EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FANNIN ON GUIDELINES

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, yesterday's edition of the Charleston News & Courier contains a fine editorial praising the work of the senior Senator from Arizona (Mr. FANNIN). The editorial points out that he has no sectional ax to grind on the subject of civil rights. Yet the editorial quotes our colleague as saying that 5 years after the passage of title VII, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, no less than 22 agencies are involved in enforcing it. The editorial praises Mr. FANNIN for his objective attempt to show how the enforcement of guidelines has resulted in complicated sets of conflicting guidelines. The editorial goes on to point out that the enforcement by guideline is not confined to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. This tendency, says the News & Courier, is apparent in other agencies such as the Federal Trade Commission, which issues rules and regulations having the weight of law even though not authorized by the Legislative Branch.

Mr. President, I am proud that the Charleston News & Courier has recognized the work of the Senator and has given publicity to his efforts. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Guideline Law," published in the Charleston News & Courier of Monday, March 3, 1969, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

GUIDELINE LAW

Inasmuch as he is neither a Democrat nor a Southerner, Sen. Paul J. Fannin, R-Ariz., has no sectional ax to grind on the subject of civil rights. So when he takes aim at Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 creating the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission what he says is well worth hearing.

Today, five years after passage of the act, no less than 22 agencies are involved in enforcing it. Sen. Fannin, presenting a bill in the Senate aimed at eliminating the confusion such a bevy of agencies creates, explains matters thus:

"I have found companies which have been inspected by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and have been told to take certain actions to comply with Title VII of the Civil Rights Act. After taking these measures, the same company has been visited a few days later by representatives of the Dept. of Defense and given an entirely new set of requirements to insure compliance with the executive order on equal employment. Later, the Office of Federal Contract Compliance, under the Dept. of Labor, has visited the same plant and given the company still another list of requirements. The Dept. of Justice has then become involved to scrutinize further the company's affairs. And finally, state and local agencies, where they exist, may also get into the act. . . .

"It has become apparent that none of the agencies, including the (Equal Employment Opportunity) Commission, has evidenced an inclination to carry out the will of Congress. Relying on Executive Order 11246, the policies and practices of these agencies are governed, not by what Congress has established as law, but by their own concept of social progress."

The federal tendency to base enforcement on guidelines instead of on law obviously is not confined to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. It is apparent also in enforcement of Title IV of the act, Desegregation of Public Education. It also is apparent in other agencies, such as the Federal Trade Commission, which issues rules and regulations having the weight of law even though not authorized by the legislative branch.

That branch, and that branch only, has the power to put an end to time-consuming and costly harassment coming not from the law but from executive orders and agency guidelines which promote social theories beyond the limits of legislative intent.

SCIENCE PLANNING

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on February 12 our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. DADDARIO), chairman of the Science Subcommittee of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, gave the annual Ferguson Lecture at Washington University in St. Louis.

A part of Mr. DADDARIO's lecture dealt with future science planning and possible governmental organization for science policy. These remarks seem to me particularly timely, and I include in the RECORD the portion of the lecture which dealt with this matter:

SCIENCE PLANNING

One thing we can do when money is short is to manage it better—get more out of it, make it last longer.

This very issue—getting more bang for our science buck—is receiving intensified scrutiny right now at all levels of government.

For the most part it is in the form of surveys and reviews looking toward revised or innovated administrative mechanisms. Reorganization of Federal science management in the executive branch may well be the result. You have all heard some distant thunder in this regard in the form of varying proposals for a new Department of Science—or something similar.

While no decisions in the arena appear to be imminent, the matter is no longer just an exercise in rhetorical dialogue.

At this point I should like to stress that we on the House Committee on Science and Astronautics intend to become very much involved in the fact-finding and informational processes which eventually will lead to changes in government structures for the support of science. This is part of our charter and our mission as an integral part of the Congress of the United States. We would, in my view, be derelict to undertake less.

By the same token, perhaps a special caveat should be added to the effect that undue haste in this effort could prove abortive and leave us with something less effective than what we now have.

Science and education for science, it seems to me, are something like a countryside of natural shrubs and wildflowers—the total effect of which, though apparently disorganized, is somehow remarkably elegant and beautiful. What we are trying to do is preserve and promote the growth of this countryside. But we must do it by assuring ecological necessities such as adequate but not too much water, prevention of erosion, sufficient minerals, appropriate fauna and the like—not by trying to remake it into a formal garden according to the plan of a single landscape architect.

Perhaps this sounds simple, but my guess is that it will not be simple at all.

COMMITTEE ACTION

As we on the Science Committee of the House begin our inquiry into government organization for science, we are trying to throw out a fairly comprehensive dragnet for information.

Hence we have underway pro and con analyses of the various possibilities in the Science Policy Research Division of the Library of Congress. We are having informal discussions with the Committee's Panel on Science and Technology. We are holding frequent sessions, in camera, with the Research Management Advisory Panel of our Science Subcommittee. We are in liaison with officials of the President's Office of Science and Technology, both incumbents and those who have served in the past. We are seeking assistance through frequent exchanges with the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering. And we are endeavoring to secure additional inputs from industry, the academic world and the non-profits.

When we have completed our planned excursions into these fields and have reviewed the materials accumulated, hopefully we shall be in a position to make constructive suggestions leading to a better deal for Science.

Meanwhile, it may be useful to draw the curtains of speculation and to describe the various elements of the organizational ferment now in progress.

MOTIVATIONS

Just what are the motivations behind it?

Undoubtedly there are many motivations, but these tend to stand out most prominently.

The first of these is simply a matter of organizational neatness. Many competent and concerned persons, in Congress and out, believe that it would be beneficial from the standpoint of good government if science and technology could be dealt with as one bureaucratic entity. Presumably this would make it easier to handle the science budget and assess its management.

A second motivation is a rather strong belief in some quarters that a Department of Science or some unified science agency could exert a more effective and dependable priority lever on behalf of regular funding. As a visible and permanent agency, they aver, Science itself would be something with which Congress would have to deal individually each year in the appropriation process. As such it could neither be ignored nor—with watchful patrons in the House and Senate—seriously curtailed.

A third motivation is the growing conviction that Federal support of Science should be able to show tangible evidence that it is proving effective in the solution, or partial solution, of the serious social problems with which the nation is faced. I would be less than candid if I did not recognize that a considerable groundswell of such feeling is presently running through the Congress. In the months ahead it may well increase.

AREAS OF CONCERN

From an organizational point of view, studies of the Federal science structure seem to be concentrated in a few theaters, some specific and some general.

One of these is the Executive Office of the President and, particularly, the Office of Science and Technology. The Office of Science and Technology, whose functions have never been wholly clear nor distinguishable from those of other organizational units within the Executive Office, is a major target of review.

A second area includes the National Science Foundation plus the other more or less "pure" science agencies such as the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Institutes of Health, the National Aeronutics and Space Administration, the Bureau of Standards and the Environmental Science Services Administration.

Another group whose science activities are being critically reviewed consists of the many mission-oriented departments and agencies which have a strong stake in research and development or in scientific and technological education. The Departments involved are those of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Health, Education and Welfare, Housing and Urban Development, Interior, Labor, Post Office, State and Transportation. The agencies include the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Office of Emergency Planning, the Smithsonian Institution, the Tennessee Valley Authority, Arms Control Administration, the Veterans Administration—plus the Library of Congress.

Finally, an area that is frequently overlooked by those outside the government though rarely by those in it—is the Bureau of the Budget. The appropriate central administrative responsibility, where science is concerned, of the Bureau has become a matter of great interest and some controversy in recent years. Without question the Bureau's hand in the control of Science spending is influential—and it is of special interest since the Bureau is the only operational agency of government which is organized to consider all Federal science activities as a functional whole. Beyond this, the Bureau has sufficient resources to permit a continuing overview of science activities and sufficient authority to make its determinations stick. These factors, added to certain questionable elements concerning the Bureau's competence to assess the relative values of science—within itself and vis-a-vis other programs—make the Bureau's role in the future a particularly important one.

APPROACHES

As one approaches the science organization task, a host of questions immediately begin a clamor for attention. None of them is easy to answer. None can be ignored. Each is prefixed by the words "should we?"

For example.

Should we undertake to study science organization primarily, or exclusively, from an administrative point of view with administrative reorganization our goal?

Should we identify our major problem areas, group them as to priority, and proceed to organize science support from this Base?

Should we consider Science alone or operate on an interdisciplinary theme—that is, expand our inquiry to include such other fields as education and cultural affairs?

Should we separate academic science and graduate education from their sister fields: applied research, development, technology, secondary and undergraduate education?

Should we be concerned with scientific manpower and/or engineering training as a necessary tool of our society?

Should we become involved with the sticky problems of science information handling and exchange?

Should we expend effort upon the study and utilization of Federal science laboratories, their missions, reorganization or centralization?

Should we concern ourselves with possible new Federal mechanisms designed solely to determine priorities and allocate funds accordingly?

These are a few of the questions we must face.

LEADING CURRENT POSSIBILITIES

In spite of the fact that such questions cannot now be answered with assurance, several rather specific plans for Federal science organization seem to have gained currency.

Among them, the following five appear to have the most substance at the moment.

(1) A prototype Department of Science, Education and Cultural Affairs. This would be a cabinet-level organization designed to consolidate eight existing Federal units.

The National Science Foundation.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

The Atomic Energy Commission—minus its weapons development which would be shifted to Defense.

The National Institutes of Health.

The Environmental Science Services Administration.

The National Bureau of Standards.

The Bureau of Higher Education from Health, Education and Welfare.

The National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities.

The composition of such a Department would be based on organizations whose development and exploitation of science is the major objective, whose principal operation is not a routine program and which, in cases of transferral, would be drawn from agencies whose mission is not precisely dependent on the science unit transferred.

(2) A corollary of the foregoing would be a cabinet-level Department of Science and Higher Education.

It would draw together essentially the same groups listed, but its functions would be defined in a less sweeping fashion and would omit any responsibility for cultural development *per se*.

A still more watered-down version of the cabinet-level concept would be a Department of Education and Research whose functions would consist mainly of those now performed by the National Science Foundation, the Office of Education, and the Foundation for the Arts and the Humanities.

(3) A loose confederation of the agencies listed in the first plan has also been proposed.

This is sometimes referred to as the "GSA for Science" plan—with reference to the link of logistical services now provided the various agencies of government by the General Services Administration.

As I understand it, this plan conceives of a centralized administration of the agencies involved, with common operations as to general administration, budget and accounting procedures and the like—but with no overview or authority as to mission, priorities, program development or operational activities.

(4) Another plan would be the establishment of a statutory Council of Advisers on Science and Education.

Under this arrangement the Council would be established by Congressional action (in contrast to the Office of Science and Technology which originated through Executive reorganizational authority subject to Congressional veto.) Its members would be full-time Presidential appointees or brought from existing Federal agencies.

The function of the Council would be to provide a continuing service to the President in respect to policy matters on science and technology, education and their multiple interrelations. A further role of the Council would presumably be to help meet the needs of Congress for understanding the facts and position of the administration relative to national goals in these matters. In short, it would concern itself with matters now concerning the Office of Science and Technology and possibly some of those affecting the Federal Council for Science and Technology—plus central policy issues faced by the Federal government with respect to education.

(5) The fifth contender at present seems to be the revamping of the Office of Science and Technology.

The thought here is to broaden and strengthen the Office of Science and Technology through the medium of a specific Congressional charter and mandate. It would become, under this plan, a coordinator of Federal Science support, a priority-setter and an evaluator of results. In effect, the Office of Science and Technology would thus play a more influential and hard-nosed role than it has up to this point.

CONCLUSIONS

Clearly, a myriad of arguments on both sides exists with regard to each of these proposals. I cannot discuss them here and, in any case, given my present inadequate state of knowledge, it would be premature to attempt.

I have, however, reached certain conclusions with regard to some of the ramifications of the Science organization issue which I would like to submit to you.

I do, for example, consider the general policy which exists on this question—as I described it earlier—to be valid still. In other words, I do not believe an overall Science czar or a single super-bureau created to govern all Federal science endeavors is the answer to our problems.

It is, in my opinion, too early to act on the proposition of a cabinet-level department, even one composed only of those agencies whose principal reason for being is academic science or education. We do not yet have sufficient information on the probable effects and potential of a Science Department to consider formal action. The many elements involved, moreover, are probably still too diverse, too diffuse and too ill-defined to permit the emergence of a logical proposal along these lines.

In order not to be destructive of our society and some of its most useful institutions and mores, we should not, I think, limit our organizational considerations to science alone. As the ecologists are beginning to convince us, we live in an inter-related world where each facet has its impact upon every other facet— difficult to trace as it may be. This I believe to be true of science and technology as well. It must not be nurtured or used independently of or without regard for the lessons taught by the social sciences, the arts and the humanities—as well as the general processes of education.

The mere creation of more advisory groups which have no responsibility for overseeing and assessing what may result from their advice, nor any answerability to the public through its elected officials, fails to elicit much enthusiasm from me. Whatever organization structure we come up with eventually must be responsible in more than one sense of the word. In sum, it should be not only capable but it should have to account for its particular stewardship of the scientific endeavor.

Whatever is done ought, in my view, to be done through positive legislation. This route will give Congress an opportunity to study, debate and be exposed to all the issues. I recognize that this is often an arduous and frustrating procedure in many instances. But I submit it is worthwhile—for it results in Congressional understanding, continuing interest and patronage to a degree that executive orders and reorganizations rarely, if ever, achieve.

Finally, the stakes are such that we should begin to make definite plans and take positive action just as soon as sufficient information is at hand and competent analysis made. I do not know when this point will be reached, but it should not exceed two years.

UNIVERSAL MAN

HON. GEORGE McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, recently the Minister of the Embassy of India, Dr. Purnendu Banerjee, delivered a commencement address at Berry College in Georgia. Dr. Banerjee took for his theme the life and work of the great Mahatma Gandhi. As a student of this remarkable historical figure, Dr. Banerjee made a number of observations that I think will be of interest to Members of Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

UNIVERSAL MAN

I am deeply grateful to you for having honoured my country by inviting me to give the commencement address, this afternoon to the graduates of Berry College, Georgia.

The theme of my talk is "Universal Man". I thought that it would be appropriate to discuss and understand the life and work of Mahatma Gandhi—a universal man—particularly this year when we are celebrating it as the Centenary Year. You may recall that the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation has called upon all member countries of the United Nations to celebrate this year as Gandhi Year.

Mahatma Gandhi is known as a symbol of love, non-violence and truth. He belongs not to India alone but to the whole world. He belongs not to our generation alone, but to posterity as well. In him we see an image of our higher selves. His impact on human evolution will be found more and more significant as the centuries roll by.

The ideals for which Gandhi stood have been known to mankind since times immemorial. Between 2,000 and 1,000 B.C., the oldest religious thoughts in history were written in India. They were the Vedas—the first philosophical outpourings of the human mind. Following the Vedas came the Upanishads and then the two great popular Epics—the Mahabharata and the Ramanyana and, then the Bhagvad Gita. In all these philosophic and literary writings the concept of non-violence was present and was considered a superior ethical virtue. Lord Buddha—500 years before Christ—preached total commitment to tolerance and to the non-violent way of life. The conversion of the great King Asoka of India from the Law of Conquest to the Law of Piety was another example of the ideal of love, non-violence and truth. Gandhi obtained spiritual strength from this tradition and drew inspiration from Christianity and Islam. "The Sermon on the Mount", said Gandhi, "went straight to my head". And he records his delight in the verses which begin "But I say unto you that ye resist evil: but whosoever smite thee on thy right cheek turn to him the other also". The essence of what Jesus taught crystallizes in the two great commandments of "complete love of God" and "unfailing love of one's neighbour." He found in Tolstoy and Thoreau, fuller expression of the spirit of non-violence.

Thus the ideals of love, non-violence and truth are as old as the mountains. Gandhi nourished the spirit of these old truths by personal experimentation. Gandhi's life was an experiment with non-violence and truth. He was the first thinker in human history to extend the principle of non-violence from the individual to the social and political plane. No leader within our memory balanced so beautifully and so perfectly within himself the dynamic responses to the challenge of the human spirit and to the challenges of material life at the same time. He entered politics for the purpose of experimenting with non-violence and establishing its validity. His faith in non-violence arose from his inalienable love of mankind. This love of mankind is the main aspect of the Gandhian Trinity—the two others being non-violence and truth. All these three put together constitute an invisible force that incessantly works for the good of mankind.

Living amidst the dazzling success of our machine age civilization, modern man is insensitive to universal unity. Hate, suspicion and fear are seizing the minds of men. Gandhi's teachings were intended to bring love where hate dominated, trust where suspicion existed and courage where fear prevailed. He lighted the path of mankind with his message of "universal brotherhood". Gandhi's principles have universal and eternal validity. His heart was incapable of making any discrimination. He absorbed into himself the finest in every culture and civilization known to us. The welfare of all was his aim. He preached this gospel throughout his life by word and deed.

Gandhi used Love to solve difficult problems. As an instrument he considered it more efficient and lasting because Love eliminates fear, anger, pride and all other devisive emotions and attitudes. It is important that we be tolerant and change our outlook to accommodate others' viewpoints, for truth appears in fragments and can be perceived from different angles of vision. Tolerance and understanding are equally important in international relations. Conflict of ideas bring about chaos and unrest. The more a nation keeps its mind open, the better it is for international understanding. He said, "I do not want my house to be walled on all sides and my windows to be stuffed. I want the cultures of all lands to be blown about my house as freely as possible".

Gandhi's patriotism or nationalism was quite consistent with his love of mankind. It was the same as humanity. He recognized that in the present day world nationalism must not be in conflict with progressive internationalism. No nation can stand in isolation and remain unaffected by what is going on in other parts of the world. He said once "My notion of freedom for India is not isolated independence but healthy and dignified inter-dependence. My nationalism, fierce though it is, is not exclusive, not designed to harm any nation or individual . . . Our nationalism can be no peril to other nations inasmuch as we will exploit none, just as we will allow none to exploit us. Through independence we will serve the whole world". This exceptional moral approach distinguishes Gandhi from many past and present leaders.

The view of universal brotherhood leads naturally to the adoption of non-violence as the best method in human relations—national and international. He defined non-violence as "love in action". According to him, non-violence is the law of our species as violence is the law of the brute. The spirit lies dormant in the brute and he knows no law but that of physical might. The dignity of man requires obedience to a higher law, to the strength of spirit. If non-violence is the law of our life, we have to work it out in daily life deliberately and ceaselessly. In the struggle for India's independence he insisted that we should adopt civilized methods of sacrifice and non-violence. Many people today, have adopted the Gandhian method of non-violent resistance for achieving liberty and social justice.

Gandhi believed that true democracy can be the only outcome of non-violence because in the absence of it the weakest will be denied the same opportunity as the strongest. Nor can there be real freedom in the face of violence and force. The human society being a living organization must change but it should do so in a healthy and constructive manner. The way modern society and the nations of the world are moving is like a diseased and sick person full of discrimination, appalling poverty, hunger and lack of opportunity. But this sickness is impossible to cure by force. Violence on the part of the masses will never remove the disease and establish social justice because violence is a disease in itself. Success born of violence has been short-lived. Violence leads to greater violence. It is possible by non-violent means to secure redress of the wrong. Gandhi believed that the weapon of Truth, if firmly grasped and purposefully used, could lead to peaceful changes without resort to violence.

The law of non-violence can be extended to the domain of economics through the introduction of moral values in regulating economic relations between man and man. Economic equality is the master key to non-violent independence. A non-violent system of society is clearly an impossibility so long as a wide gulf exists between the rich and the poor.

And what is true of families and communities is true of nations. It is incorrect to say that non-violence can only be practiced by individuals and not by nations. There is no reason to believe that there is one law for families and another for nations. Assuming the fundamental unity between all peoples and classes, Gandhi rejected the inevitability of violent confrontation and clashes between nations. Thereby he offered the alternatives of a genuine doctrine of co-existence which has become the most significant guideline in world affairs today. The development of nuclear weaponry has imposed upon us an obligation to rethink and recast our ways of settling international disputes through peaceful negotiation. We know that in a nuclear war, there would be neither victors nor vanquished and the living could only envy the dead. Gandhi realised that the essential conditions of existence demand co-existence.

There is a further quality without which no truly non-violent movement can be built. It is compassion—not simply sorrow for the suffering man but identification with him. Gandhi was one who if he were able, would have wiped every tear from every eye. Nowhere in our time, have we known a man with greater compassion for his fellowmen. When he could not give any clothes to the needy, he reduced his own to the barest minimum. When the removal of untouchable slums was one of his great missions, he made his home in one.

Gandhi's love for the poor and the downtrodden and his belief in non-violence were deep and boundless, as was his affection for all mankind. However, these feelings were subservint to a much deeper faith in truth and righteousness. His truth was neither dogmatic nor exclusive. According to him non-violence and truth are so closely intertwined that it is practically impossible to distinguish and separate them. Non-violence is the means and truth is the end. He did not believe that a noble end could be achieved by ignoble means. To him means merged in the end, and the end sanctified rather than justified the means. Truth to him was God and there was no way to find God except through tolerance and non-violence.

Gandhi founded no religion; to him the key to inter-religious unity lay in equal reverence for all the religions. These, then, are the universals in Gandhi which are part of the experience of all of us. These universals take on greater meaning as we try to study and understand them against specific situations. Gandhi's life today is like a Pole Star in the political firmament of the world. The light which shines out of his life is universal and eternal. It is the light of love and peace which represents something more than the immediate future. It represents the living truth. The eternal man was with us, with his eternal truth reminding us of the right path, deterring us from error and inspiring us new hope. The future of our world is unpredictable. There is increasing crisis, intolerance and embitterment. And yet the great principles of love, non-violence and truth will always guide mankind. The ordinary people who form the larger majority of every nation—the unsophisticated—find in Gandhi something familiar, something they have always felt deep within themselves right. Gandhi justifies their faith in man and in God.

DISTINGUISHED GSA ADMINISTRATOR RETIRES

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of this Nation are fortunate to have many people of great capabilities and dedication who devote their energies to public service.

I want to salute and commend one of the most capable and most dedicated public servants I have ever known, Lawson B. Knott, Jr., who retired as Administrator of General Services last week after more than 30 years of the highest type of Government service.

I have been closely associated with Lawson Knott for many years, and I can think of no administrator who has exhibited greater integrity, keener judgment, and more devotion to the public interest.

Mr. Knott, a native of North Carolina and a graduate of Duke University, came to the General Services Administration from the Department of Defense in 1956 after 21 years of Government service in various legal and administrative positions relating to real property management.

He served as Deputy Commissioner, Public Buildings Services, from early 1959 until his appointment as Deputy Administrator of GSA in November of 1961.

Lawson served as Acting Administrator of General Services from November of 1964 until his appointment as Administrator by President Johnson in June 1965.

As Administrator, he established a distinguished record in the many and diverse activities charged to General Services, the central management agency for the Federal Government.

He has discharged his responsibilities in a manner which reflects the greatest credit on his endeavors.

Among the most notable of his responsibilities was the providing of efficient working quarters for other agencies of the Government. This put him in the business of building or renting offices and facilities throughout the country. The GSA building activities alone run to more than a billion dollars a year.

He was also charged with the purchase, distribution, and efficient use of many thousands of items of supplies from paper clips to automobiles. This activity involves nearly $2 billion a year.

One of his additional responsibilities as Administrator of GSA was the management and disposal of the Government's strategic and critical materials stockpiles. This purchasing and selling operation also runs into a billion dollar figure.

Lawson Knott's responsibilities did not end there. He was also charged with the selling of surplus Government real estate and equipment, providing the communications and transportation, managing the National Archives and Records Services, and other administrative activities.

In all endeavors he compiled an enviable records of economy and efficiency.

He has served the people of this Nation well, and I want to commend him for his notable service as he retires.

I would also like to wish Lawson Knott and his family good luck and happiness in the coming years.

FREEDOM IN THE BALTIC STATES

HON. EDWARD W. BROOKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I speak today on a matter of grave concern to all Americans: The oppressed peoples of the Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

Fifty-one years ago, the Baltic States attained their independence. Since the Soviet invasion of 1940, however, the Baltic States have suffered the denial of political freedom. But while this policy of repression continues, we may be assured that something even more powerful will prevail: The yearning for freedom which these people so courageously sustain. This desire of freedom-loving peoples to exercise the full rights to which they are entitled cannot be forgotten, given up, or crushed, even after decades of captivity. Rather, the compelling promise of free thought and expression will burn from within these nations and will triumph.

Our own freedom must never be taken for granted; the millions who do not share our rights must ever be a sign of the long road that lies ahead, the road to freedom and opportunity for all.

We must show these patient peoples that they are not alone in their plight, that our hearts are with them and our hopes are high for their eventual liberation. Let us pray that the leaders of the Soviet Union recognize the human longing which has produced the hopeful changes in Czechoslovakia. Despite the harsh restrictions on change in Eastern Europe, we do not give up the hope that the nations of Eastern Europe, and especially the Baltic States, will move away from totalitarianism and toward true self-determination.

In these critical times, it is fitting that we reaffirm our commitment to the ideals of freedom and reinforce our will to help all men free themselves from political, economic, and social oppression. As we commemorate the tragic loss of independence for Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia, we must look to the day when full freedom will be restored to these persevering peoples.

In recognition of these peoples, and their love of freedom, I ask unanimous consent that resolutions passed by the American-Latvian Organizations in Boston, and by the American-Lithuanian Council of Boston, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION

Adopted by all American Latvians in Greater Boston assembled to commemorate the 50th Anniversary of the independence of the Latvian Republic, John Hancock Hall, Boston, Massachusetts, November 16, 1968.

Whereas, the year 1968 marks the 50th Anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Baltic nations. Lithuania declared her independence on February 16, Estonia on February 24, and Latvia on November 18, 1918; and

Whereas, the attainment of independence for the three Baltic States in 1918 is a memorable event in the political and national history of all three of these nations and has served to prove how fruitful the ideals of freedom are; and

Whereas, twenty-eight years ago, June, 1940, the Soviet Union violently invaded and occupied Latvia as well as the other Baltic States, and, thereafter, in violation of the generally accepted principles of international law, purported to incorporate them into the USSR; and

Whereas, the government of the Soviet Union, through a program of deportation and resettlement continues its efforts to change the ethnic character of the population of the Baltic States; and

Whereas, the subjection of the peoples to alien domination and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the charter of the United Nations and is a serious impediment to the promotion of world peace; and

Whereas, the government of the United States maintains diplomatic relations with the government of the free Republic of Latvia and has consistently refused to recognize her seizure and forced annexation to the Soviet Union; and

Whereas, the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States of America adopted the H. Con. Res. 416 calling for free Baltic States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America request the President of the United States to bring the question of liberation of Latvia and the other Baltic States before the United Nations and ask the United Nations to request the Soviet Union:

1. To withdraw all Soviet troops, secret police, colonists and all control from the Baltic States;

2. To return to their homes all Latvian exiles and deportees from Siberia, prisons and slave-labor camps in the Soviet Union; and, be it further

Resolved, That the United Nations conduct free elections in Latvia under its supervision and bring to a trial by an international court all Russian communists who are guilty of crime against the people of Latvia.

We express our appreciation to the President and the government of the United States of America for their strong resistance to communist aggression anywhere in the world. We believe that under the leadership of the United States of America and with the support of the nations of the free world, the injustice perpetrated by the Soviet Union since 1940 will be rectified, and self-determination, and freedom and independence will be restored to the Baltic States.

On behalf of the American-Latvian Organizations in Boston.

L. O. REITERS,
Chairman.

RESOLUTION

By the unanimous vote of the Lithuanian people of Greater Boston assembled in the Auditorium of the South Boston Lithuanian Citizens Association to commemorate the Fifty-first Anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania on February 16, 1969, the following resolutions were adopted;

Whereas the Great Congress of Lithuania assembled in Vilna in 1917 to demand freedom from Russia, there elected the Council of Lithuania, which, on February 16, 1918 proclaimed the Independence of Lithuania "in accordance with the recognized right of National self-determination" and asserted its restoration as an independant State, which status was thereafter recognized by all the Great Nations of the World, and marked the severance of ties of bondage by which it had been enslaved since 1795; and

Whereas this action corresponded to the American Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776 wherein it was stated: That all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness, and

Whereas Lithuania, the land of our ancestors, enjoyed a free and independent existence from 1919 until June, 1940, when the Soviet Union by chicanery, subversion and force invaded and occupied the country, and still oppressingly rules Lithuania to this day; and

Whereas The United States of America has taken and firmly maintains the only just and honorable position of not recognizing the illegal occupation and rule of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia by Soviet Russia; and

Whereas this year also marks the 29th year of Soviet occupation and subjugation of Lithuania; and

Whereas His Excellency, Governor Francis W. Sargent of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and His Honor, Kevin H. White, Mayor of Boston, both have proclaimed February 16, 1969 "Republic of Lithuania Day" and urged all our citizens to observe this day in tribute to the oppressed people of this brave nation: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That we again express our appreciation and gratitude to our government for its firm stand in refusing to recognize th- fruits of the brutal Soviet aggression and occupation of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge President Richard Nixon that in his reorganization of the Department of State, he instruct his Secretary of State to include the freedom of Lithuania, and the other Baltic States, as urgent and necessary for the peace as well as that in Vietnam and Asia; and be it further

Resolved, That President Nixon instruct his Ambassador to the United Nations to place the case of Lithuania's independence before the Committee to Abolish Colonialism and the Liberation of Enslaved Nations and to insist that the Committee take positive action to establish negotiations for the freedom of Lithuania with the Soviet Union; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to the President of the United States of America, to the Secretary of State, to our Senators and Representatives in Congress, to our Governor Sargent and Mayor White and to the press; and be it further

Resolved, That we continue to voice our convictions for an early settlement of the Rights of all Lithuanians for independence through the Lithuanian radio and press throughout the year and until our great nation succeeds in obtaining the liberation of Lithuania.

AMERICAN LITHUANIAN COUNCIL OF BOSTON
EDMUND CIBAS, *President.*
JACKUS SONDA, *Secretary.*

RIOTS AT UNIVERSITIES MUST BE STOPPED—STUDENTS' RIGHT TO AN EDUCATION MUST BE GUARANTEED

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, lawlessness is a poor substitute for education and the concern of the Governors of our Nation over the violence on our campuses is commendable and understandable.

Not only are our Governors concerned—we are all concerned—the Nation is concerned over the efforts of a very small minority to disrupt education in many of our colleges and universities.

The freedom to pursue an education is a vital part of the concept of pursuit of happiness set out in the Declaration of Independence as a guarantee—the unalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Students have a right to attend the school of their choice and this right should be enforced. Students uninterested in education should not be permitted to interfere with the education of those who are interested.

In this connection, I place in the RECORD an editorial from Life magazine calling for a return to law and order on our campuses.

The editorial follows:

LIBERATING THE CAMPUS FROM "LIBERATORS"

"Without the law," says Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, president of Notre Dame, "the university is a sitting duck for any small group from outside or inside that wishes to destroy it, to incapacitate it, to terrorize it at whim."

Educators like Hesburgh have now begun to blow the whistle on student lawlessness. The sound came loud and clear through a new din of turmoil. At the University of Wisconsin, student agitators turned on water hoses and fire alarms, forcibly blocked their peers and professors from attending classes, and scratched their message to the university—"Shut It Down"—into the paint of the Wisconsin state governor's automobile. At North Carolina's Duke University, "Black Is Beautiful Week" ended in pitched battles between policemen spraying and flinging tear gas and students wielding clubs and the occasional bicycle chain. The spring term at San Francisco State College opened to the blast of a terrorist bomb that injured a watchman and knocked out 18 windows.

But there were also signs of growing university impatience with such tactics. National Guardsmen were called in to restore order at Wisconsin and placed on alert at Duke, San Francisco State's Acting President S. I. Hayakawa told newsmen "you're darned right" that large contingents of cops would be a campus fixture for the new term, and California's troubled Berkeley campus will also be policed by state highway patrolmen and sheriff's deputies. Ronald Reagan has ordered his men to enforce order "at the point of a bayonet, if necessary."

A new phase seems to have begun in dealing with students violently disrupting U.S. campuses to express their grievances. Campus lawbreakers have always been a very small minority, but university administrators feared that stern repression would turn them into a majority. They were also inhibited by knowing that agitators often had the sympathy of a sizable faculty minority. Themselves sympathetic to at least some of the student demands, administrators have been lenient in punishing the guilty and slow to take unpleasant steps to restore order. A measure of their permissiveness is that of the tens of thousands who took part in last spring's violent demonstrations at Columbia University and elsewhere, the National Student Association reported that only 124 were expelled. What now appears to have changed many administrators' minds is their realization that on some disturbed campuses the continued existence of a functioning university is at stake—and that is far more important than any specific student grievance.

