree-lined boulevards of the Sadovoye Kiltso and replaced them with a poisoned zone of asphalt and petrol?) The irreplaceable face of the city and all the ancient city plan have been obliterated, and imitations of the West are being slung up, like the New Arbat; the city has been so squeezed, stretched and pushed upwards that life has become intolerable—so what do we do now? Reconstruct the former Moscow in a new place? That is probably impossible. Accept, then, that we have lost it completely?

We have squandered our resources foolishly without so much as a backward glance, sapped our soil, mutilated our vast expanse with idiotic "inland seas" and contaminated belts of waste land around our industrial centres—but for the moment, at least, far more still remains untainted by us, which we haven't had time to touch. So let us come to our senses in time, let us change our course!

4. THE RUSSIAN NORTH-EAST

And here there is some extra hope for us, for there is one peculiarity, one reservation in the arguments of the scientists I mentioned earlier. That reservation is: The supreme asset of all peoples is now the Earth. The earth as open space for settling. The earth as the extent of the biosphere. The earth as a cloak over our deeply buried resources. The earth as fertile soil. Nevertheless, the prognoses for fertility are gloomy too: land resources averaged out over the planet as a whole—and any rises in fertility will be exhausted by the year 2000, and if agricultural output can be doubled (not by the collective farms, of course, not by us), fertility, on average for the planet as a whole, will still be exhausted by 2030. But there are four fortunate countries still abundantly rich in untapped land even today. They are: Russia (that is not a slip of the tongue: it is precisely the RSFSR that I mean), Australia, Canada, and Brazil.

And herein lies Russia's hope for winning time and winning salvation: in our vast north-eastern spaces, which over four centuries our sluggishness has prevented us from mutilating by our mistakes, we can build anew: not the senseless, voracious civilisation of "progress"—no; we can set up a stable economy without pain or delay and settle people there for the first time according to the needs and principles of that economy. These spaces allow us to hope that we shall not destroy Russia in the general crisis of Western civilisation. (And there are many lands nearer to us that have been lost through collective farm neglect.)

Let us, without any dogmatic preconceptions, recall Stolypin and give him his due. Speaking in the state Duma in 1908 he said prophetically: "The land is a guarantee of our strength in the future, the land is Russia." And on the subject of the Amur railway: "If we remain plunged in our lethargic sleep, these lands will be running with for-

sign sap, and when we wake up they will perhaps be Russian only in name."

Today, because of the confrontation with China, this danger is spreading until it threatens virtually the whole of our Siberia. Two dangers merge, but by a stroke of good fortune, a single way out of both of them presents itself: throw away the dead ideology that threatens to destroy us militarily and economically, throw away all its fantastic alien global missions and concentrate on opening up (on the principles of a stable, nonprogressive economy) the Russian North-East—the north-east of the European part and the north of the Asian part and the main Siberian massif. We shall not nurture hopes—we shall not hasten the cataclysm which is perhaps ripening, perhaps will even come to pass in the Western countries. These hopes may be deceived, just as the hopes for China were in the 1940s, if new social systems are created in the West, they may prove even harsher and more unfriendly to us than the present ones. And let's leave the Arabs to their fate, they have Islam, they'll sort themselves out. And let's leave South America to itself, nobody is threatening to take it over. And let's leave Africa to find out for itself how to start on an independent road to statehood and civilisation, and simply wish it the good fortune not to repeat the mistakes of "uninterrupted progress." For half a century we have busied ourselves with world revolution, extending our influence over Eastern Europe and over other continents; with the reform of agriculture according to ideological principles; with the annihilation of the land-owning classes; with the eradication of Christian religion and morality; with the useless show of the space race; with arming ourselves and others whenever they want it; with everything and anything, in fact, but developing and tending our country's chief asset, the North-East. Our people are not going to live in space, or in South-East Asia, or Latin America: it is Siberia and the North that are our hope and our reservoir.

It may be said that even there we have done a lot, built a lot, but we have done less of building than destroying people, as it was with the "death road" from Salekhard to Igarka (but let's not go through all those prison camp stories again here). Building the railway round Lake Balkal so that it became flooded, and sending the loop line senselessly through the mountains, so that the bracken burned, building things like the pulp mills on Lake Balkal and the Selenga River, the quicker to profit and poison—we would have done better to wait a while. In terms of the speed of development in this century we have done very little in the North-East. But today we can say: how fortunate that it is so little, for now we can do everything rationally, right from the start, according to the principles of a stable economy. Today that "little" is still fortunate; but in a very short time it will already be a disaster.

We have lost half of our entire people

And what irony: for a half a century, since 1920, we have proudly (and rightly) refused to entrust the exploitation of our natural resources to foreigners—this may have looked like budding national aspirations. But we went on and on dragging our feet and wasting more and more time. And suddenly now, when it has been revealed that the world's energy resources are drying up, we, a great industrial super-power, like the meanest of backward countries, invite foreigners to exploit our mineral wealth and, by way of payment, suggest that they carry off our priceless treasure, Siberian natural gas—for which our children will curse us in half a generation's time as irresponsible prodigals. (We would have had plenty of other fine goods to barter if our industry had not also been built chiefly on . . . ideology. Once again ideology stands in the way of our people!)

March 8, 1974

I would not consider it moral to recommend a policy of saving only ourselves, when the difficulties are universal, had our people not suffered more in the twentieth century, as I believe they have, than any other people in the world. *In addition to* the toll of two world wars, we have lost, as a result of civil strife and tumult alone—as a result of internal political and economic “class” extermination alone—66 (sixty six) million people!!! That is the calculation of a former Leningrad professor of statistics, I. A. Kurganov, and you can have it brought to you whenever you wish. I am no trained statistician, I cannot undertake to verify it; and anyway all statistics are kept secret in our country, and this is an indirect calculation. But it’s true: a hundred million are no more (exactly a hundred, just as Dostoyevsky prophesied!), and with and without we have lost one third of the population we could have now had and almost a half of the one we in fact have! What other people has had to pay such a price? After such losses, we may permit ourselves a little luxury, the way an invalid is given a rest after a serious illness. We need to heal our wounds, cure our national body and national spirit. Let us find the strength, sense, and courage to put our own house in order before we busy ourselves with the cares of the entire planet.

And once again, by a happy coincidence, the whole world can only gain by it.

Another moral objection may be raised: that our North-East is not entirely Russia’s, that a historical sin was committed in conquering it; large numbers of the local inhabitants were wiped out (but nothing to compare with our own recent self-extinction) and others were harried. Yes, it was so, it happened in the sixteenth century, but there is nothing whatsoever we can do now to rectify that. Since then, these spreading expanses have remained almost unpeopled, or even entirely so. According to the census the people of the North number 128,000 in all, thinly scattered and strung out across vast distances. We would not be crowding them in the slightest by opening up the North. Quite the contrary, we are now sustaining their way of life and their existence as a matter of course; they seek no separate destiny for themselves and would be unable to find one. Of all the ethnic problems facing our country, this is the least; it hardly exists.

And so there is one way out for us (and the sooner we take it, the more effective it will be), namely, for the state to switch its attention away from distant continents—and even away from Europe and the south of our country—and make the North-East the centre of national activity and settlement and a focus for the aspirations of young people. (Of course, a switch of this kind would oblige us sooner or later to withdraw our protective surveillance of Eastern Europe. Nor can there be any question of any peripheral nation being forcibly kept within the bounds of our country.)

5. INTERNAL, NOT EXTERNAL DEVELOPMENT

This switching of the focus of our attention and efforts will need to take place, of course, in more than just the geographical sense: not only from external to internal land masses, but also from external to internal problems—in all senses, from outer to inner. The actual—not the ostensible—condition of our people, our families, our schools, our nation, our spirit, our life-style and our economy demands this of you.

The sickening roar in our skies shatters rest, sleep, and nerves

Let us begin at the end, with agriculture. It is a paradox, impossible to believe: that such a great power, one of such military might and with such brilliant foreign policy successes, should be in such an impasse, and in such desperate straits with its economy. Everything we have achieved here has been

gained not by brains, but by numbers, that is, through the extravagant expenditure of human energies and material. Everything we create costs us far more than it is worth, but the state allows itself to disregard the expense. Our “ideological agriculture” has already become the laughing-stock of the entire world, and with the worldwide shortage of food-stuffs it will soon be a burden on it as well. Famine rages in many parts of the world, and will rage even more fiercely because of over-population; scarcity of land, and the problems of emergence from colonialism. In other words, people cannot produce the grain. We, who should be able to, however, don’t produce enough, or we shudder after one year of drought (and doesn’t the history of farming tell us of cases of seven years in succession?) And all because we won’t admit our blunder over the collective farms. For centuries, Russia exported grain, ten to twelve million tons a year just before the First World War, and here we are after fifty-five years of the new order and forty years of the much-vaunted collective farm system, forced to import twenty million tons per year! It’s shameful—it really is time we came to our senses! The village, for centuries the mainstay of Russia, has become its chief weakness! For too many decades we have sapped the collectivised village of all its strength, driven it to utter despair, and now at last we have begun giving back its treasures and paying it fair prices—but too late. Its interest and faith in its work have been drained. As the old saying goes: Rebuff a man and riches won’t buy him back. With the impending worldwide shortage of grain there is only one way for us to fill the people’s bellies: give up the forced collective farms and leave just the voluntary ones. And set up in the wide open spaces of our North-East (at great expense, of course) the kind of agricultural system that will feed us at a natural economic tempo, and not flood us with Party agitators and mobilised labour from the towns.

I assume you know (it’s obvious from your degrees) about the state of affairs throughout our national economy and throughout our gargantuan civil service: people don’t put any effort at all into their official duties and have no enthusiasm for them, but cheat (and sometimes steal) as much as they can and spend their office hours doing private jobs (they’re forced to, with wages as low as they are today; for nobody is strong enough and no life-time long enough to earn a living from wages alone). Everybody is trying to make money for less work. If this is the mood of the nation, what sort of time scale can we work to for saving the country?

But even more destructive is vodka. That’s something else you know about, there was even that decree of yours—but did it change anything? So long as vodka is an important item of State revenue nothing will change, and we shall simply go on ravaging the people’s vitals (when I was in exile I worked in a consumers’ co-operative and I distinctly remember that vodka amounted to 60–70 per cent of our turnover).

Bearing in mind the state of people’s morals, their spiritual condition and their relations with one another and with society, all the material achievements we trumpet so proudly are petty and worthless.

When we set about what, in geographical terms, we shall call the opening up of the North-East, and in economic terms the building of a stable economy, and when we tackle all the technical problems (construction, transport and social organisation), we must also recognise, inherent in all these aspects, the existence of a moral dimension. The physical and spiritual health of the people must be at the heart of the entire exercise, including every stage and part.

The construction of more than half our state in a fresh new place will enable us to avoid repeating the disastrous errors of the twentieth century—industry roads and cities

for example. If we are to stop sweating over the short-term economic needs of today and create a land of clean air and clean water for our children, we must renounce many forms of industrial production which result in toxic waste. Military obligations dictate, you say? But in fact we have only one-tenth of the military obligations that we pretend to have; or rather that we intensively and assiduously create for ourselves by inventing interests in the Atlantic or Indian oceans. For the next half-century our only genuine military need will be to defend ourselves against China, and it would be better not to go to war with her at all. A well-established North-East is also our best defence against China. No one else on earth threatens us, and no one is going to attack us. For peacetime we are armed to excess several times over; we manufacture vast quantities of arms that are constantly having to be exchanged for new ones; and we are training far more manpower than we require who will anyway be past the age for serving by the time the military need arises.

From all sides except China we have ample guarantees of security for a long time to come, which means that we can make drastic cuts in our military investment for many years ahead and throw the released resources into the economy and reorganising our life. For technological extinction is no less a threat than war.

The time has also come to exempt the youth of Russia from universal, compulsory military service, which exists neither in China, nor in the United States, nor in any other large country in the world. We maintain this army solely out of military and diplomatic vanity—for reasons of prestige and conceit; also for expansion abroad, which we must give up if we are to achieve our own physical and spiritual salvation; and finally in the misguided notion that the only way to educate young men to be of use to the state is to have them spend years going through the mill of army training. Even if it is ever acknowledged that we cannot secure our defence otherwise than by putting everybody through the army, the period of service could nevertheless be greatly reduced and army “education” humanised. Under the present system, we as people lose inwardly far more than what we gain from all these parades.

In reducing our military forces we shall also deliver our skies from the sickening roar of aerial armadas—day and night, all the hours that God made, they perform their interminable flights and exercises over our broad lands, breaking the sound barrier, roaring and booming, shattering the daily life, rest, sleep and nerves of hundreds of thousands of people, effectively addling their brains by screeching overhead (all the big bosses ban flights over their country estates); and all this has been going on for decades and has nothing at all to do with saving the country—it is a futile waste of energy. Give the country back a healthy silence, without which you cannot begin to have a healthy people.

