

placement of a State prison near Coalinga—a \$36 million industry—the development of a 40-acre industrial park, and the building of an \$8 million airport facility.

I am certain Coalinga will continue to persevere and to prosper into the future. It has 90 years of history to call on when facing the challenges of the years to come.

#### A TRIBUTE TO ROMAN MYCYK

HON. LUIS V. GUTIERREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 29, 1996

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an individual who spent his life serving the people of the Ukraine and the people of Chicago. Roman Mycyk was one of the founders of the Self-reliance Ukrainian Federal Credit Union, which was chartered on July 2, 1951. He served as president of the Board of Directors, bringing leadership to the members of the Self-reliance FCU.

The Self-reliance FCU has 12,660 members and assets totaling more than 187 million dollars. Roman Mycyk's leadership touched the lives of all those who came in contact with him and brought unheralded success to the Self-reliance.

Mr. Mycyk was born in the Ukraine on April 10, 1909 and made his mark in his homeland as a scholar, achieving a Masters Degree in economics from the University of the Ukraine.

He was very active on behalf of Ukrainian independence from the Soviet Union. His belief in freedom for his people and his country led to his imprisonment for 7 long years.

Throughout his life, Roman Mycyk has worked with a number of Ukrainian community groups to enable immigrants to assimilate into American society. His work was proven invaluable in integrating thousands of Ukrainian immigrants into our Nation's political and economic life.

I take this time today, so that the memory of Roman Mycyk will be commemorated on March 31, 1996. I would also like to pay my respects to Mr. Mycyk's family, in particular his daughter Christine and son Roman Jr.

#### SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 1833, PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION BAN ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. BART STUPAK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1996

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support of the Senate amendments to H.R. 1833, legislation to ban partial-birth abortions.

I would like to share with my colleagues some highly cogent articles on the highly emotional issue of partial-birth abortions. I believe Dennis Byrne of the Chicago Sun-Times; George Will, writing for Newsweek magazine; and, John Leo, in U.S. News and World Report, convey some very important views that we should take into consideration as we debate and deliberate this legislation.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Dec. 12, 1995]

TRUTH IN REPORTING? GIMME A BREAK

(By Dennis Byrne)

Hands-down winner of the sleazy, dishonest journalism award is NBC's "Dateline" for its "reporting" on the partial-birth abortion ban. Not that NBC didn't have some stiff competition from other pro-choice media acolytes who blindly parrot the line that partial-birth abortions don't hurt the kid and are used only to save mama.

But NBC outdid all of them with a segment broadcast before the Senate voted Thursday to approve the ban on grisly partial-birth abortions. In it, NBC gave the white, middle-aged male senator who backed the bill (apparently no self-respecting woman of child-bearing age could be found to support the bill) a fraction of the time and none of the sympathetic treatment accorded the other side: a tearful woman who told Congress she had to have the procedure because of a defect in her fetus. The grieving, sensitive couple was even interviewed at graveside.

NBC neglected to make one critical fact clear, though: The couple's story had absolutely nothing to do with the ban. The whole story was irrelevant because the law would apply only to such abortions on live fetuses. This couple's was dead.

Continuing the parade of horrors: ABC's Sam Donaldson (M.D., Ph.D., etc.) explained Sunday that partial-birth abortions are used only for the most serious of health reasons. Which ignores what one doctor who performs them, Martin Haskell, told the American Medical Association's newspaper, American Medical News: "In my particular case, probably 20 percent are for genetic reasons. And the other 80 percent are purely elective."

The story also speared some other pro-choice myths, such as the idea that the fetus is dead before the abortion begins. "No, it's not," replied Haskell, estimating that in his case, about two-thirds of the fetuses are alive at the start of the procedure. Naturally, pro-choice extremists attacked the publication for supposedly misrepresenting Haskell, but the paper stood by the reporting, and produced a transcript from a tape recording.