Student dissidents, who in recent years made many gains in their demands for university reform and have had some influence on national attitudes on the draft and on Vietnam, are now primarily campaigning for Black Studies programs. At a number of universities (*e.g.,* Cornell, Yale) where there was a genuine will on both sides to reach a solution, this demand has been met. But at Berkeley, when the administration announced acceptance of the Black Studies program the student Third World Liberation Front had been striking for, the student front pronounced itself supremely uninterested, and switched to demands for a Black-Latino-Amero-Asian-American Indian Studies program instead. When the president of City College of New York emerged from the administration building to announce to 100 Negro and Puerto Rican students "affirmative answers to all their demands," they barreled past him without listening, kicked in the door of his office, and spent several hours littering the carpeted floor with cigarette butts and sampling his office liquor supply.

Such student tactics are not legitimate dissent; they should plainly be labeled coercion and totalitarianism. "Participatory democracy," the slogan of Students for a Democratic Society, is hardly an accurate description of the S.D.S. silencing of a South Vietnamese diplomat (who was doused with water) when he answered an invitation from other students to speak at New York University this winter. When teen-aged Luddites seize, vandalize and close down university buildings, they say they are "liberating" them. They have similar double-talk to describe assaulting and beating students, hurling incendiary bombs into the homes of professors, disrupting and forcibly preventing entrance to lectures, vandalizing library books and student records, and arson.

Though these outrageous acts must be punished if the authority of the university community is to be reestablished, anger is not the best guide. At least 12 state legislatures are debating punitive bills that would cut off student lawbreakers' scholarships; in California no fewer than 20 separate bills, and in Wisconsin a dozen, have been proposed to penalize guilty students, "investigate" universities and fire lenient chancellors and presidents. Withdrawing scholarship aid is unequal punishment, singling out some students for extra penalty when their unlawful acts are fully subject to existing criminal legislation, and hurting only poor students without really affecting offenders from well-to-do homes.

Instead, the university community should itself act to end the leniency and overprotectiveness that permit troublemakers the luxury of being, in the words of University of Denver Chancellor Maurice Mitchell, "martyrs thrown to toothless lions." The universities could begin by withdrawing student status and legal protection from students who continue to use spoiler tactics (which should be clearly enumerated in advance). This is not a matter of stifling the right of dissent. Rather, it would restore the open procedures, rational debate and respect for others' rights that are necessary if academic freedom and avenues of effective dissent are to be maintained. Announcing that students who do not respect this distinction henceforth would lose their academic standing, Notre Dame's President Hesburgh put the point succinctly by saying that such students "will be suspended from this community as not understanding what this community is."

Happily, most students are neither sheep nor idiots. Given more discriminating guidance by university authorities, they will surely grasp the point that student dissent—which made many important gains on campus, and has more to make—can only suffer if allowed to degenerate into these mindless "confrontation" tactics. Father Hesburgh, a wise and sympathetic Catholic educator who worries about just that happening, is again worth quoting when he points a truer path for student dissent: "God knows, there is more than enough in our often nonglorious civilization to be alienated from, be you young, middle-aged, or old. But understanding and analysis of social ills cannot be conducted in a boiler factory. Complicated social mechanisms, out-of-joint, are not adjusted with sledgehammers."

SALUTE TO MOROCCO AND HER KING

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the Kingdom of Morocco celebrated on March 3 the eighth anniversary of King Hassan II's succession to the throne in 1961. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa, House Foreign Affairs, I believe it is fitting that we should salute Morocco, with which the United States has long enjoyed friendly, warm relations.

Located at the northwest corner of Africa, Morocco is the closest African country to the United States. In large part its history has been shaped by its geographic location, only 8 miles from Europe across the Strait of Gibraltar. In 1778 an ancestor of the present King ordered recognition of U.S. ships, beginning the long history of close relations between our two countries. One of our oldest treaties, that of 1786 with Morocco, was renewed in 1836 and remains in force today.

Upon regaining her independence, Morocco embarked on a social and economic development program, today embodied in the 5-year plan—1968–72. That program calls for total public investment of $1 billion over the 5 years, with emphasis on agriculture, education and tourism. I am proud that the United States is associated with Morocco in its own extensive efforts to bring a better life to its 14 million people.

In saluting Morocco and her King today, I should like particularly to note that Moroccan-American relations are ably advanced by the presence in Washington of Ambassador Ahmed Osman and his charming wife, the Princess Lalla Nezha, younger sister of Hassan II.

ADDRESS BY HON. THOMAS S. KLEPPE AT THE COLORADO GRAIN & FEED DEALERS ASSOCIATION MEETING IN DENVER, COLO.

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 24, 1969, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. KLEPPE), addressed the luncheon meeting of the Colorado Grain & Feed Dealers Association in Denver, Colo.

His speech is an excellent commentary on the problems facing the agricultural industry today and, I, for one, have found his comments and suggestions to be of great assistance in bringing a better understanding of the plight of the American farmer.

Mr. Speaker, having received permission, I insert the text of Representative KLEPPE's speech in the RECORD.

The speech follows:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS BY REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS S. KLEPPE

It is a great privilege to meet with members of the Colorado Grain and Feed Dealers Association and their associates from neighboring states who are here today.

When my good friend and colleague, Congressman Don Brotzman called to extend your kind invitation, I was more than happy to accept for two reasons. First, this will make it most difficult for Don to turn me down when I invite him to speak in my own District in North Dakota. Second, this meeting provides me with an opportunity to discuss agricultural interests which I share with members of your organization.

My indoctrination into the grain and feed business came about at an early age. My father operated a country elevator at Kintyre, North Dakota, and back in the "threadbare" thirties, you didn't hire an extra hand if there happened to be an able-bodied son around the house. It is my recollection that the wages were relatively modest and the hours, especially at harvest time, could make you mighty late for the country dance.

In the drought years—and we had more of those than bountiful ones—the work load was lighter—almost as light as the shriveled grain which came to the elevator. I know that many of you went through similar experiences back in the 1930's. When nature lays a drought on top of a depression, you really wind up on the losing side of the war against poverty.

Last fall, as I campaigned throughout my district, I stopped at many country elevators. I made it a point to check their card prices from day to day. No. 2 Hard Spring wheat was bringing around $1.07 a bushel and barley 50 to 60 cents. When you consider that today's dollar is worth only about 40 cents in relation to the 1939 dollar, this meant that wheat and barley prices were actually at about the same levels as they were 30 years ago.

I made some further calculations, based on Department of Agriculture figures. They showed, for example, that a 40–49 horsepower tractor, which cost a North Dakota farmer $4,300 in 1964, carried a $6,000 price tag in the autumn of 1968. To put it another way—with $1.37 wheat in 1964, it took 3,038 bushels to buy such a tractor. Just four years later, it took 5,600 bushels—84% more.

In 1964, it took 5,733 bushels of barley to buy this tractor. Just four years later, it took 12,000 bushels!

These figures dramatically show what is happening to the farm economy. They show that inflation hits farmers hardest of all. Caught between declining prices for everything they sell and soaring costs for everything they must buy, farmers are in the tightest economic squeeze they have known since the 1930's.

Inflation doesn't just happen. It is caused—caused by in large part loose Federal fiscal policies, by uncontrolled deficit spending and a ballooning national debt. The current inflationary binge has been accompanied by the highest interest rates since the Civil War. Farm debt has doubled since 1960 and the rising interest rates have made this burden more than three times as heavy to carry.

Since Government policies cause inflation, only a change in those policies can halt it. The mushrooming growth of big government can and must be controlled.

As businessmen who deal with farmers every day, you are acutely aware of the problems confronting agriculture. Moreover, I am sure you will all agree that while it is comparatively easy to diagnose the malady, it is enormously difficult to prescribe effective treatment.

It's no time for hasty remedies or bandaid application. Fortunately the new administration has some much-needed time to reexamine and reassess present farm programs. The one-year extension of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 by the 90th Congress was primarily designed to permit this. It would be my hope that the administration's farm program recommendations could be sent to Congress next January, with congressional hearings commencing immediately thereafter. It would be desirable to have new legislation enacted as early in 1970 as possible, certainly no later than April or May.

Considerable revision is obviously required for several of the basic commodity programs, as is clearly indicated by their failure either to control production or insure satisfactory market prices. I personally believe parts of the 1965 act, including domestic wheat certificate payments, should be retained. It might be simpler to submit a new bill, incorporating parts of the old legislation, rather than to seek changes through a long series of amendments.

I believe we should take a new look at a land retirement program.

I think also that greater emphasis must be placed upon market expansion and development, both at home and abroad. The search for new industrial uses for agricultural products should be stepped up.

Last session I introduced and this year have re-introduced legislation which would lock up in the hands of farmers themselves, rather than in CCC inventory, a Strategic Grain Reserve of 300 million bushels of wheat, 500 million bushels of feed grains and 75 million of soybeans. I hope that consideration will be given to this approach. Clearly this is not, of itself, a solution. It would, however, impart some immediate strength to grain and soybean prices. It would serve as a stop-gap until long-range programs have an opportunity to take hold.

I favor an extension of the Great Plains Program and have introduced legislation to extend it, with additional funding. This is basically aimed at applying conservation practices to entire units, with special emphasis upon converting land unsuited for sustained crop production into permanent grass. To date, more than 31,500 farmers and ranchers have entered into cost-sharing agreements, covering 57,279,220 acres, under the Great Plains Program.

Virtually everyone seems to agree that

farmers need additional bargaining power but there appears to be no general consensus as to what form this should take. It is an area which I believe the new Administration will thoroughly explore. I would strongly oppose any plan which would make government the final arbiter in bargaining between farmers and buyers of agricultural commodities. Obviously a bargaining mechanism which might work satisfactorily for walnut growers would not necessarily be adaptable to wheat and some other commodities which are produced by hundreds of thousands of farmers in all parts of the Nation.

While large and small farmers share some of the same problems, the problem of underemployment is largely restricted to the small operator. I would like to see more off-farm employment opportunities for small farmers—jobs which would permit them to remain on the land and still make a decent living. This concept has been tested on a limited scale for many years but more concentrated effort is needed. It takes much more than good intentions to bring industry into rural areas. It has been done in a number of instances, however, and I think more can be done. This may require tax incentives and perhaps even outright subsidies.

I would like to see, as I am sure most farmers would, a greater percentage of agricultural income derived from the market greater market demand which, in turn, would increase free market prices. I hope higher farm prices will stem from increased demand, rather than strict, mandatory controls on production.

In conclusion, I would emphasize again that there are no quick or easy solutions to the Nation's farm dilemma. We are confronted not by a single problem but by a multitude of problems. They vary by area and by commodity. Both social and economic problems are intertwined and it is often difficult to separate them.

By now, surely, we must have just about exhausted the non-solutions for agriculture's ills. We need, for a change, programs which have at least a reasonable chance of succeeding—of improving farm income and at the same time insuring continued production of an adequate supply of food and fiber.

It seems to me that the time has come for all of the general farm organizations, the various commodity groups and those in the allied agricultural industries such as yours to attempt to reach some broad agreement on America's farm policy of the future. Without some general consensus from all these groups which are so directly concerned, it is going to be extremely difficult, if not impossible, for this Administration and the Congress to come forward with an agricultural program which is both genuinely workable and widely acceptable.

I might add it will be impossible to win from an increasingly city and urban-oriented Congress approval of any program which fails to meet this double test. This is the challenge which confronts agriculture and the agir-business community. We must meet it or be overwhelmed by it.

PRAYER IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing my proposed amendment to the Constitution which would permit the offering of prayers and the reading of the Bible as part of the program of any public school in the United States.

I first introduced this legislation in 1963 when the U.S. Supreme Court issued its decision which held that the establishment clause of the first amendment to the Constitution is violated by prayers in the public schools of our Nation, and I have introduced this legislation every year since.

The reference to God in the Pledge of Allegiance, the Star-Spangled Banner, and in the ceremony preceding the opening of sessions of courts and Congress should serve as an impetus to this Congress to restore the rights of our schoolchildren to share in the spiritual heritage of our Nation. I am sure there are a great many of my colleagues who share my concern over this situation, and I am hopeful that action on this amendment can be taken this session.

THE HOWARD UNIVERSITY BOYCOTT

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, as demonstrations, protests, boycotts, and violence continue on college and university campuses across the country, I believe it is important to recognize that the real destroyers represent only a tiny minority of students.

For every militant leading others into senseless violence there are hundreds of others who want to continue their education and who want to preserve, not ruin, their schools.

One student who has had the courage and constructive attitude to speak out in favor of moderation is Henry C. Tribbitt, a student at the Law School of Howard University.

Mr. Tribbitt, who is from Mobile in my congressional district, has written, mimeographed, and distributed a statement to his fellow students in this regard. I believe it is worthy of the close attention of all of us and of the country as a whole. I include it at this point in the RECORD:

LET US RETURN TO CLASSES

FEBRUARY 25, 1969.

To: My fellow students, Law School of Howard University.

From: Henry C. Tribbitt.

The hottest place in Hell is reserved for good men who, in the face of crisis, purport to remain neutral. Grave issues face us today. We must make a choice of whether or not we will examine truth or get lost in rhetoric and meaningless syntax. The issue is: do we intend to be lawyers or outlaws?

Why are we out of classes? Certainly we are not outside of the classroom in order to learn the law. Why are we here at Howard in the first place? Certainly we were not directed to come here against our will? We chose to attend here presumably to obtain a legal education because that is what we wanted.

But we cannot obtain a legal education by staying out of class. When the problem is placed in proper focus we can see that we are not doing what we travelled miles to do. We are not accomplishing what we have made many personal sacrifices to accomplish.

We (you and I) have the same goals. Our interests are the same. We should not be sidetracked into irrelevancies and collateral issues. Today marks the second week we have been out of classes. During this time the faculty has, in fact, made many concessions at our behest. What do we seek now? Blood?

A legal education is a privilege. To practice law is a privilege. But a legal education is also a responsibility. It is a venture that has matured to us only over many years of work and study. Are we to throw all this away on rhetoric and meaningless syntax?

I submit to you, my fellow students, that this is folly. In my case it was necessary for me to practically give away more than $4000 worth of household goods and dispose of a house in a few days, all of which it took me six years to acquire, in order that I could study the law here.

I did this willingly because I wanted to be relevant to the black community. Now I am told that to be relevant I must, on the strength of ill-defined glittering generalities, forsake the only useful service I could possibly render to my fellow man.

You and I owe a certain duty to ourselves, our parents, wives, husbands, friends, families, as well as to our respective communities from which we came. My community is Mobile, Alabama. The people there know me as their friend. They trust me and they take pride in the fact that a man known as one of them will one day in the near future (1970) graduate as a lawyer from Howard University. They are relying upon me to complete this three-year program so that I might return to my community where over 30,000 blacks live with only two black lawyers to serve their legal needs.

If ever there was a time when black people need articulate spokesmen that time is now. If ever there was a place where effective spokesmen were essential it is in the communities from which you and I have come and where you and I plan to return. You know the conditions that exist there. The knowledge you and I acquire here is precisely for the purpose of alleviating those conditions. But that knowledge presupposes that you and I attend classes.

There is no room for dispute that many inequities exist in this world. Nor is there any substantial question as to inequities here at Howard. But does one behead a dandruff patient to cure the dandruff?

I submit to you, my fellow students, that we have put ourselves in this kind of situation without recognizing that it is essentially negative and destructive rather than positive. No compromise can come out of it. This country was built on compromise. Continued progress for all of us demands that there be a middle ground.

Howard is your school. Howard is my school. Howard is a part of me. I love Howard because I know that my school is also the school of Spottswood Robinson, Charlie Houston, and is the dream of John Mercer Langston. Many dedicated barristers have devoted their lives to Howard. It has been built with the blood, sweat, and tears of black men who wanted to render an unscented service to the black man.

It is for us to improve the legacy they left us, not to destroy it. A little reflection tells us that continuation of the boycott does not serve that legacy but can only destroy it. I entreat you to consider all of the facts and return to reason. Your future and mine lies in the balance.

We need not close our eyes to what is wrong at Howard. Nor should we hesitate to work by productive means at every opportunity to correct problems. But can we count as productive the loss of a year of work and study? Must we become sacrificial lambs? If so, then for what purpose?

The black community needs each and every one of us as lawyers, not as boycotters: as the promoters of progress in the solution of problems, not as barriers to progress. The needs are in the home communities from which we come and I believe we ought to keep that in mind.

While we list all of the wrongs of Howard let us not forget the corresponding rights. Howard accepts young blacks in law school when no other school in this country will do so. Howard does not require a LSAT score. Many of us would never have been in law school if this were not the case.

Remember, it takes only one moment to destroy what it takes a lifetime to build. A majority of Howard students benefit from at least tuition scholarships without distinction to honor students. The primary requirement is a passing average. Howard today is an accredited law school. But how long will this be so if this boycott continues?

If classes cannot be held more than 100 black students who are in line for graduation in Spring will not reach the black community where they are needed so desperately. And I remind you, as I have said, that two lawyers serve more than 30,000 blacks in Mobile, Alabama.

The continuation of this boycott can serve no useful purpose. Should we stay out of class for the rest of this year nobody on the faculty will be hurt, even financially. On the contrary, they will only have less work to do.

We can't demand a penny of our tuition back because if a contract has been breached we are clearly the party in default. But in this case our greatest default would be to ourselves and to our brothers who look to us for leadership in the difficult days ahead. I admonish you to use your head and to think carefully. A man does not tear down his own house simply because the roof has a leak. I cannot see that any useful purpose will be served should we close the doors of Howard University for future black students. To build constructively we don't tear down the old: we doggedly preserve the existing opportunities and build on them.

When I consider that I am the son of a lowly washerwoman who earned 50 cents a day with nine children to support, and that now I am in law school where more than $2,000 has been invested for my education thus far, I want to ask serious questions about obstructions that appear.

No one would contend that all is well at Howard University or in the United States generally. But it is for us to seek change that is meaningful in a constructive way. And opportunity for constructive change does exist if we can keep from turning it into destructive force.

Those of us who love this country in spite of all its faults, measuring it against other nations, can appreciate the words of C. J. Vinson more than 14 years ago when he stated in the case of *Dennis* v. *United States*, 341 U.S. 494, 501:

"(Whatever) theoretical merit there may be to the argument that there is a 'right' to rebellion against dictatorial government is without force where the existing structure of government provides for peaceful and orderly change. We reject any principle of governmental helplessness in the face of preparation for revolution, which principle, carried to its logical conclusion must lead to anarchy."

Conceding as we must that we have real and substantial complaints with Howard I submit to you that as law students and prospective members of the bar we must seek positive solutions to these problems within the legal system that we have avowedly dedicated our lives to. Our continued presence here attests to this proposition. If we short circuit the legal system how can we sell its merits to others?

In conclusion, therefore, I hope to see you in class with me on Wednesday, February 26, 1969, at 8 a.m. so that we can be about the business of being relevant. By preparations to mend broken lives, and to bind up the wounds of recent days, we should proceed now to get on with the work and the study which we have freely chosen as the first stage of our vocation.

STUDY LOOKS TO WYOMING COAL RESOURCES

HON. JOHN WOLD

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, electrical power is the physical mainstream of the technology that provides Americans with the highest standard of living in the world and allows so many amenities of life to an ever-growing number of our citizens.

Economists, in fact, use per capita consumption of electric power as a prime measure of the comparative standards of living among the nations of the world. Its importance is emphasized by estimates that per capita consumption of electric power by citizens of the United States will double by the year 1985.

The United States currently has abundant resources to fuel plants generating electric power, but I would propose the caveat that our resources of petroleum and oil shale, even, are not inexhaustible. There are strong grounds also to suspect that atomic power may not be completely desirable in all instances for the production of electrical power.

There are, however, in my district, the great State of Wyoming, tremendous reserves of fossil fuels in the form of bituminous coals and lignites. Increasingly they are being utilized to provide the fuel for generation of electric power.

I have just received a copy of the Basin Electric Cooperative's report for January 1969 giving an outline of what is happening in the area of coal power generation.

I include the article, "Study Looks to Wyoming Coal Resources," in the RECORD, at this point:

STUDY LOOKS TO WYOMING COAL RESOURCES

Expectations that the Wyoming and Colorado members of Basin Electric will require an increasingly greater proportion of the power produced by the Cooperative's thermal generating plants led the Board of Directors to authorize R. W. Beck and Associates to make studies of coal resources in Wyoming as an initial step in determining potential sites for future generating facilities. The action was taken at the regular Board of Directors meeting December 12.

Vast quantities of sub-bituminous coal are known to exist in Wyoming. Strip mining is carried on near Gillette for a plant partially owned by Rushmore Electric Power Cooperative, one of Basin Electric's Class A members.

Engineers note that the sub-bituminous coal has a higher Btu content per pound than the lignite burned in the Basin Electric first unit. For example, lignite averages about 6700 Btu's per pound compared to about 8500 Btu's per pound for sub-bituminous coal.

In announcing the action of the Cooperative, James Grahl, general manager, noted that rapidly growing power requirements of member cooperatives in Wyoming and Colorado make a thorough investigation of the economics of locating generating units of more than 400,000 kilowatts in that area very important to the long range power supply plans of Basin Electric.

"In addition to R. W. Beck's investigation, we are engaged in studies with our member power supply cooperative in that area—Tri-State G & T Association—which serves 12 Wyoming rural electric cooperatives. The lowest cost, most efficient power supply for these systems, as well as for the entire membership of Basin Electric, depends upon our pooling the requirements of these rural systems which serve in sparsely settled western areas. Such pooling of requirements has permitted us to build the largest lignite-burning unit constructed in the country to-date, and has made feasible the 400,000 kilowatt unit scheduled for operation at our North Dakota power station in late 1974.

"For our third, and subsequent generating units, we feel it necessary to study locations in Wyoming because of the substantial growth in power requirements being experienced by member cooperatives in that section of the region and because of the presence of very large and important coal deposits there which could benefit power users throughout the region."

Availability of an adequate supply of water for cooling purposes in large generating plants is an essential element in determining feasible site locations. Basin Electric has taken under consideration, therefore, a study of ground water resources in Wyoming, including analysis of "drilling logs," to determine ground water availability. Cooling towers which require less water for cooling purposes of a generating plant add to the cost of such a plant and diminish the desirability of a site which would require them. Such factors are weighed against the cost of longer transmission lines if the plants are located further from the load centers. These are elements of studies being made by Basin Electric.

BROTZMAN INTRODUCES LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE YOUTH FARE RATES ON AIRLINES

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to enable young people, the aged, the handicapped, and military personnel to travel at reduced fares on the Nation's airlines.

A recent decision by an examiner for the Civil Aeronautics Board, which is currently under review by the full Board, would eliminate the present airline youth fares.

It is my opinion that the Congress did not intend to proscribe reduced airline fares such as that for youth in its prohibition against unjust discrimination in the Federal Aviation Act of 1958. Regardless of how the CAB rules, we need to settle this matter legislatively. I believe that the standby system is important to our young people for two reasons. First, it makes it feasible for many of them to maintain family ties despite great geographical separation during college years. And second, it enables them to add to their educations by travel which normally they could not afford.

The bill which I am introducing today will, for the first time, specifically authorize the CAB to extend half-price fares to youth and the other groups mentioned above, on a standby basis during offpeak travel hours. This is enabling legislation. It should be emphasized that the airlines are not required to put these reduced fares into effect. But, there will be clear legislative basis to do so.

REPORT TO CONSTITUENTS

HON. MARK ANDREWS

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, it is my custom to send regular reports to my constituents regarding my activities in their behalf as well as on the events in Congress. Such a report is being mailed today, and under unanimous consent I submit the report for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

"ALL INCOME IS SUBJECT TO TAX"

That's how the U.S. Revenue Code starts out—but the next dozen pages list the deductions, exclusions, exemptions, special rules and special exemptions which have been added over the years until now only about 50% of income is subject to tax.

According to outgoing Secretary of the Treasury, Joseph Barr, there are 155 persons with incomes of over $200,000 a year who have paid no tax whatsoever, and of these 155, there are 21 with annual incomes of over $1 million, and yet they pay absolutely no tax.

The alternatives for our Government, I believe, are tax reforms—or a tax revolt by the low and middle income taxpayers who bear the brunt of the costs of running this nation.

With the encouragement of President Nixon, the House Ways and Means Committee has started public hearings on tax reforms—hearings every citizen should follow closely.

One of the reforms to be considered is the proposal to levy at least a minimum tax on individual incomes of those wealthy persons whose income is now tax-exempt for various reasons under the law. Another of the first tasks of the Committee will be to simplify the income tax computation, eliminating as much as possible the complicated and confusing 150 page instruction booklet that must necessarily accompany tax forms sent out at the present time.

Tax reform legislation will not be realized quickly, but we can all be happy that the task has at least begun—after being postponed for far too long.

FOOD FOR THE NEEDY

The recent action by USDA Secretary Hardin to provide free food stamps to the hungry poor people in South Carolina is just a start and all indications point to massive action to rub out hunger and malnutrition in the nation—a move long overdue in our land of plenty.

This should, hopefully, mean more money spent on food for the poor than on the red tape and paper work that have in the past used up far too much of the welfare dollar.

The day Vince Lombardi took over the direction of Washington's hapless "Redskins" professional football team, he told a meeting of Congressmen and outstanding Boy Scouts about the importance of "commitment" as a key to success in athletics, as well as in Scouting.

Commitment is an essential factor of good citizenship, too, as our form of government depends on the dedication and interest of the people and by the people so that it can indeed function for the people.

Meeting Coach Lombardi with me is Paul Collins, son of Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Collins of Fargo, who was one of 15 leading Scouts selected to make that fine organization's annual "Report to the Nation."

It is an important part of my job as your Representative to keep you informed of my activities on your behalf in the Congress. Therefore, I send weekly reports to the radio stations in North Dakota's 1st District and a number of these stations (listed below) carry them on a regularly scheduled basis. Other stations, of course, include portions of the report on their regular news broadcasts.

KOVC, Valley City, Monday, 2:05 p.m.
KDLR, Devils Lake, Saturday, 11:25 a.m.
KBMW, Wahpeton, Sunday, 11:45 a.m.
KQWB, Fargo, Sunday, 8:15 a.m.
KEYJ, Jamestown, Wednesday, 6:35 p.m.
KGCA, Rugby, Monday, 6:00 p.m.
KMAV, Mayville, Monday, 5:25 p.m.
KNDK, Langdon, Sunday, 1:25 p.m.
KGPC, Grafton, Tuesday, 1 p.m.
KDAK, Carrington, Saturday, 2:30 p.m.
KILO, Grand Forks, Monday, 6:15 p.m.

At a time when a minority of our young people are shouting their intolerance of our government, I am very proud of my association, as a member of the Board of Advisors of the Presidential classroom for Young Americans, which was initiated and approved by the White House.

This nonpartisan, non-profit organization is bringing high school students to Washington in groups of up to 350 to observe for one week the operations of our government. Every high school in the country has been invited to participate in this program which is designed to give members of the senior class an opportunity for in-depth study of how our government functions, to challenge them toward personal involvement by showing them what the Government is doing in various fields, to encourage dedication to and understanding of the American system, which all too often seems remote, bureaucratic and inaccessible to today's young people.

The first of 5 classes started February 22nd and these young people from all over America are having wide open sessions with government, press, and organization leaders. This direct involvement of our students with their government is certainly one of the best ways to let young America know that they can be heard and participate in the affairs of their country.

The bi-partisan Board of Advisors includes Justice Thurgood Marshall of the Supreme Court, Senators Howard Baker and Mark Hatfield, General William C. Westmoreland and Mrs. Scott Carpenter, wife of the astronaut as well as others.

State Treasurer Bernice Asbridge made a point about money matters while in Washington attending President Nixon's Inaugural. As the most recent example of a woman's success in North Dakota politics, I am sure this very able lady will inspire others to take a more active interest in government.

Prior to the start of the 91st Congress, I visited several Central and Latin American countries on a mission for the State Department, and had the opportunity of visiting an area that will have a great future impact on our wheat farms in North Dakota, the International Crop Improvement Center at Chapingo, Mexico—one of the largest wheat breeding nurseries in the world.

Besides contributing significantly to agriculture in Mexico, the U.S. trained plant breeders have wisely used the ideal weather year-round low labor costs and many new dwarf and semi dwarf wheat varieties have resulted. These are all being made available to our experiment stations and wheat breeding companies.

SMALL WATERSHED DEVELOPMENT AIDS LINCOLN, ARK.

HON. JOHN P. HAMMERSCHMIDT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, Arkansas and the Nation are the beneficiaries of small watershed development under Public Law 566. These Federal-State-local cooperative ventures bring out the best in the land and afford broader opportunities to the people.

Some 250 watersheds in Arkansas have been found suitable for development under Public Law 566. In many cases, the flood retention reservoir is structured to yield other benefits, including a dependable source of municipal and industrial water.

A number of projects have been completed in our State, and in the case of Lincoln, Ark., there is now enough experience to constitute evidence of some of the benefits derived from this program.

The January edition of Soil Conservation carried an article entitled "Water for a Thirsty Town Pumps New Life Into Economy of Watershed Community." In the belief this article will interest many of my colleagues in the Congress, I include it at this point in the RECORD:

WATER FOR A THIRSTY TOWN PUMPS NEW LIFE INTO ECONOMY OF A WATERSHED COMMUNITY

Add abundant pure water to a thirsty town and you will get instant economic growth and opportunity, according to business and civic leaders of Lincoln, Ark.

Water-short Lincoln turned the valve on a new water source from a Public Law 566 multiple-purpose lake in January of 1964.

"The town started growing immediately," Mayor Roy Jackson asserts, "and with 2 million gallons of good water a day from the new source, it kept on growing."

The Lincoln water system was fed until recent years by a spring which produced about 100,000 gallons a day. This gave the little town's water subscribers an average of about 200 gallons daily—inadequate in view of the service stations, restaurants, and other businesses that required several thousand gallons a day each.

In 1960 the Washington County Soil and Water Conservation District and other sponsors were working on a watershed protection and flood-prevention project for the Muddy Fork of the Illinois Creek watershed, in which Lincoln is located. The plan, authorized in 1961, contained provisions for a multiple-purpose water supply and flood-detention lake, with Lincoln paying for the easements and extra cost of construction over and above that needed for flood detention.

For 2 years, water users had to eke by on what they could get. During the dry summer of 1962, volunteer firemen lived in constant fear of an outbreak and Water Manager Jack Cox had to restort to tank trucks to keep Lincoln alive.

Rains started filling the new lake before New Year's Day of 1964, and water at last filled the thirsty pipes of the Lincoln water system.

C. C. Karnes was contracting officer for the sponsors during the construction of the lake, and as an officer in the Bank of Lincoln has kept his hand on the strengthening pulse of the town's economic growth.

"The changes are visible to the naked eye," Karnes says, "because we do not have a lot of empty stores and buildings staring at us now. We have had about 20 new or expanded businesses since we obtained our new water supply—not counting industries.

"Our bank assets have grown by more than $2 million since the new water went into our pipes—most of it in new deposits.

"Upwards of a million dollars worth of new homes—nearly 100 houses—have been built or are under construction. The expanding benefits of these new homes touch building supply houses, appliance dealers, grocery stores—in fact all of our businesses.

"The largest industry to be attracted is a new food processing plant. It will employ 225 people at first, and eventually 450.

"This one industry will use eight times as much water in its operations each day as the town's total supply before the watershed project," Karnes said.

Probably one of the best indicators of Lincoln's growth since 1963 is the Lincoln School District tax assessment. In 1963 it was $2,405,634. Now it is $3,021,376.

THE PRESIDENT'S TRIP

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the public reaction to President Nixon's European visit has been uniformly favorable. Editorial comments of the various communications media have been generally fair and constructive.

One of the thoughtful editorials on the success of the President's trip appears in today's Chicago Tribune, which follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S TRIP

Mr. Nixon was wise to set modest goals in his trip to Europe and to listen rather than to dictate. His open and friendly manner seems to have made a good impression, so much so that kind words came even from those who speak for the usually chilly President de Gaulle of France.

The President's principal intentions were to get acquainted with the heads of state with whom he will be dealing; to give assurances that the United States intends to cooperate and not to dominate; and to make it clear that, much as he may hope to establish concord with the Soviet Union, he will make no deal with Russia over the heads of his European allies.

Whether the flaccid North Atlantic Treaty organization will be reinvigorated in consequence of Mr. Nixon's journey is for the future to establish. His emphasis on the solidarity of the alliance was symbolized in his selection of Belgium as his first stop, for it is there that NATO headquarters was moved when French hospitality ran out. We should know shortly whether the alliance will disintegrate, for the treaty was signed to run for 20 years and the terminal date is next month unless the members extend their commitments.

Mr. Nixon's trip also had the intended effect of showing Europe that, no matter how deeply we may be involved in Vietnam, the concerns of Europe are very much on America's mind.

The President's warm reception by street crowds was not lessened by communist-inspired disorders in Rome. It is standard operating procedure for the Reds to turn out their claque whenever there is the possibility of embarrassing the United States.

These unassuming travels need not be trumpeted as some vast triumph, such as Franklin Roosevelt misrepresented his trips to Teheran and Yalta to be. We can be thankful that no grandiose designs were meditated or hatched. These personal excursions into diplomacy have been uniformly unfortunate in the past, and this time, at least, there will be no bitter fruits over which to repine.