The urban life which by now as much as half our population is doomed to live, is utterly unnatural—and you agree entirely, everyone of you, for every evening with one accord you all escape from the city to your dachas in the country. And you are all old enough to remember our old towns—towns made for people, horses, dogs—and the trams too; towns which were humane, friendly, cosy places, where the air was always clean, which were snow-clad in winter and in spring redolent with garden aromas streaming through the fences into the streets. There was a garden to almost every house and hardly a house more than two stories high—the pleasantest height for human habitation. The inhabitants of those towns were not nomads, they didn’t have to decamp twice a year to save their children from a blazing inferno. An economy of non-giantism with

small-scale, though highly developed, technology will not only allow for but will necessitate the new building of towns in the old style. And we can perfectly well set up road barriers at all the entrances and admit horses, and electric accumulator engines, but not poisonous internal combustion engines, and if anybody has to dive underground at cross-roads, let it be the vehicles, and not the old, the young and the sick.

God forbid war between communist super-powers

These are the sort of towns that should adorn our frost-bitten North-East when it has been thawed out, and let that cosmic expenditure on space research be poured into the thawing-out process instead.

It's true that there was another special feature of the old Russian towns, a spiritual one which made life there enjoyable even for the most highly educated and which meant they didn't have to congregate in a single capital city of seven million: many provincial towns—not just Irkutsk, Tomsk, Saratov, Yaroslavl and Kazan, but many besides—were important cultural centres *in their own right*. But is it conceivable nowadays that we would allow any centre of independent activity and thought to exist outside Moscow? Even Petersburg has quite lost its lustre. There was a time when a unique and tremendously valuable book might be published in some little place like Vyshni Volochev—could our *ideology* conceivably allow that now? The present-day centralisation of all forms of life of the mind is a monstrosity amounting to spiritual murder. Without these sixty or eighty towns Russia does not exist as a country but is merely some sort of inarticulate rump. So here again, at every step and in every direction, it is IDEOLOGY that prevents us from building a healthy Russia.

A man's mental and emotional condition is inextricably linked with every aspect of his daily life. People who are forced to drive caterpillar tractor or massive-wheeled lorries down grassy byways and country lanes ill-suited and unprepared for them, churning up everything in their path, or who, out of greed, jolt a whole village awake at first light with the frenzied revving of a chainsaw, become brutal and cynical. It is no accident either that there are these innumerable drunks and hooligans who pester women in the evenings and when they are not at work; if no police force can handle them, still less are they going to be restrained by an *ideology* that claims to be a substitute for morality. Having spent a fair amount of time working both in village and town schools, I can confidently state that our educational system is a poor teacher and a bad educator, and merely cheapens and squanders the childhood and hearts of our young people. Everything is so organised that the pupils have no reason at all to respect their teachers. Schooling will be genuine only when people of the highest calibre and with a real vocation go into teaching. But to achieve this we will have to expend untold energy and resources—and pay our teachers much better and make their position less humiliating. At the moment the teacher training institute has the least prestige of almost all the institutes and grown men are ashamed to be school teachers. School-leavers rush into military electronics like flies to a honey pot—is it really for such sterile pursuits that we have been developing these last eleven hundred years?

Apart from not getting what they need from the schools, our future citizens don't get much from the family either. We are always boasting about our equality for women and our kindergartens but we hide the fact that all this is just a substitute for the family we have undermined. Equality for women doesn't mean that they have to occupy the same number of factory jobs and office positions as men, but just that all these posts should in principle be equally open to

women. In practice, a man's wage level ought to be such that whether he has a family of two or even four children, the woman *does not need* to earn a separate pay-packet and *does not need* to support her family financially on top of all her other toils and troubles. In pursuit of the five-year plans and more manpower we have never given our men the right sort of wages, with the result that the undermining and destruction of the family is part of the terrible prices we have paid for those five-year plans.

How can one fail to feel shame and compassion at the sight of our women carrying heavy barrows of stones for paving the street or for spreading on the tracks of our railway lines? When we contemplate such scenes, what more is there to say, what doubt can there possibly be? Who would hesitate to abandon the financing of South American revolutionaries in order to free our women from this bondage? Almost every sphere of activity is neglected and in desperate need of funds, hard work and perseverance. Nor is *leisure* time an exception, reduced as it is to television, cards, dominoes and that same old vodka; and if anybody *reads*, it is either sport or spy stories, or else that same old *Ideology* in newspaper form. Can this really be that seductive socialism-cum-communism for which all those people laid down their lives, and for which 60 to 90 million perished?

The demands of *internal* growth are incomparably more important to us, as a people, than the need for any *external* expansion of our power. The whole of world history demonstrates that the peoples who created empires have always suffered spiritually as a result. The aims of a great empire and the moral health of the people are incompatible. We should not presume to invent international tasks and bear the cost of them so long as our people is in such moral disarray and we consider ourselves to be its sons.

And should we not also give up our Mediterranean aspirations while we are about it? But to do that, we must first of all give up our *ideology*.

This *ideology* that fell to us by inheritance is not only decrepit and hopelessly antiquated now; even during its best decades it was totally mistaken in its predictions and was never a science.

6. IDEOLOGY

A primitive, superficial economic theory, it declared that only the worker creates value and failed to take into account the contribution of either organisers, engineers, transport or marketing systems. It was mistaken when it forecast that the proletariat would be endlessly oppressed and would never achieve anything in a bourgeois democracy—if only we could shower people with as much food, clothing and leisure as they have gained under capitalism! It missed the point when it asserted that the prosperity of the European countries depended on their colonies—it was only after they had shaken the colonies off that they began to accomplish their "economic miracles." It was mistaken through and through and its prediction that socialists could only ever come to power by an armed uprising. It miscalculated in thinking that the first uprisings would take place in the advanced industrial countries—quite the reverse.

And the picture of how the whole world would rapidly be overtaken by revolutions and how states would soon wither away was sheer delusion, sheer ignorance of human nature. And as for wars being characteristic of capitalism alone and coming to an end when capitalism did—we have already witnessed the longest war of the twentieth century so far, and it was not capitalism that rejected negotiations and a truce for fifteen to twenty years; and God forbid that we should witness the bloodiest and most brutal of all mankind's wars—a war between two

communist super-powers. Then there was nationalism, which this theory also buried in 1848 as a "survival"—but find a stronger force in the world today. And it's the same with many other things too boring to list.

Marxism is not only not accurate, not only not a science, has not only failed to predict a *single event* in terms of figures, quantities, time-scales or locations (something that electronic computers today do with laughable ease in the course of social forecasting, although never with the help of Marxism)—it absolutely astounds one by the economic and mechanistic crudity of its attempts to explain that most subtle of creatures, the human being, and that even more complex synthesis of millions of people, society. Only the *cupidity* of some, the *blindness* of others and a *craving for faith* on the part of still others can serve to explain this grim humour of the twentieth century: how can such a discredited and bankrupt doctrine still have so many followers in the West! In our country there are fewest of all left. We who have had a taste of it are only pretending willy-nilly....

We have seen above that it was not your common sense, but that same antiquated legacy of the Progressive Doctrine that endowed you with all the millstones that are dragging you down: first collectivisation; then the nationalisation of small trades and services (which has made the lives of ordinary citizens unbearable—but you don't feel that yourselves; which has caused thieving and lying to pile up and up even in the day-to-day running of the country—and you are powerless against it), then the need to inflate military development for the sake of making grand international gestures, so that the whole internal life of the country is going down the drain and in fifty years we haven't even found the time to open up Siberia; then the obstacles in the way of industrial development and technological reconstruction; then religious persecution, which is very important for Marxism*, but senseless and self-defeating for pragmatic state leaders—to set useless good-for-nothings to hounding their most conscientious workers, innocent of all cheating and theft, and as a result to suffer from universal cheating and theft. For the believer his *faith* is *supremely* precious, more precious than the food he puts in his stomach.

Have you ever paused to reflect on why it is that you deprive these millions of your finest subjects of their homeland? All this can do you as the leaders of the state nothing but harm, but you do it mechanically, automatically, because Marxism insists that you do it. Just as it insists that you, the rulers of a superpower, deliver accounts of your activities to outlandish visitors from distant parts—leaders of unimportant, insignificant communist parties from the other end of the globe preoccupied least of all with the fortunes of Russia.

Let's shake off this sweaty shirt of ideology

To someone brought up on Marxism it seems a terrifying step—suddenly to start living without the familiar *ideology*. But in point of fact you have no choice, circumstances themselves will force you to do it, and it may already be too late. In anticipation of an impending war with China, Russia's national leaders will in any case have to rely on patriotism, and patriotism alone. When Stalin initiated such a shift during the war—remember?—nobody was in the least surprised and nobody shed a tear for Marxism—everyone took it as the most nat-

*Sergei Bulgakov showed in "Karl Marx as a Religious Type" (1906) that atheism is the chief inspirational and emotional hub of Marxism and that all the rest of the doctrine has simply been tacked on. Ferocious hostility to religion is Marxism's most persistent feature.

ural thing in the world, something they recognise as Russian! It is only prudent to redeploy one's forces when faced by a great danger—but sooner rather than later. In any event, this process of repudiation, though tentative, began long ago in our country, for what is the "combination" of Marxism and patriotism but a meaningless absurdity? These two points of view can be "merged" only in generalised incantations, for history has shown us that in practice they are always diametrically opposed. This is so obvious that Lenin in 1915 actually proclaimed: "We are anti-patriots." And that was the honest truth. And throughout the 1920s in our country the word "patriot" meant exactly the same as "White Guard." And the whole of this letter that I am now putting before you is patriotism, which means rejection of Marxism. For Marxism orders us to leave the North East unexploited and to leave our women with their crowbars and shovels, and instead finance and expedite world revolution.

Beware when the first cannons fire on the Sino-Soviet border lest you find yourselves in a doubly precarious position because the national consciousness in our country has become stunted and blurred—witness how mighty America lost to tiny North Vietnam, how easily the nerves of American society and American youth gave way, precisely because the United States has a weak and undeveloped national consciousness. Don't miss the chance while you've got it!

The step seems a hard one at first, but in fact, once you have thrown off this rubbishy ideology of ours, you will quickly sense a huge relief and become aware of a relaxation in the entire structure of the state and in all the processes of government. After all, this ideology, which is driving us into a situation of acute conflict abroad, has long ceased to be helpful to us here at home, as it was in the twenties and thirties. In our country today nothing constructive rests upon it, it is a sham, cardboard, theatrical prop—take it away and nothing will collapse, nothing will even wobble. For a long time now, everything has rested solely on material calculation and the subjection of the people, and not on any upsurge of ideological enthusiasm, as you perfectly well know. This ideology does nothing now but sap our strength and bind us. It clogs up the whole life of society—minds, tongues, radio and press, with lies, lies, lies. For how else can something dead pretend that it is living except by erecting a scaffolding of lies. Everything is steeped in lies and everybody knows it—and says so openly in private conversation, and jokes and moans about it, but in their official speeches they go on hypocritically parroting what they are "supposed to say," and with equal hypocrisy and boredom read and listen to the speeches of others! How much of society's energy is squandered on this! And you, when you open your newspapers or switch on your television—do you yourselves really believe for one instant that these speeches are sincere? No, you stopped believing long ago. I am certain of it. And if you didn't, then you must have become totally insulated from the inner life of the country.

This universal, obligatory force-feeding with lies is now the most agonizing aspect of existence in our country—worse than all our material miseries, worse than any lack of civil liberties.

All these arsenals of lies, which are totally unnecessary for our stability as a state, are levied as a kind of tax for the benefit of Ideology—to nail down events as they happen and clamp them to a tenacious, sharp-clawed but dead Ideology: and it is precisely because our state, through sheer force of habit, tradition and inertia, continues to cling to this false doctrine with all its tortuous aberrations, that it needs to put the dissenter behind bars. For a false ideology

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

can find no other answer to argument and protest than weapons and prison bars.

Cast off this cracked ideology! Relinquish it to your rivals, let it go wherever it wants, let it pass from our country like a storm-cloud, like an epidemic, let others concern themselves with it and study it, just so long as we don't! In ridding ourselves of it we shall also rid ourselves of the need to fill our life with lies.

Let us pull off and shake off from all of us this filthy, sweaty shirt of Ideology which is now so stained with the blood of those 66 million that it prevents the living body of the nation from breathing. This Ideology bears the entire responsibility for all the blood that has been shed. Do you need me to persuade you to throw it off without more ado? Whoever wants can pick it up in our place.

I am certainly not proposing that you go to the opposite extreme and persecute or ban Marxism, or even argue against it (nobody will argue against it for very long, if only out of sheer apathy). All I am suggesting is that you rescue yourselves from it, and rescue your state system and your people as well. *All you have to do* is deprive Marxism of its powerful state support and let it exist by itself and stand on its own feet. And let all who wish to do so make propaganda for it, defend it and din it into others without let or hindrance—but outside working hours and *not on state salaries*. In other words, the whole *agitprop* system of agitation and propaganda must cease to be paid for out of the nation's pocket. This should not anger or antagonize the numerous people who work in *agitprop*: this new statute would free them from all possible insulting accusations of self-interest and give them for the first time the opportunity to prove the true strength of their ideological convictions and sincerity. And they could only be overjoyed with their new twofold commitment: to undertake productive labour for their country, to produce something of practical value on weekdays in the daytime (and whatever work they chose in place of their present occupation would be much more productive for the work they do now is useless, if not positively detrimental), and in the evenings, on free days and during their holidays, to devote their leisure to propagating their beloved doctrine, revelling selflessly in the truth! After all, that is exactly what our believers do (while being persecuted for it, too) and they consider it spiritually satisfying. What a marvelous opportunity. I will not say to test but to prove the sincerity of all those people who have been haranguing the rest of us for decades.