Then comes AP reporter Diane Duston, who, in a story Friday about President Clinton promising to veto the bill, wrote without attribution: "Late second- or third-trimester abortions are performed to remove a severely deformed or already dead fetus that could cause the mother to die, become infertile or otherwise desperately ill." She ignores Haskell, who himself testified that "agoraphobia" (fear of open places) was among the reasons some women had sought a second-trimester abortion. Another physician testified that three of her own patients had gone to Haskell for abortions well beyond 4½ months into pregnancy—and that none were ill and all had normal fetuses. Another doctor who performed partial-birth abortions, the late James McMahon, acknowledged he performed at least 39 partial-birth abortions for "depression" and nine for cleft palate.

Then there is Kate ("I-make-it-up-as-I-go-along") Michelman, president of the National Abortion and Reproductive Rights Action League, who said that anesthesia kills the fetus before the abortion. That riled the American Society of Anesthesiologists, which said such claims have "absolutely no basis in scientific fact." It doesn't kill the fetus, and may not even relieve its pain. Such false claims, the group added, endanger pregnant women and their unborn children because they might discourage medically necessary surgical procedures.

Finally, the Chicago Tribune weighed in Nov. 8 with a one-sided report of a National

Organization for Women press conference opposing the ban. It was a moving story of a Naperville woman who had this procedure to spare her deformed child the trouble of living. But neither the Tribune nor NBC bothered telling the equally moving and eloquent story of an Oak Park woman, a Democrat, who also testified before Congress about how she decided not to have the procedure. More on her later.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Jan. 4 1996]

NEVER LET FACTS IMPEDE IDEOLOGY

(By Dennis Byrne)

Somehow the wacky idea has gotten out that giving pregnant women anesthesia is bad.

The American Society of Anesthesiologists worries that women will delay necessary or even lifesaving medical procedures because they fear anesthesia will harm their fetuses. Dr. David Birnbach, of the Society for Obstetric Anesthesia and Perinatology, says cases of maternal concerns about dangers to the fetus have recently surfaced, the American Medical Association's American Medical News reported. Rep. Tom Coburn (R-Okla.), who still delivers babies, said a patient even refused epidural anesthesia during childbirth.

Birnbach and other experts uniformly insist that the fear is unfounded. Dr. Norig Ellison, president of the American Society of Anesthesiologists, told Congress that more than 50,000 pregnant women are safely anesthetized annually without ill effects to mother or fetus.

Yet some folks are saying otherwise, including Kate Michelman, president of the National Abortion and Reproductive Rights Action League. Their insistence that anesthesia administered during partial-birth abortions prevents fetal pain and causes fetal death is having an unfortunate consequence: Some women are becoming afraid that anesthesia will harm babies they're planning to have.

Ellison's group has no position on the controversial ban on partially-birth abortions, in which a live, late-term fetus is partially pulled feet first, from the womb, stabbed in the back of the neck and its brains sucked out. But they do feel strongly about Michelman's misinformation. Birnbach said assertions that anesthesia causes fetal death in such abortions are shocking and crazy.

Ellison branded as "entirely inaccurate" a claim by an abortionist that the anesthesia eliminates fetal pain and causes brain death before the abortion. The fact is, he said, only a small portion of general anesthesia crosses the placenta to reach the fetus, depending on the amount, and none administered regionally does. It is not "absolutely known," he added, that the anesthesia even reduces the fetus' pain. "I have not spoken with one anesthesiologist who agrees with [the abortionist's] conclusion, and in my judgment, it is contrary to scientific fact. It simply must not be allowed to stand," he said.

As their evidence, pro-choicers cite a letter from an Albuquerque physician (not an anesthesiologist), Lewis Koplik, who opposes the ban. I read the letter to Ellison, who branded its conclusions "wrong" and "untrue." A dose of anesthesia massive enough to kill the fetus, as cited in the letter, places the mother's own health "in serious jeopardy," Ellison said, and should require the presence of an anesthesiologist (which is not standard practice).

Despite all this, Michelman's misinformation continues to be repeated as the unqualified truth by, for example, Sen. Carol Moseley-Braun (D-Chicago), syndicated columnist Ellen Goodman, a USA Today editorial, KMOX-AM in St. Louis and Planned

Parenthood, said the National Right to Life Committee. Michelman repeated the assertion in a letter to the editor here on Sunday, attacking my support of the ban. (She also claimed I said that the anesthesia "does not affect the fetus"—which I didn't. But accuracy apparently isn't Michelman's strong suit.)