CINCINNATI POLICE CAPTAIN THOMAS DIXON AND DISTRICT FOUR OFFICERS WIN AMERICANISM AWARD

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, on March 20, for the first time in the history of the award, an entire Cincinnati police unit will receive the American Legion's Americanism Award. The honor goes to the men of Police District Four whose outstanding police-community-relations program, under the direction of Capt. Thomas Dixon, has earned the respect and admiration of all.

The following summary, which was prepared by Cincinnati Post & Times-Star reporter, Graydon DeCamp, describes the achievements and work of Police District Four's outstanding men:

CINCINNATI POLICE-COMMUNITY RELATIONS PROGRAM

Much of the success of Cincinnati's Police-Community Relations program is directly attributable to Capt. Thomas Dixon and the men of the Police District 4, which he commands. The program was first tried in District 4, as an experiment. This district consists, in large part, of neighborhoods where urban renewal, changing racial balance in population, and ghetto-like conditions have bred unrest. It is where Cincinnati's only major racial disturbances began. It was a high crime area. It has become the lowest crime area.

Capt. Tom Dixon became commander of the district in January, 1967, about six months after the district had begun a pilot Police-Community Relations program under joint sponsorship of the Cincinnati Police Division and the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

His district's success with the program has been phenomenal. The main thrust was at winning the children (although open discussion meetings with adult citizens has played a large part).

Capt. Tom Dixon and his men undertook such projects as speaking programs in schools, organizing competitions with the help of the city's Recreation Department and providing prizes for winners, trophies, and certificates. Capt. Tom Dixon arranged to have 300 District 4 Police T-shirts distributed to youngsters who wanted to play baseball or basketball but who were unable to find, or get on, regular organized Knothole or Little League teams. They arranged a series of awards for a summer program in music competition, giving 28 awards and aiding in formal presentations. Capt. Tom Dixon and his officers helped conduct a "patriotism, law and order" program at Longview State (Mental) Hospital's children's unit, and have conducted similar programs and poster contests at every school in the district—the district has 28 schools.

The result of all this has been the affection, admiration, and loyalty of almost every school child in the district. On numerous occasions, whole schools of children have marched on the District 4 stationhouse, bearing signs saying such things as "Thank you Capt. Dixon and District 4 Police." Students from Samuel Ach Junior High School showed up en masse last Christmas and gave each officer a bag of candy.

Whenever Capt. Tom Dixon visits the Longview School, youngsters crowd around, cling to his arms, wear his cap. They love him.

A veteran detective in District 4 says, "It's a pleasure to come to work for Capt. Tom Dixon."

The accolades for Tom Dixon and District 4 come from many sources outside the Police Division. The National Conference of Christians and Jews have given him an award for outstanding leadership in promoting the cause of good will. He has received the Syrian Shrine Temple National Police Week Award for service to the community. The Cincinnati Citizens' Crusade has honored him for outstanding promotion of patriotism among young people.

When he received the Shrine Award—at the Shrine Circus in mid-1968—Capt. Dixon received far greater applause from the 15,000 in the audience than did any of the circus acts they had paid to see. When receiving the Grocery Manufacturers' Representatives award last year, at a dinner attended by 450, Capt. Dixon's acceptance talk was interrupted eight times by applause—twice for standing ovations.

Capt. Tom Dixon and the men of his District 4 were nominated for, and chosen to receive, the 1969 American Legion Americanism Award. It will be presented to him March 20th. This is the only time this award has gone to an entire police unit.

SOME THOUGHTS ON THE ABM DEBATE

HON. EARLE CABELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, much has been said in the past and even more will be said in the coming months concerning the installation of an anti-ballistic-missile system.

Both Houses of the Congress will debate the authorization and funding of this highly controversial system.

Unfortunately, the debate will become clouded with emotionalism and the real meat in the need for such a defensive installation might became submerged.

One of the most knowledgeable men in the country on such subjects is Gen. Ira C. Eaker, USAF, retired, and he has written a brief treatise on the subject which I hope every Member of the Congress will read. This paper was released for publication on March 2 and I am including it in the RECORD at this point:

SOME THOUGHTS ON THE ABM DEBATE

(By Ira C. Eaker)

In the current ABM (anti-ballistic missile) controversy ideological passion threatens rational analysis. It appears that the average citizen, whose interest is primary, should now become informed and take a stand.

The opponents of the Sentinel ABM say that it will not be fully effective; it will be obsolescent when installed; and it will start a new round in the arms race.

Testimony before congressional committees indicates that while the Sentinel can be effective against one missile, such as an accidental launch which could trigger a full nuclear exchange, or against small numbers of missiles such as the Chinese may have in their arsenal in the early 1970's, it could be saturated by a large-scale ICBM attack such as Russia could mount.

Although the Sentinel system as now being deployed cannot stop all the missiles Russia could launch, it will be capable of destroying many of them. The former Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, told Congress that the Sentinel might save 60 million U.S. lives. It can also provide considerable protection for our own retaliatory ICBM forces.

Admittedly the Sentinel will be obsolescent when installed, since science and technology will by that time know how to produce a more effective anti-missile system. The Spitfire fighters which saved London in the Battle of Britain, were also obsolescent, since better fighters, like the U.S. Lightning, were already on the drawing board. But weapons on the drawing board never deterred any enemy nor won any battles.

Our own Minutemen and Polaris missiles were obsolescent before installation was completed since better missiles, Minutemen II and III and Poseidon, had already been developed. These are now being installed. A similar upgrading of the Sentinel can also be expected.

The prime purpose of the ABM system, as indeed of all defense weapons, is to deter war. It appears obvious therefore that if the Russians have an ABM system and we do not, the credibility of our deterrence is diminished. What the far left intellectuals think of the effectiveness of the ABM system is not material: It is what the men in the Kremlin think about it which is important. Obviously they believe it effective or they would not have spent billions to install such a system.

Who are the opponents of the Sentinel ABM system? They are the peace-at-any-price politicians, unilateral disarmament advocates, pacifists, far-left scientists and self-styled intellectuals.

These are the same people who assured President Kennedy that there were no Russian missiles in Cuba because Russian leaders had told us there were none there. These are the same men who advised Mr. McNamara that the U.S. should unilaterly disarm as an example. Russian leaders, needing to increase the standard of living for their people, obviously would seize a welcome opportunity to scale down their weapons outlays.

Instead, as Secretary of Defense Laird recently disclosed, Russia has been spending about four times as much as the U.S. on strategic weapons. Those who now oppose the ABM system assured President Johnson that peace would soon come when he stopped bombing North Vietnam. Instead 10,000 Americans and 15,000 South Vietnamese have been killed since the bombing halt.

Any concerned citizen, confused by the present ABM controversy, may find a valid position through this analogy. If, in the days of the Old West, the bad men had worn bullet-proof vests, while the marshals had no such protection, obviously the bandits would have been more likely to challenge the peace officers.

Now, with Red fleets moving into the Mediterranean and Indian Ocean, with Russian missiles going onto launch pads in Egypt, with the Kremlin giving Cuba a nuclear laboratory and sending more than 100 nuclear scientists to Havana and with the renewed threat to Berlin, prudence suggests that the U.S. peace keepers reach for their bullet proof vests—the best ABM system current technology can provide.

TRIBUTE TO AVERELL HARRIMAN: DEDICATED MAN OF PEACE

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to one of the great public servants of our time, the Honorable Averell Harriman—industrialist, philanthropist, Governor, Assistant Secretary of State, Ambassador and negotiator for world peace.

Averell Harriman has lived a wonderful, dedicated, selfless life—a full life of service and usefulness.

As we all know, his most recent contribution to world peace was his success in getting the Paris negotiations with North Vietnam underway in an effort to achieve an honorable settlement to the Vietnam conflict. Averell Harriman is an experienced, skilled negotiator who fully understands the vital importance of negotiations for peace in the nuclear age.

This great diplomat and public servant began his career of public service during the depression of the thirties in the Roosevelt administration. He became Ambassador to Great Britain and Russia and through the years, his knowledge and understanding of international problems involving Russia and the United States were invaluable to our Nation.

In 1961 Ambassador Harriman was Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs and Under Secretary for Political Affairs from 1963 to 1965.

Averell Harriman is a dedicated American—a devoted champion of peace. America is indebted to this wonderful man for his life of service.

All of us wish him the very best of good luck and success as he relaxes following his strenuous tour of duty in Paris.

MRS. B. W. SHAPER, CHICO, CALIFORNIA'S MOST WORLD-MINDED CITIZEN

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the Gen. Douglas MacArthur Scholarship Committee sponsored "The Most World-Minded Citizen Award." This was an endeavor to find someone in the Chico State College service area who had promoted international understanding and who had provided direct assistance for international students at Chico State College. Mrs. B. W. Shaper, who was sponsored by the League of Women Voters, won this honor over two other candidates.

Mrs. Shaper worked for the YMCA in France and England many years ago. She was also a charter member of the local chapter of the United Nations Association of United States of America, being its first secretary. She has supported UNICEF since the early 1950's and has given speeches locally and in Redding in support of UNA–USA.

She was involved in the first efforts to bring international students to Chico in the 1950's. She and her husband have always had a student in their home and have encouraged others in their family to do so also. They have never missed a function given for the international students.

Mrs. Shaper has always bought tickets and sold them as well for the previous seven international dinners. Last year, Mrs. Shaper saw to it that Rotary Club provided tickets for students, American and international, who could not otherwise have afforded it.

The winner is a member of the Women's Club of Chico and has been active with the League of Women Voters. She has been National Items Study Chairman of the league for the past 10 years, directing the study of foreign trade, East-West relations, and China-United States relations. She is also a member of the Unitarian Church of Chico.

The three applicants for the award were evaluated by a screening committee with representatives from the following groups: Chico Chamber of Commerce, Chico Ministerial Union, American Field Service of Chico, United Nations Association of Chico, Chico State College Alumni Association, Chico State College Faculty Senate, Chico State College Associated Students and Students' International Club.

At this point I would like to share with my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the Chico Enterprise Record "Merited Honor in a Field of Promise":

MERITED HONOR IN A FIELD OF PROMISE

In one sweeping gesture tomorrow night, the Mid-Valley area will pay off a long list of debts to one of its leading citizens.

The payoff will come when Chico's Mrs. B. W. Shaper is presented with the first annual "Most World Minded Citizen" award during the International Dinner sponsored by the General Douglas MacArthur Scholarship Foundation at Chico State College.

In making the presentation to Mrs. Shaper, the scholarship foundation will in effect be playing a proxy role for people and organizations of the entire nine-county service area of the college who for many years have paid homage to the Chico woman but could never come up with the proper vehicle for a formalized honor.

The foundation's "Most World-Minded Citizen" award is uniquely appropriate as the proper vehicle of honor for Mrs. Shaper.

This is because it requires a concept as broad as "the world" to truly represent the far-ranging interests and endeavors of the tireless and compassionate Mrs. Shaper.

Education in general has never had a better "lay community" friend than the Chico woman. The "international student" field—a relatively new realm in American education—has been a matter of special interest with her. She participated in initial efforts to bring foreign students to Chico in the early 1950s and she and her husband—a retired educator—have provided a home for many international students over the years.

As chairman of the National Items Study Program of the Chico League of Women Voters for a decade, Mrs. Shaper has promoted interest and participation in fields of importance concerning America's posture and programs in world affairs and international relations.

Yet perhaps it has been her ceaseless work on behalf of the United Nations—the primary "international endeavor" of the past 2½ decades—which has most marked Mrs. Shaper as the best-qualified person to receive the first annual "Most World-Minded Citizen" award.

Through good times and bad, Mrs. Shaper has softly but firmly explained and supported the principles and programs of the United Nations. A key to the success of Mrs. Shaper in this effort may be the fact, for example, that while she has never been able to convince The Enterprise-Record that the U.N. embodies the unity, strength and authority to fully accomplish its awesome goals, she has managed to dispel doubts from our mind that the U.N. does indeed represent the hopes of mankind for world peace and understanding—and that if the U.N. did not presently exist, then some organization just like it would have to be invented to provide the peoples of the world with a meaningful forum of potential.

In her determination to continue to fan the flickering flame of man's hopes for peace and understanding and in the gentle persistence of her endeavors to apprise all of us of the need for compassion, Mrs. Shaper truly is exemplary.

The MacArthur Scholarship Foundation is to be commended for providing the appropriate vehicle of honor for this outstanding person. We join the foundation in paying tribute to Mrs. B. W. Shaper as the "Most World-Minded Citizen."

Mr. Speaker, tickets for the International Dinner were sold out in advance. This "sell-out" was indicative of the feeling of pride and cooperation which exists between the college and the community in respect to the international students program.

The Chico Enterprise Record stated "It seems likely that if true peace and understanding ever are to be established throughout the world, that happy circumstance will be based chiefly on the principles involved in the international students program at Chico State College and its helpmate, the MacArthur Scholarship Foundation.

"Education surely is the key to the future. Thus when a dinner dedicated to the matter of international education draws a turn-away crowd, the future is indeed a bit brighter."

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to share with you and our colleagues a letter from Mrs. Shaper addressed to Mrs. Vonnie Eastham:

FEBRUARY 2, 1969.

DEAR MRS. EASTHAM: You were so much a part—in every way—of this honor which came my way—that I want to thank you once again. Through the years your interest was always a part of our endeavor and you have continued so earnestly in the MacArthur Scholarship group that you deserve the honor and gratitude of all of us who want this effort to grow.

I truly feel very humble and very grateful. It did not seem quite real the other night—more as if I was moving in a dream of some sort!

The very lovely standard is here on my desk now to help me absorb the idea! I have never thought of any reward in regard to this work—just a never ending hope that the "brotherhood of man" can become the ideal for all peoples! In my inner soul I am sure it will for I know "the eternal path" is upward—only just now we humans move so slowly up that path! But there are many ways to the top of the mountain and some day we will all get there!

Always most sincerely,

HELEN S. SHAPER.

PRESIDENT NIXON IS TO BE CONGRATULATED

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon is to be congratulated on the success of his trip to Europe.

Clearly, if the United States is to be successful in any negotiations with the Soviets, it is essential to consult our allies who are most immediately concerned. Any other course would only result in misunderstandings, which would be seized upon by the Soviets.

The establishment of the closest possible rapport with our partners in the Atlantic Alliance was necessary. According to all reports, the President met with full success in accomplishing this primary task.

Reports indicate that the leaders and people in the countries visited were all impressed by the President's sincerity, realism, and pragmatism. All seemed pleased at the prospect of mutual participation in solving the problems that face the Western World, so vital to the security of all.

The wisdom of undertaking this task and the beginning of the new administration is obvious. Already the key problem of Germany and Berlin is in the forefront, and there will be many others involving the Soviets and our European allies. The groundwork laid by the President in his trip will now serve him in good stead.

SALUTE TO FFA ORGANIZATION

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, the week of February 15 to 22 was proclaimed as National FFA Week. This nationwide association of 14- to 21-year-old boys enrolled in vocational agriculture now has 450,000 members. These students are from over 9,000 high schools.

Minnesota ranks high in both number of members and in excellence of their projects. My home State has 13,645 Future Farmers of America and 274 local affiliated clubs. The Sixth District of Minnesota has over 5,000 members of the total State membership. There are 66 high schools which have an FFA chapter and the largest club, with 173 members, is located at Canby.

I have been especially pleased with the ability of the FFA program of activity to provide sufficient challenge and opportunity for farm boys to gain meaningful experiences that will be useful in later life.

In addition to their classroom work, the FFA chapters may select extra outside projects for community or self improvement and I have summarized a few of these projects in the community beautification field within the Sixth District to give my urban colleagues a small but accurate view of this great rural farm youth program.

The chapter at Atwater planted 500 tree seedlings on the highway right-of-way to screen the city dump. At Ivanhoe, 400 trees were planted as a beautification project to screen a salvage company's operations. The Danube chapter installed traffic safety signs and placed six trash cans in approved areas of the community. Morgan has a community project in the establishment of a roadside camping park. The Appleton FFA chapter has an annual rose plant sale and they also planted 200 evergreen trees.

The Redwood Falls chapter has started a tree "Hall of Nations" in which at least one tree of every nation is now growing, while at Tyler, a tree that was presented to a member of the chapter by Mrs. Lyndon Johnson has been planted at the new swimming pool. The Echo chapter also is engaged in a tree planting project of a community benefit nature.

In those projects designed to be useful for the propagation of wildlife, the chapters at Walnut Grove, Crosby-Ironton, Franklin, Litchfield, Hector, Appleton, Graceville, Redwood Falls, and Buffalo Lake are all outstanding.

In the field of forestry, three chapters in Minnesota have planted over a million seedlings with Clinton, Monticello, and Tyler all reporting success in this area this year.

Each chapter makes an activity report at the annual meeting of the State association and from scanning these reports, one receives a most hopeful feeling for the welfare of our Nation's future. Confirmation of this becomes stronger as we note the statewide project of helping to finance the construction and activities of a camp for young handicapped people in Minnesota. This facility is known as Camp Courage and is located in the Sixth District.

FFA boys have had a continual project of gleaning cornfields after they have been mechanically harvested. While hampered with problems of a late harvest and wet fields, still they picked up the dropped ears, shelled and dried the corn and finally turned the proceeds over to Camp Courage.

I join with the Governor of Minnesota in saluting the boys, their advisers, and instructors who have produced such examples of industry, good will, and community betterment.

THE COMPREHENSIVE COMMUNITY COLLEGE ACT OF 1969

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I introduce today the Comprehensive Community College Act of 1969, a bill to improve and increase post-secondary educational opportunities throughout the United States. I am pleased that 16 of my colleagues have joined in sponsoring this legislation.

One of the more remarkable developments in American education in the past 20 years has been the growth of the 2-year community colleges. Since 1960 the enrollment in community colleges has increased 15 percent each year. Today, there are almost 1,000 such colleges, serving nearly 2 million students. One-third of all students entering a higher education program start in a junior college. The future growth of such colleges is inevitable.

The community college has shown that it is admirably suited to fill a great need in education today. Increasing numbers of Americans believe that postsecondary education is necessary to enable them to realize their full personal potential, and to improve their future economic and social position. The 2-year community college offers opportunities and advantages which are different from those of a 4-year college, and which are well-suited to the needs of many young people. The cost to the student is low; the college is close to his home; the college's administrative arrangements are flexible; the curriculum is timely.

Some students enroll at a 2-year college to prepare for transfer to a traditional 4-year college. But many young people do not wish to pursue a professional and academic course of study; they wish to prepare for a technical or a semiprofessional career. Community colleges can provide the training these students want and need. They offer business courses, including training in data processing, office skills, and real estate sales; they offer programs related to the medical profession, including dental assistance, laboratory technology, and nursing; they train students in areas related to engineering, including architectural drafting, and specifications writing. In addition, one of the fastest growing areas of study in the community colleges is public service, including law enforcement, fire protection, social work, and city management. In short, these community colleges are offering courses of study which respond to obvious needs of our economy, our society, and many of our young people. The principal sponsor of this bill in the other body, the distinguished junior Senator from New Jersey, summed it up by saying that the community colleges were adding a fourth "R"—relevancy—to the traditional three "R's."

The community colleges, for all of their different features, share one characteristic with the traditional institutions of education; they are struggling to keep their physical and teaching capacities ahead of their enrollment. The recent Carnegie Commission on Higher Education recommended the building of 500 new community colleges within the next 5 years to meet the growing demand for this form of education. Thirteen major cities in America do not have a community college within their city limits. Twenty-five major cities have only one. If we wish to update and strengthen our commitment to expanding educational opportunities for our young people, I believe that we should focus our attention on assisting our community colleges. The Comprehensive Community College Act of 1969 does just this.

This bill authorizes Federal assistance to the States for the purpose of strengthening, improving, and developing comprehensive community colleges. Briefly, it calls for the establishment of a Bureau of Community Education within the U.S. Office of Education. This Bureau would administer all Federal programs relating to community colleges. Ten million dollars would be authorized for fiscal year 1970, to be used for payments to the States to develop or update a State comprehensive community college plan. Six billion dollars would be authorized over the following 3 fiscal years to help implement the State plans.

The State plans would set forth a master plan for the improvement, development, and construction of comprehensive community colleges, including the development and implementation of comprehensive curriculum programs; provisions for the training of faculty, administrators, and other necessary personnel; a tuition-free admissions policy, or adequate financial aid programs; policies and procedures to insure that Federal funds would not supplant existing State and local funds.

Eligible State institutions would include those legally authorized within a given State to provide postsecondary education, and which admit as regular students high school graduates or persons 18 years of age or older.

A National Advisory Council, composed of those competent and interested in comprehensive community colleges, would be established to advise the Commissioner with respect to criteria for evaluating the State plans, the administration of the act, and means of improving the operation of the act.

Lastly, the bill directs the Commissioner to study all Federal programs affecting comprehensive community colleges to determine the extent of duplication of assistance provided under this act, and to recommend action for terminating any such duplication.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this legislation will stimulate thought and discussion about the role of the community colleges in American education. It seems certain that these 2-year colleges will increase in number, and I believe it is incumbent upon those concerned with education to consider whether the Federal Government should not provide assistance to this movement. Legislation such as I introduce today will offer financial aid, and will also establish a broad unifying Federal interest in the postsecondary educational opportunities present in the community colleges. Although 2-year colleges participate in some present Federal education programs, they take part in only six of the 24 institutional support programs administered by the Office of Education. Although 2-year colleges have one-third of the postsecondary student enrollment, community colleges get only 4 percent of the national defense student loan funds, 6 percent of the educational opportunity loans, and 15 percent of the college work-study assistance. These figures dramatically show that community colleges are still the stepchildren of Federal education programs.

Community colleges are now serving important educational needs, and it appears inevitable that the demand for the special features offered by such colleges will continue to increase. Just as the Congress has considered, debated, and enacted legislation supporting education at the elementary and secondary and college levels, I believe it is time we turn our attention to the community colleges. The expansion of opportunities for quality education for all our children must remain a matter of top national priority; the Comprehensive Community College Act of 1969 will help insure that it does.

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, Miss Jane Byerley, of Valley Center, Kans., has been named winner in the State of Kansas in the annual Voice of Democracy Contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary.

The VFW and the ladies auxiliary are to be highly commended for their leadership and initiative in encouraging high school students throughout the Nation to participate in this worthwhile competitive program.

The contest theme of this year was "Freedom's Challenge." Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the winning speech of Jane Byerley and congratulate her for an excellent job:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

(By Jane Byerley of Kansas)

In the constitution of the United States, four freedoms are guaranteed to the people of our country: freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of religion, and freedom of peaceful assembly. In addition to these, four more rights were expressed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt in his message to Congress, January 6, 1942, when he started, "In the future days, which we seek to make secure, we look forward to a world founded upon four universal, essential, human freedoms. The first is freedom of speech and expression. The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way. The third is freedom from want. . . The fourth is freedom from fear. . ." It is through the recognition of these rights that freedom presents her three-fold challenge to those who would reap her benefits.

First of the challenge's three parts is the challenge to recognize our rights and freedoms as Americans. To defend our freedoms we must know and understand them. Each of us, as Americans, must recognize, not only our specifically enumerated rights, but also other rights basic to our country's principles, such as the right to vote, the right to operate under the system of private enterprise, and the right to follow the trade of our choice. "America, land of opportunity" can only be kept so if we, her citizens, *recognize* these opportunities.

Freedom's second challenge to Americans who would defend her, is the challenge to educate themselves. Only through education can our country keep its democratic principles, its well-informed citizenry, and its constant industrial advancement from becoming stagnant.

Thorough knowledge is essential for a nation of responsible citizens. Our country's backbone is its people. We are the people behind the votes. We are the people behind industry's machines. We are the people behind the census reports. It is we, the people of the United States, who established our Constitution, and who made our country what it is today, and we did it through believing in the individual and his role in government. Now it is we, the people, who must accept freedom's challenge to educate ourselves so that America may remain what our forefathers created, a country of responsible individuals who used their rights and used them *intelligently*.

The third of Freedom's challenges is, perhaps, the most difficult. It stems from the challenge to recognize our rights, and to educate ourselves that we *may* exercise our rights, but it goes far beyond these. It challenges us to actually *use* freedoms. It challenges us to speak out against apathy, to express an opinion, to act as a responsible *individual*. It challenges us to worship as we please, not once a year, but to really *use* this freedom. The challenge dares us to stand *for* something, and not merely *against* everything, to make people realize that *peaceful* assembly is *not* unlawful, or irrational, but a law of our land, and a measure included in our Constitution to *protect* our people.

Lastly, our Freedom challenges us to exercise our opportunities to be good Americans, to be proud of the chance to stand for our flag's appearance, to be happy to thrill to the "Star-Spangled Banner," and to support the American ideals we believe in.

Today's world is said to be sick with apathy, to be soured by dissenters, to be torn by distrust. Perhaps this is true. But to answer this, I tell you, our nation was founded on individualism. It was based on people, and we as individuals must prepare to answer Freedom's challenge. We must *recognize* these, our freedoms and rights. We must *educate* ourselves in the workings of our land, and the world. And, finally, we must accept her greatest challenge. We must *live* as Americans. Then and *only* then can we remedy our sick society.

THE FORD FOUNDATION'S CANCER

HON. GEORGE E. SHIPLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, Chicago has been host to A.A.C.T.E. and N.S.C.T.E. conventions. Educational foundations entered into the discussions of these programs. Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., spoke on the subject "The Ford Foundation's Cancer," which indicates that even worthy organizations and projects often have undesirable features. Whether one agrees or not with the present issue, all should agree that it is desirable to carefully study the principles involved. I thus would like that the RECORD carry my extended remarks to include Dr. Reuter's address:

THE FORD FOUNDATION'S CANCER

(By Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr.)

INTRODUCTION

Probably no single book in recent history has done more to stir up Europe than one written by the young French author and editor, J. J. Servan-Schreiber. Over one million copies were sold in Europe in less than a year after publication—an all-time record. The book zeroes in on the emerging crisis in Europe. It argues that Europe is slowly dying even though it is more prosperous than at any time in history. It undertakes to document the case that Europe is slipping farther and farther behind in the race for technological progress. It sounds a loud and clear call for mobilizing the economic forces in these countries to meet the rising challenge that threatens to turn them into satellites of the American industrial machine.

Probably no educational foundation has caused more concern in the area of educational administration than the Ford Foundation's grant to the Ocean Hill-Brownsville Demonstration Project. The Project is committed to a range of educational innovations in the classrooms and in school administration. Ocean Hill, the focal point of the teacher strikes, is a border area between the slum districts of Brownsville and Bedford-Stuyvesant, some miles from downtown Brooklyn. Less than a fifth of its adult population was born in New York City; less than a third completed high school; only two-fifths have lived in the area as long as five years; and more than half the households subsist on less than $5,000 a year.

Ford Foundation entered the disputed area via the concept of decentralization. A panel headed by McGeorge Bundy, President of the Ford Foundation, drew up the first decentralization plan in 1967. Mayor John Lindsay of New York City made a slight modification and the plan subsequently was simplified for legislative purposes by New York Education Commissioner James Allen and the Board of Regents. The plan provides for the transferring of most of the administrative powers to some 30 smaller local school districts with their own community boards.

THE SCIENCE OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

Those professionals in the area of educational administration are carefully trained. They have known for many years the necessity of strong central administration. Others, who do not have the training or experience, have urged for years weak central administration. Just as the Articles of Confederation failed because of weak central powers, so do decentralized schools. The Constitution of the United States reduced the weak phases of the former document, so has strong democratic central administration given to all parties the most efficient school program.[1] But the critics never die.

Many of the same non-thinkers opposed integration under the guise of opposing the elimination of "neighborhood schools." The fight was difficult, but most thinking Americans now realize that the "neighborhood school" concept in the cities died in the 1800's. Modern residents of cities have their relatives and close friends outside the neighborhood, many attend church and clubs in various sections of the city, and they shop in shopping centers miles from where they live, hence there is no real identity with the immediate neighborhood. The less affluent shows even less concern for the neighborhood concept.

The other factor one must consider is the age in which we live. This age has imposed upon us the task of re-thinking our nature and our role in civilization. We are experiencing what appears to be a conspiracy against reality. We are caught up in a wave of insistent demand to cure every conceivable evil, either real or imagined, right now. We demand instant magic. The protestors, the activists, the nihilists are the newsmakers.

THE DEFECTS IN THE FORD FOUNDATION'S PROGRAM OF DECENTRALIZATION

1. The proposals will play into the hands of the "extremists" and hinder good administration.
2. The present administrators would be subjected to the wishes of the "lunatic fringe" under the name of community control.
3. The plan will destroy the well-planned and established tenure system.
4. The abolition of the present system of civil service examination in addition to state certification requirements would reduce the quality of the staff and result in the return of the "spoils system" of patronage.
5. The United Federation of Teachers has had inferior leadership through the years to that of the Chicago Teachers Union—both locals of the American Federation of Teachers—but they are correct in opposing the Ocean Hill-Brownsville Demonstration Project.
6. The side argument which has emerged in the debate over big-city school decentralization involves around the term "teacher accountability." The non-educators often contend that teachers will try harder if they are under the control of localized school boards instead of being mere units in a huge administration, but research shows the theory is false.
7. Decentralization and teacher accountability do not go to the root causes of low learning-expectation. It is not because teachers are bad people with bad middle-class attitudes that they frequently have low achievement expectations for ghetto children.
8. The Jews have been the best friend the Negroes have had yet this project is fostering anti-Semitism. The Puerto Ricans have also received great compassion from the Jews. The philosophy of one blood[2] must be expanded—not discarded.
9. White teachers and administrators in ghettos are as good in New York and Chicago as anywhere else.

CONCLUSIONS

New York City is currently spending $1,272,456,000 for education and $1,346,000,000 for welfare, which demonstrates the compassion of the people for their people. A vital difference between Servan-Schreiber and reality in one realm and the Ocean Hill-Brownsville Demonstration Project and reality in the other realm exists. The Ford Foundation made a great contribution to education with the Arkansas Experiment in Teacher Education, but they are creating a cancer in good educational administration at the present time. Human talent is the one commodity which no society can afford to waste. Therefore, the free flow of human talent and ideas without regard to national origins should be permitted and encouraged. To allow human talent to seek that environment where it can be most productive strengthens the individual and at the same time strengthens his nation and the free world.

There are times, though, when we feel that human nature thrives only on crisis and feeds only on violence. Every age has had its prophets of doom. The end of the world has been forcast in every generation. And, we have our share of the exponents of despair today. We tend to consider it normal for a spirit of pessimism to prevail. But, by what inflation of the vanity do we think we are the generation chosen to see the end of the world that was born many years ago.

Our society, our nation, and our economy are fundamentally sound. Instinctively we feel our basic strength. The American people have an inherent commitment to steady progress. The goal of equality will not be reached by thinking that riots are unavoidable or that they will cease when every Negro wrong has been righted and when every white heart has been cleansed of prejudice and selfishness. The blacks will be in the majority of 14 of our major cities in ten years and they will have good leadership then. Mankind must

---

[1] George S. Reuter, Jr. and Helen H. Reuter, *Democracy and Quality Education*, Cambridge: Educational Research Association of the U.S.A., 1965.

[2] George S. Reuter, Jr., August M. Hintz, and Helen H. Reuter, *One Blood*, New York: Exposition Press, 1964.

work to solve current and future problems, but the educational administrator—not a foundation or social reformer—must provide the leadership in educational matters. Decentralization is a cancer in public education that the Ford Foundation is currently fostering.

In closing may I remind you of the words written early in this century about a world power then at the zenith of its development:

"The tumult and the shouting dies;
The captains and the kings depart;
Still stands Thine ancient sacrifice.
An humble and a contrite heart.
Lord God of hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget!"

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER AND THE FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1956

HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, today I am going to talk briefly about a great Federal program and the great man who inaugurated it. The program I refer to, is the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956, the man—Ike Eisenhower. The creation of the Federal Highway Trust Fund was, undoubtedly, the most important development in highway financing in the history of this Nation.

Let me go briefly into the historical background of the present great highway policy.

In 1806 the Federal Government began construction of the National Pike or Cumberland Road. By 1819 the road extended 131 miles from Cumberland, Md., to Wheeling on the Ohio River. By 1819, also, Pennsylvania had completed a surfaced highway from Philadelphia to Pittsburgh. The Nation was probably on the brink of a great highway expansion when in 1830 the steam locomotive demolished its superiority over the horse-drawn vehicle and captured public interest as the ideal instrument of long-distance transportation.

Soon the resources of the country were being devoted to the construction of railroads. Highways entered into a "dark age" until almost the turn of the century. What little road building was done, was left to local governments. Often under a system whereby citizens could "work out the road tax."

Just before the turn of the century, a "good roads" movement began to make progress. This movement was spearheaded by farmers wanting to get out of the mud and railroad interests looking to roads as feeds to their lines. The movement spread rapidly, particularly after the automobile appeared. By 1917 all States were participating in the highway function.

Thus we had a confusion of Federal, State, county, township and other systems, all participating in roadbuilding. As you crossed a State line, or even went from county to county within a State, the quality and type of highway varied in a dozen different ways. There was little, if any, coordination nationally.