7. BUT HOW CAN ALL THIS BE MANAGED?

Having said all that, I have not forgotten for a moment that you are total realists—that was the starting-point of this discussion. You are realists *par excellence*, and you will not allow the power to slip out of your hands. That is why you will not willingly tolerate a two party or multiparty parliamentary system in our country, will not tolerate *real* elections, at which people might not vote you in. And on the basis of realism one must admit that this will be within your power for a long time to come.

A long time—but not for ever.

Many workers grab what they can for themselves

Having proposed a dialogue on the basis of realism, I too must confess that from my experience of Russian history I have become an opponent of all revolutions and all armed convulsions, including future ones—both those you crave (*not in our country*) and those you fear (*in our country*). Intensive study has convinced me that bloody mass revolutions are always disastrous for the people in whose midst they occur. And in our present-day society I am by no means alone in that conviction. The sudden upheaval of

any hastily carried out change of the present leadership (the whole pyramid) might provoke only a new and destructive struggle and would certainly lead to only a very dubious gain in the quality of the leadership.

In such a situation what is there left for us to do? Console ourselves by saying "sour grapes." Argue in all sincerity that we are not adherents of that turbulent "democracy run riot" in which once every four years the politicians, and indeed the entire country nearly kill themselves over an electoral campaign, trying to gratify the masses (and this is something which not only internal groups but also foreign governments have repeatedly played on); in which a judge, flouting his obligatory independence to pander to the passions of society, acquits a man who, during an exhausting war, steals and publishes War Ministry documents? While even in an established democracy, we can see many instances when a fatal course of action is chosen as a result of self-deception, or of a random majority caused by the swing of a small and unpopular party between two big ones—and it is this insignificant swing, which in a way expresses the will of the majority (and even the will of the majority is not immune to misdirection), which decides vitally important questions in national and sometimes even world politics. And there are very many instances today of groups of workers who have learned to grab as much as they can for themselves whenever their country is going through a crisis, even if they ruin the country in the process. And even the most respected democracies have turned out to be powerless against a harmful of miserable terrorists.

Yes, of course: freedom is moral. But only if it keeps within certain bounds, beyond which it degenerates into complacency and licentiousness.

And *order* is not immoral, if it means a calm and stable system. But *order* too has its limits, beyond which it degenerates into arbitrariness and tyranny.

Here in Russia, for sheer lack of practice, democracy survived for only eight months—from February to October 1917. The emigre groups of Constitutional Democrats and Social Democrats still pride themselves on it to this very day and say that outside forces brought about its collapse. But in reality that democracy was their disgrace, they invoked it and promised it so arrogantly, and then created a chaotic caricature of democracy, because first of all they turned out to be ill-prepared for it themselves, and then Russia was worse prepared still. Over the last half-century Russia's preparedness for democracy, for a multi-party parliamentary system, could only have diminished. I am inclined to think that its sudden reintroduction now would merely be a melancholy repetition of 1917.

Should we record as our democratic tradition the Land Assemblies of Moscovite Russia, Novgorod, the early Cossacks, the village commune? Or should we console ourselves with the thought that for a thousand years Russia lived with an authoritarian order—and at the beginning of the twentieth century, both the physical and spiritual health of her people were still intact?

However, in those days an important condition was fulfilled, that authoritarian order possessed a strong moral foundation, embryonic and rudimentary though it was—not the ideology of universal violence, but Christian Orthodoxy, the ancient, seven centuries old Orthodoxy of Sergel Radonezhsky and Nil Sorsky, before it was battered by Patriarch Nikon and bureaucratised by Peter the Great. From the end of the Moscow period and throughout the whole of the Petersburg period, once this moral principle was perverted and weakened, the authoritarian order, despite the apparent external successes of the state gradually went into a decline and eventually perished.

But even the Russian intelligentsia, which for more than a century has invested all its

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

strength in the struggle with an authoritarian regime—what has it achieved for itself or the common people—by its enormous losses? The opposite of what it intended, of course. So should we not perhaps acknowledge that for Russia this path was either false or premature? That for the foreseeable future, perhaps, whether we like it or not, whether we intend it or not, Russia is nevertheless destined to have an authoritarian order? Perhaps this is all that she is ripe for today?

Everything depends upon what sort of authoritarian order lies in store for us in the future. It is not authoritarianism itself that is intolerable, but the ideological lies that are daily foisted upon us. Not so much authoritarianism as arbitrariness and illegality, the sheer illegality of having a single overlord in each district, each province and each sphere, often ignorant and brutal, whose will alone decides all things. An authoritarian order does not necessarily mean that laws are unnecessary or that they exist only on paper, or that they should not reflect the notions and will of the population. Nor does it mean that the legislative, executive and judicial authorities are not independent, any of them, that they are in fact not authorities at all but utterly at the mercy of a telephone call from the only true, self-appointed authority. May I remind you that the Soviets, which gave their name to our system and existed until 6 July 1918, were in no way dependent upon ideology. Ideology or no Ideology, they always envisaged the widest possible consultation with all working people.

Would it be still within the bounds of realism or a lapse into daydreams if we were to propose that at least some of the real power of the Soviets be restored? I do not know what can be said on the subject of our constitution: from 1936 it has not been observed for a single day, and for that reason does not appear to be viable. But perhaps even the constitution is not beyond all hope?

Still keeping within the limits of strict realism, I do not suggest that you alter the disposition of the leadership which you find so convenient.

But take all whom you regard as the active and desirable leadership, and transform them en bloc into a Soviet system. And from then onwards let posts in the state service no longer depend on party membership as they do now. In doing so you can clear your party of the accusation that people join it only to further their careers. Give to some of your other hard-working fellow-countrymen the chance to move up the rungs without having to have a party card—you will get good workers, and only in the disinterested will remain in the party. You will, of course, want to keep your party a strong organisation of like-minded confederates and keep your special meetings conspiratorial and "closed" to the masses. But at least let your party, once it has relinquished its Ideology, renounce its unattainable and irrelevant missions of world domination, and instead fulfill its national missions and save us from war with China and from technological disaster. These goals are both noble and attainable.

What have you to fear? Is it so terrible?

We must not be governed by considerations of political giantism, nor concern ourselves with the fortunes of other hemispheres; this we must renounce for ever, for that bubble is bound to burst—the other hemispheres and the warm oceans will in any case develop without us in their own way, and no one can control this development from Moscow or predict it even in 1973, much less could Marx have done so back in 1848. The considerations which guide our country must be these: to encourage the inner, the moral, the healthy development of the people; to liberate women from the forced labour of money-earning—especially from the crowbar and shovel; to improve

schooling and children's upbringing; to save the soil and the waters and all of Russian nature; to re-establish healthy cities and complete the conquest of the North East. Let us hear no more about outer space and the cosmos, no more historic victories of universal significance, and no more dreaming up of international missions: other nations are no whit more stupid than we are, and China has money and divisions to spare—let her have a try.

Stalin taught us—you and all of us—that kind-heartedness was a "very dangerous thing," meaning that kind-hearted rulers were a very dangerous thing! He had to say that because it fitted in with his scheme of exterminating millions of his subjects. But if you have no such aim, disavow his accursed teaching! Let it be an authoritarian order, but one founded not on an inexhaustible "class hatred" but on love of your fellow men—not of your immediate entourage but sincere love for your whole people. And the very first mark that distinguishes this path is magnanimity and mercy shown to captives. Look back and contemplate the horror: from 1918 to 1954 and from 1958 to the present day not one person in our country has been released from imprisonment as a result of a humane impulse! If the odd one has occasionally been let out, it has been out of barefaced political calculation: either the man's spirit is completely broken or else the pressure of world opinion has become intolerable. Of course, we shall have to renounce, once and for all, the psychiatric violence and secret trials, and that brutal, immoral bag of camps where those who have errred and fallen by the wayside are still further maimed and destroyed.

So that the country and people do not suffocate, and so that they all have the chance to develop and enrich us with ideas, allow competition on an equal and honourable basis—not for power, but for truth—between all ideological and moral currents, in particular between all *religions*: there will be nobody to persecute them if their tormentor, Marxism, is deprived of its state privileges. But allow competition honestly, not the way you do now, not by gagging people; allow it to religious youth organisations (which are totally non-political); let the Komsomol be the only political one), grant them the right to instruct and educate children, and the right to free parish activity. (I myself see Christianity today as the only living spiritual force capable of undertaking the spiritual healing of Russia. But I request and propose no special privileges for it, simply that it should be treated fairly and not suppressed.) Allow us a free art and literature, the free publication not just of political books—God preserve us!—and exhortations and election leaflets; allow us philosophical, ethical, economic and social studies, and you will see what a rich harvest it brings and how it bears fruit—for the good of Russia. Such an abundant and free flowering of inspiration will rapidly absolve us of the need to keep on belatedly translating new ideas from Western languages, as has been the case for the whole of the last fifty years—as you know.

What have you to fear? Is the idea really so terrible? Are you really so unsure of yourselves? You will still have absolute and impregnable power, a separate, strong and exclusive party, the army, the police force, industry, transport, communications, mineral wealth, a monopoly of foreign trade, an artificial rate of exchange for the trouble—but let the people breathe, let them think and develop! If you belong to the people heart and soul, there can be nothing to hold you back!

After all, does the human heart not still feel the need to atone for the past?

Perhaps it will seem to you that I have deviated from my initial platform of realism? But I shall remind you of my original

March 8, 1974

assumption that you are not alien to your fathers, your grandfathers, and the expanses of Russia. I repeat: the wise heed advice long before the need becomes overwhelming.

You may dismiss the counsels of some lone individual, some writer, with laughter or indignation. But with each passing year—for different reasons, at different times and in different guises—life itself will keep on thrusting exactly the same suggestion at you, exactly the same. Because this is the only feasible and *peaceful* way in which you can save our country and our people.

Soviet Russia is 55—and so am I

And yourselves into the bargain. For the hour of peril will come, and you will appeal to your people once more, not to world communism. And even your own fate—yes, even yours!—will depend on you.

Of course, decisions like these are not made overnight. But now you still have the opportunity to make the transition calmly, over the next three years perhaps—or five, or even ten, allowing for the whole process. But that is only if you make a start now, only if you make up your minds this moment. For the demands life is going to make on you later will be even harsher and more pressing.

Your dearest wish is for our state structure and our ideological system never to change, to remain as they are for centuries. But history is not like that. Every system either finds a way to develop or else collapses.

It is impossible to run a country like Russia according to the passing needs of the day: in 1942 to condemn Nehru and his national liberation movement is a clique (for undermining the military efforts of our allies the English), and in 1956 to exchange kisses with him. And the same with Tito and with many, many others. To run a country like Russia you need to have a national policy and to feel constantly at your back all the eleven hundred years of its history, not just the last fifty-five—five per cent.

You will have noticed, of course, that this letter pursues no personal aims. I have long since outgrown your shell anyway and my writings will be published irrespective of any sanction or prohibition by you. All I had to say is now said. I too am fifty-five, and I think I have amply demonstrated that I set no store by material wealth and am prepared to sacrifice my life. To you such a version of life is a rarity—but here it is for you to behold.

In writing this letter I too am taking upon myself a heavy responsibility to Russian history. But not to take upon oneself the task of seeking a way out, not to undertake anything at all, is an even greater responsibility.

A. SOLZHENITSYN.

September 5, 1973.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1974

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanian people have a glorious history which dates back to the 12th century, and February 16, 1974 was the day on which Lithuanians throughout the world observed the 56th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania.

The only country where the people were unable to celebrate this historic event was in Lithuania itself because of

the continuing subjugation and oppression by the Soviet Union. However, the Soviets are unable to suppress the aspirations of the Lithuanian people for freedom and the exercise of their human rights as demonstrated by the events of recent years.

The brave people of the Baltic republic, just as those of other nations subjugated by Soviet imperialism have suffered untold hardships since their unjust annexation by Soviet Russia in 1940. But they have also demonstrated a remarkable courage and devotion to the cause of freedom and true democracy.

I sincerely hope that our interest in their great and proud nation will not end within our profound expressions of sympathy and admiration. I think they are entitled to more than that. I sincerely believe that we, by positive action, will support efforts to maintain the universal principles of independence, personal liberty, and human dignity and demonstrate that we do not recognize the illegal acts which deprived the Lithuanians of their freedom and that we are determined to work toward the goal which they acquired on February 16, 1918.

Without justice to all the oppressed people there can be no hope for a just and permanent peace.

I pay my deep respects to the courage, patriotism, and love of freedom and liberty to that gallant nation. I share the fond hopes and prayers of those who express faith in the restoration of freedom to the Lithuanian people.