Ellison confesses to frustration that Michelman's misinformation gets circulated without challenge, while his scientific evidence is barely mentioned. Welcome, Doc, to the abortion wars, as referred by the ever-objective media. Never let facts stand in the way of a favored ideological agenda. Not even at the expense of women's health.

[From Newsweek, Dec. 11, 1995]

THE LAST WORD—FANATICS FOR CHOICE

PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTIONS, SONOGRAM PHOTOS AND THE IDEA THAT "THE FETUS MEANS NOTHING"

(By George F. Will)

Americans are beginning to recoil against the fanaticism that has helped to produce this fact: more than a quarter of all American pregnancies are ended by abortions. Abundant media attention has been given to the extremism that has tainted the right-to-life movement. Now events are exposing the extraordinary moral evasions and callousness characteristic of fanaticism, prevalent in the abortion-rights lobby.

Begin with "partial-birth abortions." Pro-abortion extremists object to that name, preferring "intact dilation and evacuation," for the same reason the pro-abortion movement prefers to be called "pro-choice." What is "intact" is a baby. During the debate that led to House passage of a ban on partial-birth abortions, the right-to-life movement was criticized for the sensationalism of its print advertisements featuring a Dayton nurse's description of such an abortion:

"The mother was six months pregnant. The baby's heartbeat was clearly visible on the ultrasound screen. The doctor went in with forceps and grabbed the baby's legs and pulled them down into the birth canal. Then he delivered the baby's body and the arms—everything but the head. The doctor kept the baby's head just inside the uterus. The baby's little fingers were clasping and unclasping and his feet were kicking. Then the doctor stuck the scissors through the back of his head, and the baby's arms jerked out in a flinch, a startled reaction, like a baby does when he thinks that he might fall. The doctor opened up the scissors, stuck a high-powered suction tube into the opening and sucked the baby's brains out."

To object to this as a sensationalism is to say that discomfiting truths should be suppressed. But increasingly the language of pro-abortion people betrays a flinching from facts. In a woman's story about her chemical abortion, published last year in *Mother Jones* magazine, she quotes her doctor as saying, "By Sunday you won't see on the monitor what we call the heartbeat." "What we call"? In partial-birth abortions the birth is kept (just barely) partial to preserve the legal fiction that a baby (what some pro-abortion people call "fetal material") is not being killed. An abortionist has told *The New York Times* that some mothers find such abortions comforting because after the killing, the small body can be "dressed and held" so the (if pro-abortionists will pardon the expression) mother can "say goodbye." *The New York Times* reports, "Most of the doctors interviewed said they saw no moral difference between dismembering the fetus within the uterus and partially delivering it, intact, before killing it." Yes.

Opponents of a ban on partial-birth abortions say almost all such abortions are medi-

cally necessary. However, an abortionist at the Dayton clinic is quoted as saying 80 percent are elective. Opponents of a ban on such abortions assert that the baby is killed before the procedure, by the anesthesia given to the mother. (The baby "undergoes demise," in the mincing words of Kate Michelman of the National Abortion and Reproductive Rights Action League. Does Michelman say herbicides cause the crab grass in her lawn to "undergo demise"? Such Orwellian language is a sure sign of squeamishness.) However, the president of the American Society of Anesthesiologists says this "misinformation" has "absolutely no basis in scientific fact" and might endanger pregnant women's health by deterring them from receiving treatment that is safe.

Opponents of a ban say there are only about 600 such procedures a year. Let us suppose, as not everyone does, the number 600 is accurate concerning the more than 13,000 abortions performed after 21 weeks of gestation. Still, 600 is a lot. Think of two crashes of jumbo airliners. Opponents of the ban darkly warn that it would be the first step toward repeal of all abortion rights. Columnist John Leo of *U.S. News & World Report* says that is akin to the gun lobby's argument that a ban on assault weapons must lead to repeal of the Second Amendment.

In a prophecy born of hope, many pundits have been predicting that the right-to-life "extremists" would drastically divide the Republican Party. But 73 House Democrats voted to ban partial-birth abortions; only 15 Republicans opposed the ban. If the ban survives the Senate, President Clinton will probably veto it. The convention that nominated him refused to allow the Democratic governor of Pennsylvania, Bob Casey, who is pro-life, to speak. Pro-choice speakers addressed the 1992 Republican Convention. The two presidential candidates who hope that a pro-choice stance would resonate among Republicans—Gov. Pete Wilson, Sen. Arlen Specter—have become the first two candidates to fold their tents.