Then came President Eisenhower's Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956, at which time the whole program was drawn together. It was given purpose. It was given an aim. Interstate highways were recognized as Federal rather than State responsibilities. This was the key that unlocked the problem of overlapping jurisdictions.

The most important point about this act is that it functions on a pay-as-you-go basis and its cost is paid for by highway users. No revenues from general taxes, such as the income tax, are used to finance Federal aid for highways. And the permissible rate of use of the funds is geared to anticipated trust fund revenues. This maintains the program on the required pay-as-you-go basis.

Using President Eisenhower's own notes, Vice President Nixon presented the concept of the act to the Governors' conference on July 12, 1954. He said that President Eisenhower was convinced that the Nation's highway system was obsolete and quite inadequate. President Eisenhower's notes said:

> It is obsolete because in a large part it just happened. It resulted from Indian trails, cattle trails and arbitrary section lines. It has never been completely overhauled. It has never been planned to satisfy the need 10 years ahead.
>
> We live in a dramatic age of technical revolution through atomic power and we should recognize that the pace is far faster than the simpler revolutions of the past. Look at the prospects in population. In 1870 the population of the United States was 38½ million. In 1970 it is estimated that it will reach 200 million. Our population growth is one of the wonders of the world.

The President specifically called for a grand plan for a properly articulated highway system that solves the problems of speedy, safe transcontinental travel.

This the act has given us. Our network of interstate highways has also become one of the world's wonders.

The United States is a nation on wheels. Among its 195 million people, 100 million drivers operate some 75 million cars. Fifteen million buses and trucks travel 880 billion miles a year. There is a vehicle for every 2.2 persons. Four out of every five persons old enough to drive have a driver's license. The United States is indeed a nation on wheels.

But the act has given us more, much more than this. Our network of roads has bound the Nation together as never before in our history. It has made us one people. It is nothing now for a man or woman to jump into a car in Maine and take off for California. We are not so much Californians or Texans or New Englanders, we are Americans. We know the whole of this country. The easterner no longer thinks of South Dakota as somewhere in the sticks. He knows he can get there quickly and safely over the Interstate Highway System.

You perhaps have been wondering why I have taken up your time in telling you what must be obvious to all of you. Well, I have a reason and a very good one. I am today introducing legislation to name this great interstate network the Eisenhower Interstate Highway System. As our great and beloved former President recuperates at Walter Reed Hospital, I hope the Congress can move expeditiously to thank him for his foresight that has done so much to bring us all together.

BROTZMAN INTRODUCES PROFESSIONAL AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLER BILL

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 27, I was pleased to join with the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. FRIEDEL) in introducing legislation to establish certain requirements with respect to air traffic controllers.

In 1958, the Congress enacted into law the Federal Aviation Act which provided, what then was believed to be, the necessary tools for the Federal Aviation Administration to establish a sound air traffic control system. However, events and the times have outdistanced the FAA program. The bill which is being introduced today will amend the 1958 act to insure the development of a safer and more efficient air traffic control system and a competent and highly qualified air traffic controller.

Air traffic in the United States is rapidly approaching a critical stage. Competent air traffic controllers are in short supply. Many controllers are working mandatory overtime hours and their resources are being so overtaxed that their efficiency necessarily suffers. It is becoming increasingly difficult to attract new men of high caliber who possess the skill and stamina necessary to function in this delicate and essential occupation.

Last fall I was able to visit the FAA air traffic control center at Longmont, Colo., in my district. There I had an opportunity to not only see the problems facing the air traffic controller, but to visit with some of the men now involved in this highly specialized profession. I was particularly interested in the unique aviation safety problems faced by the Denver area controller. The mountainous terrain is a special problem in Colorado and constitutes an added danger to flights and as one controller put it so well, is a "nerve-racking frustration to the air traffic control system." Of course, added to this problem of terrain is the fact that there is a lack of trained personnel and up-to-date equipment which is facing almost every major airport in the country.

The problem at the Denver air traffic control center was outlined in a letter I recently received from one of the controllers. He said, in part:

> Recent changes in staffing at the Federal Aviation Administration's Denver Air Route Traffic Control Center presents alarming threats to an already overburdened air traffic control system. Understaffing of all facilities was of real concern to you last year, since funds were voted to hire additional controllers, which will complete their training in 3 years. We were told part of these funds were used to pay overtime, and hiring of new trainees has been curtailed.
>
> On October 7, 1968 the Denver Center was started on a scheduled 6 day work week. The shift complement at that time was 52 con-

trollers on the day watch, 47 controllers on the evening watch and 15 on the midnight shift. After the overtime bill was passed to become effective November 17, 1968, F.A.A. Denver Center cut the controller complement, to be effective the same date, to 50 for the day shift, 45 for the evening shift, the midnight shift remained at 15 men; eliminated the scheduled 6 day work week and instigated irregular scheduled overtime, whereby a sixth day was to be worked 3 weeks out of 4.

This gave minimum man power coverage, allowing for occasional annual leave and if a controller was ill and on "sick leave", the controllers could still manage "sector coverage." However on December 27, 1968 a Denver Center order was issued stating the F.A.A. was out of funds. All scheduled overtime was to be stopped. Controllers that had been assigned to temporary duty as supervisors for the assistant controllers were reassigned to control duty. Those controllers assigned to the training room to train the new controllers on radar, etc., were called back to the control boards.

Effective January 6, 1969 the new staffing for the 3 shifts has been cut to 46 on the day shift, 42 on the evening, and 14 on the mid shift. This cut back is critical! We are starting shifts with bare minimum staffing, men feel obligated to try to work when they are physically unable. Sectors (areas) that are decombined now have to be worked by one man instead of the 2 men that are needed. Sectors that have 3 men at the peak periods are now worked with 2 men.

The controllers were told in a meeting Monday January 6, 1969 with the Facility Chief, that the Bureau of the Budget has not released the money that was alloted for the extra expense of the new time and ½ bill and the Denver controllers would be expected to work on a "call back" basis from 9 A.M. to 1 P.M. on their first day off if needed. (*The cut back in staffing in Denver is also being put into effect nation wide.*) The controllers will not be paid overtime on the "call back" work, but will be given compensatory time at the rate of one hour off for one hour worked. This not only defeats the entire overtime bill, but call back overtime has proved entirely unfeasible prior to October, for if a man is not scheduled to work, he usually makes other plans and is not available. The Watch Supervisors were making 19 or 20 calls before they could find one controller that could come in to work, and there is certainly no indication that call back will work now, especially for such a short period of time. (It's not worth dirtying a shirt). In the meantime traffic and tensions continue to build.

The bill introduced today clearly defines the job of the air traffic controller and directs the Secretary of Transportation to establish procedures for rating air traffic controllers. The Secretary also is directed to implement and carry out a program to assure that all certified air traffic controllers will be required to perform duties which are as nearly practicable equal, and thereby preclude the necessity of high density, low density, or similar classifications of air traffic control areas. The bill also establishes a schedule for air traffic controller compensation and regulations governing overtime. Hours ordered or approved in excess of 40 hours a week are designated as overtime work and shall be compensated at a premium pay scale.

If we are to have air transportation that stays on schedule and at the same time meets proper safety standards, the country must, without further delay, develop the facilities and the manpower which will make it possible to manage safely and efficiently our rapidly accelerating air traffic flow. This legislation will assist in the development of those facilities and manpower.

RETIREMENT OF DR. ARTHUR L. RUDOLPH

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished citizen who has contributed his considerable talents and energies to our Nation's space and missile efforts has recently retired in Huntsville, Ala., and I want to commend him for his achievements and his dedication.

I refer to Dr. Arthur L. Rudolph, who was born in Stepfershausen, Germany, nearly 63 years ago. He became associated with Dr. Wernher von Braun as a member of the Peenemunde team and came to this country with more than 100 other rocket experts at the end of World War II in 1945.

With the other German experts he helped in construction and tests of the V-2 rocket system at White Sands Proving Ground, N. Mex., and in the development of the Hermes II missile.

Dr. Rudolph and most of the other German scientists moved to Huntsville, Ala., nearly 20 years ago when the Army established its missile and rocket research operation at Redstone Arsenal. He was technical director of the Redstone missile system, director of the research and development directorate of the Army Ballistic Missile Agency, and project director for the Pershing missile system.

The Pershing was a simple and highly reliable missile which could be used by soldiers. The outstanding reliability of the Pershing reflects great credit on Dr. Rudolph's insistence on attention to detail at the component, assembly, and system levels.

In the early 1960's Dr. Rudolph transferred to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's Office of Manned Space Flight in Huntsville. In August 1963, he was appointed manager of the Saturn V launch vehicle program where he demonstrated outstanding managerial and technical competence in directing that program through the first two Saturn V launches.

The fantastic thrust capability of the Saturn V makes it one of the most phenomenal development tasks in history. The Saturn V, of course, is the launch vehicle for our Nation's major space explorations.

Dr. Rudolph's unusual talents in the field of mechanical engineering were recognized when he received an honorary doctorate of science from Rollins College of Florida. He was among the first of the German rocket scientists to receive an honorary degree in this country.

He became a citizen of the United States November 11, 1954. He has recently retired and continues to live in Huntsville where he remains available to both the Army Missile Command and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for consultation.

I commend him on his outstanding achievements in our Nation's missile and space programs, and I wish Dr. Rudolph and his family every happiness in their future years.

THE PRESIDENT BACK HOME

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, as I watched the television screen during President Nixon's European trip, I felt a sense of confidence, pride, and gratitude. I am sure that everyone who watched the President representing our country abroad felt as I did. He was eloquent, dignified, direct, courteous and, as a result of his trip, our European allies are reassured of this country's continuing interest in their problems. The erosion of our European alliances has been impeded. While there are still vast problems facing us in Europe, at least a beginning has been made toward seeking their solution. In addition to other congratulatory statements received by the President, I would like to add my personal "Well done, Mr. President."

I insert at this point an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of Monday, March 3:

THE PRESIDENT BACK HOME

President Nixon has reason to feel a deep sense of satisfaction with the mission he has accomplished in free Europe. After eight days of strenuous travel and intensive talks, he has a clearer and surer understanding now of the problems our country shares with its NATO allies. And they in turn have a better appreciation of the American position. To that extent, as the President has said, his trip has generated a new degree of mutual trust.

This is all to the good. It does not mean, of course, that any important interallied issue has been resolved, or that everything will be smooth sailing from this point on in what Mr. Nixon calls the European-American community. But a promising beginning has been made. He has impressed all the leaders—in Brussels, London, Bonn, West Berlin, Rome and Paris—with his repeated emphasis on give-and-take consultation between them and us. His assurances on that point have allayed fears in many quarters that the United States—which has been preoccupied with Asia and somewhat neglectful of its ties with Europe—might be veering toward a neo-isolationist policy and a go-it-alone approach to the Soviet Union.

The President has effectively cleared away such suspicions. Besides reaffirming American commitments in such vital areas as the defense of free Berlin—now menaced once again—he has left no room for doubt that the United States will be in close touch with its allies before, during and after any negotiations with the Kremlin on arms control and other crucial matters affecting the peace and freedom of the world. Mr. Nixon's trip, for that reason alone, may be hailed as a success.

LAST CHANCE TO SAVE THE PRIVATE COLLEGE: A SPECIAL REPORT ON THE FINANCING OF HIGHER EDUCATION, PREPARED FOR THE AMERICAN CONSERVATIVE UNION BY ROGER A. FREEMAN

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 4, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, those of us in the American political spectrum who count ourselves as conservatives have long believed in the cardinal principle of the limitation of government power over the individual citizen. This basic concept of maximum personal freedom has been repeatedly proven correct as the Federal Government has sought to assume greater powers and control over almost every aspect of our existence.

Thus it was that even many liberals found acceptable President Nixon's 1968 campaign advocacy of a new and greater role for the private sector in solving our national problems of poverty, urban decay and education, to mention but a few.

I have always believed that the Government can be effective by doing all possible to permit private initiative and knowledge to work its will without bureaucratic restrictions and unnecessary "guidelines."

In his new book on government and politics, "The Age of Discontinuity," Peter F. Drucker challenges the long held belief that Government is the agency for the solution for all our problems. He asserts that about all the Federal Government has ever succeeded in doing well has been the waging of war and the inflation of our currency. In all other areas it has shown a remarkable inability to set priorities or effectuate its announced policies.

I mention the foregoing because I, as a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, have long been concerned with the financial plight of higher education in America and what can be done about the problem consistent with the conservative philosophy of government.

Toward a solution of this problem, I requested the staff of the American Conservative Union, of which I am national chairman, to explore possible solutions to the problem of financing higher education. Mr. Frank S. Meyer, the distinguished author and editor of National Review, and a member of the ACU board of directors, subsequently commissioned a study of the higher education problem by Roger A. Freeman, one of the most authoritative experts in the field of education.

Mr. Freeman has a long and distinguished record of achievements in the field of education and particularly, its financing problems. The author of several books on public finance, intergovernmental relations and educational topics, Mr. Freeman is now a senior staff member of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace at Stanford University in California.

He served the two Presidential Commissions which studied public school financing during the last 30 years, and was director of research for the Education Committee of President Eisenhower's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. He also served as a special consultant on school finance to the White House Conference on Education, and as a member of the White House staff during the Eisenhower administration.

The author of the special ACU study, Mr. Freeman, was also chairman of the Committee on Financing of Public Education of the National Tax Association, and served on the advisory board of the Tax Institute. He is the former chairman of the State and Local Government Advisory Commission to the U.S. Census Bureau. He was vice president of the Institute of Social Research in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Freeman's conclusions are twofold: he calls for tax credits for private donations to private colleges and universities, and, second, tax credits for certain individuals who pay college tuition for themselves or their relatives or others. These solutions appropriately come within the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Ways and Means, which this month will begin an extensive reexamination of the possible reform of Federal tax laws.

I sincerely commend this excellent study by Mr. Freeman to those thoughtful people everywhere, who sincerely wish to solve our national problem of higher education with a minimum involvement of the Federal Government.

The special study prepared for the American Conservative Union follows:

LAST CHANCE TO SAVE THE PRIVATE COLLEGE

(By Roger A. Freeman)

IS THE PRIVATE COLLEGE ON THE WAY OUT?

From its beginings more than three hundred years ago, and for a long time thereafter, the growth of higher education in the United States was supported largely through the initiative and generosity of individuals and voluntary organizations. This has been in contrast to the situation in European countries, where most institutions of higher learning were founded by a ruler and still are run by government. To a European young man or woman, higher education generally means attendance at a nearby state university. Americans enjoy a broad choice among many hundreds of colleges and universities, private or public, offering a wide diversity of programs to suit every need, ideology or wish for specialization. To be sure, state systems of higher education have sharply expanded for over a century, but even today almost two-thirds of America's 2,230 colleges and universities are independent and not under direct governmental control.

In view of the 1,409 private institutions with their 2.1 million students, the question, "Is the Private College on the Way Out?" may seem strange or even appear paradoxical. Have not our institutions of higher learning for years been swamped with applications from millions of aspiring young men and women competing with each other for the limited, if increasing number of available spaces? Has not the tuition skyrocketed? Have not the finances of private colleges and universities been rapidly growing to a point where today they spend $7.5 billion a year? And is it not all but certain that the pressure to get into college will continue unabated for many years, and that institutional fees and income will keep climbing at a good pace?

The answers to these questions are all in the affirmative. It is also true that in the past few years only a handful of private universities have "gone public," i.e. preferred to be taken over by the state rather than closing their doors: Wayne University, Temple University and the universities of Kansas City, Houston, and Buffalo are *among* the best known institutions which have lately sought shelter under the state's wings. But the trickle of the 1960's may soon turn into the flood of the 1970's. Hundreds of private universities and colleges will be faced with the alternative of going out of business or giving up their identity and independence and merging into the state system.

The crisis in private higher education did not come unexpectedly. At the 1960 convention of the Association of American Colleges, President Louis T. Benezet of the Claremont Graduate School and University Center predicted: "We may expect to see the monumental construction of state university metropolises on the one hand, and on the other the disappearance of most of the private colleges—perhaps in a state junior college system, or possibly into mental hospitals, another growing public need." Subsequent developments proved that Dr. Benezet and many of his colleagues were not just crying "wolf," that they were not merely telling tales of woe and painting a bleak future in an effort to touch the heart and tap the pockets of prospective donors. The truth is that the wolf is now at the college door, ready to swallow Little Red Ridinghood.

A feature story in *Newsweek*, December 11, 1967, "Cost Crises on Campus" concluded: "The time may be coming when all but a few of the strongest private institutions will have gone public," and an article by Duncan Norton-Taylor in *Fortune* for October, 1967, "Private Colleges: A Question of Survival," found that "America's private colleges and universities are living with a formula for bankruptcy—charging students less than the real cost of their education while desperately dipping into capital funds to make up the difference." Its forecast: Time is running out for private colleges and universities. Many—maybe even most—will be swallowed up by the various state educational institutions within a few decades.

Fortune formed its conclusion after surveying twenty of the country's wealthiest institutions including Yale, Cal Tech, Stanford, Pomona, Dartmouth, and Carleton. If they are in trouble, then it is obvious that most of the other 1390 privately controlled colleges and universities in the United States are worse off. When Ford Foundation President McGeorge Bundy told the assembled presidents at the American Council on Education's annual meeting in October, 1967, that colleges and universities "are faced with imminent bankruptcy" he was not telling them something they did not know. What is still uncertain and controversial is what if anything can be done about it.

The consequences of doing nothing and letting the apparent trend take its course *are* certain: an end to diversity and freedom of choice in higher education for all but a few selected students, a virtual state monopoly by state-controlled institutions, and a huge additional burden on the taxpayers who may—or may not—be willing to shoulder it.

To be sure, such an outcome is not inevitable. The crisis can still be prevented or, at least alleviated, *if* an adequate rescue operation for independent higher education is devised and carried out *now*. But there are not many avenues by which this can be done, and time is running short.

THE DECLINE IN PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATION

Independent higher education has been on the losing end for about 15 years. Historically until 1951, more students enrolled in privately controlled colleges and universities than in state and city institutions. But only one student out of every four in the enrollment added since 1951 has gone to a private college. By the fall of 1967 more than twice as many students were in public institutions than in private, and sometime during the 1970's the latter will be lucky to keep one-fourth of the total enrollment. Their share could well slide lower.

Most of the financially well-endowed, "prestige" universities and colleges are likely to survive, and will be able to offer a high caliber education to students who either are from rich families or possess extraordinary talent and can get a sizable scholarship. Most other students will have as little choice in higher education as they have at the elementary-secondary level. They will attend a state college close to their home.

What is the reason for the relative decline of private higher education when there is allegedly a shortage of college space, when eager high school seniors compete for an insufficient number of openings? The truth of the matter is that there is no *over-all* shortage of college spaces, that the total supply is adequate.

There is admissions pressure on state institutions which charge their students on the average between 10% and 15% of the cost of their education. A business which offers its goods or services at a fraction of cost is likely to face a greater demand than it can meet. Also, it will soon go bankrupt unless its owners (in this case, the taxpayers) are willing and able to subsidize it generously. Over the past eight years, while national income grew 61% and state tax revenues doubled, state appropriations for higher education more than tripled. But this is just a beginning. The City University of New York, which insists on remaining tuition-free, lowered its admission standards in 1967—preparing to admit *all* New York City high school students by 1975.

The great private universities in the Ivy League as well as other name colleges are swamped with four to five times as many applications as they can handle. This will continue as long as, for policy reasons, they set their charges at one-half or less of their costs, far below what the market would bear. But many other private colleges could accommodate more qualified students than apply, and open the academic year with unfilled spaces although they too charge the students less than the cost of their education. Their administrators feel that they cannot afford to boost tuitions to the level their expenses require, for fear that they would be pricing themselves out of the market.

THE TUITION GAP

The reason for this anomaly is the "tuition gap." Tuition at independent colleges and universities which used to average 3 times as much as at governmental institutions now runs more than four times as high. And the "gap" is widening every year, contrary to projections of the United States Office of Education, which showed it narrowing.

In 1964, tuition at state colleges averaged $185, at private colleges $807; at universities the charges at public institutions averaged $268, at private ones $1200.[1] Fees have since gone up, but much more at private than at public institutions.

The governing boards of state institutions are determined to keep charges low, at a declining percentage of the cost, and many aim at making public higher education as free as elementary-secondary education. This imposes a heavier penalty for attending a private college than many students and their families can afford.

The reason for the relative decline in private higher education is obvious and Chancellor Lawrence A. Kimpton of the University of Chicago once expressed it succinctly: "It is hard to market a product at a fair price when down the street someone is giving it away for free."

Private colleges may have to offer much to the student who seeks a particular kind of education in terms of ideology, religion, specialization, mentality or atmosphere. Their trustees have broad discretion, being responsible only to themselves, their supporters and students, and to the purposes and goals for which the institution was established. They are not under the control of or accountable to a legislature or to other elected or appointed public officials. This gives them a high degree of flexibility.

But for the purpose of obtaining a bachelor's, master's or doctor's degree, an independent institution has nothing to offer that the student cannot get for less at a state university. Many private colleges, faced with vacant spaces, have tended to lower their admission standards, and some threaten to become havens for young people who are more amply endowed financially than intellectually. Moreover, as financial pressure increased, many private colleges have been unable to keep up with salary increases at state institutions. At the professorial level a state college now pays on the average over $1,000 a year more than a private liberal arts college. This is bound to be reflected, sooner or later, in the caliber of the faculty which private colleges are able to attract and keep. Who will then wish to pay *more* for a *lower quality* education?

HOW TO BRIDGE THE FINANCIAL GAP

The U.S. Office of Education reports that public colleges and universities spent $2,442, and private institutions $3,102 per student in 1965–66. That includes many outlays which cannot properly be charged to instruction. But, even so, it is obvious that there is a huge gap between the cost of higher education and the fees students are charged for it. How do colleges bridge the gap?

Public institutions make up the difference from state appropriations and other governmental subsidies. Just in the past eight years state appropriations for higher education have jumped from $1.4 to $4.4 billion.

But only a handful of private colleges receive a state subsidy or are likely to get one. With state funds always smaller than the aggregate of all budget requests, state institutions lay a prior and preemptive claim to whatever state appropriations become available for higher education. To be sure, it would often be much cheaper for the state's taxpayers to encourage students by a small subvention to attend a private college than to accommodate them at a state institution. A few states do, in fact, provide scholarships for students at private colleges, in recognition of the resulting savings to the state treasury and the extra burden borne by these students and their parents.

It would also often be less expensive for the state to keep a struggling private college alive and growing through a minor financial contribution than to take it over or let it close its doors and shift the students to a state college. This however raises the possibility or likelihood of increasing state influence and eventual control.

Even more ominous is the dark constitutional cloud which hovers over the issue of state subvention of private educational institutions. It involves the question of separation of church and state. The United States Supreme Court has interpreted the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution as meaning that no tax funds may be allocated for the general support of educational institutions with religious ties. But two-thirds of all private colleges and universities are church-connected. A legislature could of course decide to subsidize only the remaining one-third of the colleges which are secular. But that would be tantamount to offering a reward for severing church ties and thus to a penalty on the exercise of religion. This, state legislatures are relucant to do. It appears therefore that the prospect of state subventions offers little hope to independent educational institutions.

Private colleges and universities bridge the gap between the cost of instruction and the charges made therefor from endowment income and current gifts. But the growth in endowments has not kept pace with the soaring costs of college operation. Under the pressure of urgent needs colleges aim their fund drives more at monies they can currently spend than at endowments whose principal they cannot touch. Half a century ago endowments accounted for three-fourths of all gifts to higher education, today they account for only about one-third. Endowment income now totals less than 5% of all revenues and is so highly concentrated in a few name institutions that it plays an insignificant and often purely nominal role in most other colleges.

Private giving to higher education has been increasing about 10% per annum, which is a respectable rate of growth and now totals about $1.5 billion a year. American generosity for education—and for other purposes—is a marvel and the envy of the rest of the world. But even such great generosity does not seem to be able to keep up with soaring needs. Recently, a new method of college fund-raising, the dramatic "multi-year" campaign has not succeeded in closing the financial "gap," except temporarily and in a few institutions. Most colleges now live from hand to mouth.

The first of the modern campaigns was Harvard College's $82.5 million drive in 1957, while Stanford's *Pace* campaign was the first to surpass $100 million. All are exceeded by Yale's current 10-year goal of $388 million. But not many of the 1,409 private colleges and universities have a chance of raising commensurate funds. They face large deficits and just hope for the best.

HELPING HIGHER EDUCATION THROUGH FEDERAL INCOME TAX CREDITS FOR DONATIONS

Donations to higher education are highly concentrated in two ways:

(a) The bulk of the gifts goes to well-known prestige institutions with the crumbs left for the others;

(b) Most of the total amount of gifts from individuals comes from wealthy persons and families. Small contributors account for only a small share of the aggregate.

This is probably inevitable under our present federal tax laws. The Internal Revenue Code permits an individual to donate to higher education, and to deduct from his income for tax purposes, up to 30% of his income, a corporation up to 5% of its profits. But most taxpayers give nothing to higher education and those who donate give only a small fraction of their allowable contribution—except for some persons in the highest income brackets. Under our progressive income tax scale, with rates ranging from 14% to 70%, high-income persons can shift up to 70% of the cost of their gift to the U.S. Treasury. Moreover, by donating property which has gained in value over the years, they can avoid paying a capital gains tax. So their gift may in the end cost them little, if anything.

But taxpayers in the lower brackets find that up to 86% of their donation comes from their own pockets. And since it is so much more expensive for them to donate, not many of them do. Only a small fraction of the ten million college graduates and of another ten million persons who attended college for from one to three years are regular contributors to their alma mater or to any other college—although they paid only part of the cost of their education while they attended and most of them derive substantial material benefits from the education they received or the degree they were given.

Footnotes at end of speech.

The undesirable consequences of the high concentration of voluntary giving—from a few wealthy individuals and families and to name colleges—are too obvious to require much explanation. It is much healthier for a college to get 10,000 contributions of $100 each, and get them on an annually recurring basis, than to receive a $1 million gift from a rich individual.

Voluntary support of higher education could be placed on a far broader foundation, with millions of new contributors making regular annual donations, by a change in the Federal tax law which has been repeatedly suggested in recent years but has not yet been approved by Congress: *to permit deduction of a donation from the income tax itself rather than merely from the tax base (adjusted gross income)*. A proposal to permit a 100% tax credit (i.e. a direct offset against tax liability) up to $100 to individuals and $5,000 to corporations was submitted to the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee in May, 1963, by President John A. Howard of Rockford College on behalf of an ad hoc committee of college and university presidents.[2] Several bills to implement the plan were introduced in the 88th and succeeding Congresses but no further action has so far been taken. Only the Indiana Legislature authorized in 1966 a 50% tax credit for donations to higher education.

If a donation up to a ceiling of $100 (or preferably a somewhat larger amount) were deductible from the federal income tax liability itself it would give taxpayers the choice of sending $100 to the federal tax collector or to the college of their choice. This would cause millions of alumni and others to make regular annual donations to higher education, and huge amounts of new money would flow to the colleges, public and private, for general operating purposes and for scholarships. Small colleges would then more equitably participate in the gifts and the existing imbalance would gradually be reduced. Federal income tax credits for donations to institutions of higher learning could well bring about a most significant advance in college finance and help save many institutions which otherwise may not be able to survive.

UNCLE SAM TO THE RESCUE?

In such a way, the federal government could assist effectively in the financing of higher education by granting income tax credits for voluntary donations. But many persons have for years pinned their hopes for easing the financial pressure on academe—and focused their efforts—on getting federal appropriations. The national government, they say, is the country's most powerful tax gatherer and ought to bear a fair share of the cost of education. This argument sounds quite persuasive, though it is made somewhat shaky by the fact that the U.S. Treasury has taken in less than it spent in 34 out of the past 39 years, for an aggregate deficit of almost $360 billion. But huge deficits have not kept the federal government from offering a generous financial solution to almost every problem placed at its door, whether the problem be domestic or foreign, genuine or contrived, a proper federal concern or not. Does not higher education rate at least as much consideration as most other demands?

Federal funds for higher education have jumped from $1 billion in 1960 to over $4 billion in 1967. The United States Treasury is now the source of close to one-half or more of the income of such large private institutions as Princeton, Stanford, California Institute of Technology, and University of California at San Diego. But half of the federal money, about $2 billion, goes for research grants and contracts, more than 90% of it to 5% of all institutions of higher learning which leaves the remaining 95% of the institutions relatively poorer off than they were before. It "makes the rich richer and the poor poorer" and has led to a "brain drain" from the small colleges as well as a "flight from teaching" to research. Most of the other half of the federal funds for construction grants and loans, student aid, and for the support of various peripheral services. Almost none is earmarked or can be used for the general support of instruction, for faculty and staff salaries.

To be sure, there have been numerous suggestions over the past 30 years for general institutional support by the national government. But no such program has been adopted *or* was ever recommended by a President, considered by Congress or is likely to be authorized.

As mentioned earlier, two-thirds of the private institutions are church-connnected and thereby, under the U.S. Supreme Court's interpretation of the First Amendment, ineligible for subventions from a public treasury, local, state or federal. If Congress were to enact a program of federal support only to *public* higher education it would sound the death knell of most private institutions.

Congressional opinion appears to be split down the middle: Many members will not vote for grants to higher education if they *ex*clude private colleges and about as many oppose grants if they *in*clude nonpublic institutions. The resulting stalemate means that federal appropriations for the *general* support of colleges and universities are unlikely to be authorized. The chances are that federal funds for higher education will remain fragmented, minutely earmarked for multitudes of special programs and projects, and closely directed and controlled by the Washington agencies that parcel them out and supervise their spending.

The threat of tightening control of education by the government has aroused doubts about the advisability of expanding federal grants among many who would otherwise support them. Even such a strong advocate of federal aid as Clark Kerr, while president of the University of California, said:

"A university's control over its destiny has been substantially reduced. [Federal funds] . . . commit some of the university's own funds; they influence the assignment of space; they determine the distribution of time as between teaching and research; to a large extent they establish the areas in which a university grows the fastest; almost imperceptibly a university is changed." (*Los Angeles Times*, Oct. 13, 1963)

This parallels the findings in the school field of the Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association and the American Association of School Administrators in a report issued in the summer of 1967:

"Perhaps the most serious consequence of the ESEA (Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965) has been the shifting of power of decision in education from the state and local level to the federal level of government. . . .

"Federal specification of categories also militates against the organic integrity and essential unity of the educational enterprise, to the detriment of the educational program and the individual child." (*Federal Financial Relationships to Education*, EPC-NEA, 1967)[3]

Controversies over the issues of church and state, and over the undesirability of federal control have obstructed broad *direct* federal support of education for many years, and will probably continue to do so. But the national government could avoid those roadblocks and give aid *indirectly* by helping those who now provide much of higher education's income to support the institutions more adequately. By assisting students and their families with paying tuitions, the government could open a promising avenue to an effective college aid program.

THE BURDEN OF TUITIONS

Putting their offspring through undergraduate colleges now places a heavier strain on the finances of most college families than it ever did—often more severe than buying a home and a car simultaneously. Former United States Commissioner of Education Harold Howe reported at congressional hearings that the cost to undergraduates of tuition, board and room, etc. in public institutions of higher learning soared from an average of $850 a year in 1940 to $1,560 in 1965, and in private institutions from $1,100 to $2,370. What Commissioner Howe did not mention is that the rates of increase—85 percent and 115 percent respectively—were less than those of consumer prices—125 percent—and of the simultaneous growth of 320 percent in per-capita disposable income.

If income has grown three times as fast as the cost of college attendance why is the latter so many families' greatest financial worry? For the simple reason that prior to World War II a family might have called itself fortunate if it managed to put one son through college but it now tries to enable all of its sons and daughters to acquire a higher education. College enrollment equalled 15% of the 18-to-21-year-old population in 1940 and now runs at 48%, headed still higher. A higher education used to be privilege, but it now has come to be regarded as the birthright of every young man or woman unless he or she lacks even the minimum required intellectual endowment. With job specifications and hiring practices demanding ever higher educational attainment of applicants, it is essential that all young people who are qualified by intelligence and aspiration to be given the opportunity to acquire a higher education.

The total cost of four years at an undergraduate school may now run from $8,000 to $20,000. Multiplied by the number of children, this presents many families with a staggering problem.

Sending its children to college of course imposes no financial hardship on a wealthy family. Nor is attendance an insuperable task for a student from a low-income family who, if otherwise qualified, is eligible for a scholarship. Several hundred thousand scholarships are now being sponsored by the states, the colleges and private donors. The national government offers another half million scholarships to low-income students. A scholarship combined with a loan and work-study helps many needy, aspiring young men and women of low means to overcome the financial obstacles. No one is denied access to higher education solely by inability to pay the necessary costs.

But students from a middle-income background and their families often can raise the required funds only with great difficulty, while they are ineligible for federal aid and many other scholarships. They fall between two extremes. Although they account for the majority of the student body at most institutions, they are hardest hit by the inadequacies of the present system. An official study at the University of California at Berkeley in 1967 (conducted by David Bradwell & Associates) found that students from middle-income families are financially worse off than those from either rich or poor backgrounds.