I hope that the time will not be too far distant when Lithuania, free and strong and dedicated to liberty and justice, will once again take its rightful place among the sovereign nations.

REPORT ON UNSAFE CAMP TENTS

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, hidden dangers which can threaten the health and safety of Americans sometimes remain hidden, because the ramifications of the danger escape detection. Such a situation has been revealed in a special report on the hidden hazards in tent camping which was telecast by WNBC-TV of New York City on March 4, 1974. The report noted that because of the usually bucolic, relaxed atmosphere of camping there seems to be no conscious concern about one particular danger: Fire.

In its report, WNBC-TV alerted Americans to the fact that most of the tents in their possession, as well as most of the tents in the commercial market, were in fact nothing less than vertical candles. This is because so many of the tents are constructed of a fabric made of paraffin-coated cotton.

The report was produced, written, and reported by Bernard Gavzer, investigative reporter for WNBC-TV. It emerged

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

from prior work done by William Perez, Gavzer's colleague on the television station's investigative unit. Perez had earlier produced a report on fire hazards in aircraft. I am inserting a copy of this well-done report in the Record at this point so that my colleagues in the House may have the benefit of it:

TENTS

JIM HARTZ: The story we're about to report has some scenes of a badly injured boy, which may be upsetting to some viewers, but this report about hidden hazards in camping, specifically danger of death and injury from tent fires is so important we urge you to watch it. This report was produced and written by Bernard Gavzer of WNBC-TV's special investigative unit.

It seems so rustic, carefree, peaceful, but there's a hidden danger in tent camping, one which the tent industry has treated like a secret. It's the hazard of fire. The worst disasters have come when people are most vulnerable, asleep in their tents. It's a risk that threatens millions of Americans who go camping. That's because most of the small tents now in use are basically paraffin and cotton. They are like candles and once they start burning they keep burning. The large umbrella tent was set on fire by its maker, the Olin Corporation. It became a flaming mass and collapsed in two minutes. The pup tent was burned as part of a court case, and collapsed in about one minute.

BILLY AQUINO. I didn't know it'd be so fast, so quick. Thought it'd take five, ten minutes, probably, or more.

HARTZ: That's Billy Aquino of San Antonio. On the night of June 13th, 1971, he was in the back yard of a scoutmaster's home in Pensacola, Florida. He was with his twin brother, and the scoutmaster's son. They pitched a tent like this one, bought with trading stamps. The boys got some light by using a candle holder like this. They put the candle outside the tent, and went to sleep.

AQUINO. I heard someone yell, "Fire, fire," and got up. I saw—on fire in front of me, and I—and I waited for a few seconds, and saw Tom Hammer and my brother Tom, they went out before me. We stood there just for a few seconds. . . .

HARTZ. They got out: Tom Hammer died the next day; Tommy Aquino died sixteen days later.

AQUINO. First time I saw them, I saw myself, I saw my face and I was kind of shocked. I don't really notice my hands now. I don't know how long . . .

HARTZ. Besides those tents now on the market, there are literally hundreds of thousands of flammable tents which people have in attics, garages, and basements. They drag them out once in a while and go camping, or let the kids put them up in the backyard. There are fire retardant tents, like this one being tested by the Olin Corporation. Notice that the fabric sort of melts, rather than allowing the flame to spread rapidly, as it did in the other umbrella tent, which was burned.

Franklin Hauser, the San Antonio lawyer who represented Billy Aquino, claims the Boy Scouts have had fire retardant tents, they fail to promote them.

FRANKLIN HAUSER. They have yet to advertise if they have a flame retardant tent, and yet I know personally of at least nine Boy Scouts who were either killed(?) or severely injured when they were using a tent which was not flame retardant.

LUDY CHRISTOFERO. We have had a number of our tents that are fire retardant, the lightweight tents. And we've not been secretive about it, as we published a catalog that had the tents in it, it's stated there that they are fire retardant.

HARTZ. Our investigation shows that in the

last few years, there have been at least five deaths and twenty-one gross disfigurements in such fires. We simply haven't been able to find any statistic for the number of fires or minor injuries. Obviously, it costs more to make a fire retardant tent. How much? According to some court depositions, by textile chemists from eight to twelve cents a square yard extra. On the average, there's ten square yards in a pup tent, so it would come to about one dollar.

Olin Corporation is one of the large manufacturing companies now making tents, which have clear warnings on the tent fabric itself. Olin made the change after it was the principal loser in a nine hundred thousand dollar settlement given Billy Aquino. Our investigation shows: one, most tents are fire hazardous; two, there is no federal standard for the industry; three, retail sales people often are ignorant or just lying about tent flammability; four, labelling and warnings are now wholly inadequate; five, fire retardant tents might cost more, but not much.

Billy Aquino is trying to return to some sort of normal routine, he's a brave young man. Perhaps one day he will even fulfill his desire to become an astronaut. But Billy has already been some sort of astronaut for society. His tragedy and his lonely voyage of pain and suffering have opened the doors on a highly dangerous problem. Maybe Billy's suffering will bring us the awareness we need to prevent future tent mishaps.

HARTZ. Since we began our investigation, the tent industry is urging some federal standards. A spokesman for a major trade group told us the industry has no alternatives, morally or economically, other than changing to fire retardant tents. Right now, there are labels such as this one in red and black that say in plain words that tents can burn quickly. Tents that would resist burning would be better, but at least these new labels are being honest with the public.

TRIBUTE TO NORTHERN MICHIGAN RESIDENT

HON. PHILIP E. RUPPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, a recent occurrence in the upper peninsula of Michigan deserves the attention of those who say all is not well in the United States in 1974. The statement which follows should serve to reaffirm that compassion and courage are still alive. I feel privileged to commend Craig Denholm of the 11th District of Michigan in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by formally acknowledging his selfless action on December 24, 1973. The statement follows:

On December 24, 1973, my family from the Washington, D.C. area, came to Gaylord, Michigan to celebrate Christmas with my brother-in-law. Unfortunately, I suffered a heart attack on that morning at the age of 29. The unusual aspect of this episode and my purpose for writing is to call your attention to an outstanding young resident of your great state. Craig Denholm, 855 S. Court, Gaylord, Michigan 49735, an employee of the Chalet Motel, observed my collapse and immediately came to my aid. Having lost his own father to a heart attack, he knew exactly what to do. While others called for the Rescue Squad, he applied external heart massage until relieved by the Rescue Squad. As attested by a statement by my doctor, without Craig's quick and knowledgeable ef-

forts, any action by the excellent Rescue Squad or later at the fully competent hospital might have been fruitless or so delayed that I would have suffered irreparable brain damage. Because of Craig's actions, neither is true and I am well on the road to recovery.

With appreciation,

KENNETH R. VELIE.

**REGARDING VOTE ON H.R. 11793,
THE FEDERAL ENERGY ADMINIS-
TRATION ACT**

HON. BEN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I opposed and voted against the Federal Energy Administration Act because it fails to address the basic and critical problem of energy development and production. Worse, this act will compound our present problem by creating a powerful Government bureaucracy to aggravate it.

Through such governmental meddling and regulation, the Federal Energy Administration can determine the life or death of any industry in America. By simple bureaucratic whim or fiat, this agency can grant life to one industry and slow down or kill another.

In short, in a moment of crisis, this body has replaced the free market with still another interruptive factor. It would appear that my colleagues have learned little from the grim and costly lessons of history. It was bureaucratic interruptions of the normal economic flow of supply and demand that led to our present serious shortage in such critical commodities as steel, paper, and fertilizers as well as in petroleum products.

In large measure, most recognized economists trace these shortages to the wage and price controls imposed by the administration in August 1971.

This is now compounded by a worsening milk shortage caused by feed stock prices so high that the costs of production of milk is higher than the anticipated sale price of the raw milk. Under such circumstances, dairy farmers are reducing herds and production capabilities at a time when demand is increasing. Such results of Government meddling have become the rule rather than the exception.

My colleagues seem to forget that it was Government regulation under the guise of improving and insuring freight service that led to bankruptcy for the Nation's largest railroad.

When the independent truckowners found themselves caught in the unbearable squeeze of rising prices and reduced income, the bureaucracy known as the Interstate Commerce Commission found itself unable to respond. Antiquated anachronism that it is, it was already overburdened by self-imposed stagnation of paperwork. It is this same ICC that today stifles development of urgently needed satellite cities and dispersal of business and housing activities from our overly impacted major cities.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The dismal performance of economies controlled by Government bureaucracies stands in chilling contrast with the performance of those controlled by the free flow of an unfettered market.

That the Congress would respond to the energy shortage with this kind of legislation worries me greatly and gives me considerable reason to fear for the future.

Certainly, additional efforts must be made to develop new energy sources. But these efforts must create incentives for research, exploration, and production of such energy.

I would, indeed, support Government funding designed to assure research and development necessary to achievement of such a goal. I would support moves to grant special tax treatment to industries, institutions, or individuals attempting innovative techniques in energy production or use. For this is the sort of thing we must have if we are truly to address ourselves to our energy problem.

Sadly, the Federal Energy Administration Act is not such a vehicle. Rather, I see it as perhaps a fateful step toward further Government intervention and imposition in the already-badly battered marketplace.

**NO ROLLBACK ON GASOLINE
PRICE**

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, as one of those Members who changed his mind on the price rollback provision contained in H.R. 11793, the Federal Energy Administration Act, I would like to put forth my reasons for doing so.

I, too, would like to offer the people I represent a reduction in oil and gasoline prices. While a price rollback would offer temporary relief, it is not a long-term solution. We have already involved the Federal Government in private enterprise to such an extent that we are now compounding the problem instead of solving it. I have previously had misgivings about the idea of a price rollback, and the comments of my colleague from Florida, SAM GIBBONS, during yesterday's debate convinced me that rolling back prices is not the best way to go about this.

With the Ways and Means Committee working on excess profit taxes for the oil companies, we can expect to have a bill on the floor within the next few months that will deal more wisely with the problems of excess profits and costs to consumers. By taxing excess profits and thereby discouraging excess costs that consumers would otherwise have to pay, we will both help the consumer and encourage exploration and development by the oil companies.

Second, just as the President vetoed the National Energy Emergency Act because of the rollback provision, we could expect a veto of this bill for precisely the same reason. I do not believe we can

March 8, 1974

afford to spend more time debating this issue. The energy problems in my district are not getting better by any means; the FEO office in Atlanta is concerned because it will soon lose its 90 day personnel appointments; and we would be back where we started from, with the all confusion that accompanied the first weeks of FEO's operation.

**CASE FOR A FEDERAL OIL AND GAS
CORPORATION: NO. 7**

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, last Friday an article appeared in the Washington Post explaining that consumers are again being forced to realize price increases for gasoline.

These increases are necessary, the Federal Energy Office claims, to provide the oil companies an incentive to produce increased amounts of gasoline, instead of heating oil, as the weather gets warmer.

In light of the revenues the major oil firms are now recording, increasing these profits at the expense of consumers is unconscionable. I believe that measures to make the petroleum industry more competitive must be adopted before any escalation in "production incentives" is even considered.

I have introduced legislation to set up a Federal Oil and Gas Corp. As I have expressed in previous extensions of remarks in the RECORD, the corporation would enter the producing sector of the oil industry with the aim of enhancing competition.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I request that the March 1, 1974, Washington Post article be inserted in the RECORD:

TWO-CENT RISE IN GAS COST SEEN TODAY

(By Peter Millius)

Gasoline prices at most service stations will go up another 2 cents today, and will probably rise at least another cent later in March.

One oil company, Getty, with outlets in 11 northeastern states, said it is raising its prices 5.25 cents a gallon effective today. That is on top of the general two-cent increase expected.

Gasoline prices, which the Labor Department says make up about 3 per cent of the cost of living, have already gone up 25 per cent in the last year, and rose 6 per cent in January alone. The average U.S. price for regular gasoline was 46.5 cents a gallon in January.

A two-cent increase, to take effect today, was granted to the nation's independent service station operators last Saturday by federal energy chief William E. Simon.

That is for the service station operators themselves, in addition to the prices they pay their supplying companies and pass along to their customers. The independent operators, who run 90 per cent of the nation's gas stations, had threatened a "pump-out" to protest their declining profits.

The supplying companies are also expected to raise their prices in March, as Getty announced it was doing. First of all, they are allowed to pass on the rising price of crude oil, which Getty said was one factor in its announcement.

Second, Simon's Federal Energy Office is allowing refiners to raise their gasoline prices 1 cent beginning today, to induce them to start producing more gasoline per barrel of crude oil and less heating oil and other distillates.

Last winter, when he wanted more heating oil, Simon had let them charge more for that, and cut back on what they could charge for gasoline.

Getty, a relatively small company, is the first to announce how much prices to its dealers will go up in March. It is not known how much the prices of the major companies will go up.

While prices continued upward, some 17,000 coal miners in West Virginia continued to stay home from work yesterday, saying they cannot get enough gasoline to get to the mines. Their walkout, now two days old, has stopped production of an estimated 175,000 tons a day of metallurgical coal used mainly in steel-making.

Simon's energy office has ordered additional gasoline sent into West Virginia, but Gov. Arch A. Moore Jr. says much of it hadn't arrived.