In October in *The New Republic*, Naomi Wolf, a feminist and pro-choice writer, argued that by resorting to abortion rhetoric that recognizes neither life nor death, pro-choice people "risk becoming precisely what our critics charge us with being: callous, selfish and casually destructive men and women who share a cheapened view of human life." Other consequences of a "lexicon of dehumanization" about the unborn are "hardness of heart, lying and political failure." Wolf said that the "fetus means nothing" stance of the pro-choice movement is refuted by common current practices of parents-to-be who have framed sonogram photos and fetal heartbeat stethoscopes in their homes. Young upscale adults of child-bearing age are a solidly pro-choice demographic group. But they enjoy watching their unborn babies on sonograms, responding to outside stimuli, and they read "The Well Baby Book," which says: "Increasing knowledge is increasing the awe and respect we have for the unborn baby and is causing us to regard the unborn baby as a real person long before birth. . . ."

Wolf argued for keeping abortion legal but treating it as a matter of moral gravity because "grief and respect are the proper tones for all discussions about choosing to endanger or destroy a manifestation of life." This temperate judgment drew from Jane Johnson, interim president of Planned Parenthood, a denunciation of the "view that there are good and bad reasons for abortion." So, who now are the fanatics?

[From *U.S. News & World Report*, Nov. 1995]

HARDER HEARTS ON ABORTION

(By John Leo)

Partial birth abortions are unsettling even to read about—the only version of abortion

in which fetuses, either viable, or near viability, are partly visible outside the body while alive and inches away from birth before being dispatched.

They are typically performed at 20 to 24 weeks, but sometimes later. The fetus is manipulated so that its feet and sometimes part of its body are outside the mother. The head is left in the uterus. Then the skull is pierced and the brain is suctioned out, causing skull collapse and death.

Why is the head of the fetus left inside the uterus when the removal of the brain takes place? "Avoiding trauma to the cervix" is usually cited as the reason, but the bottom line is really legal. Stopping the head just short of birth is a legal fig leaf for a procedure that doesn't look like abortion at all. It looks like infanticide.

Brenda Shafer, a registered nurse who supports abortion rights, says she witnessed three of these operations during a brief assignment to assist Dr. Martin Haskell at an Ohio abortion clinic in 1993. She says the three fetuses, two normal and one with Down's syndrome, all three 25 or more weeks along were alive when Dr. Haskell inserted scissors into their skulls. "I still have nightmares about what I saw," she said in a letter to an antiabortion Congressman in urging passage of the Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act.

Abortion-rights supporters have greeted the partial birth issue as the beginning of a new crusade to undermine *Roe v. Wade*. For some abortion opponents, it obviously is. But it also is true that a great many Americans, on both sides and in the middle are deeply troubled by the brutality and questionable morality of this particular procedure. It deserves to be judged on its own.

COSTLY VOTE

In the House vote, a dozen pro-choice Congressmen, including Ted Kennedy's son Patrick joined the lopsided majority and voted to ban partial birth procedures. They did this knowing they face some aggressive retribution from the abortion-rights lobby without gaining any support from the anti-abortion side. "It was a costly vote," said Rep. Jim Moran of Virginia, an abortion-rights backer. "I'm not going to vote in such a way that I have to put my conscience on the shelf."

It should be noted that the abortion lobby is having trouble getting its facts straight. After Brenda Shafer made her statement, Dr. Haskell said he didn't recall any such person working at his clinic. An employment card was produced. Then Rep. Patricia Schroeder and others extracted a nondental denial from Dr. Haskell's head nurse, saying that Brenda Shafer "would not" have been present at the three abortions she said she saw.

Kate Michelman and other abortion-rights lobbyists insisted that partial birth abortion is "confined to extraordinary medical circumstances" and that anesthesia "causes fetal demise . . . prior to the procedure." Not true. A 1993 interview with Dr. Haskell in an *American Medical Association* newspaper quotes him as saying that 80 percent of these procedures are elective and two thirds occur while the fetus is alive. Dr. Haskell wrote a letter strongly implying he was misquoted. But an audiotape was produced showing that he wasn't.