The federal income tax code adds to the troubles of middle-class college families. It grants relief to taxpayers by permitting them to deduct from the tax base such major outlays as mortgage interest, state and local taxes, charitable contributions, medical expenses, and casualty losses. But it denies consideration of what sometimes is the biggest item of family expenditure and the cause of the greatest headache: the cost of attending college.

All students are now able to borrow sizeable amounts to pay for their education through a variety of public and private loan programs by the availability of loan guarantees to students who would not otherwise be regarded as good credit risks. On the whole, borrowing is a sound way to finance part of a

Footnotes at end of speech.

college education because it stretches the cost over a larger number of years than the four or five years of attendance. Most students can expect to earn during their working lives a higher income with a college degree than without. Why should they not reimburse the college for part of the cost they caused? A student who is reluctant to invest in his own education—and to borrow for it—has a very doubtful claim to be assisted by others or by the public treasury.

Borrowing is an adequate answer for some students, particularly for many attending a low-tuition state college. But for others it is not. Some graduates choose careers such as teaching which, though essential, are not necessarily highly lucrative. Girls may be gainfully employed for only a few years and then spend the next 20 or 30 years raising a family. An educated mother may be invaluable to her children but this does not help pay back a large debt incurred during her college years.

Effective tax relief could be given to college families, particularly those in the middle income brackets, by according them tangible recognition on their federal, and state, income tax for the special burden they bear. This would continue a long-established American tradition of aiding education by tax abatement. The "spillover" effects of higher education, that is the benefits which accrue to society in general, also justify benefits to those who incur the heavy outlays. This would shift at least part of the cost of future tuition boosts to the public treasury and also help to ease the colleges' financing problem.

Hundreds of bills were introduced in Congress during the 1950's and early 1960's permitting tax deductibility of college expenses or additional exemptions for college students and their families. They all suffered from the same shortcoming: the progressive tax scale would have bestowed the most substantial benefits to high income families and given little to those in the lower brackets. Nor did flat tax credit plans seem to provide an acceptable distribution of benefits between high-tuition and low-tuition institutions. A new formula was needed to allocate benefits more equitably.

In 1963 when I was asked by the Senate Labor and Welfare Committee to testify on President John F. Kennedy's recommendations for federal aid to education I conceived of a method of aiding higher education that allocated the benefits more fairly: federal income tax credits for tuition and other educational expenses on a graduated or sliding scale.

The new plan quickly found broad acceptance in both Houses of Congress and its sponsorship extended over the whole range of the political spectrum. During a congressional debate in 1963 it was called the Humphrey-Ribicoff-Goldwater-Keating bill—a unique designation. Ten days after I first advanced the proposal Senator (the former Vice President) Hubert Humphrey announced in the Senate that he had introduced a bill to implement it:

"The sliding tax credit schedule provides a sensible and workable system of federal assistance that helps every student, indirectly helps both public and private institutions, and does so in a manner that in no way interferes with individual or institutional freedom or policies. This bill, providing for a declining tax credit for expenditures on tuition, fees, books, and supplies mitigates the distortion found in the large majority of bills that rely on tax deductions, additional exemptions, or non-variable tax credit. . . .

"While this tax credit proposal would not solve all the financial problems related to higher education, it would represent a significant contribution well within our national means. It would provide this assistance in a manner that avoids any argument about federal control of education and also the nagging question of church-state relations. Moreover, it would provide this aid without having to expand the Federal bureaucracy to administer the program.

"Support in the Congress has been growing for this general approach to the problem of federal aid to higher education. I know the appropriate committees in both Houses are giving these proposals careful scrutiny and consideration. I hope that the Administration will consider seriously requesting such legislation from the Congress." (*Congressional Record*, vol. 109, pt. 8, p. 10254.

The plan came up for congressional action three times and commanded a clear majority on each occasion. But it was not enacted when "the Johnson Administration used every ounce of influence it could muster" and "snapped the whip and lashed Senators in line against the proposal" (citing reports from U.S. News and World Report of February 14, 1964, and the Washington Star of March 14, 1966). Key legislators were told by Presidential Assistant W. Marvin Watson "that 'they were through' at the White House if they backed the Ribicoff plan." Mr. Watson ". . . emphasized that he was speaking for the President who . . . was prepared to deal them out of all Federal patronage and projects if 'you cross him on this vote'." (The New York Herald Tribune, March 10, 1966.) Even some of the bill's sponsors were forced to reverse themselves and vote against it on Senate votes in February, 1964, and March, 1966, so that the plan was defeated by a narrow margin. On April 14, 1967, the Senate adopted the tax credit plan by a vote of 53 to 26. But again President Johnson subsequently succeeded in preventing final enactment.

However, support for the sliding scale tuition tax credit plan has gathered such broad support in both Houses of Congress, in the public and among the colleges—as evidenced by a resolution of the Association of American Colleges—that eventual enactment appears likely.

WHAT TUITION TAX CREDITS WOULD DO

The Ribicoff-Dominick plan, so named after its leading sponsors, Senator Abraham Ribicoff, Democrat from Connecticut, and Senator Peter Dominick, Republican from Colorado, would permit anybody who pays for tuition, fees, books, and supplies for a student at an institution of higher learning—whether the payer be the student himself, his parents, or a benefactor a tax credit of 75% of the first \$200, 25% of the next \$300, and 10% of the next \$1,000. Thus a credit of \$175 would be allowed for expenses of \$300 (58%) and a credit of \$325 for expenses of \$1,500 (25%). The scale is weighted in favor of low-tuition institutions where it wipes out much or most of the tuition cost. The credit starts tapering off from an income of \$25,000 on and vanishes at \$57,500.

The Treasury Department estimated that the cost of the Ribicoff-Dominick plan would initially be \$750 million a year, gradually rising to \$1.3 billion. Sixty-two percent of the credits would accrue to beneficiaries with an income between \$3,000 and \$10,000; 91% to persons whose income is under \$20,000. (This gives the lie to the misconception that tax credit plans benefit the rich.)

The Ribicoff-Dominick tax credit plan offers little or nothing to the rich, little or nothing to the poor, and aims at easing the future college burden—the inevitable tuition boosts—of the great majority of students who come from families "in between." Most students from families whose income is so low that they pay little or no income tax are probably on a scholarship. The granting of tuition tax credits would not only free more scholarships for needy students (because students from lower-middle income families would no longer need them), it would also stimulate many thousands of benefactors to donate scholarships for which they would receive credit on their income tax.

If it were still held desirable to make direct tax credit benefits available to people who pay no income tax, the tax credits could be made "absolute": a potential recipient of an educational tax credit would compute his income tax, including his tuition tax credit, and if his return winds up with a final net credit it would be paid to him by the Internal Reserve Service like a net credit from overpayment on the income tax.

WHO OPPOSES EDUCATIONAL TAX CREDITS AND WHY?

As mentioned before, President Johnson strongly opposed educational tax credits and was able, by using his power to the utmost, to prevent Congress from enacting them. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare, which administers most federal grants to education, and the Treasury Department both used their influence against the granting of tax credits, as did several special interest groups and their Washington lobbyists.

Earlier, the claim that tax credits would benefit rich people was refuted. It has also been said that to grant tax credits in higher education would be unfair to persons who have no college expenses. That is like saying that the presently allowable tax deductions for medical expenses, casualty losses or state taxes are unfair to persons who incur no such outlays. It has even been claimed that tax credits would be inequitable because they provide no direct benefits to persons who pay no income tax. That is like saying that, for example, the 1964 tax cut was unfair to low-income persons who pay no income tax because they did not benefit from the cut; or that exemptions and deductions are unfair to persons whose income is wholly tax exempt—e.g. derived from social security, unemployment compensation or public assistance—because they cannot take advantage of them. Such arguments are specious and contrived and need not be taken seriously.

Some object to tax credits because they would open another loophole in the Internal Revenue Code. This would be a valid argument if the federal income tax were otherwise comprehensive. The fact is, however, that at the present time, out of a total personal income of \$625 billion at least \$350 billion escape taxation through deductions, exclusions, exemptions and credits. Contrary to a widely believed myth, most of that tax-free income goes to middle- and low-income groups. Compunction about an educational tax credit as a danger to the integrity of our income tax is like worrying over danger from a sexy book to the virtue of a prostitute. The concern is somewhat belated, to put it mildly. A tax credit for business investment was newly authorized in 1962 and Presidents Kennedy and Johnson have recommended tax credits for political contributions. Do business investments and political contributions really merit greater consideration than education?

Some object to educational tax credits because they would cause a revenue loss to the Treasury and boost the federal budget deficit. Strangely though, many of the same people are in the forefront of the groups which press for higher federal expenditures for education and other purposes. They are concerned about the budget deficit only when it is proposed to aid education by *reducing taxes*, not when it comes to *increasing expenditures*. They know that direct federal support could go only to *public* colleges while tax credits would benefit *public and private* institutions alike. When the argument is analyzed, it becomes obvious that what the objectors are opposed to is not just tax credits which would benefit private education, but private education as such. They believe—though some of them are reluctant to admit it—that education is a governmental task and that private institutions which give the student a choice and may offer curricula of their own choosing, not controlled by government, are somehow divisive.

Uniformity in government-directed education—as in most other services—is the true goal of large and powerful groups in this country. There exists a widely accepted philosophy that government should provide an ever-widening range of services without a direct charge to the consumer—and then raise the funds by taxes or deficit financing and inflation.

State colleges and universities need and demand sharply enlarged funds to take care of their soaring enrollment, to attract and keep faculty, to increase the number and amounts of scholarships. They could raise a substantial part of the needed money through tuition boosts. But they keep their charges and fees deliberately low partly as the most effective method of driving the private colleges out of business and attaining a near-monopoly for government-controlled higher education.

The tuition and tax credit questions in higher education therefore cannot be viewed in isolation. They are part and parcel of a far broader struggle between those who would steadily enlarge government and have it take over most individual and family responsibilities and those who fear loss of precious freedoms under such a system. A trend, toward growing government involvement, would in the future, as it has in the past, gradually reduce the area of liberty, of individual freedom and responsibility and enlarge the area of coercion.

Through direct financial support of institutions, governmental control of education could and would be continuously tightened while the granting of tax credits would strengthen the decision-making power of individuals and families, and the independence of the governing boards of the institutions. Tax credits are just one battleground in the greater struggle over the issue whether government should be bigger and have more power—or whether it should be restricted to those areas in which individuals cannot act adequately or effectively.

That the alignment in the fight over educational tax credits is not entirely along the ideological division between the advocates and opponents of bigger government is due to one fact: the history of the fight over federal aid to education, and the continued presence of the church and state question make it appear unlikely that federal support for the operation of colleges and universities—or elementary and secondary schools—can be enacted, at least for many years ahead. Protagonists for the private and church-connected institutions are sufficiently powerful to prevent authorization of grants exclusively to public schools and colleges. But they are not strong enough to obtain such support for their own schools, at least as long as the present court interpretation of the First Amendment remains unchanged.

Those who believe in maintaining—or restoring—the widest possible freedom of choice in education and a broad diversity of institutions and offerings naturally favor tax credits as the most promising and most effective method of attaining their aims.[4] Some of those who, at heart, favor bigger government, but despair of obtaining federal support for public institutions unless commensurate benefits are made available to nongovernmental schools are willing to compromise: they may not approve of *direct* federal support of private educational institutions, but they are willing to accept the principle of tax credits as an indirect means of aiding education by assisting its supporters. The coalition between the two groups has given tax credits a clear majority in the Congress and is likely to carry them to victory if the new president ceases to follow President Johnson's policy of opposition to the proposal.

There is not much time left. Many or most private colleges and universities are fighting for survival and must be given help within the next years. Failing to get such aid, many will be forced to close their doors. None of the concern that is now widely expressed for the fate of private colleges, nor of the crocodile tears being shed for their impending demise, are of much avail unless a rescue operation is mounted *now*. And none of the measures that have been suggested for saving private higher education promise to aid it as effectively as federal income tax credits for donations and for tuition and other expenses.

FOOTNOTES

[1] There is however not much difference in board and room charges between public and private institutions.

[2] See: John A. Howard, *Financing American Education*, published by the American Conservative Union, 1965.

[3] One ironic note: It has been just a few years since many academic "liberals" used to wax enthusiastic not only over federal money but about the "progressive" influence which the national government could thereby exert over the parochialism of state and private campuses and their backward if not outright reactionary boards of trustees and administrators. The presence of Uncle Sam was just what was needed to cut down the power of alumni and donors. But when they realized, in the past two or three years, that much of the government-sponsored research aimed to strengthen the defense of the United States, activist student movements, supported by vocal faculty groups, turned into the most articulate and violent opponents of federal control or influence.

[4] A Citizens National Committee for Higher Education, consisting of college and university presidents and others interested in higher education was formed in January, 1964, "to conduct research into and propose ways and means of increasing the flow of national income into higher education." It views tax credits for donations and college expenses as the most promising immediate way of strengthening higher educational finances and favors the Ribicoff-Dominick bill and related proposals.

JOHN SCOTT, OF LAFAYETTE, IND., COURIER-JOURNAL, EXAMINES TECHNIQUES OF PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION "ANALYSTS"

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, last November, just a few days before the election, Mr. John Scott, editor of the Lafayette, Ind., Courier-Journal, had some fun with political pundits and analysts and their "election predictions." Following is Mr. Scott's "Editor's File" for November 2, 1968, from the Lafayette Courier-Journal:

SEARCH IMAGINATION FOR CLUE TO NATURE OF TUESDAY'S VOTE AND STATE OF NATION

(By John Scott)

In the closing days before a presidential election, political observers seek out a "typical town" in America. They try to examine this community, then project their findings into a national pattern so they can forecast with reasonable inaccuracy how the election will not come out.

It was inevitable that they would finally get around to Imagination, Indiana, a quiet community, nestled inside a bend of the Wabash River. Imagination, Indiana, has voted for the winning candidate in every presidential election in this centruy except 1908, 1916, 1924, 1936, 1944, 1952, 1956 and 1964.

In 1952, Imagination voters went for the Prohibition candidate. In 1956 there was a dead heat between Dwight D. Eisenhower and Duke Snider of the Brooklyn Dodgers, whose maternal grandmother was born in this township. (Duke led the National League in Home Runs in 1956.) Except for those two elections, Imagination, when it has not been correct, always has voted for the leading loser.

In this year of computer projections, pollsters have had an exciting time in Imagination because 166 absentee ballots already have been cast by citizens who will be out of town next Tuesday. These men and their wives are members of TDA (Tax Dodgers Anonymous) who will be holding their annual meeting in the Grand Bahamas on Election Day.

On the basis of these 166 votes, observers project that Richard Nixon will win the national election by a 7–5 margin over Hubert Humphrey, with George Wallace a strong third. Seventeen of the absentee ballots were again cast for Duke Snider.

There are curious forces, however, that may have influenced the 166 voters this year. One is the activities of the community's only Yippie, Timothy O'Yoder, who is highly regarded by some of the younger businessmen in the area because of his national image.

During the Democratic National Convention, O'Yoder suffered scalp lacerations and was interviewed on national television by Sideburn Van Okra. Young businessmen in Imagination claim that the publicity has helped the town's industrial development program because nobody had ever heard of the place until the Democratic convention.

O'Yoder himself has been very active in the local campaign attempting to get peopla not to vote for anybody. He has also launched a campaign against police brutality in Imagination. Although the community has only one part-time law enforcement officer, he works a full-time day shift at the Soybean Processing Plant. O'Yoder accuses the officer of being part of the Military-Industrial Complex because Soybean Oil is used to lubricate the release mechanisms on the aircraft that drop Napalm. He also alleges that the town's part-time constable re-opened one of his head cuts when O'Yoder picketed the PTA at the high school the night the FBI man gave the speech on drugs. (O'Yoder says that he has never taken drugs himself but that he thinks they are less dangerous than the driver-training program at the high school.)

Although the TDA group has come under fire for planning this year's trip during election week, the chairman explained that Imagination's airport has only a small dirt landing strip and 87 single-engine airplanes are required to get the group to O'Hare Field in Chicago. "This requires advance planning and split-second timing," explained the group's chairman, Ayr Fleet.

Another factor that may influence the election here Tuesday is the battle for township commissioner between Joe Socrates and Ed Zybricki. Since the community has strong ethnic origins, local Democrats, concerned about Spiro Agnew being the Republican vice presidential nominee, Socrates decided to balance their ticket by nominating of Zybricki, a great grandson of General Zybricki, the famous Polish Indian fighter. As a result, all of the billboards here ignore the presidential candidates. "Vote Ethnic! Win with Muskie-Socrates" say the Democrats, and the Republican signs say simply "Vote for Spiro Agnew and General Zybricki's Great Grandson"!

This past week Scotty Wrestlin, the New York reporter, was in Imagination, attempting to capture the national trend in this quiet little town, a cross-section of mid-America where the homes are modest but well-kept and where the ghetto consists of only one house, the home of Timothy O'Yoder, a colonial mansion that O'Yoder made over into a model slum the year he inherited the AT&T stock.

Scotty Wrestlin, looking for a trend, became diverted by a local conflict-of-interest charge against Joe Socrates, the Democratic candidate. The local weekly paper charged that Socrates has been speculating in Soybean Futures and, if elected, will be in a position to influence the price of Soybeans by raising the Township Cartage Tax at the silo. Socrates could not be reached for comment because he is with the TDA group in the Grand Bahamas.

One of the television networks is making a documentary on Imagination. It will be called "Typical, USA" and will be shown nationally if Nixon wins by the 7 to 5 margin. The presence of the TV crew has stirred up a great deal of excitement in town and truckloads of props have been unloaded here all week. These include cracker barrels, pickle jars and an old-time bar complete with player piano. Plastic cobwebs have been attached to the street light posts and the cocktail lounge at the hotel has been completely demodernized. The Happy Hour Special Double Martini will not be served during the video-taping. "They only drink beer in America's Heartland," chuckled Sideburn Van Okra, the network commentator assigned to the production.

Ed Zybricki, the Republican candidate for commissioner, has refused to cooperate in the television show. He says it's a waste of time because neither Nixon nor Humphrey will carry Imagination. "Furthermore," shouted Zybricki, "If those television crews get in front of my pickup truck, it will be the last pickup truck they ever get in front of."

"They won't be the only thing that's run down in Imagination, Indiana," said Timothy O'Yoder, leering through his latest lacerations.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SCIENCE

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call the attention of my colleagues to the position statement adopted by the Association of Research Libraries at its recent midwinter meeting here in Washington, supporting the creation of a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science as provided for in my bill, H.R. 908.

The association states:

This Commission, properly located within the Federal Government, could be extremely helpful in advising the President, the Congress, the Federal agencies, and the many other state and private institutions on the priorities and measures required to establish and carry out a long-term program for the improvement of library and information services.

At this point in my remarks, I include the full text of the ARL statement:

POSITION STATEMENT OF THE ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES' FEDERAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE ON THE REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES*

Since the members of the Association of Research Libraries have long been directly concerned with the Nation's library and information needs, they were heartened by the action of the President of the United States in September, 1966, in appointing the distinguished National Advisory Commission on Libraries, chaired by President Douglas M. Knight of Duke University, to survey the library needs of the Nation and to make appropriate recommendations for action. The ARL now strongly supports the basic recommendations appearing in the Commission's recent summary Report.

During the last two decades a number of powerful social, technical, economic and intellectual forces have led to a mounting need for basic improvements and changes in library and information services throughout America. The postwar involvement of the Federal Government in scientific and technical research, the rapid expansion of education at all levels, the need for better international understanding, the so-called information explosion and the potentials of technology are but some of the forces at work.

In response to these widespread needs and expectations, the Federal Government has increasingly sought ways to improve and strengthen library services for all the people. The result has been a sequence of important Federal legislation, beginning with the Library Services (and Construction) Act of 1956. Today Federal involvement, stemming from a variety of legislative acts, is the responsibility of a great number of departments and agencies throughout the governmental structure.

The Report of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries defines the scope of the national need and proposes a responsible mechanism for reviewing and coordinating the present wide range of critically important Federal efforts in support of libraries, as well as for the effective planning of any future efforts which may be undertaken. Further, it will assist in coordinating these Federal efforts with those of the States, the universities, the library associations and of many other institutions and organizations.

The Association of Research Libraries agrees that the most important measure which can be undertaken, and which should be undertaken immediately, is the establishment of a distinguished, well staffed and continuing Federal review, coordinating and planning mechanism. The ARL fully supports, therefore, the Advisory Commission in its proposal that the Congress and the President establish a permanent and influential National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. This Commission, properly located within the Federal Government, could be extremely helpful in advising the President, the Congress, the Federal agencies, and the many other state and private institutions on the priorities and measures required to establish and carry out a long-term program for the improvement of library and information services.

The ARL equally supports the Advisory Commission in its recommendation that the Library of Congress, in full recognition of its generous services and potential, be officially designated and supported as the National Library of the United States and that it be provided with a distinguished public board of advisors.

Similarly, the ARL endorses the Commission's recognition that there should be certain changes within the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to enable the U.S. Office of Education to carry out the present and future library responsibilities assigned to it by the Congress.

The Association of Research Libraries, which consists of institutional representatives of seventy-nine major university libraries, privately established research libraries, and certain of the great Federal libraries, stands ready to assist and cooperate to the fullest in thus moving American libraries into a new era of national service.

ROBERT VOSPER,
Chairman.
WILLIAM DIX.
STUART FORTH,
BENJAMIN POWELL.
RUTHERFORD ROGERS.

*This position statement was adopted by the ARL membership, on January 26, 1969, as the official statement of the Association on the Report of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries.

A STEP IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, having served in the past both as chairman of the Republican task force on the civil service merit system and as a member of the Hatch Act Commission, I have been pleased to note the widespread public support for the President's efforts to abandon patronage as a basis for employment in the postal service. One such indication of the broad support Mr. Nixon has in this matter is provided by recent editorial comments of Kenneth Anderson, publisher of the Cottonwood County Citizen & Windom Reporter, Windom, Minn. I include the editorial for the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

A STEP IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION

President Nixon in a few short weeks in office has given every indication that he plans to put the federal government on a business-like basis.

One of his first steps in that direction was to announce that postal affairs will be divorced from politics.

Henceforth, if Congress approves, postmasters will get their jobs through a merit system rather than as a political plum.

This action will be popular with everyone but postmasters and politicians.

For too long post office appointments have hinged more on who you knew than what you knew. It probably explains better than anything else why the post office department is in such sad shape today.

Mr. Nixon's move had to be a tough decision. When you head a party that has been in office for only eight out of the last 36 years, then there has to be a lot of party faithfuls waiting in the wings for appointments.

The fact that these appointments will not be made is a great credit to the man in the White House who is not playing politics with the welfare of his country.

As a non-supporter of President Nixon, we would be the first to admit that he is doing a fine job. If he can restore some fiscal sanity and business judgment to the federal government, then he deserves the support of all Americans.

Certainly the removal of the postal political patronage system is a step in the right direction.

THE NIXON TRIP

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, the Nixon trip to Europe was like a breath of fresh air. The objectives were kept within the realm of possibility and therefore achieved. Our relationship with France has again taken on the warmth that always characterized it in the past. Britain gave the President a memorable reception. And even the official gifts to the Pope were apparently in good taste.

It is a good beginning and ranks as probably the biggest diplomatic achievement of the decade. We have now demonstrated our willingness to listen, and our image is that of the "friendly ally." We must next turn our attention to demonstrating that as leader of the free world, we are in fact capable of leading.

So, I think that the President must make his first agonizing reappraisal. I think he must take note of the fact that as the conferees in Paris continue to talk on and on, American men continue to give their lives on the battlefield. If the enemy is willing to negotiate, let them offer some sort of proof immediately. If not, let them face the consequences that Ambassador Lodge spoke of last week.

President Nixon has the momentum. He has seized the initiative. I hope and pray he will use this opportunity to end the Vietnam war, regardless of the means that must be employed in achieving it.

LETTER FROM DISTRICT RESIDENT REGARDING HOME RULE

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter from a Negro resident of the District of Columbia who expresses quite well the fears I have heard from literally hundreds of District residents, that his city may be turned over to militants in the event home rule legislation is enacted here.

As I was most impressed with the sincerity of the writer, I forwarded his letter to the President of the United States for his consideration in connection with any legislative proposals he may be planning for the District. I include the text of the letter, deleting the name of the writer to prevent harassment, at this point in the RECORD, together with a copy of the transmittal letter I sent to the President today:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 5, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Recently, I received a letter from a Negro resident of the District of Columbia, which I sincerely believe should have been addressed to you as the man most concerned with the government of the District of Columbia. As you will note, the writer once favored home rule for the District, but today he is pleading that his city not be turned over to militants.

As I feel my Colleagues in the Congress should know the content of the letter, I have placed a copy in the Record today, deleting the name of the writer to protect him from harassment.

You may be interested to know that the writer is representative of literally hundreds of District of Columbia residents, both black and white, who have communicated with me by letter or by telephone calls or personal visits in my office, to express their deep fear for the future of their city.

Their petitions have gone largely unheeded by previous Administrations, and it is their sincere hope that they will be heeded this year.

With warmest regards, I am,
Yours respectfully,
JOEL T. BROYHILL,
Member of Congress.

FEBRUARY 12, 1969.

Hon. JOEL BROYHILL,
House of Representatives,
Rayburn Building.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROYHILL: I am a Negro, a resident of D.C. and one of the few older natives of the city. I have been and am still alarmed at the widespread acts of violence and crime that are constantly being committed in the City. I have at one time felt that "Home Rule" should be granted the District of Columbia but have always had certain reservations because of it's Federal city status. I have never felt total and complete "Home Rule" would be feasable. D.C. is very unique in being a city that belongs to all the people of the country since it is the Capitol city and there should be some form of Federal involvement by those representatives of the people.

Recent events have made me feel any transition, at this time would only give the City to the militants. I not only say this in fear but in deep feeling for the city I have so long lived in. There is not one clear thinking person who would not make such a statement at this time. There is much factionalism and intimidation in the politics of the people who would eventually be elected to positions of power. I could hardly think of any election that would not and I again say, *at this time,* be tainted with all types of factions moderate and militants. They would be so emotionally filled until common sense and reasoning could not prevail. The winner would, without a doubt, be one of the most militant or he who could shout the loudest. Any clear thinking moderate would definitely be defeated.

I am asking that you and all the members of the Congress who are involved in District matters, give serious thought to any bill that proposes "Home Rule" for the District of Columbia, in view of the chaotic and unsettled condition of our community. This is not the time to experiment.

Sincerely yours,
___ ___.

PARTIAL REMARKS OF HYMAN BOOKBINDER, WASHINGTON REPRESENTATIVE OF THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE, FEBRUARY 28, 1969, AT THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE'S KERNER ANNIVERSARY LUNCHEON

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, as we mark the first anniversary of the publication of the Kerner Commission report, I want to draw to the attention of my colleagues the most thoughtful and penetrating remarks of Mr. Hyman Bookbinder, Washington representative of the American Jewish Committee, delivered on February 28, 1969, at the American Jewish Committee's Kerner anniversary luncheon.

Under unanimous consent I insert at this point in the RECORD the text of Mr. Bookbinder's remarks on this occasion:

PARTIAL REMARKS OF HYMAN BOOKBINDER, WASHINGTON REPRESENTATIVE OF THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE—FEBRUARY 28, 1969, AT THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE'S KERNER ANNIVERSARY LUNCHEON

It is impossible to quarrel with the conclusion reached in "One Year Later," the assessment just released of the nation's response to the Kerner Commission Report: "We are a year closer to being two societies, black and white, increasingly separate and scarcely less unequal."

The past year has seen some positive actions taken, in both the public and private sectors, but there is little ground for satisfaction. For the most part, the findings of the Kerner Commission were soon forgotten and the recommendations largely ignored.

The Commission called for many things. It called for better understanding, for better communications, for better programs. But, above all, it called for "a commitment to national action—compassionate, massive and sustained, backed by the resources of the most powerful and the richest nation on this earth."

LITTLE PROGRESS MADE

A year later, it is clear and it is tragic that America has failed to make such a commitment, has been unwilling to assign the resources needed to save the society that makes those resources possible.

It was Lyndon Johnson's tragedy—in my judgment, one he could have and should have avoided—that he felt he could not embrace the challenge of the Kerner Report at the very time he was struggling with Congress for approval of his substantially more modest proposals in education, housing, health, and the poverty program itself. I sympathized then, and still do, with his problems. But he should have hailed the Kerner Report and he should have told the American people the unvarnished truth—that they would have to approve massive Federal efforts to solve the urban crisis.

Now it is Richard Nixon who must face up to the challenge. It is true, as the President has said, that money alone won't solve it. It is true that local and private and volunteer forces must be more fully mobilized.

MASSIVE INVESTMENT OF PUBLIC RESOURCES ESSENTIAL

But the biggest truth of all is that without a massive investment of public resources, none of the other remedies will work.

The United States *can* afford to implement the Kerner Report. There need only be the will to do so. What is needed is an assessment of the nation's present and forthcoming economic potential—and a decision to allocate whatever portion of that tremendous economic resource is needed to eliminate poverty and blight in the United States over the next generation.

I do not claim to be or to have the final word on what our resources are and what our needs are. But I know that both are colossal. I have checked most of the available knowledge—and I have concluded that we can do what must be done by allocating only a small part of our *increased wealth* in the next two decades. This is why: *The aggregate growth dividend in 1969 prices over the next twenty years will be 10 trillion dollars. We could commit ourselves now to a 20-year one-trillion dollar investment to save America—and use only 10% of the increase in our total GNP over the next generation. A trillion dollars would permit an average additional investment of fifty billion dollars a year—and that amount is clearly and urgently needed.*

America's economic power is tremendous. If we do not botch it up, our economy can continue to grow at rates which would make possible any reasonable national objective.

During the last eight years, our Gross National Product, after adjusting for price changes, increased almost 5% a year. In the following projections, I am assuming a very modest increase of only 4% per year over the next 20 years: *In 1969 prices, our GNP would grow from $910 billions this year to $1.350 trillions in 1979—and to just under $2 trillions in 1979!*

If the present $910 billion rate remained unchanged for the twenty years, the aggregate GNP would be *$18.2* trillion. But at the reasonable 4% growth projection, the aggregate will actually be over *$28 trillion*—which means a $10 trillion *"growth dividend."* Present tax rates would yield $2 trillion more in Federal revenue and $1 trillion more in State and local revenues.

ORDERING OF PRIORITIES

The question, then, before the American people is simply this: "Are we willing to assign one-tenth of our projected increase in living standards over the next twenty years in order finally to eliminate poverty and urban blight and all of the social consequences that flow from it? Are 88% of us willing to grow richer at a slightly slower rate so that the poor among us can stop being poor?"

We've heard much about "re-ordering our national priorities." We must choose between fighting in Vietnam and fighting hunger in America, we are told; we must choose between putting a man on the moon and putting more men here on their feet. In my judgment, the real choice is even more basic than that. Over the next decade or two, Americans must choose between three cars in almost everybody's garage and three meals for every child; between five-week vacations in the Caribbean and clean air in New York or Washington the year round. To put it colloquially, and mixing metaphors, how long can we live "high on the hog" without winding up "in the soup."

LONG-TERM COMMITMENT ESSENTIAL

We need nothing less than a 20-year commitment—because the problems of inherited poverty will require a full generation of cure. In 1968, there were almost a million children born into poverty—and unless we help them overcome their educational, their housing, their health, their employment disadvantages, they may well be the parents of other poor children twenty years from now.

If the Kerner Report teaches us anything, it is that the multifaceted complex of problems called "poverty" or "the urban crisis" requires a multi-faceted, inter-related, long-term plan. It needs a social "systems" approach, one to dwarf all previous "systems" approaches.

I find it incredible that a nation which can embark on a ten-year co-ordinated, rounded, multi-billion-dollar program to put a man on the moon, or a ten-year multi-billion-dollar program to build a national highway network, does not find it appropriate to develop a comprehensive multi-faceted long-term plan to save America from internal decay.

To save America from foreign attack, this nation develops a combined defense system, goes to the Congress, and without too much difficulty gets a 60 or 70 billion dollar defense appropriation. But when it comes to our domestic crisis, we have dozens of isolated proposals, separate programs, innumerable Congressional actions—reflecting vested interests in the agencies as well as the Congressional committees—that too frequently overlap and even conflict with one another.

The new Urban Affairs Council is a good beginning. What they must do, however, is develop a total strategy for meeting our great domestic crisis. They must determine what we must do in every important field in five years, in ten years, in twenty years. They must tell us what it will take—and then we as a people must make a decision. Of course no master plan can be cast in concrete. There must be flexibility; there must be readiness and capacity to adjust to changes. But let's know what our housing needs are, what our health needs are, what our manpower needs are—and let's have the programs developed to achieve maximum meshing and co-ordination.