The miners, some of whom have to drive long distances to and from work, also want Moore to rescind an order of his barring gasoline sales to anyone whose tank is more than one-quarter full. A United Mine Workers spokesman here said Moore promised on Wednesday that he would relax the order, but hasn't done so yet.

In other developments yesterday:

The American Petroleum Institute said both crude oil imports and gasoline production in the United States increased somewhat in the week ended Feb. 22 from the week before.

McGraw-Hill Publications Co. said its latest survey showed energy-producing companies have sharply increased their planned new investments from the total projected last fall. The petroleum industry had planned about \$6.5 billion in investment, and now plans \$7.68 billion, McGraw-Hill said.

POST CARD VOTER REGISTRATION BILL

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, in the event we have the unfortunate experience of voting on H.R. 8053, the post card voter registration bill, I intend to offer the following amendments:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 8053, AS REPORTED, OFFERED BY MR. FRENZEL

Page 14, line 17, strike out "or political subdivision thereof" and insert in lieu thereof, "of a county, town, or township election board, or of a county, town, or township voter registration board".

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 8053, AS REPORTED, OFFERED BY MR. FRENZEL

Page 15, strike out lines 17, 18, and 19, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(3) provide information to State officials concerning voter registration-by-mail and information relating to election administration generally;

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 8053, AS REPORTED, OFFERED BY MR. FRENZEL

Page 17, line 11, strike out "and as the Administration determines appropriate".

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 8053, AS REPORTED, OFFERED BY MR. FRENZEL

Page 18, strike out line 22 and all that follows through page 19, line 2, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(c) The Postal Service shall distribute the registration forms no earlier than 120 days or no later than 60 days before the close of registration for each biennial general election.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 8053, AS REPORTED, OFFERED BY MR. FRENZEL

Page 21, line 13, immediately after "that State." insert the following:

The Administration is authorized to compensate any State which adopts a centralized accounting system for voter registration form processing costs.

REMOVAL OF THE ARCHITECTURAL BARRIERS FOR THE HANDICAPPED

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans' Administration has always been in the forefront of the effort to improve the design, construction, and alteration of buildings, its own and others, to overcome architectural barriers for the handicapped. The VA's first steps in the field were taken back in the 1950's. Fortunately for the entire country other groups have adopted and utilized standards which have been set by the agency.

Several months ago the VA issued new construction standards which, while applying only to the 170 VA hospitals and other VA facilities, will hopefully lead to implementation in both public and private facilities. The new standards include requirements for wider sidewalks and shallower gradients; improved accessibility to and from parking lots and curb ramps at intersection of roads and walks for wheelchair users; improvement in toilet facilities for the handicapped; lower drinking fountains; modifications of passenger elevators including audible signals to assist the blind; and other provisions to make it more likely for these individuals to participate fully in activities on the same basis as those who do not suffer the loss of any physical function.

Dr. Marc J. Musser, the chief medical director, and Mr. Viggo Miller, assistant administrator for construction of the VA, have been most active in developing these new standards and I commend them for their leadership.

I include as a part of my remarks the text of the newly promulgated standards:

ACCOMMODATIONS FOR THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED PURPOSES

This standard establishes policy for the design, construction, and alteration of cer-

tain VA buildings and facilities so that physically handicapped persons will have ready access to, and use of, such buildings and facilities.

FEDERAL LAW AND REGULATIONS

The design, construction, and alteration of VA buildings and facilities shall comply with the following applicable Federal law and regulations:

a. Public Law 90-480, approved August 12, 1968, entitled "An Act to insure that certain buildings financed with Federal funds are so designed and constructed as to be accessible to the physically handicapped"; (42 U.S.C. 4151), as amended.

b. Federal Property Management Regulations, Chapter 101, Subpart 101-17.7, entitled "Accommodations for the Physically Handicapped"; (41 CFR 101-17.7).

VA SUPPLEMENTARY STANDARDS

The applicable Federal Property Management Regulations (41 CFR 101-17.7) require conformance to the minimum standards contained in the "American Standard Specification for Making Buildings and Facilities Accessible to, and Usable by, the Physically Handicapped. Number A117.1-1961", approved by the American National Standards Institute, Inc. In addition to the basic minimum standards in ANSI A117.1-1961, the VA requires conformance to the supplementary standards prescribed in the following paragraphs of this VA construction standard. These supplementary VA standards are not intended to be a substitute for all the basic standards in ANSI A117.1-1961. To forestall misinterpretations and to avoid potential conflicts between the two standards, the unsupplemented basic standards in ANSI A117.1-1961 are neither repeated nor paraphrased in this VA construction standard. However, this VA construction standard shall govern wherever it deviates from ANSI A117.1-1961.

SITE DEVELOPMENT

Walks

Walks shall be at least 72 inches wide and shall have a gradient not greater than 3 percent. A ramp shall be substituted for any walk where the gradient of the walk would otherwise exceed 3 percent. The ramps shall comply with the requirements prescribed in paragraph 5a of this VA construction standard. Walks that have gradients of from 2 to 3 percent shall be provided with level platforms at 200-foot intervals and at intersections with other walks. A walk shall have a level platform that is at least 6 feet by 6 feet, at the entry to a building, or where the direction of traffic-flow changes. These platforms shall extend at least 18 inches beyond each side of the doorway for single leaf doors and 12 inches for double leaf doors. Walks and platforms shall have nonslip surfaces. Warning lines of a contrasting color shall be provided across the full width of a walk at its intersection with a vehicular traffic lane. The warning lines shall be perpendicular to the vehicular traffic lane and shall extend not less than 3 feet from the vehicular traffic lane. In order to be perceptible to the touch when swept by the cane of a blind person, the warning lines shall be composed of durable nonslip strips that project approximately 1/16-inch above the finished surface of the walk. The strips shall be 3 inches wide; a 3-inch clear space shall be left between them.

Parking lots

Spaces that are accessible and proximate to the main entrance and to the outpatient entrance to each building or facility shall be set aside and identified for use by individuals with physical disabilities. When placed between two conventional diagonal or head-on parking spaces, single parking spaces for

March 8, 1974

individuals with physical disabilities shall be 13 feet 6 inches wide. If multiple parking spaces are provided for individuals with physical disabilities, each of the parking spaces shall be not less than 9 feet wide; in addition, a clear space 4 feet wide shall be provided between the adjacent parking spaces and also on the outside of the end spaces. Curb ramps (curb cuts) shall be provided between the parking spaces used by individuals with physical disabilities and the access walks to those parking spaces. The curb ramps shall comply with the detailed standards in the following paragraph 4c.

Curb ramps—curb cuts

Curb ramps shall be provided at all intersections of roads and walks. The curb ramps shall be not less than 4 feet wide; they shall not have a slope greater than 8 percent, and preferably not greater than 5 percent. The vertical angle between the surface of a curb ramp and the surface of a road or gutter shall not be less than 176 degrees; the transition between the two surfaces shall be smooth. Warning lines that meet the requirements in the preceding paragraph 4a shall be provided on a curb ramp at its intersection with a vehicular traffic lane. Curb ramps shall have nonslip surfaces.

BUILDINGS

Ramps with gradients

Any walks or floors shall be ramped if the slope exceeds 3 percent. Ramps shall not have a slope greater than 8 percent, and preferably not greater than 5 percent. The ramps shall have handrails on both sides; every handrail shall have a clearance of not less than 1½ inches between the back of the handrail and the wall or any other vertical surface behind it. Ramps shall not be less than 4 feet wide clear between curbs; curbs shall be provided on both sides. The curbs shall not be less than 4 inches high and 4 inches wide. A level platform in a ramp shall not be less than the full width of the ramp and not less than 5 feet long. Entrance platforms and ramps shall be provided with protective weather barriers to shield them against hazardous conditions resulting from inclement weather. Ramps and level platforms in ramps shall have nonslip surfaces.

Entrances

Entrances shall be level, within the requirements of this standard. Entrances to all outpatient buildings and facilities shall be usable by individuals with physical disabilities. Routes to the entrances that are accessible to, and usable by, the handicapped shall be marked by directional signs placed at the parking lot, the main entrances, and along the way to the accessible entrances; the accessible entrances themselves shall also be marked by identification signs. The signs shall incorporate the *International Symbol of Accessibility for the Handicapped*, as prescribed in paragraph 5j of this VA construction standard.

Doors and doorways

Single-leaf doors, and at least one leaf of double-leaf doors, shall have a clear opening of no less than 34 inches and shall be operable by a single effort. "Operable by a single effort" means that they can be opened the full width of the doorway by a single push or pull of not more than 8 pounds of pressure, and preferably not more than 5 pounds. Thresholds shall not project above the finished floor. The centerline of door handles shall be not more than 36 inches above the floor. Lever type handles are preferred instead of door knobs. At full glass doors, warning lines of a contrasting color shall be provided on the floor across the full width of the doorway. The warning lines shall be perpendicular to the door and shall extend not less than 3 feet on both sides of the door. In order to be perceptible to the touch when

swept by the cane of a blind person, the warning lines shall be composed of durable nonslip abrasive strips that project approximately $\frac{1}{16}$ inch above the finished surface of the floor. The strips shall be 3 inches wide; a 3-inch clear space shall be left between them.

Stairs

Handrails shall be provided on both sides of stairs. The handrails shall be designed so that loose clothing cannot catch over their ends. Treads shall have nonslip surfaces and shall have nosings of a color in contrast to the general color of the stairs. The contrasting color shall extend 1 inch down the riser and 1 inch deep along the full length of the tread. At the top and bottom of stairs, warning lines of a contrasting color shall be provided on the floor across the full width of the stairs. The warning lines shall be perpendicular to the stairs and shall extend not less than 3 feet from the stairs. In order to be perceptible to the touch when swept by the cane of a blind person, the warning lines shall be composed of durable nonslip abrasive strips that project approximately $\frac{1}{16}$ inch above the finished surface of the floor. The strips shall be 3 inches wide; a clear space of 3 inches shall be left between them.

Toilet Rooms

Toilet rooms that are made accessible to, and usable by, the physically handicapped shall be clearly marked by signs incorporating the *International Symbol of Accessibility for the Handicapped*, as prescribed in paragraph 5j of this VA construction standard. The toilet rooms of this type that are provided for visitors shall preferably be located on the level at which the visitors enter the building; the toilet rooms that are provided for employees shall be located adjacent to main locker rooms. Every toilet room of this type shall be provided with the following:

Water Closet Compartment

At least one water closet compartment shall: (a) be not less than 5 feet 6 inches wide and not less than 6 feet deep; (b) have a door that is 34 inches wide which swings out and that is not located directly in front of the water closet; (c) have a grab rail on one side, 30 inches high, 1½ inches in outside diameter with 1½ inches clearance between rail and wall; and (d) have one wall mounted water closet with its centerline located 18 inches from the side wall to which the grab rail is fastened, and placed with the seat 15 inches above the finished floor.

Exception.—As an alternative to the immediately preceding standards, the water closet compartment may: (a) be not less than 3 feet 6 inches wide and not less than 6 feet 6 inches deep; (b) have a door that is 34 inches wide which swings out; (c) have grab rails on each side, 30 inches high, 1½ inches in outside diameter, with 1½ inches clearance between rail and wall; and (d) have one wall mounted water closet located on the centerline of the rear wall of the compartment, and placed with the seat 20 inches above the finished floor.

Lavatories

One of the lavatories shall be either a wheelchair type, VA Equipment Guide List Symbol No. P-66WCL and have a tilted mirror above as shown on VA Architectural Standard Detail No. 15; or it shall be a vanity type as shown on VA Architectural Standard Detail No. 53. Either single lever (not "Push-Pull" type) or wrist blade water controls shall be provided for wheelchair lavatories. A paper towel dispenser and a duplex electrical receptacle shall be provided within easy reach of a handicapped individual seated in a wheelchair in front of the lavatory. The dispenser shall be surface mounted, with its bottom no higher than 40 inches above the finished floor. The towel dispenser shall be designed for multifold interlocking paper towels.

Urinals

Urinals shall have a manual flushing handle mounted not more than 40 inches above the finished floor. Stall urinals extending to the floor are acceptable for use by the handicapped and may be provided under this standard. Wherever wall mounted urinals are provided for use by patients, staff, and/or the general public, one of the urinals shall be mounted with the lip of the basin not more than 15 inches above the finished floor, so as to be usable by the handicapped.

Entrance Doors

The toilet room entrance doors shall be easy opening, 3 feet wide, and hinged to swing into the room. Where the plan arrangement would otherwise permit a direct view of the toilet room while the entrance door is open, a suitable screen partition shall be provided not less than 4 feet away from the entrance door, as shown on VA Architectural Standard Detail No. 12A.

Water Fountains

Water fountains and water coolers provided for the handicapped shall be set into alcoves and shall be wall mounted with the rim at 34 inches above the finished floor and provide a minimum clearance of 27 inches under the fountain, all as shown on VA Architectural Standard Detail No. 4C.

Public Telephones

At least one public telephone for handicapped individuals shall be provided on each floor. These telephones shall have amplifiers on the receivers, push button controls, and cords not less than 3 feet long. The telephone cabinets shall be as shown on VA Architectural Standard Detail No. 56.