And Michelman said, "It's not only a myth, it's a lie" that partial birth abortions are used to eliminate fetuses for minor defects such as cleft palates. But abortion practitioner Dr. James McMahon already had told Congress he had personally performed nine of these procedures solely because of cleft palates. Compared with the abortion-rights lobby, the O.J. defense looks obsessively ethical and tightly focused on verifiable truth.

In an article last month in the *New Republic*, feminist Naomi Wolf, an abortion-rights advocate, wrote that "with the prochoice rhetoric we use now, we incur three destructive consequences . . . hardness of heart, lying and political failure." She wrote: "By refusing to look at abortion within a moral framework, we lose the millions of Americans who want to support abortion as a legal right but still need to condemn it as a moral iniquity."

The partial birth issue is a good time for abortion-rights supporters to reclaim the moral framework that Wolf says they have relinquished. This repellent procedure goes way too far. No other Western nation, to my knowledge, allows it. It was unanimously condemned by the American Medical Association's council on legislation. (The full association later decided to duck the issue and take no position.)

Those who defend it reflexively because it may lead to other legislation are in the exact position of gun lobbyists who shoot down bans on assault weapons because those bans may one day lead to a roundup of everybody's handguns. They refuse, on tactical grounds, to confront the moral issue involved. More of the abstract hardness that Wolf writes about.

Killing a five-month or six-month fetus that's halfway down the birth canal raises a moral issue way beyond that of ordinary abortion. It's perfectly possible to support a woman's right to abort and still think that the anything goes ethic of this horrific procedure has no place in a culture with any reverence left for life.

#### A TRIBUTE TO JOHN CLARK

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 29, 1996

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have this opportunity to pay tribute to one of my fellow Tennesseans, John Clark from Elizabethton, TN. I respectfully submit the article that appeared in the *Elizabethton Star*, reporting his prisoner of war experiences during World War II. Mr. Clark is truly a fine man and a great American.

As time elapses, we often forget the many sacrifices made by Americans who fought against tyranny and for our fundamental values of democracy during World War II. The hardships encountered by Mr. Clark as a prisoner of war in Germany are to be studied for lessons in faith, courage, honor, duty, and fortitude.

I encourage my colleagues to read the account of this brave man who endured so much for our freedom, yet kept his love of our country and his religious faith inviolate.

All Americans are grateful to Mr. Clark, and we salute him for his valor and for his service to his country, and his generosity in sharing this personal history with us and others.

AFTER 50 YEARS, FREEDOM STILL SPECIAL FOR EX-POW

(By John Thompson, Star Staff)

Friday the 13th was the luckiest day in the life of John Clark. One that day in April, 50 years ago, American soldiers liberated the young Carter Countian and a group of other prisoners of war from the small town of Horsinger, Germany.

He remembers the scene vividly. Armored vehicles approaching, the roaring noise of the motors, the American flag flying in the wind.

"That American flag was the most beautiful thing I ever saw," Clark recalls a half century later.

That flag was a sight Clark had longed to see. He had heard allied machine guns the day before but he was not sure he would live long enough to see the men who were firing the guns. When he went to bed on April 12, 1945, he did not know if he had the strength to live through the next day.

Clark and his fellow prisoners had been forced marched 600 miles since February, staying one step ahead of the advancing Russian Army. The prisoners marched as much as 32 kilometers a day with little or no food.

Hungry prisoners who stole an egg or a potato from a German farm risked being shot. Clark saw prisoners executed this way. Others, who had lost the strength to go on were also shot when they staggered out of the formation.

Clark had been in perfect health and weighed 198 pounds when he was captured. By the time he reached an American hospital three days after his rescue, Clark, who is 5 feet, 11 inches tall, weighed only 127 pounds.

In addition to his malnutrition, Clark was also facing another threat to his life. The month before, Russian POWs had stolen one of his boots. His best friend, Bill Furay, had the opposite boot stolen. Since Clark wore size 9½ and Furay wore size 9, Clark gave Furay his other boot.

Clark marched for days without shoes. He finally got a pair of old galoshes and stuffed them with rags.