Even with all the resources and determination imaginable, our urban crisis will not be solved in a year or two, or even five. All the more reason, then, for a solid and lasting commitment to be made now—inspiring confidence among our poor and our minority groups that we are finally on our way.

In my judgment, as I have indicated, the job will take at least twenty years—and at least a trillion dollars in that period over and above what we are doing now and what would be the normal increase in governmental functions due to increased population.

ADDITIONAL FEDERAL RESOURCES SUGGESTED

Here are some illustrations of how additional Federal resources could be put to work:

National standards for welfare payments—at least $5 billion a year.

Public employment programs for 1 million persons—$5 billion a year.

Head Start year round for every poor child—another $2 billion a year.

Greater support to education at all levels—at least $7 billion more.

Health programs, especially for the poor—need about $4 billion more.

Housing and Urban Development and Model Cities—at least $5 billion.

And then there are needs in transportation, in water and air pollution, in economic development, in crime and delinquency—and so much more. An integrated attack on urban blight could co-ordinate all of these needs—public employment, for example, in anti-pollution and similar programs.

Too often, in recent years, we have made promises and embarked on programs—only to starve them and bring on disillusionment. It is outrageous that at this time there is a gap of six billion dollars between the levels authorized for a wide range of programs in the social and economic areas and the amounts actually appropriated.

Much of our present difficulty, as the Kerner Report warned us, stems from the gap between promise and performance. There are those who say that we must promise less. I'm afraid that advice is too late—and not too good in the first place. There is only one right way to close the gap: to increase our performance.

FACILITATION OF THE ENTRY OF ALIEN BROTHERS AND SISTERS OF U.S. CITIZENS

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to facilitate the entry into the United States of aliens who are brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens. This legislation would affect any otherwise admissible alien who had filed a petition for a visa on the basis of this kinship with the Attorney General before July 1, 1966. Entry would be permitted under the "immediate relative" clause of our immigration law, without—in the language of that legislation—"regard to the numerical limitations in this act." Immediate relatives now include spouses, minor children and—as broadened by the 1965 amendments—parents of U.S. citizens.

This bill, popularly referred to as the Italian Immigration Act, received support in both the House and Senate last year. It is a temporary measure, designed primarily to absorb the huge waiting lists of Italians who have been waiting for years to join their brothers and sisters in this country. And, may I add, it is a measure of some urgency. They wish to rejoin them in the flesh, not in wooden boxes.

The existence of the long waiting list of Italians seeking visas in this category is directly attributable to the inequities of the national origins quota system, which Congress recognized in 1965 as both discriminatory and inefficient, and acted to abolish. Under this system, which had been in effect for more than 40 years, the number from each country which could enter the United States annually was based on the origins of the U.S. population at the time of the 1920 census. This meant that more than 70-percent of the total annual quota from the non-Western Hemisphere countries was allotted to Great Britain, Ireland, and Germany. It also meant that many allotted visa numbers went unused, since they were not redistributable. Great Britain in 1965 used less than half of its allotted quota of 65,361. At the same time, countries with low quotas developed enormous waiting lists. Italy in 1965 had a waiting list of more than 200,000 in excess of its allotted quota of 5,666.

The 1965 amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act were designed to correct the evils of this system. National origins has been replaced as the basis of entry by a seven-point preference system aimed first at reuniting families; and second, at attracting professional talent and needed skilled labor. Under this system, visas are distributed according to this seven-point order of preference categories, with a certain percentage of the total allotted to each category. They are available on a first-come, first-served basis, with no more than 20,000 for each country, and no more than 170,000 for all the non-Western Hemisphere countries together.

This system went into effect in July of 1968. It was preceded, as prescribed by the 1965 amendments, by a 2½-year transitional period during which unused numbers from each prior year were pooled and made available to oversubscribed countries in order to absorb the long waiting lists which these countries had built up. This mechanism generally accomplished its purpose, although here, in articles on this subject, there is always a parentheses: "(except for Italy)." For the Italians, the waiting list still remains, and because of it, Italian brothers and sisters receive little more equitable treatment under this new system designed allegedly to reunite families than they did under the old national origins quota system.

The brothers-and-sisters preference category ranks fifth in the seven-category system, behind unmarried children of U.S. citizens; spouses and unmarried children of permanent U.S. residents;

professional and exceptional talent; and married children of U.S. citizens. This low point on the preference scale, combined with the long waiting list, means that the 20,000 national quota includes comparatively few brothers and sisters. To illustrate, in February 1969—this month—visas are now being issued to Italians who filed on the basis of being brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens prior to January 1, 1958. For most other countries, visas in this category are currently available. In fiscal 1968, 5,979 Italians entered in the brother-and-sister category. As of January 1, 1969, approximately 70,000 Italians were waiting for visas in this category.

It is abundantly clear that the system is not working here, and that the reason for this is that the Italian waiting list in this category, huge before enactment of the 1965 amendments, was unabsorbed by the transitional pooling and is unabsorbable under the new system which admits, as fifth preference, a total of 40,800—plus any unused numbers from higher categories—brothers and sisters for the entire non-Western Hemisphere. The legislation which I am introducing would eliminate this waiting list, it would allow immediate entry to all otherwise admissible aliens who had filed prior to July 1, 1966, and it would then, as a result, permit the proper functioning on the intended first-come, first-served basis of the present system, a system intended primarily to reunite families.

In brief, this legislation is intended to correct a technical malfunctioning of our complex immigration system. It is intended to implement the congressional intent of the 1965 amendments. And, most importantly, it is intended to allow my countrymen abroad to rejoin their brothers and their sisters in this country.

Thank you.

THE LOSS OF A LAKE

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial appearing in the Washington, D.C., Star of Friday, February 28, 1969, entitled "The Loss of a Lake."

It is hard to believe that a situation of this kind could be going on. Yet it is. The editorial follows:

THE LOSS OF A LAKE

For years we Americans have watched the gradual erosion of some of our finest natural resources with appalling equanimity. The unfortunate remarks of Secretary of the Interior Hickel about "conservation for conservation's sake" was an accurate reflection of an indifference far too widespread.

We are on the verge of one result of our indifference so catastrophic that it may stir all of us to action—the people, the Congress, the appropriate government agencies and even those who profit from pollution of natural resources. A recent report reminds us that we are about to lose Lake Erie.

The loss of one of the Great Lakes is no small thing and the process was not accomplished overnight. All along the American shore of the lake, for over a century communities have been pouring raw sewage into the water either directly or by way of the rivers. In addition, the great industrial complexes centered on Detroit and Cleveland have contributed their special mix of chlorides, acids, cyanides, oils and other industrial pollutants every hour of the day every day of the year, in steadily increasing volume and lethalness for almost as long.

In biological terms, the lake, which was carved out by glaciers only 12,000 years ago, has aged 15,000 years in the last half century. The Cuyahoga River, one of the great tributaries of this pollution, has the distinction of being the only body of water classified as a fire hazard, for its oily surface periodically bursts into flames.

The traditional delicacies of the lake, the Northern Pike, the Blue Pike, the sturgeon and the cisco are long gone, replaced by scavenger fish such as suckers and carp. The wild duck, another old resident, is going fast, the victim of pollution.

Ironically, the products of sewage treatment plants are even worse for the lake than raw sewage. The phosphates and nitrates so produced have fertilized huge growths of algae which in turn have devastated the oxygen content of the water. If this oxygen depletion has proceeded far enough and if it is not reversed—which to many experts seems unlikely—a "biological cataclysm" may take place at the bottom. A thin covering of ferric iron will decompose releasing millions of tons of past waste now buried there. At that point the lake will be virtually useless for any purpose.

It is not true that when you've seen one Great Lake you've seen them all, nor is it any consolation that four remain. Lake Erie must be saved if possible. If it cannot be saved, its loss must initiate an adequate program to save what is left of this country from its inhabitants.

CLARENCE ALLEN SALUTED AS RIVER CHAMPION

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I hope one day the people of Oklahoma and Arkansas establish an honor roll bearing the names of the many dedicated men who devoted literally years of their lives to making the dream of navigation of the Arkansas River a reality.

Such an honor roll would be long and impressive. Men along the Arkansas River dreamed for years of navigation to Tulsa. In the years immediately following World War II they set about making the dream come true.

One of these men who is seldom mentioned in tributes of river pioneers is Clarence C. Allen, of Tulsa, an artist and ardent civic worker. In the early years of the Arkansas River effort, Mr. Allen was staff artist for the Tulsa Daily World. The World editor at the time was the late Newt Graham, one of the three or four men most directly responsible for the Arkansas project.

Mr. Graham called upon Clarence Allen to translate ideas into visual presentations. Mr. Allen modestly states that he was selected by Mr. Graham because "it cost him nothing." In fact, Mr. Allen's talent in presenting the Arkansas story made a direct and strong contribution to selling the project—a sales job many thought impossible.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to pay tribute to Clarence Allen, one of the great unsung heroes of the Arkansas River battle. Mr. Allen recently retired as staff artist and cartoonist for the Tulsa Tribune, but he has not retired from his role as Arkansas River booster and civic leader. The people of eastern Oklahoma know they can count on Clarence 100 percent.

THE 1968 HOUSING ACT AIDS MINNEAPOLIS RESIDENTS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most significant actions of the 90th Congress was the passage of the 1968 Housing Act. This legislation, enacted into law only last August, is already having a significant impact in communities throughout the country. The following story in the February 26, 1969, Minneapolis Star tells how this new legislation is affecting my district:

HOUSING ACT CHANGE GAINS CITY $2 MILLION

(By Al Woodruff)

Revisions in the U.S. Housing Act last year by Congress have enabled Minneapolis to make loans and grants of $2 million to homeowners with low income to repair and rehabilitate their property.

The number of loans and grants made to city residents is the highest in the nation, said Robert Purcell, assistant director of the housing authority.

In addition, under a part of the law added last year, the Minneapolis Housing and Redevelopment Authority has permitted 14 persons with low incomes to purchase homes in the city with federally subsidized, Federal Housing Authority (FHA)-guaranteed loans.

Under the loans and grants procedure for repair and rehabilitation, persons with annual incomes less than $3,000 may apply for such loans or grants to bring their homes up to meet city housing codes or standards of the housing authority.

MAXIMUM GRANT

Grants of up to $3,000 may be made, Purcell said. Until the law was amended, at the instigation of Rep. Donald M. Fraser, D-Minn., and Sen. Walter F. Mondale, D-Minn., the maximum grant was $1,500.

Loans of up to $14,500 for each dwelling unit also may be made for repairs under the program at a simple interest rate of 3 percent and repayable over 20 years.

In some cases owners have been able, with the help of the housing authority, to refinance their mortgages to borrow funds for repairs and at the same time reduce their monthly payments by nearly one-half, Purcell said.

Loans and grants are made only in those parts of the city that are either in urban renewal projects or in the federally assisted code-enforcement areas.

Examples of such urban renewal areas are those located in the near Northside, Seward and St. Anthony neighborhoods of the city, he said. Code-enforcement areas are in Como

South and soon will be in the Model Neighborhood area in South Minneapolis and the Jordan area.

MORE U.S. FUNDS

Grants for rehabilitation of dwelling units totaling $400,000 have been made to 260 applicants and loans of $1.6 million have been made to another 375 applicants. Another $100,000 is expected shortly for the city's loan and grant program from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Purcell said.

In the citywide program of subsidized, FHA-guaranteed loans, known as FHA-235, 10 families who formerly were tenants have bought homes and another four families in the near North Side urban renewal area have signed purchase agreements to buy new three-bedroom homes on lots claimed by urban renewal.

Persons looking for houses are assisted by the housing authority's relocation counselors.

Generally, to be eligible for the subsidized, FHA-guaranteed-mortgages, families cannot have a gross income that is more than 135 percent of the gross income of a similar family living in public housing.

In Minneapolis this would mean a family of three or four can have a gross income of $6,750; a family of five or six, $8,100, and a family of seven or more, $9,450.

Homes may be purchased under the FHA-235 program anywhere in the city.

The maximum mortgage is $17,500, and the downpayment cannot exceed $200, which means that the seller must pay all closing costs.

PAYMENTS CUT

Monthly payments for the mortgage, taxes and insurance are reduced to one-fifth of the family's monthly income. The minimum interest rate on the mortgage is one percent.

Mrs. Katherine Holmberg, a relocation counselor for the housing authority, said this means that a family of four with an income of $348 a month buying a home for $17,700 with a down payment of $200 would make monthly payments of $85.35.

The federal government would pay an additional $73.41 to the mortgage holder, the maximum subsidy at the one percent interest rate.

The average subsidy to the families that have been helped by the FHA-235 program is $50 a month, Mrs. Holmberg said.

"Subsidy of home ownership is not a new idea," she said.

"Through income tax deductions for mortgage interest and real estate taxes, families who could afford to buy homes have had a generous subsidy for 20 years or more. This has favored the middle- and upper-income families.

"Today's high interest rate make it almost impossible for low-income families to become homeowners under FHA mortgages. The 1968 change in the housing law removes this inequity by reducing down payments and monthly mortgage payments. It allows the large family with inadequate income for good rental housing to find an adequate home under an insured mortgage. This privilege should be in the reach of all families."

COUNTRYSIDE DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, the economic opportunities of rural areas and small towns must be improved if rural America is to survive. That is why I have joined with some of our colleagues in cosponsoring a bill to establish a Countryside Development Commission. This bill is designed to explore every possibility for the encouragement of sound economic growth and development in the countryside.

The industrial world must be made aware of the fact that rural areas have much to offer them. The human and other natural resources are in such abundance that industry should look to such areas for future expansion and location. One of the purposes of the Commission would be to communicate these facts to industry and guide our towns and villages in putting their best foot forward to attract such development. This proposed Commission would bring to light the many opportunities and possibilities for improving the economies of rural communities that are not now apparent.

It has been my longstanding contention that achieving adequate farm income comprises the first necessary step in solving rural problems, and we must continue to work for better commodity prices. But we must also look at the total countryside picture and utilize our valuable resources to the best advantage. The Countryside Development Commission would take us a giant step toward the realization of our full potential.

PAN AM'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE "VISIT U.S.A." PROGRAM

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to learn of an enterprising endeavor that will assist foreign visitors to this country. Pan American Airways has published a booklet which will provide inside information much desired by foreigners traveling within the United States.

The pamphlet, called "Pan Am Makes the Going Great to the U.S.A.," is available in French, German, Italian, Japanese, Portuguese, and Spanish, as well as English. There is plenty of information on what to see and where to go, but the emphasis is on preparing visitors for getting along in a new environment.

An explanation of the American currency system, complete with illustrations, is designed to get visitors off on the right financial foot. Another useful chart shows typical prices for everything from meals to dry cleaning. There is a description, too of American tipping practices, one of the most misunderstood of American customs.

Other sections explain American eating and drinking habits, including what goes into a dry martini. There is also information on shopping, climate, weights and measures, telephone, telegraph, and mail service. A two-page map indicates major roads, cities, and points of interest. Road and traffic signs are explained, too. A section on accommodations covers everything from hotels and motels to camps and accommodations for young people.

A booklet is being offered without charge to Pan Am customers in 50 countries by direct mail, and will soon be available at Pan Am sales offices around the world. It is part of Pan Am's contribution to the "Visit U.S.A." program. Also, the airline is offering maps of 10 leading U.S. cities in six languages, and maintains a Visitors Hospitality Center in the Pan Am Building in New York City.

Mr. Speaker, I think Pan Am has done a wonderful job here in promoting the "Visit U.S.A." concept and is to be congratulated on this latest contribution, in addition to its considerable efforts in the past to attract visitors to this country.

TWO STATE GI'S DIE IN VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Sgt. Richard L. Shuck and Sp4. Franklin B. Gilbert, two fine young men from Maryland, were killed recently in Vietnam. I wish to commend their courage and honor their memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

TWO STATE GI'S DIE IN VIETNAM: SEABROOK, HAVRE DE GRACE MEN ARE CASUALTIES

Two more soldiers from Maryland have been killed in the war in Vietnam, the Defense Department reported yesterday.

They were identified as: Sgt. Richard L. Shuck, 21, of Seabrook, who died from wounds he received last Monday. Sergeant Shuck served in Company D, 135th Infantry, 4th Infantry Division. Spec. 4 Franklin B. Gilbert, 20, of Havre de Grace, who died after the helicopter in which he was a crew chief crashed near Long Thanh last Saturday.

Specialist Gilbert, who served in the 1st Squadron, 19th Cavalry, 1st Air Cavalry Division, graduated from Havre de Grace High School in June 1966. He was drafted a year later and assigned to Vietnam in June, 1968. He was due home in four months.

LETTER HOME

In his last letter home he told his mother that the soldier sent to replace him had been shot February 1. "I'll never see him again," he wrote. "He was hurt pretty bad and they sent him to Japan.

"Mother, I'll never forget Vietnam," he added, "It's made a big impression on my mind."

His mother, Mrs. Mildred E. Keithley, of Havre de Grace, said Specialist Gilbert was concerned about the growing racial tensions in the United States, while Negro and white soldiers fought together in Vietnam.

PLAYED FOOTBALL

Specialist Gilbert played halfback on the varsity football team in high school, where he was elected "best personality" his senior year.

Ten years ago he received a merit award from Henry J. Loeblein, mayor of Havre de Grace, when he was a patrol leader on a school bus that was involved in an accident.

"He was only 10 years old," his mother said yesterday, "and he laid the driver down because he was hurt bad and he kept the children under control until help came."

In addition to his mother, Specialist Gilbert is survived by a brother, SFC Lloyd H. Gilbert, who is stationed at Fort Meade.

His father, Lloyd Gilbert, who was known as Babby, died when he was an infant.

Sergeant Shuck, a graduate of Central Senior High School in Seat Pleasant, planned to attend Prince Georges Community College on his return home. He was due to leave Vietnam in June.

Before he was drafted in June, 1967, he worked as the assistant manager at the Thom McCann shoe store at the Penn-Marr Shopping Center in Forestville, Maryland.

"HATED" THE WAR

He rose to the rank of sergeant within his first year of service, his sister Bonnie Shuck said yesterday, but he wanted to leave the Vietnam war. "He hated it," she said. "He didn't want to be over there. He wanted to be home. But he made the best of a terrible situation."

He is survived by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Paul F. Shuck, of Seabrook, Md., his sister Bonnie and another sister, Vicki Shuck, and two brothers, Mike Shuck and Mark Shuck.

HOW MUCH ELECTORAL REFORM?

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the debate over electoral reform much of the argument in opposition to a direct popular election of the President has centered on the issue that the smaller States would not approve such a change because of the advantage they enjoy under the present system. However, I have long believed that the smaller States are deceiving themselves if they believe that they actually gain political leverage in presidential politics by having a disproportionate number of electoral college votes. Anyone who watches presidential campaigns realizes that the candidates focus their efforts on the larger, more populated States, regardless of the apportionment of the electoral college. My State, Oregon, is considered one of the smaller States, and according to this argument should be opposed to a direct popular election. However, throughout my campaign I mentioned the possibility of replacing the electoral college with a direct popular election and received overwhelming support for the idea.

An editorial appeared in the February 27 edition of the Christian Science Monitor encouraging Congress to make a complete change in our presidential election system now, without fear of obstruction from the smaller States. I include this editorial in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

HOW MUCH ELECTORAL REFORM?

The case for revising the method by which the United States selects its president is tremendously strong. The question at this moment is whether the most widely recommended reform—direct, popular election—could be agreed upon by Congress and the states in time for 1972.

President Nixon, in his special message to Congress, usefully calls attention to this time factor. No one wants another near brush with the disaster of deadlock as almost happened last year. Mr. Nixon enunciates a change which, by administration calculation, is least likely to stir resistance and delay. He proposes simply that the electoral vote in each state be allocated according to the popular vote won by each presidential candidate. He would make the electoral count automatic—abolishing the individual electors (and any prospect that they could vote their individual whims). And he would make a 40 percent plurality sufficient to elect a president; if no candidate won this much, there would be a runoff election, featuring the two top candidates.

The President says he is not "wedded" to any particular reform. Public opinion polls show that 80 percent of the nation's voters favor direct, popular-vote election of the president. So do the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the American Bar Association, and a number of other organizations. But there is apprehension that in Congress some legislators from the smaller states would vote against this plan as eliminating the weight these states carry under the Electoral College system (each state gets two statewide electoral votes representing, in effect, its two senators).

Is it better to risk all, now when tempers are keen for revision, by attempting a complete switch to popular election, or is it safer to accept merely a modification of the electoral system, so as to have something on the books by 1972? The country should ponder this carefully.

Resolutions are pending in House and Senate for all shades of change. Any constitutional amendment requires approval by a two-thirds majority in both House and Senate, then ratification by the legislatures of three quarters of the 50 states. The requirement is, intentionally, tough and searching.

We should keep in mind what the reform is intended to accomplish: First, to assure that no third-party candidate can deadlock the election as threatened last year and thus initiate a hectic period of wheeling and dealing for electoral votes or send the election into the House of Representatives. Then, that it never happen again that the Electoral College gives the election to one candidate when another candidate has won the popular vote.

The time for tailoring an effective constitutional amendment is at hand.

CAPT. ANTHONY S. PAGONI

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most distinguished soldiers of my home city of Waterbury, Conn., has just retired after 20 years of service with the U.S. Air Force.

Capt. Anthony S. Pagoni started service in 1942 in the enlisted reserves and retired January 31, 1969, as a captain. At the time of his retirement he received the Distinguished Flying Cross and the Air Medal.

Captain Pagoni's career ranged from Oklahoma to Wiesbaden, Germany, and from Mississippi to Bien Hoa, Vietnam. His range of activity included acting as an instructor, testing fighter planes, and supervising safety and flight operations.

His career has been an outstanding example of devotion to duty and I want to express the appreciation that his fellow citizens feel for his service and to wish him every success and happiness in his retirement.

I include herewith an article on Captain Pagoni's retirement which appeared in the Waterbury American on February 26:

CITY NATIVE HONORED BY AIR CORPS

Capt. Anthony S. Pagoni, a Waterbury native, has received the Distinguished Flying Cross and Air Medal with seven Oak Leaf clusters.

The medals were awarded for his action in Vietnam on Feb. 29, 1968. The citation reads in part: "On that date, Capt. Pagoni was flying in support of a friendly force that was engaged in heavy contact with hostile forces. While preparing to mark the target area, he observed eight friendly personnel in the target area, and prevented a major accident. Capt. Pagoni then directed combat support missions against the hostile positions."

Pagoni was born in Waterbury Sept. 28, 1920, son of the late Salvatore and Filomena Pagoni. He attended Crosby High School, Post College, and the University of Maryland.

He entered the Air Corps on Oct. 2, 1942, and was discharged in 1945. He was recalled to active duty for the Korean conflict in 1951, when he served as an instructor pilot for jet aircraft.

Pagoni, discharged Jan. 31, is not sure about his future plans.

DEPARTURE OF DR. PACKER IS LOSS TO POSTAL SERVICE

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, it was a great disappointment to me when I learned of the resignation of Dr. Leo S. Packer as Assistant Postmaster General for Research and Engineering.

Dr. Packer was the first man to occupy this position in the Department, and he has served with great distinction in a demanding assignment.

The research and engineering activity of the Department is off on the right track, it seems to me, and I had hoped that Dr. Packer would be able to continue to give his professional experience and leadership to the program he has charted.

Dr. Packer came to the Post Office Department in 1966 with outstanding credentials and experience in the private sector. He was previously in charge of specialized Government research and development contracts at the Xerox Corp. Prior to that he headed the instrumentation section at Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory in Buffalo, N.Y., and also the space and defense division of Bausch & Lomb, Inc., in Rochester, N.Y.

Dr. Packer's task, upon accepting this newly created sub-Cabinet post, was to reorganize the Department's neglected and inadequate research and engineering activities. He was to obtain for them the stature and the backing which is required, if the Department is to deal adequately with today's and tomorrow's mail load.

In looking ahead to the critically needed modernization of the postal service, I was much impressed by the practical approach which he gave to his assignment. He was not looking for "gadgets" or high-sounding procedures, but rather he was seeking realistic answers not only for now but also for decades ahead.

During the first formative years of the Bureau of Research and Engineering, Dr. Packer can be credited with building a purposeful professional spirit in postal technology activities. He initiated a vigorous recruiting program to bring into the Bureau qualified engineers and technicians from private industry, government, and the academic community. Not only were manpower growth objectives satisfied in a timely fashion, but the quality and competence of the new personnel speak well for the future of postal engineering.

Early in 1967, Dr. Packer organized the Research and Engineering Advisory Council—REAC—a group of nationally respected engineers, scientists, and leaders of industry and business, to act as an advisory "Board of Directors" for the Bureau of Research and Engineering, with direct access to the Postmaster General. This council is responsible for many constructive and imaginative recommendations for expanding and accelerating technology programs for the Post Office Department. Most of the recommendations have been carried out or are in process of being carried out. Some of the most advanced thinking and expertise in the country have been applied to the difficult problems of postal technology—with a potential of very important results in the future.

Dr. Packer is credited with initiating and pushing several important new programs that had not been conceived or implemented in previous years. A considerable step forward in standards for mail to achieve compatibility with postal processing machines was taken recently, with the support of Congress and of the business community. We now have published standards for Government-generated mail and we are moving rapidly toward meaningful standards for business-generated mail.

Also, during the past year, optical character reading machines have achieved a dramatic improvement in performance effectiveness and have become operational in several large cities. An imaginative research program to develop future generations of automatic address reading equipment is now being carried out.

A very promising new program to develop a fully automatic mail processing system involving code indications on mail, which can be read at high speeds by relatively inexpensive readers, is in the early stages of development. If successful, this approach can revolutionize the sorting and distribution of mail, particularly in large cities.

It is unfortunately true that modern industrial engineering techniques have not been applied to improving the operation and working environment of post offices throughout the country. Recognizing this deficiency and the immense potential for improvement of postal operations and efficiency, Dr. Packer greatly expanded the industrial engineering staff and turned its emphasis to field operations. These engineers are now operating in the field, conducting technical studies and suggesting required improvements. With the cooperation and support of postal headquarters and field management, the industrial engineering program is expected to expand rapidly and show tangible short-term results.

To improve the construction engineering work of the Bureau, Dr. Packer brought in several outstanding managers and engineers. He developed modern management and control techniques, and sought to upgrade the effectiveness of the regional engineering branches in the field. By providing technical support, manpower assistance, and funding when needed, the Bureau of Research and Engineering has encouraged the field engineering branches to assume larger responsibilities and upgrade their competence. This will permit the process of decentralization to provide more responsive technical support in the field—a necessary requirement for applying modern concepts and techniques to solve problems in the field.

In less than 3 years, Dr. Packer led the Bureau of Research and Engineering to a status of established professional credibility. The scientific, engineering, and business people of the private sector are much more aware than ever before of the problems and opportunities of postal technology. Some of the outstanding research and development firms in the country are under contract to the Post Office Department.

With relatively modest expenditures for postal technology, we are beginning to see significant results and improvements, and I am confident that more dramatic and substantial developments will come from the long range programs now being pursued. Although technology is not the only ingredient in improving the postal service, it is an indispensable one. I feel that the Bureau of Research and Engineering, created by Congress two and a half years ago, has made splendid progress under Dr. Packer's direction. We now have a strong foundation for the future.

But we must still recognize that the Post Office Department faces a crisis in handling the mail. Its basic system is outdated, its facilities are outmoded, and it is hampered on all sides by archaic rules and limitations in its effort to make corrections.

What is needed is a major overhaul of the Department such as I have proposed in H.R. 4, the broad postal reform bill which I introduced on the opening day of the 91st Congress.

Dr. Packer warrants our sincere gratitude for his contributions to the betterment of the postal service. It is to be regretted that he has left before the shackles could be released by law and the Department given the authority to carry out realistically the responsibilities it has been assigned.

JOBS PROGRAM ATTACKS THE PROBLEM OF HARD-CORE UNEMPLOYED

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the District Fifty News, February 25, 1969:

JOBS PROGRAM ATTACKS THE PROBLEM OF HARD-CORE UNEMPLOYED

Today's chronically unemployed, unlike those of the 30's, are not merely the victims of an economic cycle. They are the permanently poor. Their plight is accentuated rather than eased by America's growing affluence. They sink deeper into the sediment of society while scores of millions of their neighbors are productively employed and thousands of new jobs are created each day. Their situation does not get better with the passage of time. It gets worse.

Hard-core poverty is a heavy burden for the country. Each year billions of dollars are lost in income and spent on welfare because of unemployment. But there is a greater cost, a human one.

Lacking job skills, work experience, education or social acceptance, the hard-core unemployed remain jobless and hopeless. And so do their children. And their children's children.

For these people, the American dream—that everyone with a strong back and a willing heart can get a job and progress to the limit of his ability—is a hollow one. Its echoes produce human despair and are a primary cause of the physical deterioration of our cities.

The urban crisis intensifies during the summer when schools close and millions of young people throng the streets of the inner-city with no constructive outlet for their energies. Many of these youth are poor, many are Negro or other minority group members, and they are trapped in the heat and the squalor of the nation's ghettos.

The seriousness of the problem has led government and business to explore new roads to manpower use. The National Alliance of Businessmen—the JOBS program—is a major step in this effort.

In the past year, thousands of private firms working with the Alliance have successfully hired and trained hard-core people for work previously performed only by those already educated and trained.

But the Alliance is a continuing effort, for thousands upon thousands of hard-core unemployed people, whose potential is just as great, still lack the opportunity to use and develop their ability. Six out of seven jobs in the United States and the knowledge and ability to train people for these jobs exists in private industry.

With this in mind, the President proposed a partnership between government and business, a partnership joining industry resources for hiring and training and government resources for identifying and locating the unemployed to fill these jobs.

Many who are presently unemployed can become productive members of our economy by simple changes in existing entry level standards. But many others require special programs in recruiting, training, counseling, etc., which add substantially to normal industrial personnel costs.

To underwrite these costs, Congress has appropriated funds to reimburse industry for the extraordinary costs of hiring and training the hard-core. The mechanism is a simple contract with the Department of Labor. The National Alliance of Businessmen has a single purpose: to solicit, recruit for, and fill, jobs in the business sector for the hard-core unemployed.

Providing jobs and training for the hard-core unemployed will not by itself end poverty in this nation. Employment is only part of the answer for disadvantaged and minority groups. But it is an indispensable part of the final solution, and with the cooperation of local union members working along with the disadvantaged members of the program, helping to instill confidence and self-respect, the program will succeed.

Underscoring the importance attached to the Alliance program, President Richard Nixon announced an important meeting to be held in Washington next month to chart plans for an intensified effort in the coming year. In a telegram to District 50 President Elwood Moffett, Mr. Nixon said, "I invite you to join with members of my cabinet, chief executives of America's leading companies, State Governors, Mayors of the Nation's largest cities and national labor leaders in an important meeting with NAB Executive Board members. I look forward to having you join personally in this vital effort."

District 50 has cooperated fully with the goals of the JOBS program and will continue to work on this important goal in the year to come.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEGISLATION

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I and four of my colleagues representing the city of Philadelphia in the Congress of the United States introduced a bill which will greatly increase the availability of postsecondary education to all segments of the population by establishing a program of Federal grants to the States for the purpose of strengthening, improving, and developing comprehensive community colleges.

The community college is as much a social movement as it is an educational enterprise. It is perhaps closer to realizing the concept of a "people's college" than any other institution in the United States. The community college continues to demonstrate that it is best equipped for the job of expanding educational opportunity in this Nation. Its low cost to students, flexible admissions arrangement, strong counseling and advising services, and varied educational programs are responding to the lack of relevance in traditional education. Yet the Federal Government has failed in its duty to encourage these colleges to expand their efforts even though they represent almost one-half of the institutions of higher learning and enroll about one-third of all students pursuing a higher education.

Some people will no doubt ask why we need yet another program to provide Federal aid to education. The reasons are legion. There are 13 major cities in the United States without a single public community college within their city limits. In addition to the problem of inadequate 2-year college space, we face the imbalanced allocation of Federal resources from existing programs. Out of the 24 institutional support programs administered by the Office of Education, junior colleges take part in only six. Community colleges are last in line when funds are released because they must compete with the monolithic multiversities. An even greater imbalance exists in individual assistance allotments. Although 2-year colleges represent about one-third of the student population, their share of student aid funds is dangerously low. Community colleges get only 4 percent of the national defense student loan funds, 6 percent of the educational opportunity loans, and 15 percent of the college work-study assistance. To add insult to injury, there is no bureau or division within the Office of Education which is specifically charged with administering existing programs and developing new ones for the plethora of community colleges in this country.

The pace of knowledge has accelerated so quickly in the past few years that the world we live in no longer views a high school diploma as terminal. It demands continuing education. It pressures the Nation's youth to seek at least 2 years of college in order to survive. But how can they survive if now, when their need is greatest, this additional education is farthest from their reach. How can they get started when institutions judge them wholly on past performance and completely disregard future potential? How do they finance their higher education when we set an arbitrary standard of ability over need? And how do we demonstrate the necessity of a 4- or 5-year investment in a college education when the curriculum offered is so often irrelevant to their needs?