Elevators

These requirements apply to all elevators except mortuary and freight elevators. Call buttons in elevator lobbies shall be centered 3 feet 4 inches above the finished floor. Signals audible in elevator lobbies shall emit a sound of higher pitch for upward bound arriving cars; lower pitch for downward bound arriving cars. An automatic elevator shall have: (1) slow-acting doors, meaning doors requiring 7 foot-pounds or less of kinetic energy to close, resulting in an average closing speed of one foot per second; (2) doors with mechanical safety edges and twin photoelectric light ray protection; (3) a door opening not less than 36 inches wide and preferably 48 inches wide; (4) raised or engraved identification provided on the panel adjacent to each control button; (5) an auxiliary call button panel in the car mounted either in the front return panel opposite the main car operating station or in the side wall of the car adjacent to the entrance strike jamb; (6) the auxiliary call buttons in the car centered at 3 feet, and extended not more than 3 feet 6 inches, above the floor of the car (where an auxiliary car operating panel is not feasible, the main car operating panel shall meet these height requirements); (7) double handrails on three sides of the car located at heights of 32 inches and 42 inches respectively above the floor of the car; (8) a car that is not less than 5 feet 8 inches wide and 5 feet deep; (9) an emergency intercom station, without dial, located not more than 40 inches above the floor of the car; (10) call and operating buttons illuminated and projecting from the panel board; and, (11) push-to-stop emergency buttons raised from the panel board.

Utility outlets, receptacles, and controls

The centerlines of utility outlets, receptacles, switches, and controls for light, heat (exclusive of thermostats), ventilation, windows, draperies, plumbing and all similar controls of frequent or essential use, shall be located where they will be accessible to the handicapped and shall be mounted within a range of 18 to 40 inches above the finished

floor. The centerlines of fire alarm boxes shall be mounted 48 inches above the finished floor.

Identification

The International System of Accessibility for the Handicapped shall be used to clearly identify facilities and areas that are designed for full access and use by all handicapped individuals. The Symbol is illustrated on VA Architectural Standard Details No. 45A and 45B.

Cafeterias and retail stores

Food serving lanes and aisles shall not be less than 36 inches wide, and preferably 48 inches wide. Cutlery and display racks shall be visible to, and within easy reach of, an individual seated in a wheelchair; the racks shall not be higher than 54 inches above the finished floor. Tray lines should be continuous through the serving and dispensing areas to the cashier's station.

Vestibules

Where a vestibule is considered necessary, its depth shall be not less than 6 feet 6 inches and both doors shall swing in the same direction.

Carpets

Carpets in public areas shall be the contract type designed for heavy traffic. The carpeting shall have a tight weave and a low pile, preferably a tight dense loop pile and not a plush or cut pile. Carpets installed without underlays are preferred by wheelchair users.

Tables

The vertical clear space between the bottom surface of a table and the finished floor shall not be less than 30 inches; nor shall the clear space be obstructed by horizontal bracing, skirts, fascias, and table bases. Pedestal base or cantilevered type tables are preferred.

Ash trays

The lips of wall mounted ash trays shall not be higher than 36 inches above the finished floor.

RESCISSON

VA Construction Standard CD-28 "Facilities for the Handicapped (Other Than Patients)", dated March 24, 1966, is hereby rescinded.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

WORLD OPINION

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, ever since I came to Congress 17 years ago, I have been hearing about world opinion. Evidently only Americans have to worry about it.

Just what is world opinion? If there is such a thing, perhaps it can be found in the United Nations Organization, to which the U.N. cult has given the grandiose designation of "world body."

Let us take a look at the makeup of the United Nations. At present it has 135 members, the Soviet Union having three memberships. The member nations have a total population of 3,568,531,000, which is just 190,556,000 short of the total world population of 3,759,087,000. The member nations contain 94.93 percent of the earth's people.

Now let us take a further look and see how close the organization comes to reflecting world opinion. A majority of 68 votes can be formed by nations representing 157,276,000 people, or 4.41 percent of the world's population. A two-thirds majority of 90 votes can be formed by nations representing 346,193,000 people, or 9.70 percent of the world's population.

Each member of the United Nations, no matter how large or how small, has one vote. Communist China, with 800,720,000 people, has one vote. Qatar, with 115,000 people, has one vote.

When the disparities in population are taken into account, we find that Red China and India each have a voting strength of 1, while Qatar has a voting strength of 6,963. The United States has a voting strength of 4.

All of the members put together, while having a total of 135 votes—one each—have a voting strength of 72,429. In other words, the United States, which pays the lion's share of the organization's expenses, can be outnumbered by 72,425 to 4.

No other nation should be permitted to vote away our money, our resources, or our young men, but votes in the United Nations could furnish some indication of what popular opinion throughout the world might be, provided a more intelligent system of voting were put into effect.

If one vote were given for each 50,000 people, there would be a total vote of 71,369 or 98.54 percent of the present voting strength. Maldives and Qatar would each have a voting strength of 2 instead of the present 6,510 and 6,963, respectively. The United States would have 4,231 instead of the present 4.

Even with a more realistic system of voting, the United States would be hopelessly outnumbered, 67,138 to 4,231. I hope that my colleagues will keep this imbalance in mind when this body considers S. 1868, which provides that the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act concerning

the importation of strategic raw materials including Rhodesian chrome shall not apply to prohibitions or regulations issued under the United Nations Participation Act of 1945.

Mr. Speaker, the following table includes the population, present voting strength, and what the voting strength would be under a more equitable apportionment of the present membership of the United Nations Organization. I am sure that my colleagues will be interested in these statistics.

The table follows:

Member ¹	Population (thousands)	Approximate present voting strength	Voting strength if 1 per 50,000
Afghanistan	17,880	45	358
Albania	2,230	359	45
Algeria	15,270	52	305
Argentina	23,920	33	478
Australia	15,612	51	312
Austria	7,490	107	150
Bahamas	190	4,214	4
Bahrain	220	3,640	4
Barbados	240	3,336	5
Belgium	9,691	83	194
Bhutan	1,150	696	23
Bolivia	5,190	154	104
Botswana	690	1,160	14
Brazil	100,100	8	2,002
Bulgaria	8,580	93	172
Burma	28,900	28	578
Burundi	3,400	236	68
Cameroon	6,000	133	120
Canada	22,047	36	441
Central African Republic	3,000	267	60
Chad	3,790	211	76
Chile	10,000	80	200
China, Communist	800,720	1	16,014
Colombia	23,000	35	460
Congo (ex-French)	980	817	20
Costa Rica	1,843	434	37
Cuba	8,750	92	175
Cyprus	651	1,230	13
Czechoslovakia	14,480	55	290
Dahomey	2,830	283	57
Denmark	5,100	157	102
Dominican Republic	4,300	186	86
Ecuador	6,598	121	132
Egypt	34,839	23	697
El Salvador	3,760	213	75
Equatorial Guinea	300	2,669	6
Ethiopia	25,930	31	519
Fiji	540	1,483	11
Finland	4,630	173	93
France	53,820	15	1,076
Gabon	500	1,601	10
Gambia	380	2,107	18
Germany, East	17,050	47	341
Germany, West	61,670	13	1,233
Ghana	9,090	88	182
Greece	9,030	89	181
Guatemala	5,600	143	112
Guinea	4,110	195	82
Guyana	750	1,068	15
Haiti	5,070	158	101
Honduras	2,690	298	54
Hungary	10,400	77	208
Iceland	210	3,813	4
India	563,490	1	11,270
Indonesia	120,400	7	2,408
Iran	30,550	26	611
Iraq	10,070	80	201
Ireland	3,010	266	60
Israel	3,200	250	64
Italy	54,350	15	1,087
Ivory Coast	4,530	177	91
Jamaica	1,920	417	38
Japan	107,332	7	2,147
Jordan	2,470	324	49
Kenya	12,070	66	241
Khmer	7,250	110	145
Kuwait	910	880	18
Laos	3,110	257	62
Lebanon	2,960	271	59
Lesotho	1,200	667	24
Liberia	1,650	485	33
Libya	2,080	385	42
Luxemburg	350	2,288	7
Madagascar	7,655	105	153
Malawi	4,670	171	93
Malaysia	10,920	73	218
Maldives	123	6,510	2
Mali	5,260	152	105
Malta	322	2,487	6
Mauritania	1,230	651	25
Mauritius	840	953	17
Mexico	52,640	15	1,053
Mongolia	1,320	607	26
Morocco	15,830	51	317

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1974

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that I learned of my friend JULIA's decision not to seek another term in the House. It will not only be a personal loss to me as she has been a close friend and associate of mine for many years, but also a profound loss to the people she has served so well. Mrs. HANSEN has not only produced numerous legislative innovations, in addition she has also demonstrated that recognition and ability must be measured by one's achievements rather than by one's race, creed, or in this case sex. It has been a rewarding experience to be her colleague and I know my own stay in the Halls of Congress has been enriched by her presence. I want to wish her much happiness and success in any future endeavors which she may pursue in her new role as a private citizen.

Member	Population (thousands)	Approximate present voting strength	Voting strength if 1 per 50,000 ¹
Nepal	11,470	70	229
Netherlands	13,371	60	267
New Zealand	2,962	270	59
Nicaragua	1,990	402	40
Niger	4,210	190	84
Nigeria	58,020	14	1,160
Norway	3,930	204	79
Oman	700	1,144	14
Pakistan	64,892	12	1,298
Panama	1,520	527	30
Paraguay	2,580	310	52
Peru	14,460	55	289
Philippines	39,040	21	781
Poland	33,070	24	661
Portugal	24,870	32	497
Qatar	115	6,963	2
Romania	20,770	39	415
Rwanda	3,900	205	78
Saudi Arabia	8,000	100	160
Senegal	4,120	194	82
Sierra Leone	2,630	304	53
Singapore	2,150	372	43
Somalia	2,940	272	59
South Africa	23,650	34	473
Spain	34,490	23	690
Sri Lanka	13,030	61	261
Sudan	16,490	49	330
Swaziland	430	1,862	9
Sweden	8,143	98	163
Syria	6,680	120	134
Tanzania	14,000	57	280
Thailand	36,290	22	726
Togo	2,090	383	42
Trinidad and Tobago	1,040	770	21
Tunisia	5,380	149	108
Turkey	37,500	21	750
Uganda	10,460	77	209
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	250,000	3	5,000
United Arab Emirates	200	4,004	4
United Kingdom	61,304	13	1,226
United States	211,561	4	4,231
Upper Volta	5,610	143	112
Uruguay	2,960	271	59
Venezuela	10,970	73	219
Yemen Arab Republic	6,060	132	121
Yemen, People's Democratic Republic of	1,510	530	30
Yugoslavia	20,770	39	415
Zaire	22,860	35	457
Zambia	4,420	181	88
Total	3,568,531	72,429	71,369
Nonmembers	190,556		
Grand total	3,759,087		

¹ Members have 94.93 percent of the world's population.

² Voting strength of 1 per 50,000—98.54 percent of approximate present voting strength.

NORTH SIDE TOPICS OF INDIANAPOLIS HAS SOME PLAIN FACTS ABOUT BUSING

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, following is an editorial from the February 28, 1974, North Side Topics, of Indianapolis, on busing:

BUSING: JUST AN EXPEDIENT

As central Indiana awaits the federal court ruling on metropolitan desegregation here, most of the real issues in the matter are, unfortunately, obscured.

"Busing", that is, the transportation of pupils from one school or one school system to another to achieve a "racial balance", is merely an expedient.

The real cause for concern comes from the inevitable fact that busing, as a tool of the kind of "desegregation" ordered by the courts, will result in the "federalization" of one of the few remaining branches of government still under local control—the schools.

The sorry fact that "discrimination" and "desegregation" as principles have become entwined in this affair only serves to con-

fuse it even more. Indeed, anyone or any party who chooses to differ with the aims of busing is liable to have the tag "racist" or "bigot" hung around his neck.

That is deplorable, to be sure, because "school desegregation" and busing to achieve a "racial balance" are two entirely different things.

"Desegregation" means the elimination of practices that differentiate between people on the basis of race. Busing to achieve a "racial balance" is not, according to its lawful definition, the same as "desegregation". Busing of the sort ordered in and about Indianapolis, where 11,000 city children could be bused into the "innocent" suburban school systems, is an unconstitutional, illegal, and unprecedented usurpation of lawful local control of the schools.

It is unconstitutional because the 1954 Supreme Court ruling in *Brown vs. the Board of Education* affirmed the tradition of neighborhood schools and stated that no attention whatsoever should be paid to the color of one's skin in assigning pupils to schools. It is illegal because the 1964 Civil Rights Act explicitly states that "racial balance" shall not mean "desegregation" and that busing to achieve such a balance in public schools is unlawful.

It is unprecedented because the 1971 Supreme Court ruling in *Swann vs. Board of Education*, the very ruling which gave the initial go ahead to inter-district busing states that busing solutions may only apply to school systems found guilty of practicing segregation.