Worse was to come. After marching for several days in the galoshes, the Germans gave him a pair of new shoes. He had to break them in by marching 25 kilometers that day and 27 kilometers each of the next two days.

"My feet were solid blisters," Clark remembers.

Each day the agony of his starvation diet and his mangled feet only seemed to get worse. He shared his agony with Furay, not only his best friend but a buddy he had been with since basic training. They had remained in the same unit for their entire service, and had even been captured together.

The two had marched side by side from France to the prison camps and now were together on this forced march.

"The day before I was liberated I told Bill that I just did not think I could make it another day." He knew the Germans would shoot him if he did not keep up.

That is why that American flag looked so wonderful to the haggard prisoner and why Friday the 13th will always be special to him. He remembers that shortly after the rescue, he stooped over and blacked out from his hunger and pain. If he had done that while still with the German guards it would have meant certain death.

Clark's hardship had begun when he was captured during the Battle of the Bulge. He was a squad leader in the 106th Infantry Division. It was a new division, thrown together from replacement and green troops during the past few months. The unit had only been able to train together for a month in England before being committed to the front lines.

The Germans knew the 106th was green, and, naturally, it was a prime target in Hitler's desperate last gamble to reverse the tide of war.

The Germans attacked at 5:30 a.m. on Dec. 16.

Clark's unit got the word to fall back. His platoon was the lead element. As they were retreating, German artillery caught them in the open. His platoon was able to keep going while the rest were pinned down. They were soon captured.

It was part of the greatest mass surrender in American history.

Clark was not yet one of them. He struggled on with fragments of the shattered division until they reached the middle of the storm: Hill 576.

A perimeter was established. More men kept coming until they were 500 strong. They would come to be known as "The Lost 500."

But 500 men could not hold out for long against the massive German offensive. Clark and the other men were told to destroy their weapons and surrender on Dec. 21.

As their German captors marched them away, Clark said he saw more Tiger tanks lined up against them than he had ever seen. There was not way the 500 could have survived against such firepower.

At the time, Clark said the men felt they had made the right decision to surrender. "If we had known what was in the future, we would have stayed and fought to the death."

Clark's ordeal began with a three day march from St. Vith, Belgium to Prum, Germany. They were given no food during the march.

Finally, they reached a railhead, where they were loaded onto box cars, headed for POW camps. They had only been on the train for a part of the day before it had to stop because the American Air Force had bombed the trestles.

The boxcars were moved to a siding. Later, an American P-51 shot up the train, killing six and wounding 47. The soldier sitting on Clark's left and the one sitting on his right were both killed.

Clark said the prisoners then broke the doors down and laid in the snow, linking their bodies together to form the words "USPW."

"The plane came back and rolled its wings (in salute). This was the day before Christmas. We spent the night back in the rail cars. On Christmas, we got a half-loaf of bread and a spoon of jam. This was for two days."

After marching for three days, they were put on another train. Again, they were bombed by their own planes but finally reached the prison camps.

During inprocessing, a German officer took all of Clark's possessions, handing him a receipt for the few dollars and francs he carried. Clark managed to hide two things from the officer which would become crucial to him as times got tougher.

Inside the pocket of his field jacket, Clark hid a tiny note pad he had picked up at a USO canteen. He used this note pad to keep a diary of his captivity and record his thoughts during his ordeal.

He also managed to hide a small New Testament.

With the Russians advancing from the east, the Germans began to move their POWs westward. Clark's camp was evacuated on Feb. 14.

At the end of each day's march, Clark and his fellow prisoners might expect a cup of "grass" soup and some bread.

Clark and the other prisoners sometimes managed to steal an egg or some potatoes from a German farm. If they were caught, they would be shot, and some were.

Each night, Clark recorded how far they marched that day and the name of the town where they stopped. Clark was able to record the distances by remembering the mileage on the road signs.

Clark also recorded occasional comments. On March 3, he wrote, "Lined up to be shot because one of our group stole a chicken. They shot 3 prisoners the night before for stealing from a garden."

On March 21, he wrote, "Got out of line for water—dog turned loose on us."

Other than these short notes, Clark's focus on the world got narrower and narrower. Finally, all that was on his mind was survival and food.