The answer to these questions can be found in part in the community college. The community junior college seems to be made for the job of extending and expanding opportunities for education beyond high school. The curriculum offered grows out of the needs of society and the community, and out of the personal and social requirements of the students. It is designed to fill personnel requirements in fragmenting professional fields; provide a new trust in urban education; and provide the key to open doors to new careers. These institutions have demonstrated their ability to respond to society's changing needs in ways that bring improvement to the communities they serve.

The example of the Philadelphia Community College points this out quite well. It was established in 1965 on the premises of the old Snellenburg Department Store and in that first year enrolled 1,200 full- and part-time students. In September of 1966 enrollment had grown to 3,200, in September of 1967 to 4,600, and in September of 1968 to 6,000. In September of 1968, there were openings for some 1,500 freshmen and some 2,500 applications for these openings. Dr. Allen T. Bonnell, president of the school estimates that at the beginning of the next school year there will be openings for some 1,800 new students and applications for these openings will total about 5,000. The school has rapidly outgrown its original campus. Negotiations are now underway for a second campus but Dr. Bonnell estimated that there will be a need for a third campus before these negotiations are completed.

The Philadelphia Community College offers a wide range of programs; some designed to prepare students to go on to other institutions to complete their college education; some oriented toward occupational training and an associate degree in applied science; some toward technical careers in subject areas such as engineering, human service careers such as police and fire protection as well as teaching. Over one-half of those students who graduate move immediately into full-time employment.

In addition, the school operates several special education programs such as one for employees of the city's department of licenses and inspections. Here 25 employees at a time are instructed in the importance of their jobs and how they should be carried out in the urban environment in which they work.

The Philadelphia school has a full-time faculty of 180, 80 part-time faculty members, and 125 support staff. About 20 percent of the full-time students enrolled are from minority groups and 30 percent of the part-time students.

Certainly, the Philadelphia Community College is serving an essential need of the city. It could do more. The bill which we have introduced yesterday will help achieve this end for the Philadelphia Community College and others like it across the country.

There is much enthusiasm throughout the country for this bill. This in itself should be sufficient mandate for us to extend this program to community colleges across the country. We must take our commitment to this effort every bit as seriously as we have those to elementary and secondary education as well as vocational and higher education.

A HOUSE DIVIDED: NIXON'S CHALLENGE

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, Lincoln's Birthday is a traditional day for political speechmaking throughout the Nation. Much of this speaking is devoted to recapitulation of the words and deeds of this great President who saved the Union. This annual tribute keeps the torch of Lincoln's greatness burning in the heart of every American as a living flame.

Out of the vast bulk of rhetoric and praise delivered on this last Lincoln Day, however, has come what I believe is a truly outstanding speech. Oregon Secretary of State Clay Myers, a brilliant young public servant from my State, delivered this address at the Curry County Lincoln Day dinner. It is titled "A House Divided: The Agony of Lincoln, the Challenge of Nixon." In it he has shown the similarities between the problems faced by President Lincoln and those, today, which face our President Nixon.

Mr. Myers' speech succeeds in applying the legendary greatness of Lincoln to the problems faced by this Nation and its President today. It is a clear and incisive effort showing the lessons of our past as applicable to our Nation's future. I would like to present Mr. Myers' address at this time and commend to my colleagues as an excellent presentation of the challenge faced by our 37th President:

A HOUSE DIVIDED: THE AGONY OF LINCOLN, THE CHALLENGE OF NIXON

(By Clay Myers, secretary of state, Curry County Republican Central Committee, Lincoln Day Dinner, February 14, 1969)

It is entirely fitting that we should gather here tonight to honor and pay tribute to the memory of Abraham Lincoln. By any measure or standard, he was one of the truly great men this country, or any other country, has produced, in any age.

His life, his accomplishments, his remarkable writings, have inspired succeeding generations, here and abroad, as have those of few other men in world history. Though he was the absolute epitome of an American, his extraordinary qualities have had relevance and meaning to people generally, regardless of nationality, race or religion.

Abraham Lincoln's simple virtues—his honesty, his dry wit, his humility and his plainness—all typify the American spirit, and reaffirm to us that those qualities are to be admired and emulated particularly in a modern and sophisticated society.

Anecdotes about his life—when he fought and beat the village bully; how he studied and pored over borrowed books by firelight; how he rose from humble origins to lead his nation—have become part of our basic folklore. And through these stories, we transmit the moral and ethical values of our culture to our children.

Abraham Lincoln's importance to this nation is abundantly demonstrated in the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, D.C., where his great, brooding presence is captured and preserved in that statue, which seems so paternal, so wise and strong and, at the same time, so hauntingly sad.

There was a deep sorrow about Lincoln, and only a moment's reflection explains why. It was the agony of Lincoln that the great man of peace, that grave, gentle spirit, was a "war president."

By the time Lincoln moved into the White House, the dark issue of slavery had already torn the nation asunder, hopelessly dividing the people, pitting father against son and brother against brother.

He had foreseen the crisis and said so in a speech in Springfield, Illinois, on June 16, 1858:

"In my opinion, agitation will not cease until a crisis shall have been reached and passed. A house divided against itself cannot stand. I believe this government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved—I do not expect the house to fall—but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing, or all the other. Either the opponents of slavery will arrest the further spread of it, and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction; or its advocates will push it forward till it shall become alike lawful in all the States, old as well as new, North as well as South."

Lincoln was nominated on the third ballot in the 1859 Republican National Convention as a compromise candidate, after his favored and more politically popular opponent, William Seward, adopted a hard-line Abolitionist position.

His election had been virtually assured a month earlier when the Democrats had broken themselves apart on the slavery question at their convention. Though Lincoln won by a margin of about 500,000 votes over his next opponent, Stephen A. Douglas, Lincoln was still a minority president since there were four candidates in the race, and the combined total of the other three far exceeded his 1,800,000 votes.

But he was never given a chance to pull the nation together. Scarcely three months after Lincoln took the oath of office, Fort Sumpter was fired upon, and the cruel war between the states began.

Throughout those long and bloody years of the Civil War, until he fell mortally wounded by the assassin's bullet in Ford's Theater the night of April 14, 1865, Lincoln's foremost thought was to preserve the Union.

Lincoln despised slavery as an abomination among men, and there was no question about his position on the controversy, though he had avoided a blatant abolitionist stance. However, it was secondary in his mind to preservation of the Union, as became abundantly clear in his message at the time of the Emancipation Proclamation:

"My paramount object is to save the Union, and not either to save or destroy slavery. If I could save the Union without freeing any slave, I would do it; if I could save it by freeing all the slaves, I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing some and leaving others alone, I would also do that."

Lincoln was struck down before his remarkable leadership could be applied to reuniting the North and the South into a cohesive nation. But there is no doubt that had he lived, it would have been his first order of business and his over-riding preoccupation.

And had he lived, he would have approached the task with a practical and realistic attitude. He said once:

"I am for the people of the whole nation doing just as they please in all matters which concern the whole nation; for that of each part doing just as they choose in all matters which concern no other part; and for each individual doing just as he chooses in all matters which concern nobody else."

Now, a little more than 100 years later, another United States President finds himself with a divided nation, with a people torn by controversy and suspicion.

In many ways, President Richard Nixon faces problems that are nearly as divisive and dangerous, and certainly far more complex in nature, than those confronted by President Lincoln when he took office.

Our nation, wracked by internal conflicts and hostile factions, suffered shock after shock during 1968, certainly one of the worst years in our history. Any other country with a less elastic system of government could not possibly have survived intact after such upheavals.

It was, and still is, a time of extraordinary stress, when opposing points of view seem rigid and unbending, and the national temperature has been pushed up to the fever level.

A "generation gap" has pitted age against youth, in virtually every conceivable area, from the campus to the courthouse.

The Black Revolution, with its attendant problems of poverty, the urban ghetto and unemployment, seems to have widened the breach between the Negro and Caucasian segments of our population.

The war in Vietnam has provoked an emotional and intellectual division among our people that is without parallel in our history.

These are just three of the crises that are dividing our house today as President Nixon assumes the reins of government. Each relates to the other; each has ramifications and implications far beyond the perimeters of its own area.

Let us examine each for a moment in an attempt to understand where we and the Nixon administration are at this point in time.

Hopefully, the issue of the Vietnam war is past its peak, especially if the delegates to the Peace Conference in Paris begin to make some headway in their talks.

But, without question, this has been the nation's most unpopular war—if war, indeed, can ever be popular—while its staggering cost has been magnified by our pressing domestic needs.

There are signs that the South Vietnamese are beginning to assume a larger role in their own defense, and that the time may not be too distant when substantial numbers of our forces can be brought home.

Any prolonged delay, or sudden flareup in the conflict, however, will arouse and antagonize the deep resentment and division among our people about our presence in Southeast Asia.

In order to keep those factions quiescent, President Nixon will have to show evidence of steady progress toward peace. If talks bog down badly, there will be increased pressure to resume the fighting at a heightened level.

The Black-White issue is interwoven with the very roots of this nation, though few concerned themselves with it, as such, until just this last decade.

The first slaves were brought to the North American continent about 350 years ago in 1619. The subjugation of the Black man has been perpetuated—physically, culturally and economically—until it culminated in recent years in violent outbreaks, loss of life and vast destruction of property.

As Lincoln was plagued by the abolition question, so Nixon must deal with desegregation of the schools, enforcement of open housing laws, expanded vocational opportunity and general Black militancy.

President Nixon did not receive the support of most Blacks during the election campaign, and now many of their leaders, even including such moderates as Roy Wilkins, National Director of the NAACP, will be watching carefully to see whether the President intends to move forward in the whole Civil Rights area, or whether he will tacitly allow the status quo to continue.

Black spokesmen have said that the President does not have much time in which to move. The "grace" period will run out very quickly, and if positive action does not occur, we could well see a White-Black confrontation in the streets and suburbs of our cities that will make what has happened up to now look like child's play.

The conflict between the younger and adult generations is one President Lincoln never encountered. It has been produced by a radical revolution in our system of standards and values since the end of World War II.

The implications of this dilemma are profoundly serious and far-reaching, for a sizable part of a generation, now in our high schools and on our college and university campuses, has become alienated from the adult population.

These young people appear thoroughly disillusioned with many of our traditional democratic processes, particularly since thousands of them tried to work through those processes in the Eugene McCarthy campaign last year, and failed utterly and miserably.

These youngsters oppose the draft; they scorn careers in business and the professions; they protest our presence in Vietnam; and they are seeking a greater voice in their own education.

To a greater or lesser degree, these are all movements which break with tradition; and adult resistance to some of these changes has stimulated counteraction that is frequently expressive and violent.

The overwhelming point—one which is frequently missed—is not what dismay or confusion the adult generation may be undergoing now because of the attitudes of youth; but rather what will happen in just a few short years when those under the age of 25 will be in the absolute majority in this nation?

Will it signal, for example, the end of our traditional two-party political system? It well could, if present signs are any accurate indication. Recent surveys have shown that more youngsters consider themselves to be independent politically than identify with either the Democratic or the Republican parties.

Here again, President Nixon has his work cut out for him. It is no secret that he was not the choice of youth in the recent presidential election, certainly not, at least, in the number and with the fervor that McCarthy and Senator Kennedy attracted them. Nor has President Nixon shown substantial evidence that he can arouse and motivate the idealism and patriotism of youth the way President Kennedy did.

As a political figure, Mr. Nixon was not able to do it in the past. As President of the United States, he must be able to do it in the future.

The plain fact is that President Johnson first antagonized many of the youth of this Nation and crystallized their rebellion against the government.

Now President Nixon must find a way to win them back into the mainstream of our society, and renew their faith in this Nation and its fundamental principles.

It seems clear, then, that there are some remarkable parallels here, some close similarities that should evoke thoughtful evaluation and considered action.

Both Lincoln and Nixon assumed office during periods of critical disunity and dissension.

For Lincoln, it was too late. The charge had already been set and the fuse lighted. He was powerless to snuff out the burning and prevent the explosion, however much he personally desired to do so.

For President Nixon, there may yet be time; though some perhaps would argue that again the forces in motion are on an irreversible course, that too much hate and alienation has developed for any reconciliation to occur.

But perhaps it is not too optimistic to say that he has some time yet—a little time—to develop programs and to present a philosophy that can draw this nation and its disparate parts together again.

Certainly he knows, better than anyone else, the enormity of the task that lies before him. His inaugural address, which was studied in its caution but moving in its hope and determination, revealed that knowledge. And his slogan, "Forward Together," demonstrated his understanding of the challenge, as well as his resolve to meet it squarely.

Let us remember now that, whatever his desire and good intentions, President Nixon cannot achieve this monumental goal unaided.

If ever a leader needed the support and help of his people, it is President Nixon in this critical hour.

Let us recall the agony of Lincoln and his "House Divided," and let us have sufficient insight to recognize that President Nixon is similarly troubled.

Without the conscious goodwill and effort of the American people, he will surely fail, and the chasms among us will widen and deepen as each day passes.

With our support, even with the best that is within us to contribute, it is still problematical whether these wounds can be bound up.

Let us begin here and now to change our attitude, and to curb our bickering and carping criticisms about each other. Let us begin to stress the positive similarities among us.

Let us bury old prejudices and turn our faces toward the hope of a new time and fresh beginning.

Let us live together in this favored House, in unity and harmony, working together toward a fulfillment of our founding fathers' vision of what we might become.

Let us remember daily that the best man among us cannot lead if we are not prepared to follow, and instead go off willfully in different directions.

Let us do this, you and I, so that "this nation, under God, shall not perish from the earth."

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF MUSEUMS PROPOSES TAX CHANGE TO HELP RELIEVE FINANCIAL PLIGHT OF MUSEUMS

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of our colleagues the most significant testimony of Mr. Kyran M. McGrath, director of the American Association of Museums, before the House Ways and Means Committee on February 26.

As we know, the committee is holding hearings on tax reform proposals and Mr. McGrath has directed his testimony to the need for a change in section 170 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code to extend to museums the same treatment by which certain other charitable and publicly supported organizations now benefit under these provisions covering charitable contributions.

It seems to me to be highly inequitable and unrealistic that under present law individuals making contributions to museums are not eligible for the additional 10 percent deduction from their adjusted gross income which applies to gifts to churches, hospitals, educational organizations, governmental units, and publicly supported charities. So I strongly endorse the proposal to specifically include museums in this category.

The need for such a change was brought most vividly to my attention on February 10, when the Newark City Council voted to close the city's library system and Museum of Art on April 1 for budgetary reasons.

It is appalling to envision a city of the importance and character of Newark with no museum or library facilities available to the public, and I find it incredible that budget cuts in this vital area were even considered.

I immediately explored the possibilities for Federal aid on an emergency basis, but unfortunately found no assistance available. There are no existing programs to aid museums, and all funds for fiscal year 1969 under the Library Services and Construction Act have already been committed. Fortunately, the aroused reaction of the citizens of Newark and the surrounding communities who use the museum and library facilities appears to be having an appreciable impact, for at a subsequent meeting the council stated it will make every effort to find the necessary funds to avoid closing these facilities so essential to the educational and cultural life of Newark and its surrounding communities.

I would like at this point, Mr. Speaker, to include Mr. McGrath's testimony in the RECORD:

TAX-REFORM-CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS

(Statement of Kyran M. McGrath, director of the American Association of Museums, before the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, February 26, 1969)

The American Association of Museums was founded in 1906 to promote the goals of museums as cultural and educational centers in America. I am Kyran M. McGrath, director of the organization. The Association represents over 1,000 museum members, in addition to approximately 3,500 individuals, plus some libraries and corporations.

It is virtually impossible for some of the country's most needy museums to qualify under section 170(b).

I am here today to represent one group of charitable organizations which has suffered under current Revenue laws relating to charitable contributions. Under Section 170(b) of the 1954 Code, individuals may deduct an additional 10% of their adjusted gross income for contributions made to a select group of charitable organizations—a group limited to churches, hospitals, educational organizations, government units, and publicly supported charities. Despite recent attempts by Congress (in the Revenue Act of 1964) to broaden the latter category, current Treasury Regulations make it virtually impossible for some of the country's most needy museums to qualify for this special treatment. Treasury Regulation, Section 1.170-2(a)(3), for example, defines an "educational organization" as "one whose primary function is the presentation of formal instruction and which normally maintains a regular faculty and curriculum and normally has a regularly enrolled body of pupils or students in attendance at the place where its educational activities are regularly carried on." Thus, "a recognized university which incidentally operates a museum is an educational organization," but a museum with an active program of education is not.

Similar obstacles are raised by the Treasury Regulations in their definition of "publicly supported" organizations; Section 1:170(b)(5), for example includes all amounts received by an organization from a governmental unit, but excludes most substantial donations by individuals or families when determining whether an organization is "publicly supported." This gives State and Federal Governments the uncontradicted power to determine which organizations qualify for the additional deduction. For example, militarily useful organizations are encouraged while privately supported museums, providing a clear, public function, are forced into increasingly difficult financial plights.

Newark Museum of Art operating funds threatened with city cutoff.

In Newark, New Jersey, we see an example of the dependence of the municipally supported Newark Museum of Art for governmental and private support. Last week, the City Council of Newark deleted an appropriation item from the city's budget which would have provided the museum with $780,306.00. These funds would have met the museum's operating needs. If the City Council fails to reconsider its decision, the museum will be unable to operate unless alternate money is provided on an emergency basis by the state legislature or through private sources. With the discrimination against museums which are unable to meet the complex formula required by the IRS for that additional 10% charitable deduction, there is little likelihood of receiving this alternate funding from private sources. The Newark City Council is scheduled to reexamine its decision March 11th, and this point hopefully will become moot as to 1969. However, the problem will remain to haunt the Newark Museum of Art, as well as museums in other cities which are under constant financial pressure. Private contributions are necessary for the continued existence of museums and the benefits they offer the public. These contributions should be encouraged by public officials.

Museums demonstrate their true public character when their doors are open and their treasures continually made available to the public.

We believe this situation represents a grave misconception of the functions served by museums in our society. From their inception, most American museums have had an educational as well as a cultural mission. In recent years, museums have devoted more and more of their resources to this educational responsibility, often in spite of severe financial distress. This strong educational function should not be denied simply because museums do not grant degrees, or because they fulfill education necessities which most schools are not equipped to handle. Nor should museums be denied their true public character when their doors are open and their treasures continually made available to the public.

Propose that museums specifically be added to the list of charitable organizations in the select group designated by section 170(b).

With this situation in mind, we should like, with the Committee's permission, to make a specific proposal concerning future applications of Section 170(b) of the 1954 Code. We propose that museums specifically be added to the list of charitable organizations in the select group designated by Section 170(b). By museum we mean those organizations, regardless of how they are founded or continued, which meet prescribed standards of accreditation and which primarily serve public cultural and educational needs. We recommend that a different concept of what constitutes an educational or public organization be employed in the Treasury Regulations pertinent to this area. Specifically, we ask that the true cultural and educational public benefits of legitimate museums throughout the country be accorded their proper status and recognition by the Federal Government. The denial of an additional ten percent individual deduction is discriminatory against museums as a class. But the imposition of an *additional* limitation prohibiting an individual from taking any deduction at all until his contribution exceeds 2% or 3% of his adjusted gross income would likely be financially devastating to America's museums.

Preserve the deductibility feature at the fair market value of donated objects.

A particularly onerous proposal, as far as museums are concerned, would be the limiting of charitable deductions to the taxpayer's tax basis (usually the cost) for the item. This proposal strikes at the heart of museums, as the present treatment has been instrumental in providing museums with the cultural treasures which they preserve, interpret, and present to the public at large. Not only would museums continue to be hampered in their ability to obtain funds for operations, but their most vital functions of preservation, interpretation, and exhibition would be threatened. Again, such a proposal stems from a basic misconception of the public and educational services performed by museums. The very essence of a museum is its ability to preserve and display in an intelligible fashion the artistic, historic, and scientific heritage of the society in which we live. To weaken or destroy the museums' ability to perform this service would be tantamount to weakening the cultural and educational foundation on which our society rests.

And lest it be thought that the situation in Newark is unique, I would particularly note in closing Mr. McGrath's significant comment that:

The problem will remain to haunt the Newark Museum of Art, as well as museums in other cities which are under constant financial pressure. Private contributions are necessary for the continued existence of museums and the benefits they offer the public. These contributions should be encouraged by public officials.

HEADS OR TAILS, RUSSIA WINS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, when we as a nation face the complications in the world today, the obvious root of all problems is the belligerence of the Soviet Union and the determination of Communists to achieve world control.

Our State Department, by its bungling policies over the years, has contributed to the growth of Soviet power and the growth of Soviet influence.

This is effectively pointed out in the following Chicago Tribune editorial, Friday, February 28:

HEADS OR TAILS, RUSSIA WINS

For a foreign policy which is supposedly designed to obstruct the spread of communism, ours has been remarkably beneficial to the Soviet Union.

Take, as an example, our imports of nickel and chromium, both of which we consume in enormous quantities and have to buy almost entirely from other countries.

Not even Canada can supply all the nickel we need, so we have had to get some from other sources—including, in past years, some American-owned mines in Cuba. When Fidel Castro expropriated the mines, we blacklisted Cuban nickel and turned increasingly to the Soviet Union, which produces large amounts of the metal on land seized from Finland. Russia gladly sold us the nickel; and the higher it was able to push the prices, the gladder it was.

It now turns out that Russia has been getting nickel from Cuba and reselling this to us along with its own. The treasury department has reacted by banning the importing of certain types of nickel believed to be Cuban—and the result, we suppose, will be even higher prices for genuine Russian nickel.

And while Russia is benefiting from our anti-communist attitude toward Castro, it is benefiting also from our opposite attitude toward Rhodesia, where we have joined the Communists in a boycott of The Ian Smith government. We formerly got a large part of our chromium from Rhodesia, but, because of the boycott, we now buy increasing amounts from good old guess who—the Soviet Union.

It is bad enough when one foreign policy conflicts with our economic well-being, but when two opposing foreign policies both help Russia at our expense, it is time to wonder if something isn't wrong.

LETTER FROM SPORTSMEN'S CLUB

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from Mr. Hartwig Swenson, president of the Gibbon Sportsmen's Club. I believe his feelings on the Gun Control Act of 1968 reflect those of thousands of others across the Nation.

For the reference of the Members, I include his letter in the RECORD at this point.

GIBBON SPORTSMEN'S CLUB,
Gibbon, Minn., February 11, 1969.

From: The Gibbon Sportsmen's Club, Gibbon, Minnesota.

To: Congressman ANCHER NELSEN, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We, the sportsmen of Gibbon, Minnesota, whose membership is now over 500 strong, are very much concerned about the Gun Control Act of 1968 as it affects firearms and ammunition in the State of Minnesota.

Our club as a group opposes the proposed laws in regard to gun registration for law abiding citizens and sportsmen. We feel that our Constitutional Rights are being infringed upon. Under the Constitution, we were given the right to bear arms to protect our homes and property, plus the right to use our firearms for hunting.

This new Gun Control Law is placing undue pressure on the sportsmen and also the law abiding citizen. We realize that crime is completely out of hand in our State and in all other States. To pass a law that would require all citizens to register their guns, would in our opinion, not stop the rise of crime. The criminal, who in the past stole his guns and ammunition to commit crimes, will continue to do so, regardless of any law passed.

As it appears now, the only people who will feel the force of this law and who will have to pay additional money to have this law enforced, will be the sportsmen as a whole.

We agree something drastic must be done to stop this terrible rise in crime in our State. We also realize that it is the criminal element in our society which is causing the major concern to all law enforcement agencies.

It is our combined request and opinion that you, as our duly elected officers of our government do everything in your power to take the pressure off the sportsman and law abiding citizens in the State of Minnesota, and place the burden where it belongs, on the criminal elements in our cities and towns.

It was our vote which placed you into office to represent us. We are contacting every Sportsmen's Club in Minnesota to help fight against this gun registration law. Our combined forces will total to many thousands of members.

It has also been proposed to raise the price of hunting and fishing licenses in our State. As sportsmen, we understand that all our wildlife and fishing areas are in danger.

Our lakes and streams are being polluted with filth from careless persons through industry. Our wetlands are slowly being drained away. Most of our upland birds are gone. Still we are required to pay millions of dollars through license fees to combat this condition. This, plus a proposed additional fee on gun registration has every sportsman wondering just when all will end.

We propose that you, our official spokesman in government propose and help pass laws that will make it impossible for anyone with any criminal record to buy, steal or carry any deadly weapon. If the punishment is made severe enough and if the laws of our State back up that punishment to the full extent of the law, we are sure that most of the pressure now being placed on sportsmen and law abiding citizens will turn and have the pressure placed where it belongs, on those who willfully disobey our laws.

We don't need new laws. We need to have the laws we have enforced.

Sincerely,

HARTWIG SWENSON,
President.

TWO MARYLAND YOUNG MEN DIE IN VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Sp4c. James W. Leaf and Sp5c. Robert W. Hartsock, two fine young men from Maryland, were killed recently in Vietnam. I wish to commend their courage and honor their memories by including the following article in the RECORD:

TWO MORE MARYLAND GI'S DIE IN FIGHTING

The Department of Defense announced yesterday the names of two Maryland servicemen killed in Vietnam February 23.

They were:

Spec. 4 James W. Leaf, the husband of Mrs. Mildred A. Leaf, of 81 Carrollview avenue, Westminster.

Spec. 5 Robert W. Hartsock, of Route 1, Flintstone, an Allegany county community near Cumberland.

Specialist Hartsock's divorced wife, Mrs. Grace L. Hartsock, said yesterday that the Army told her the 24-year-old dog patrol scout was killed during a Viet Cong mortar attack Sunday.

She said Specialist Hartsock was stationed north of Saigon with the 25th Infantry Division.

Specialist Hartsock's only child, a boy named Dion Eric, will celebrate his sixth birthday Saturday, Mrs. Hartsock said.

The Cumberland native, who enlisted in the Army in August, 1967, was due to come home from Vietnam this May, Mrs. Hartsock said.

Besides his former wife, from whom he was divorced last April, and his son, Specialist Hartsock's survivors include his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Hartsock, of Cumberland; a sister, Mrs. Rita Trail, of Artemas, Pa., and a brother, R. Frederick Hartsock, of Flintstone.

Specialist Leaf's uncle, Vernon Leaf, Sr., of Reisterstown, said yesterday that the 20-year-old medical corpsman had been in Vietnam since the fall of 1968. The Mount Airy native had attended schools in that Carroll county community and in Reisterstown before enlisting in the Army.

He is survived by Mildred A. Leaf, his wife; his parents, Mr. and Mrs. R. Frank Leaf, of Reisterstown; an older sister, Grace L., and an older brother, Donald, both of Mount Airy.

FIREARMS LOBBY

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter dated June 17, 1968, signed by J. Elliott Corbett on the official stationery of the National Council for a Responsible Firearms Policy at 100 Maryland Avenue NE.

This letter makes very plain that that private lobby group does not seek responsible controls on firearms. Their purpose is not to restrain and prevent possession of firearms by drunks, felons, fugitives, narcotics addicts, and other unsuitable persons. On the contrary, this lobby seeks to strip law-abiding citizens of their right to have firearms for legitimate sporting and defense purposes.

American sportsmen, hunters, collectors, and target shooters should know that one of the early steps in the program of this group is the outlawing of handguns, and other body blows to the rights of law-abiding and responsible citizens and sportsmen as indicated in their letter which I now insert in the RECORD:

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR A RESPONSIBLE FIREARMS POLICY,
Washington, D.C., June 17, 1968.

DEAR MISS: Thanks for sharing your views. We are now supporting the President's Bill which provides stringent restrictions on rifles and shotguns. We shall also get behind the Tydings Bill which provides for national registration and licensing if the states do not act within six months and a year respectively.

I personally believe handguns should be outlawed and provided the substance for such a bill to Senator Percy and Congressmen Conyers about a week ago. Our organization will probably officially take this stand in time but we are not anxious to rouse the opposition before we get the other legislation passed.

It would be difficult to outlaw all rifles and shotguns because of the hunting sport. But there should be stiff regulations. The day may come in this country when police are issued weapons for 24 to 48 hours when tracking down armed criminals. This is what they do in Britain.

Don't give up on us. We thought the handgun bill was a step in the right direction. But, as you can see, our movement will be toward increasingly stiff controls. Thanks for writing. Hope you are circulating the petitions and encouraging letters to Congress.

Yours sincerely,
J. ELLIOTT CORBETT, *Secretary.*

TIME EDITOR IN CHIEF ADDRESSES CLEVELAND PUBLIC LIBRARY CENTENNIAL BANQUET

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the Cleveland Public Library has stepped proudly into its second century of service to our metropolitan area. We in Cleveland are proud of possessing one of the nation's most outstanding libraries, second only in size to the New York Public Library. It pioneered in adult education services, in audio-visual facilities, in branch library services, and in special services to the blind and handicapped. It launched one of the earliest programs of service to shut-ins and patients in hospitals.

We also take great pride in the fact that one of the alumni of the Cleveland Library is the distinguished Librarian of Congress, Dr. L. Quincy Mumford.

The centennial banquet, at which I was honored to be a guest, held February 18 by the Cleveland Library, had as its principal speaker, the distinguished editor in chief of Time magazine, Mr. Hedley Donovan. His thoughtful remarks are so appropriate I would like to share them with my colleagues on Capitol Hill:

CLEVELAND PUBLIC LIBRARY CENTENNIAL DINNER, FEBRUARY 19, 1969

(By Hedley Donovan)

I am very much complimented to have a part in this Centennial celebration.

In my business, on somewhat similar occasions, say a magazine is celebrating its fiftieth anniversary, one is never quite certain whether to say Many Happy Returns. When we send out letters soliciting subscriptions to our magazines and books—some of you may have received such a letter once or even twice—the number of orders, in relation to the total mailing, is called the Return, and the higher that percentage the happier we are. On the other hand, when it comes to newsstand sales, Returns are unsold copies; some of you, by passing a newsstand and thoughtlessly failing to buy one or more of the Time Inc. publications, may have contributed to a kind of Return we do not enjoy.

In the library business, however, I take it Returns are a completely good thing, always welcome, sometimes even stimulated by kindly reminder. So I can indeed wish this library Many Happy Returns, and I offer warmest congratulations to the staff, the trustees, the city officials and all the Cleveland citizens who have built this notable institution.

I was once briefly a Library Trustee myself, in a Long Island suburb. It was the first Board of Trustees of any kind that I had belonged to. Before joining, I had pictured the board meetings as cozy evenings where a few cultivated men and women sat around and talked about books. My fellow trustees were cultivated all right, and you know of course what we did talk about—money.

I believe I was asked here, however, not as a failed trustee, but because of a quite special bond between Time Incorporated and the City of Cleveland. This city was the headquarters of our company for two crucial years of its early life. It was the mid-1920's, that brash little sheet *Time* was just barely beginning to catch hold, and its young editors found all kinds of encouragement here in Cleveland, from readers who told them first hand they were doing a good job, from several advertisers, from a bank and a printer who were willing to bet the magazine might last. The encouragement went so far, in one case, that a very pretty Cleveland girl agreed to marry the young circulation manager of *Time*, Roy Larsen; Mr. Larson is now chairman of our Executive Committee, and his very pretty wife Margot still thinks rather well of *Time*.

Henry Luce, after the Cleveland years of *Time*, always talked of this city as a second home town. I am sure that is one reason *Time* was proud to come here shortly after the war, and serve as co-sponsor, with the Cleveland Council on World Affairs, for a three-day public forum on U.S. foreign policy. In the years since those sessions in 1947, Cleveland and *Time* have both talked a good deal about U.S. foreign policy. I propose that this should also be our subject for the next few minutes.

There have been some changes in the roll-call of our biggest foreign policy problems:

How to de-escalate Viet Nam—22 years ago de-escalate was not even a word in our vocabulary, and neither was Viet Nam;

How to defuse the Middle East—22 years ago the Middle East was French and British responsibility, mainly British, and Israel was a name in the Bible;

How to negotiate a renewal of our defense treaty with Japan, which expires next year, and to smooth the way for that, should we give them back Okinawa?—which 22 years ago might not have been a very popular idea with various Americans who had just been to a good deal of trouble to take Okinawa;

How to revitalize NATO, or has it served its time?—and how to treat with the only World War II leader still in command, that great and maddening man Charles de Gaulle;

And speaking of the General, must we overhaul the whole international monetary mechanism?

And what can we do for the pitiful children of Biafra?

And how do we negotiate some nuclear arms limitation, or should we, with the Soviet Union—which about halfway through this 22 year period acquired the capability of killing half of us, more or less, on half an hour's notice—that was an option previous Americans never had to concede to a foreign government, although, to be sure, we can still kill Russians even more definitively, or as Winston Churchill once said, we can "make the rubble bounce."

And so on. You know the whole long list.

We look out on this world of 1969 as a deeply confused country. It is easy to say that it is the cruel question of Viet Nam that has got us so mixed up. Our public life has been dominated by Viet Nam ever since we began the bombing of the North four years ago this month, and then sent Marine combat units ashore at Danang in March '65. It is the longest war in American history, not the biggest but probably the most complicated, and surely the most divisive. Now, very slowly and very ambiguously, this strange war seems to be running down. No wonder we ache and grope.