And that fact makes the Indianapolis situation unconscionable: that 24 autonomous suburban school corporations, the people who run them, the taxpayers who support them, were found to be innocent of practicing segregation by Judge Dillin himself, yet are made to bear the financial burden and surrender lawful local control of their schools by being ordered into a metropolitan busing plan because of the errors, real or imagined, of the Indianapolis Public Schools.

It is to say that the suburban school systems are in fact innocent of any violation of law, but those people in the suburbs are, after all, guilty because the place in which they live does not have an appropriate "racial balance".

It is to say that where one lives and the color of one's skin distinguishes him before the law, a position totally untenable in the light of American law.

The Supreme Court will rule on the constitutionality of metropolitan busing in the Detroit, Michigan case to which Indianapolis is a party. Unless they overturn it, which appears unlikely, any hope of resolving the situation must come from Congress.

As much as 80 to 90 percent of the public, according to some polls, are against busing. Yet Congress, which purports to represent the people, has time and time again avoided the matter because it is a political "hot potato."

If there is a solution to the problem, it is not in sight. However, very much in sight is the loss of local control over education in the name of education itself.

THE END OF INFLATION

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, for decades the Federal Government has been expanding the supply of money and credit. In the last few years this inflation

has been accelerated to a point that has alarmed everyone in the Nation. Instead of stopping this expansion, this inflation of the money supply, price and wage controls have been imposed in an effort to control rising prices caused by the inflation of the money supply. The results have been the shortages that are spreading throughout the country and throughout all industries. Price controls treat malaise and help disguise the fact that the cancerous growth of our dollars continues unabated.

What must be the result of the inflationary policy our Government is pursuing? We need only rely on theory, for there are at least two historical examples of Nations which followed a course similar to ours. The first is France in the years following the Revolution of 1789, and the second is Germany in the year's following the First World War.

I ask that an editorial by Howard Flieger entitled "Fright: A Flashback" which appeared in the U.S. News & World Report be entered into the RECORD as an eyewitness account of a nation in the throes of economic chaos. The chaos in Germany brought forth Hitler; the revolution in France spawned Napoleon. Are we to undergo a similar experience? The article follows:

FRIGHT: A FLASHBACK

(By Howard Flieger)

Something is out of whack when a construction worker is taking home \$400 a week, after two 6 per cent raises this year, and is worried about the future.

The worker puts his concern succinctly:

"Everybody is frightened."

Frightened? What follows is a story that makes the fear come alive:

Kurt Lachman is an old friend—an American citizen who grew up in Germany and lives there now. He has spent many years on the staff of this magazine.

Kurt lived through the inflation that all but devoured Germany 50 years ago. When he talks about inflation, the word is not an abstraction. It takes on the characteristics of human futility—like flood, famine, plague.

"In 1921," he said the other day, "the rise in the value of foreign currencies and in domestic prices in Germany came steadily, and gained momentum."

Sound familiar? He went on:

"The situation helped businessmen who were in foreign trade, and it helped those who were allowed to raise prices. But it didn't help at all the people living on fixed retailers who had to sell their goods at controlled prices while the cost of restocking with the same goods rose constantly."

"Harsh laws were being applied to retail trade that prevented the marking up of goods beyond a certain percentage above cost. Under this system, only those merchants who broke the law could survive."

"Blue collar workers got raises. But these lagged behind the rise in prices. White collar employees, civil servants and professional people dropped even further behind. It reached the point where the pay of a university professor was down to that of a doorman."

By 1923 the runaway was at full gallop.

"Printing of federal money was being farmed out," Kurt recalls, "because the state presses couldn't keep up with the job. Some cities began to print their own money."

Paper currency grew more plentiful with each passing day—and more worthless.

At that time Kurt was an assistant editor of one of Germany's leading newspapers, the "Frankfurter Zeitung." Listen as he describes a payday in 1923:

"Large laundry baskets filled with paper

March 8, 1974

money had to be carried into the editorial conference room where the editors would sort it out, count it, and distribute the pay.

"As soon as somebody got his bundle, he'd rush out to buy whatever he could. Anything was more valuable than money."

"More and more people turned to speculation and blackmarketing in cloth, precious metals, foreign bills and so on. The result was that the output of industry sagged."

"Because of price controls and rationing, goods were scarce in the cities. Foraging in the countryside became commonplace. The railroad stations were jammed with people going out to the peasants to bargain for food."

Kurt speaks about those days as though he still finds them hard to believe.

"A feeling of frustration seized many people," he says. "To get out of the country—even out of life—became a widespread desire. Hopelessness is the word."

In this atmosphere an obscure politician named Adolf Hitler set off a theatrical putsch in Munich—a failure, but a harbinger.

German currency reached 4.2 billion marks to the U.S. dollar. Finally, it was brought down to earth with a thud—by stripping off the ciphers and revaluing the mark at 4.2 to the dollar. If you had 4 billion marks that morning, you only had 4 by sunset.

Ugly story, isn't it? There is an unreal quality about it. But it happened.

Who is to say it could never happen here?

NET ENERGY: THE REAL ENERGY CRISIS

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 8, 1974

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the energy crisis has been very much in the news in past months, and every indication is that it will continue to be in the news for some considerable time. Contrary to reassurances that we have been provided by some spokesmen and administration officials—who ought to know better—we are not over the hump, and shortages in energy supply are, I believe, a fact of life with which we are going to have to cope in the indefinite future.

My view of the problem is that the energy crisis is not an energy crisis at all: that it is rather the first major symptom of a national and global resource crisis. Other symptoms are visible: mineral-producing countries are even now beginning to discuss export controls on a number of hard minerals. Cartels and multinational corporations also will play a highly important role in this regard, and we are going to have to keep a very close eye on these activities as well.

In all of the talk about the energy crisis of today, however, there appears to be little discussion of a very important factor: the true costs of energy production. It is as true here as it is elsewhere that you never get something for nothing. There are energy costs involved in getting energy supplies, and if these costs are carefully budgeted, we may find that we are spending as much as, or more than, we are obtaining in return.

Edward Flattau and Jeffrey Stansbury, well-informed and conscientious reporters, have written a recent article on the subject, reprinted in the Wash-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ington Monthly of March 1974. Some errors crept into the article during the editing process, and I have obtained from them a corrected copy, which I ask be reprinted in the RECORD.

They make the point that a goose which lays a golden egg a day, but which consumes six of these for every seven it produces, is a net producer of only one egg a week. Simple and elementary, perhaps, but a concept that appears to be lost in the mists of high-echelon policymaking. I believe that this is, indeed, a critical concept, and one with which we will all have to become familiar as the energy and resource crises deepen. The article should be required reading for all Members and staff.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Monthly, Mar. 1974]
IT TAKES ENERGY TO PRODUCE ENERGY: THE NET'S THE THING

(By Edward Flattau and Jeff Stansbury)

Suppose you've found a wondrous goose that lays seven golden eggs a week. Does this mean you will be able to corner the gold market? Unfortunately, no, because to keep the bird fat and fluffy—and to keep its production up—you must feed it six golden egg yolks each week. Net result: only one golden egg for sale.

This yarn may augur a potentially grim tale for the U.S. economy, for it symbolizes our net energy crisis. Not the various rigged shortages and price machinations you've been reading about, but the real thing: our net energy crisis.

If you haven't pondered net energy, the fault's not yours alone. Senator Henry M. Jackson, Capitol Hill's leading energy warrior, hasn't heard of it either and William E. Simon, chief of the Federal Energy Office, wouldn't recognize a net energy ratio if he tripped over one on his way to a press briefing. Nor would *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post* reporters who have been following Simon around with almost a religious zeal. President Nixon, a flock of oil executives, and most influential economists have yet to discover net energy let alone apply its implacable logic to their decisions.

Net energy is the energy you start with minus the energy you use up producing it—in other words, the calories you must spend to find, mine, transport, refine, convert, and deliver it. From the initial resource you must also deduct any physical losses of energy in the foregoing sequence, as well as the energy yields that you have sacrificed in the single-minded pursuit of any one fuel.

Without doubt, net energy may well be the simplest idea ever to have been ignored by so many acknowledged experts. Corporations would go bankrupt if they did not understand the distinction between gross income and net profit, but our thinking about energy has somehow not yet reached this level of sophistication.

It does not matter whether you start with energy in the ground (coal, gas, oil, uranium oxide, plutonium, steam), in surface waters (hydropower reservoirs, tides, waves), on the land (timber, food, manure) or in space (sunlight, wind): in order to use this energy, you must first expend much or most of it.

Agriculture presents an object lesson in the dynamics of net energy. To produce America's moderately high per-acre crop yields (up 63 per cent in the last 20 years), American farmers use more petroleum than *any* other economic group, and, as a result, they consume much more energy than they produce.

California State University professor Michael Perelman has calculated that the energy value of the food Americans consume roughly equals the energy burned by tractors—just one fraction of our farm machin-

ery. Significantly, the energy efficiency of U.S. agriculture has been steadily declining. Even ten years ago some 150 gallons of gasoline per American flowed into food production. That was five times as much energy as each of us consumed at the table—and the ratio has grown even worse in the ensuing decade.

Perelman's research also suggests that most other countries balance this equation better than we do. In the extremely labor-intensive agriculture of China, a wet-rice farmer produces 50 units of food energy for each energy unit he expends. For a typical American grain farmer, the ratio is dramatically reversed: one unit of energy harvested for five expended.

The largest portion of our energy deficit in agriculture comes from the use of nitrogen fertilizer. Since World War II our per-acre yields of corn have tripled, but our nitrogen energy inputs have risen 16 times. That may be efficient in terms of man-hours, but it is wasteful of energy. Dr. Georg Borgstrom, a food scientist at Michigan State University, calculates that it takes the calorie equivalents of five tons of coal to make one ton of nitrogen fertilizer. Agriculture Department officials have stated that, because of the energy squeeze, we will face a nitrogen fertilizer shortfall of about one million tons this spring. And these shortages have already raised fertilizer prices by 30 to 60 percent over last year's level.

Meanwhile, the sewage technology employed by our narrowly trained sanitary engineers has been dumping about 2.4 million tons of perfectly good nitrogen into our lakes, streams, and estuaries each year. Dr. John R. Sheaffer, until recently the U.S. Army's top environmental consultant, estimates that this nitrogen is worth \$1 billion and equals nearly a third of the synthetic fertilizer sold. By wasting it and forcing us to replace it with manufactured nitrogen, sanitary engineers make us burn the equivalent of an extra 2.2 billion gallons of fuel oil each year. Reclaiming most of this sewage will greatly improve the net energy yield of our agriculture, although it is not the whole answer.

Howard T. Odum, professor of Environmental Engineering Sciences at the University of Florida, has done the most provocative thinking on the importance of net energy. "Many forms of energy are low-grade because they have to be concentrated, transported, dug from deep in the earth or pumped from far at sea," Odum says. "If it takes 10 units of energy to bring 10 units of energy to the point of use, then there is no net energy. Right now we dig further and further, deeper and deeper, and we go for energies that are more and more dilute. We are still expanding our rate of consumption of gross energy, but since we are feeding a higher and higher percentage back into the energy-seeking process, we are decreasing our percentage of net energy production."

That single paragraph makes more sense about our energy predicament than volumes of solemn declarations from the Senate Interior Committee, the Federal Energy Office, and the oil companies. It puts the spotlight on the steady decline in the net energy yields of our traditional fossil fuels. Our nearest, least resistant oil fields have been drained, now we must literally squeeze oil from marginal ones, or import it from abroad in tankers (which themselves use fuel), or pump it long distances from offshore rigs to refineries. In the past, when oil returned a high net energy yield, it handsomely subsidized all our other fuel and power sources. Oil built hydroelectric dams. Oil and electricity extracted our coal. Oil grew our wheat. Oil made 20th-century America "work." But today, our free ride on oil is coming to a halt.

FLUNKING THE NET ENERGY TEST

This means, among other things, that each of our remaining fuels must henceforth meet the test of its own intrinsic net energy ratio.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Let's look briefly at three such fuels: coal, uranium oxide, and shale oil.

In a recent interview with The Washington Post, William Simon declared: "Today we've got an 800-year supply of coal in this country where we can get from 25 to 35 per cent of our needs . . . for an infinite period of time." The kindest phrase we can think of to describe this statement is "whistling in the dark." Simon has simply commandeered—and inflated—the best prevailing estimates of our gross coal reserves without making any allowance for the energy cost of extracting this coal.

Unfortunately, common sense suggests that the net yield from our remaining coal deposits will be low. Unlike oil from wells, coal can be extracted only after tons of earth have been pushed aside. In the case of strip-mined coal these tons are literally mountains—mountains which must later be bulldozed back into shape, covered with topsoil, seeded, and carefully tended for 15 or so years (that is, unless we're willing to leave the land unreclaimed).

Seven months ago the President's Council on Environmental Quality issued a booklet on electric power. It contained some serious errors, but one useful fact can be found in it. Of all the deep or strip-mined coal that we extract, only 30 per cent reaches the final user. The rest disappears through physical losses in processing and transportation, heat losses during conversion to electricity, and electrical leakage from transmission lines. Furthermore, each of these steps, like the extraction process itself, consumes considerable energy. "Big Muskie," a giant coal dragline now tearing up Muskingum County, Ohio, gulps enough power each day for 27,000 all-electric homes. The energy costs of mining coal and converting it to electric power must therefore be subtracted from the 30 per cent of the initial resource which is left after leakage and physical disappearance.

We must also subtract the energy harvest we sacrifice when we decide to use land for strip-mining. Joseph Browder, of Washington's Environmental Policy Center, says, "The energy costs of stripping Northern Great Plains coal must include the direct loss of agricultural productivity in the Powder River Basin and other areas where livestock produced on native grasses would be replaced by livestock produced in a feedlot system dependent on energy-intensive, fertilized, irrigated crops."

In the West, the energy problems caused by strip-mining have another facet: Immense amounts of water will have to be set aside to gasify, liquefy, or convert the coal into electricity. This means new water sources will have to be developed, at a high energy cost, to replace those consumed by converting coal.

When all these relevant energy costs are deducted, the net yield from our coal reserves may drop to three or four percent or less. Presto! Simon's 800-year bonanza has shrunk to a few decades.

LOSING ENERGY WITH ATOMIC POWER

Then there's nuclear power, which the Nixon Administration is betting will eliminate our energy problems forever by the end of the century. So far, however, 25 years of nuclear fission power have drained off more energy than they have produced. It's easy to see where the problem comes from.

In 1972, according to the authoritative *Electric World*, the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) used 25.7 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity just to produce the uranium needed to fuel nuclear power stations—stations with a power output of about 50-billion kwh. This was not a fluke. "As much as half of the gross electrical output of a nuclear plant would have to be recycled to supply input for fuel processing," says E. J. Hoffman, a University of Wyoming nuclear

energy specialist. If you also include the energy costs of searching for uranium ore, mining it and transporting it; findings, mining, refining, and transporting the metals that go into nuclear power plants; manufacturing the concrete for these plants; operating them (which includes driving to and from work); and storing or reprocessing the "dirty" wastes from nuclear fission—you will find the 1972 net energy yield from uranium has probably sagged to less than 10 per cent.

The sober conclusion we draw from all this is that our nuclear energy program would collapse without its big energy subsidy from oil. Three years ago, after studying the past, present, and projected yields of U.S. nuclear power plants, Dr. Hoffman stated:

"The cumulative energy expenditure of the entire atomic energy program may not be recouped from nuclear fission power plants by the time the reserves of economically recoverable U-235 are used up."

Shale oil presents us with another statistical no-man's land. There are between one billion and 10 billion barrels of shale oil burned in the West, according to official estimates. However, after all the energy requirements of shale oil have been subtracted, there may be a net yield of only a few hundred million barrels. This could even drop off close to zero if all that buried shale has to be laid bare, heated to squeeze out the oil (which makes the waste rock expand), pushed back into place and recontoured. In a recent book, *The Energy Crisis*, Lawrence E. Rocks and Richard Runyon predict that the net energy yield from 99 per cent of our Rocky Mountain oil shale will be zero.

One reason why almost nobody seems to care about net energy is the tendency of otherwise knowledgeable people to confuse net energy with mere efficiency of extraction. When we hear the term "fuel efficiency," it is easy to think of extraction ratios: for example, we can only suck about 30 per cent of the oil in an oil field out of the ground, and solar devices can convert only about one per cent of the incoming light into useful energy. This may make oil seem more "efficient" than solar energy. But it doesn't cost us anything to pass up that 99 per cent of solar energy of 70 per cent of oil; we get nothing and we expend nothing, so this loss doesn't really affect our calculations. What really counts is how much energy we must expend to get the obtainable energy. Extracting and refining the 30 per cent of the oil may consume so much energy that the net energy yield is quite low.

Another problem is that the entire debate over fuels is dominated by economists, geologists, and capitalists who have been trained to think only in terms of dollars. Is oil shale still too costly to develop? Well then, they advise, wait for conventional fuels to grow scarce (high-priced) and shale oil will become a profitable commodity. The trouble with such incantations is that they assume the dollar costs of a given fuel will faithfully—and quickly—reflect its energy costs. This assumption is unwarranted. The dollar costs of new oil wells, for example, depend on tax write-offs and other accounting decisions which do not reflect net energy. A fuel can remain artificially underpriced for months, even years, after its net yield drops. And the notion that shale oil will become profitable at the very moment when it can no longer count on a big initial subsidy from deep-well oil is, in net energy terms, absurd.

"The truth is often stated backwards by economists," says Dr. Odum. "Often they propose that marginal energy sources will become economic when the rich sources are gone. But the ability of marginal sources to yield goes down as the sources of subsidy become poorer."

Three months ago, Brookings Institution President and former Budget Director Kermit Gordon admitted to the American Economics

Association: "I know of no neat theory of inflation that fits the facts of the last five years—neither aggregate demand, nor money supply, nor labor power, nor oligopoly power, nor bottlenecks, nor expectations—though I could easily be convinced that they all played a part."

The "facts" of the last five years boil down to a lickety-split inflation that has respected neither boom nor bust. Might not our shrinking net energies provide the "neat" theory that resolves this seeming paradox? Professor Odum sees it that way: "If the energy reaching society for its general work is less because so much energy must go into the energy-getting process, then the real work of society per unit of money circulated is less. Money then buys less real work . . . and is worth less." This inflationary bind could exist in a rising or a falling economy, provided that the actual money supply did not substantially dwindle.

The infamous U.S.-Soviet wheat deal two years ago provides a vivid example of the fickle relationship between dollars and net energy. This exchange was a financial windfall for a few grain exporting firms, but an energy disaster for Americans. Wilson Clark, a Washington, D.C. energy specialist, claims that it cost us 10 units of energy to ship grain worth one unit of energy to the Russians. In return we were promised Soviet natural gas worth two energy units. "Financially it worked out fine," Clark says, "but in energy terms we suffered a 5 to 1 net loss."

BALANCING OUR ENERGY ACCOUNTS

Clearly, before the United States invests hundreds of millions and then billions of dollars in a desperate scramble for miracle fuels, we must devise a system of national energy accounts. How much of the energy from western coal must be pumped back into its production? How will the net yield of western strip-mined coal compare with that of midwestern deep-mined coal? What natural energy harvests will be sacrificed by these alternatives? How heavily must we subsidize the next 25 years of nuclear fission? To bring one 1,200-calorie loaf of cracked wheat bread to a suburban table, how many thousands of calories must we spend on fertilizer, pesticides, cultivation, harvesting, farm overhead, milling, baking, distribution, sales, and—not least—that luxurious trip to the supermarket? For our overseas oil, how much energy do we invest in our Mediterranean fleet, in our farflung corporate empires, and in their support structures in the Departments of State, Commerce, and Interior? Will solar converters yield a rich net energy harvest? And (assuming the necessary copper can be scavenged) will windmills?

A bookkeeping system capable of answering these and a vast number of related questions will do something for us that mere dollars cannot: it will test our economic sanity, rationalize our economic planning, and give us a long-lost sense of proportion vis à vis the natural world we inhabit. We need to launch this accounting revolution immediately, for the world we face tomorrow is not the world we know today. Immutable laws of net energy are leading us toward an economic steady state.

"Our system of man and nature will soon be shifting from rapid growth to steady state non-growth as the criterion of economic survival," says Dr. Odum. Ecologists are familiar with both the growth state and the steady state; they observe both in natural systems." Economists, however, have been schooled during, by, and for growth. Most of them have never seen a steady state. Except for the London School's Ezra Mishan and a mere handful of kindred spirits, they reject the possibility of a steady state even though man lived in something very close to one during 99 per cent of his evolution.

Why is a new steady state—presumably at a decent level of health and well-being—in

our cards? It is in our cards because the high net-yielding energy sources we need to survive, with the doubtful exception of nuclear fusion, cannot match the total daily output we have heretofore enjoyed from the fossil fuels. Oil, coal, and gas have been a marvelous energy "capital," a 400-million-year-old bankroll for the Western world. Sunlight is energy "income," however; we can tap only so much of it each day. Whether we like it or not, we'll have to live within our means. This is the only way we can reach that redoubtable state Mr. Nixon calls "energy self-sufficiency."

SOVIET TRADING STRATEGY: "LET THE WEST FINANCE ITS OWN DESTRUCTION"

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1974

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Arab oil-producing countries are not the only ones reaping a handsome profit from the energy crisis. The Russians have now gotten into the act.

The Soviets recently "sold" military armaments to Iraq in exchange for \$13 million worth of Iraqi oil. The petroleum was never intended for use in Mother Russia, however. It was resold for \$40 million in hard currency to West Germany, even before the Iraqis delivered it. For their efforts at playing the middle

men, the Soviet wheeler-dealers pocketed a nice profit of \$27 million.

Sound familiar? It is the same technique the Russians used 2 years ago when they pulled off the "great grain robbery," which sent food prices in this country into orbit. In the case of the wheat deal, it will be remembered, the Russians received taxpayer subsidies and were able to purchase our wheat at bargain basement prices. Some 200,000 tons of the U.S. wheat was diverted for resale to Bangladesh, as a Soviet public relations gesture, even before it left the Port of Houston. Recent reports now indicate that the Russians are willing to sell some of the same wheat back to the United States at an inflated profit, of course.

Last April, the Soviet market manipulators arranged another deal with the European Common Market to purchase 200,000 tons of butter at 17 cents a pound while the market price was 93 cents a pound. It was assumed at the time that the cheap butter would be used on bread made from the cheap U.S. wheat. As it turned out, much of the butter was resold at a profit to the Communist government in Chile.

The Soviets also have no misgivings about "ripping off" their allies in trade deals. Cotton, which the Soviets bartered away from Egypt and the Sudan last year, has now found its way into the world market. The Russian-owned cotton is currently in direct competition with cotton exports from these two countries.

A trend appears to be developing. The Soviet Union has finally learned how to make their economic system work: Sponge off the capitalists at a profit.

Some observers in this country hail this trend as a sign that the Soviets are developing into a semicapitalistic system. I disagree. I am reminded of the accurate observation made many years ago by the great mentor of Soviet communism, V. I. Lenin. He told his comrades:

When the capitalist world starts to trade with us—on that day they will begin to finance their own destruction.

Mr. Speaker, as an additional example of our continued financing of the Soviet Union, I include a related news clipping:

SAME CREDIT TERMS EXTENDED TO MOSCOW

The Export-Import Bank has extended \$248.5 million in export trade credits to the Soviet Union on the same terms as to other borrowers, senators were told yesterday.

The loans will support exports of U.S. equipment with a total value of \$552 million.

Walter C. Sauer, vice chairman of the bank, said Moscow has received no preference and was able to obtain its required 50 per cent matching of borrowed funds from private lending institutions without government guarantees.

The bank board, Sauer said, acted on available information about the Soviet economy and trade statistics in finding "reasonable assurance of repayment."

But, he said, more information would be required to go substantially beyond the present level of borrowing.

Sauer testified at the bank's budget hearing before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, March 11, 1974

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Henry L. Reinewald, national chaplain, Veterans of Foreign Wars, offered the following prayer:

Father, we pray Your blessings upon the United States of America, upon its people, upon its Government, and especially upon the House of Representatives of the United States.

We invoke the guidance of Your Holy Spirit upon our Nation and its people, as we meet the challenges and opportunities of this day and age, that in all things we shall do Your will. We thank You Father that in every age since the founding of these United States of America Your blessing has been upon this land and its people. We pray that Your blessing will ever be the guiding light of our Nation, that we as a people shall ever know the way, the truth, and the life You desire for us. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Is there objection to dispensing with the reading of the Journal?

MOTION OFFERED BY MS. ABZUG

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I object to dispensing with the reading of the Journal, and I move that the Journal be read.

The SPEAKER. The question is, shall the Journal be read?

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5450. An act to amend the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972, in order to implement the provisions of the Convention on the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping of Wastes and Other Matter, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 265. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain mineral rights in certain lands located in Utah to the record owner thereof;

S. 1688. An act to protect the civilian employees of the executive branch of the U.S. Government in the enjoyment of their constitutional rights and to prevent unwarranted governmental invasions of their privacy; and

S. 2747. An act to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase the minimum wage rate under that act, to expand the coverage of the act, and for other purposes.

RESIGNATION OF THE PRESIDENT

(Mr. VANDER VEEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VANDER VEEN. Mr. Speaker, as you know, I was elected as the first Democrat in 4 years from the Fifth District in Michigan. When I announced in early December of 1973 that I would be a candidate, I said that the issue in the election was Richard Nixon. I said at that time that Richard Nixon, for the good of the country, should resign. Throughout the campaign, my opponent refused to take a stand against Richard Nixon. On election day the issue was clearly drawn.

The voters spoke decisively, electing me by a 7,000-vote margin in a turnout exceeding all predictions. A very recent poll showed that for each Republican that stayed home, 2 to 1 would have voted for me, thus increasing the margin by an even larger number.

Nothing has occurred since my original statement to change my position. Each passing day and each new development has only strengthened my conviction. Some Democrats have wondered whether, for partisan advantage, it would be more advantageous to have the Presi-