But I believe the causes of our confusion go much deeper than Viet Nam. Indeed the Viet Nam experience—vivid as it has been, important as it has been—has in a sense masked a more fundamental change in the underpinnings of American foreign policy. That change, very simply, is the loss of a working consensus, for the first time in the lives of any of us in this room, as to what we think America means in the world and to the world.

Look back for a moment at two aspects of American history. One we know mainly from reading about it in books, the other we ourselves have lived.

For generations, as many volumes in your library confirm, we Americans believed we were God's elect. John Adams wrote that it was the design of Providence to use America for the "illumination" and "emancipation" of all mankind. Thomas Jefferson proposed that the Seal of the United States should show the children of Israel led by a pillar of light. The notion of America as the chosen people was one of his favorite themes; this very urbane man could say: "God led our forefathers as Israel of old." He called us "the world's best hope," and we hear echoes of that when Abraham Lincoln, amidst the anguish of the Civil War, called us "the last best hope of earth." And all the way to the 1890's, that great historian George Bancroft, trained at Harvard, Heidelberg and Gottingen, believed to the end of his long life (as another historian has written of him) that American history was really "the story of the wonder-working of the hand of God in the American forest." It is hard to imagine any Harvard Ph. D., or Yale or Stanford either, looking at it just that way today.

Yet well into the 20th century, the belief persisted. The debate over our entry into World War I, 1914 to 1917, can be read as a clash between men who believed it was enough for America simply to stand here in its goodness, as example and beacon, and more militant men who believed America must carry its truths across the oceans.

Somewhere after the first World War, we lost that serene confidence that God's hand was especially upon us; the war itself came to seem a mistake and a failure, something America had never felt about its other wars; it was generally a time of rising sophistication and cynicism; the traditional religious beliefs were weakening; the memories of the frontier were fast receding; increasingly large blocs of the American population lacked any ancestral share in the classic chapters of American history; for Americans who did still have faith in the God of their fathers it was hard to believe that the spreading of the urban industrial landscape could enjoy quite the same divine favor as the crossing of the Continental Divide.

And if anything of the old idea of the Chosen People had survived the 1920's, the Great Depression of the 1930's surely did not help it.

Now for a large, literate democratic society once to have held so strongly such a righteous and spacious view of itself, and then in a few years to lose it, should be a profoundly unsettling experience.

But we never really had the experience. For at just this moment Americans were confronted with Adolf Hitler.

Starting in the late 1930's, more and more of the most thoughtful people in America, in government, in the churches, in business and banking, in the universities, were increasingly preoccupied with the threat of totalitarianism in Europe and Asia. The very people who might have been most concerned with the loss of the old sense of the American mission, and most concerned to find a new one, were spared that search. The Nazis and the Japanese militarists did not require us to think about the uses of liberty, or about deep meanings of America. They required us to defend ourselves, and that was meaning enough.

If the defeat of the Axis Powers had led to a stable peace, the once-postponed search for the modern American mission might have started soon after the war. But Stalin, almost overnight, took the place of Tojo and Hitler. The Cold War was on. Once more we believed ourselves to be holding a world-wide line against tyranny. Once more we were relieved of asking ourselves what else is America all about. We fought a tough, costly war in Korea.

The Cold War eased some in 1953, after Stalin's death and after the Korean truce, and then it eased some more around 1963. The autumn before, the Soviets had started installing missiles in Cuba, the most blatant thrust they ever made outside their own sphere of influence, and John Kennedy very coolly stared them down and eased them out. By the summer of 1963, President Kennedy was making his highly conciliatory American University speech and laying the groundwork for the nuclear test ban treaty.

But once again, just as one set of foreign dangers seemed to be receding, still another crisis, perceived as a major danger to ourselves and our allies, came to dominate our thinking about foreign policy. This of course was Viet Nam.

Let us be a little optimistic and say that Viet Nam is somehow resolved by the end of this year. That will mean that we have gone through a thirty-five-year crisis—from the rearming of Nazi Germany, starting in 1935, through World War II, through Korea and the Cold War, through Viet Nam. It means that all Americans in their forties, fifties and sixties, most of the leadership generation, have spent most or all of their adult lives with a view of an embattled, endangered America.

What if, almost all of a sudden, there were no acute external danger?

Some of the young dissenters on our campuses might be unmoored if there were no Viet Nam, but so might many of their elders, and perhaps more seriously. You know some of the public-spirited lawyers and bankers of downtown Manhattan who have served both Democratic and Republican administrations through many of these days of danger; they have their counterparts in Cleveland and other cities; and then there are the industrialists, diplomats, military men, labor leaders, Congressmen, university and foundation officials—the Establishment if you like; even editors are sometimes mentioned. Mature and responsible men with a lifetime crisis-oriented view of American foreign policy might be suddenly dis-oriented.

Now there are skeptics who say it will never be allowed to happen. Old-fashioned Marxists, new-fashioned New Leftists, would argue that it was no coincidence that the Cold War came along just as World War II ended, or that Viet Nam came along just when the Cold War was letting up a bit. According to this view, if the American people are now sick of Viet Nam, something else will be cooked up, maybe the Middle East, because the American "military-industrial complex" needs its war orders, the universities need their Pentagon research contracts, the Colonels need their chance to make General, and so on. This is a kind of devil theory of American history, even more naive, and less attractive, than the God theory I spoke of earlier.

I am optimistic enough to think we may soon lack an external crisis, and we will then face a kind of internal crisis of the American spirit. Who is America; what are we all about?

There seems to be fairly widespread agreement on a few things that we are not. During last year's Presidential campaign, one sentiment regularly uttered by all candidates was: "We cannot be the world's policeman." Nixon said it, Humphrey said it, Rockefeller, McCarthy, everybody said it. I don't think I heard anybody advocate that we *should* be the world's policeman, and there were times when it seemed not too attractive even to be a policeman for New York or Chicago.

Senator McCarthy also cautioned us against trying to be the world's judge or the world's confessor. Senator Fulbright has warned us against "the arrogance of power." Objection noted.

Many people say "No More Viet Nam." In fact it is hard, even if you wanted to, to think up another situation very much like Viet Nam. But there are plenty of other voices, McGeorge Bundy for instance, warning us not to over-react to Viet Nam, not to retreat into isolationism, or neo-isolationism. Yet in the kind of world we live in today, isolationism in the sense of the 1920's or 1930's is utterly impossible; it becomes a meaningless thing to warn against Fortress America, Fortress Cleveland—there are no such things anymore, and everybody knows it.

Indeed much of the old vocabulary for arguing about our role in the world has become obsolete. Balance of power, power vacuum, co-existence, confrontation—I'm afraid journalists no less than politicians keep using these tired old tags as a substitute for studying things as they really are. It is very hard work, of course, to figure out how things really are.

Cold War may not be a very useful expression anymore; nor is containment. I doubt if it clarifies our thinking to keep talking of "The Free World," embracing as it does so many kinds of societies and degrees of freedom, down to zero; nor does it help to call it "The Anti-Communist World," for not all of it is all that anti; we simply mean the non-communist world, and when we say that 118 countries belong to it, we haven't really said a great deal.

"The Communist World" is certainly not an entity either; there are now three big branches—Russian, Chinese, East European; and some sub-species—Yugoslav, Cuban, Viet Cong. We miss our old clear-cut enemies. Ho Chi Minh is not Hitler. I sat across a table from Kosygin one morning last winter and listened to a couple of hours of attacks on America, but it was all very calm and bureaucratic, like an argument with somebody from the Gas Company. The only mushroom clouds Americans remember are in photographs of our own explosions.

Then there are the tidy-minded people who try to lump together all the underdeveloped countries as "The Third World." I once heard some Indian journalists interviewing a group of Brazilian businessmen. I've had trouble ever since with the Third World concept.

The real world is fantastically diverse, and getting more so. We should rejoice in that and stop trying to fit it all into a few old and outdated boxes.

But this, of course, is part of our difficulty in defining America, for what we think *we* are is necessarily something we perceive in comparison with other nations. Once we defined ourselves essentially by contrast with the European monarchies, then as champion of democracy against the mid-twentieth century totalitarianisms. It gets harder to define America against all of today's rich variety of national societies, the many kinds of governments and political philosophies that abound in this world of 1969.

Nor is there any firm point of reference within our own domestic political dialogue. I do not know of anything that could be called a Republican view, of the American position in the world as of 1969. Surely one of the greatest accomplishments open to President Nixon would be to shape a modern concept, post Thomas Jefferson, post Hitler and Stalin, post Viet Nam, of America's place in the world.

To arrive at such a concept, there are, I think, four or five basic questions on which the President and the country must come to some agreed view:

1. *Do we have a moral obligation to share our wealth with other peoples?* I vote that we do. Our foreign aid programs are always being advocated as "enlightened self-interest." Congress and the public are told that the real purpose is to stop communism, etc. I think we can also afford to help other peoples simply because it's right.

2. *Do we ask that America be emulated?* Do we consider America still some kind of model? My own vote would be that our political system and our economic system are two of the greatest works of modern man. Let us continue to think of them that way, let us make them work even better. They will continue to exert great influence in many parts of the world, and we need never try to ram them down anybody's throat. We are not, however, an all-purpose example. We can hardly ask to be regarded as a model in the matter of racial justice. Almost equally shameful, in my view, is the abuse of our environment and our shoddy aesthetic standards. These uglinesses of the American spirit and landscape hurt us all over the world, and deservedly so.

3. *Are we still willing to fight?* When, where, for whom and what? You and I can list some places and governments we would not want America to fight for; I'm not sure we want President Nixon or Secretary Rogers to read off their list out loud. Are there still causes for which we should be ready to burn up most of the Northern Hemisphere? I think the nuclear deterrent does still deter; the assumption that there are situations in which we would use these weapons is still some assurance we will not have to use them. But this condition may not last much longer. We may be passing into a period where the technology is so volatile, and the missile and anti-missile production response and counter-response so relentless, that the weapons themselves are becoming, as the experts in this frightful subject put it, "destabilizing." So should we take a chance on some arms limitation agreement with the Russians, or should we take our chances with the arms? I myself vote for a try at the agreement. This delicate and dangerous decision is upon the Nixon Administration right now.

4. *As we move about the world, and act in the world, do we think of ourselves as the United States Government or as individual Americans?* My own belief is that we appear before the world far too often and too obtrusively as the U.S. Government. This is a paradox because here at home, we believe—or most of us do—that the American government is something much less than the American people, indeed that the chief aim of government is to help create conditions in which we as individuals can achieve our highest possibilities. The overseas expenditures, embassies, alliances of the U.S. Government seem to me less promising, for the long run, than the overseas activities of individual American students, doctors, businessmen, engineers, painters, basketball players. And our official policies should of course give full encouragement to the private foreign citizen for trade, travel, study in America. You have a lot of experience with this here in Cleveland. So when we ask what does America mean in the world, surely a part of the answer is that the Cleveland Orchestra is going to give concerts in Japan next year; and a Cleveland man named Jesse Owens has taught sprinting to youngsters in India; and Case Western Reserve has trained thousands of foreign teachers, doctors, engineers; and Republic Steel is digging iron ore in Liberia; and TRW is building the vehicles for the world's first commercial satellite network.

No. 5 Fifth and finally, if we have become too tactful to call ourselves the last best hope of earth, and a little uncertain, in any case, whether we really are, and if we are no longer on 24-hour Red Alert in a permanent world crisis, *can we still find some way to invest American with a touch of the heroic?* Old-fashioned patriotism has been in a long decline; the very idea of country has been eroding, and not just because of Viet Nam. America as a way of thinking about things does not have the same force with out children that it had with us and our fathers. When I was growing up two or three states west of here, in Minnesota, I could hear the Great Northern whistles at night, the trains bound for immensely romantic American places—like Montana; I especially longed to see the Rocky Mountains. The other day I heard of a Connecticut school where the whole sixth grade is going to spend Easter vacation in Rome; not a fancy private country day school and not a Catholic parochial school either, just ordinary twelve-year-olds in a suburban public school. Now we all like the idea of our children moving with so much ease and freedom in this richly interesting world that spreads all around them, and as I was saying a moment ago, the individual American learning, working, traveling all over the world is surely a big part of what we want America to mean in the world. Yet we must recognize that this growing cosmopolitanism clashes with many of our older ideas of country. And patriotism, in spite of all the follies committed in its name, has been a powerful organizing principle in human affairs, certainly so in this country; it has gotten a lot of work done, and added an extra dimension, even a nobility, to many lives. I do not know that "mankind" or "humanity" are yet capable of evoking comparable efforts or loyalties or personal satisfactions. So the question remains: can we find contemporary and civilized ways to love America? I pray we can.

You will have noticed that I came here tonight with more question than answers. I would plead, Mr. Chairman, that this is the spirit in which one approaches a library, and perhaps by extension, one can come with very large questions to the centennial of a very great library. For a great library keeps for us the highest values of the past, and holds for us at least a part of the knowledge that can unlock the doors of the future.

I thank you again for allowing me to join in this centennial. I wish for your city and its great cultural institutions a full share in working out for our time the meaning of the American community, among ourselves and amidst the nations.

RESOLUTION ON DAIRY PRODUCT IMPORTS

HON. MARTIN B. McKNEALLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. McKNEALLY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am pleased to include the following resolutions adopted by the New York Holstein-Friesian Association at its annual meeting at Kiamesha Lake, N.Y., on January 28, 1969, reaffirming its resolution of last year in support of the dairy import bill as recommended by the National Milk Producers Federation:

Whereas: The New York Holstein-Friesian Association at its Annual Meeting one year ago recognized the need for enactment of the Dairy Import Bill as then sponsored by Senator Proxmire and others into law by the Congress of the United States and signified its support for this Bill by an appropriate resolution, and

Whereas: This Bill has not been enacted into law, and

Whereas: The threat to strength, stability and price levels of domestic markets for dairy products imposed by large surpluses of dairy products in foreign countries continues to exist and is likely to exist to the same or greater degree in 1969, and

Whereas: Dairy product import quotas established by administrative actions under presently applicable laws presently provide some protection to milk producers in the United States but do not provide adequate long range safeguards;

Therefore be it resolved: That the New York Holstein-Friesian Association at its Annual Meeting at Kiamesha Lake, New York, on January 28, 1969, reaffirm its resolution of last year in support of the Dairy Import Bill as recommended by the National Milk Producers Federation and instruct the Secretary to so inform the appropriate Senators and Members of the House of Representatives representing New York State in the Congress of the United States.

BLACK OR ELSE

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a friend and constituent of mine, Mr. Stan Stanton of Arlington, Va., has called my attention to an article which appeared in the Washington Daily News in February 1969, which he requested that I include in the RECORD.

The article, which is written with great humor, is one of the best commentaries to date on the ridiculous demands being made by militant students in our colleges today.

I am, therefore, pleased to comply with Mr. Stanton's request that it be inserted at this point in the RECORD:

BLACK OR ELSE

The story is told again and again. The vast majority of students at this or that college are apathetic about the demands and demonstrations of the militants. Then the police or the National Guard or both are called in and right away thousands of previously uncommitted students, whites and blacks, team up with the raging minority. The fuzz and the troops are as great red flags to a herd of bulls. Now here's my plan to defuse the disrupters. Give 'em what they're crying for, give it to 'em till it's coming out of their ears, and give it to the vast apathetic majority, too.

Use the police and the Guardsmen to enforce gigantic Black Studies programs, with classes to be conducted from dawn to dusk. Attendance to be compulsory for All students, regardless of race, creed, color, shape, disposition, or personal preference.

Police to drive students into classrooms and keep them there until all are able to recite, letter perfect, the complete text of Frantz Fanon's "Black Skin, White Masks." Students who fail this test must pay a forfeit. The forfeit being to memorize the collected speeches of H. Rap Brown. While students are thus penned up, soul food may be sent in from the outside by the Ford Foundation, or any other broad-minded and willing organization, but there will be absolutely no cooking in the classroom.

Compulsory Swahili sessions from 7 a.m. to noon, dealing with origins of Swahili, comparative studies in the vernacular of Pygmy tribes on the Ituri, Swahili dialects of Lamu, Swahili dialects of Mombasa. . . .

One p.m. Translation class. (Any student who takes more than six days to translate the complete plays of LeRoi Jones into Swahili will be strung up by the thumbs in the campus-quadrangle.)

The Swahili sessions will be followed by a lunch period. Recordings of the Students for a Democratic Society screaming "Fascist Pig!" and "Oink!" will be piped into the cafeteria: the volume will be the maximum made possible by modern electronics, and there will be no let-up.

Afternoon sessions will be devoted to "Black Physics," "Black Geometry." "Black Chemistry," "Black Astrophysics," "Black Dianetics," etc., etc. There will also be courses in African basketweaving, African fabric weaving, African Zib-Zib Dancing, African Naga-Naga Singing, and African mah-jongg.

Night sessions will be given over to "Black History." A minimum of five hours of African pre-history will be required; conscientious objectors to this lengthy session will be promptly bayonetted. Courses in Black American history will include "How Blacks Founded the Saturday Evening Post," "How Blacks Built the Railroads and To Hell with the Irish," "How Blacks Founded the Chase Manhattan Bank and other Institutions," and "How Blacks Invented the Steam Engine Decades Before the Russians."

Students must take 76 hours of history tho any student wishing to translate the Quotations of Chairman Mao into Swahili will be allowed to substitute this endeavor for any one of the pure Black courses.

All students who refuse to disrupt basketball games will be immersed in a bath of rotten eggs.

On campuses where revolts are already in progress, crews of brick layers will be sent to Administration Buildings occupied by defiant students. These brick layers will proceed to wall up all doors and windows while indulging in dialogue of this nature: "Did you ever see anything like the way this new plastic mortar dries? One minute it's a new pudding, and the next minute it's hard as marble. Why, the only way to get thru a brick wall like this is to blast. I wonder if there's any dynamite in the dean's desk. I shouldn't think so, would you, Paddy? . . ."

If my modest proposals don't cause thousands of moderate students to run screaming from the very sight of those frenzied disrupters . . . why, I'll be one mighty chagrined student of human nature.

ABOLISH THE HOUSE INTERNAL SECURITY COMMITTEE

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I introduce today, with several colleagues, a resolution to abolish the House Internal Security Committee—HISC—and transfer its legitimate functions to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Whether as HISC or HUAC, the Committee on Internal Security has outlived its usefulness. As HUAC, its ambiguous mandate has been abused; it has been used as an excuse to trample on the constitutional rights of many individuals and to deface the principles of justice vital to our democracy. As HISC, the prospects are for more of the same.

This committee has a sorry record of encroaching on the constitutionally protected rights of individuals—a problem that would not arise if its few relevant and necessary functions were carried out by the Judiciary Committee. Although the committee work has been lacking in substantive results—unless its supporters wish to refer to HUAC's excessive expenditures as results—it has succeeded in taking advantage of the publicity engendered by its controverssial inquiries. By any standard other than publicity value, this committee has been an outright failure.

On February 18, House Resolution 89, to change the name and extend the jurisdiction of HUAC, was passed. At that time, I was unavoidably out of town and was paired against this resolution. Today I urge my colleagues to vote with me to abolish this committee.

THE KNOWN IMPERATIVES ARE STILL THE CONTROLLING ONES

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, on last November 14, the distinguished president of Cornell University, James A. Perkins, delivered the following address before the National Industrial Conference Board in New York City.

President Perkins' examination of the causes for the disarray that many have noted in our institutions, and his rational discussion of why some of the conventions we have lived by may be in temporary disrepute, as well worth our consideration. In the midst of the growing public concern over the more obvious signs of unrest one sees on American campuses, I was also particularly struck by his suggestion that—

> If the university is where much of the present unrest in this country and elsewhere was born, or first articulated, it is also the place where much of it will be resolved.

Such a resolution will, obviously, not come easily. Nevertheless, if—as Mr. Perkins reminds us—the overriding moral imperative of the university, as well as of society, is the growth and maturing of the individual, it could well be that our great universities—as our chief centers for rational inquiry and dispassionate criticism—will be where so many of the answers we seek will be found.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I was moved by President Perkins' concluding thought that—

> The known imperatives are still the controlling ones.

And his restatement of that which we have always known though sometimes forgotten, viz:

> Knowledge *is* better than ignorance, love *is* more important than hate, compassion *is* greater than distrust, concern *is* more constructive than detachment, and our common humanity *is* more central to our future than our differences.

Under leave so granted, Mr. Perkins' remarks are now set forth, as follows:

THE UNIVERSITY AND THE NEW PRIORITIES

(By James A. Perkins)

It is a measure of our changing times that university administrators who may have expected, as I did, to lead an educational revolution, now find they are participating in a social revolution as well. Few occupational groups in this country have undergone such rude awakenings as college and university presidents, and few have had to spend so much of their time trying to ferret out the causes of the national malaise. We may not have all the answers—but I promise you we have been asked all the questions!

This, then, is the topic to which I address myself in this message. I must begin with a statement of principle that is the basis of all that follows.

Social stability in a democracy or a university is the product of a consensus about social priorities and moral responsibilities. If people agree on what is important and what is right, they will support their institutions and observe the etiquette necessary for social cohesion. Where there is no consensus on the ends and means, both our institutions and our social discipline will be in disarray.

Today in the United States and in other parts of the world we are in disagreement on these matters. As a result, our social structure is in disrepair, and the conventions we live by are in disrepute. Most serious of all, the institutions that are committed to freedom and rationality and that rely on a high degree of civil discourse in the conduct of their affairs, are shaken to the core.

So it is imperative that we understand the sources of our trouble if we are to deal successfully with the great tasks that clamor for attention.

In the years after the war, from roughly 1945 to 1960, this country achieved a consensus about its basic priorities and responsibilities. The assumptions on which we built our major domestic and foreign policies were understood and accepted by most of the nation.

Our first priority was to forestall a third world war. Our second was to prevent another widespread economic depression. I think many of us may have forgotten how large these two fears loomed in the minds of adults who had gone through the experiences of the thirties and forties. Almost all our national decisions during the postwar period were governed by our determination to secure a peaceful world and to build a strong economy.

In terms of our immediate objectives, the policies we evolved to deal with these two priorities were successful. Our strategy of mutual deterrence, combined with remarkably creative measures in both the economic and cultural areas of international affairs, let to the prospect of a *détente* with Russia that, at least until the invasion of Czechoslovakia, seemed to open up the possibilities of understanding. We stopped talking about bomb shelters several years ago, and we have lately come very close indeed to a nuclear nonproliferation treaty. The doomsday clock that pointed one minute to midnight has been set back a full five minutes. We have secured a margin of survival.

On the domestic side, the whole of our social legislation during the New Deal era of the thirties had laid the groundwork for our belief that once the war was over we would be able to stabilize the economy through a partnership between government and private industry. In fact, the ideals and goals of the welfare state—which held out full employment and a rising GNP as objectives that were as desirable as any government-based programs for the public good—were so widely accepted throughout both business and government that considerable progress was made toward these goals in a remarkably brief time. By the beginning of the sixties, fears of a major depression had subsided, the general affluence had spread beyond our most optimistic predictions.

Yet all was not well. Just as we thought we were beginning to bring our first two priorities under some kind of control, two other concerns were rising to the surface. The first was the matter of justice for the Negro, made indelible by the Supreme Court's desegregation decision in 1954. The second was a deepening concern over the quality of the life we had evolved. Since 1960 these two concerns have been given increasing priority in the public mind; at times they seem to take precedence over everything else we do.

These two new concerns have been in part produced and in part aggravated by our preoccupation with measures to prevent another war and another depression. Not only did our concentration on these first two priorities blind us to many domestic ills that had been festering among us for years, but the steps we had taken to deal with these priorities actually generated new problems for which most of us were totally unprepared.

"The quality of life" was not a topic of much conversation in the forties and fifties. But now we have discovered that our conception of what makes for quality in life has been consistently bruised by the means we have used to achieve our overriding priorities. During the days of the so-called balance of terror, for example, we were prepared to drive our civilization underground as a contribution to securing our strategic posture. We invested considerable energy, you may remember, in devising backyard bomb shelters and a style of life to fit them.

But even worse, we had to convince ourselves that we were in fact prepared to make a nuclear attack on Russia in order to make the system of deterrence credible. We had to make our enemies believe in our irrationality in order to make the system work—and this posture of irrationality was bound to have a profoundly unsettling effect on a democratic society that is founded on belief in the ultimate rationality of man.

When the strategy of nuclear deterrence was placed in the reserve position, we chose instead to deter aggression, in the first instance, by fighting limited wars at the perimeters of Russia and China. We then found ourselves, however, involved in conflicts in which we had neither friends nor enemies and to which we felt no strong national commitment. The price of this policy, unforeseen at the time of its adoption, has been such a division of the American people that it has all but destroyed the consensus we so painstakingly constructed during the previous twenty years. And with the erosion of our consensus we are alarmed by the rise of an extremism that is no longer held in tight check by agreement at the center.

Furthermore, under the strategy of either central or limited warfare we had to create a large and powerful military establishment which depended upon widespread industrial support and the drafting of our young into military service. The very scale of the effort required has frightened a large section of our population embracing all age groups. These people fear a military establishment that seems to have irresistible requirements of its own, cutting across many of the indispensable requirements of individual freedom and democratic style.

Turning to the domestic front, it is clear that the energy we have spent on building the industrial system has, to be sure, satisfied many of our needs and wants. But it has also profoundly affected the quality of our life. In the name of full employment and a burgeoning economy, we have made the necessities of technology the determinants of some of our most crucial decisions and values. The result is that we are now faced with polluted air, land, lakes, and rivers; the displacement of many thousands of both blue and white collar workers by machines; the exhaustion of some of our most precious natural resources; and the widespread destruction of the balance of nature, for which we may have to pay dearly in the years to come.

The cause of domestic justice has suffered as well. For the most part, our priority preoccupations simply blinded us to the problems of the Negro and the poor white. Social reform and humane concern bypassed the ghetto and the rural slum and followed the worker of the New Deal into the suburbs. The very successes of this reform have finally served to illuminate the glaring inequities of it. The more widely affluence is enjoyed, the more conspicuous is the poverty it has not touched. The better and more universal education has become at all levels, the more clearly we see where and whom it has failed. The more prevalent is productive employment, the more restless and frustrated the remaining unemployed.

The central fact of our current malaise is that the older generation is still largely preoccupied with world stability and productivity while the new generation is largely preoccupied with justice and the quality of life. My generation is proud of its accomplishments and feels that it has been given scant credit for the success of its revolution. The restless members of the new generation accept these accomplishments as given and are frustrated by our apparent blindness to new matters on their minds.

Of course, this division is not absolute along generational lines. Justice and life's quality have always been on the American agenda. These concerns first brought our ancestors to this country; they became the guideposts of our Declaration of Independence and Constitution and they have been an essential yeast in our democratic system. The point is that these concerns have lately been grossly neglected—and we are now paying the price.

And yet, no matter where we begin, the truth is that we cannot exclusively abandon ourselves to the struggle for equal rights or to the renewal of our environment. For they will not yield to solution if we are at war or if we cannot pay for the measures that are essential to solve them. We have to keep the peace and we have to keep the economy strong. Neither of these priorities will take care of itself. If anything, each will require increasingly sophisticated attention.

But it is equally obvious, I hope, that we slacken our efforts to solve the pressing problems of race, poverty, and environment at our peril. It is no longer possible to conduct this nation's affairs, domestic or foreign, with any kind of equilibrium if these problems are not attacked on a massive scale.

As we do so, however, we must face the hydra of large scale and large organization. Technology does not flourish in a basement workshop, and a national economy cannot be monitored from the perspective of the city. Both technology and the welfare state require organization of large and formidable dimension. And they have brought with them the rise of the national and international corporation and the national labor union, not to mention the shift of power and responsibility from the city and states to the federal government. One unhappy result of organization on such large scale was the fear, particularly on the part of the young, that large organizations would dehumanize and thwart the individuality of those who became part of them.

But the problem remains, because large-scale effort is required to tackle our current problems of quality and justice, for they are national as well as local. We must now recast and enlarge the scope of the assignment that lies ahead of us. It is no less than the development of doctrines and policies that will embrace careful attention to all four priorities in appropriate masure. This means that all our policies, both domestic and foreign, must be subjected to new and more complex tests to determine how they affect the public interest. It also means that the organizations and methods we have evolved for the conduct of our public and private affairs must be reexamined in the light of our new balance of imperatives. Finally, it means that we must develop a new style of leadership capable of inventing new concepts, new organizations, and new arrangements to deal with our current problems. These new leaders must possess wide vision, more flexible attitudes, even a harder realism, and perhaps a greater compassion for the individual and his proper fulfillment—which is, after all, the essence of our human purpose. The demands on these men and women will push our notions of human capacity to new limits.

The assignment for the remainder of this century is vast—but we must get to it because the problems to be resolved will not go away. As a born optimist, I have little doubt that we will solve them. But I am realist enough to know that doing so will take all we've got. Let me talk a bit about what this involves.

First, we are going to have to strike a new balance in the allocation of our resources between domestic and foreign affairs. We may well not be willing to support another Vietnam as long as our cities are in their current state of disrepair. We will have to emphasize other means of keeping the peace, relying more on economic development and less on military assistance, more on support for international agencies and less on anti-ICBM's, more on political flexibility in our relations with China and less on confrontation with potential enemies, more on nuclear agreement and disarmament and less on nuclear buildup. The gap between the rich and the poor nations may well be a more explosive problem than the gap between the East and the West—and it is conceivable that this gap could be handled with a quarter of our defense budget.

At home we may have to invest less in consumer goods and much more in rebuilding our cities, in providing advantages for our disadvantaged, and in creating a livable environment. Shifts in public policy and individual priorities will have to be made. Social investment will have to balance the demands for productivity—even if productivity has to be curtailed. And yet we know that on many occasions industry has discovered that social investment in people has led to increased productivity rather than reduced performance. Corporate aid to education during the last two decades, while in the short run a reduction in profits, may in the medium run be the most productive investment of all.

This is not to say that restraint in our exercise of overseas power and consumer prerogatives may not face the gravest of obstacles. The world structure of over 120 nation states involves serious elements of instability. As the greatest world power, the United States will be confronted with unremitting calls to keep the peace everywhere. To resist all these calls will, at times, seem callous. As consumers we equate the possession of things not only with an advancing standard of living, but also with an indispensable relief from hard physical labor. But broad education, decent living, a healthy environment, and a chance to grow and live are also essential elements in a proper definition of a true standard of living. A rearrangement of our personal values must be a part of our salvation.

All of our institutions must now turn their full attention to the great task ahead—to humanize our lives and thus to humanize our society. The corporation will have to conceive of itself, as many do now, as more of a public service institution with a wide range of social responsibilities. The unions will have to become less stiff-jointed in their preoccupation with job security, the afterglow of a depression of thirty-five years ago. Government will have to be remodeled to deal with twenty-first-century problems with something better than our eighteenthcentury arrangements. The recent party conventions cannot be the optimal style for a great people to elect great Presidents. And what will be the role of the American university in all this? From an admittedly parochial point of view, it seems to me that our universities are and must be at the very center of our reforms; that, if the university is where much of the present unrest in this country and elsewhere was born, or first articulated, it is also the place where much of it will have to be resolved. There are several reasons why this is so.

First, the university is society's chief center for rational inquiry and dispassionate criticism. In a society with an insecure focus and irrational extremes, the university, protected by its leathery doctrines of institutional autonomy and academic freedom, is an essential haven for the careful rethinking of our social problems. There is no other institution where creative thought can be so easily brought to bear on these problems without the grinding necessity of justifying both the thought process and the solution by instant reference to what *is* rather than what *might be*.

Second, the university has the range of talents required to deal with the many facets of our current problems. Just think of the range of expertise required to rethink our posture towards the sale of military aircraft to Peru or to develop sound notions as to how to deal constructively with the ghetto! Where else can proposed solutions be subjected to such rigid scrutiny?

Third, the new leadership must be educated by and create its new frame of reference in our universities and colleges. The six million students will rise to nine million by the middle of the next decade. Outside of the family, it is the university that provides the most important contacts between the generations. Most are in their late twenties before they finish their formal education, and many go directly into work that carries considerable responsibility. Their habits of mind, their sense of priorities, their codes of behavior, their attitudes toward their fellow men have been formed by then, and their stamp on the course of national affairs for the next generation will be unmistakable if not crucial.

Finally, the university has an obligation to try to be what society must become—an open, rational, self-disciplined, and essentially humane community, where differences are respected or at least tolerated, but where, to use Northrop Frye's elegant phrase, "Concern prevents detachment from degenerating into indifference."

From this foundation, the university has a great obligation to work with society on the difficult task of reordering its priorities and remodeling its institutions to deal effectively with our great new purposes. It is an assignment not only of social development but of the blending of knowledge and purpose that must infuse those who will graduate to work at our new assignments.

This is a staggering prospect in itself, but it does not complete the roster of university responsibilities. The university must concern itself with problems that go beyond our current priorities, old and new, and help prepare the next generation to deal with matters we can only dimly see and some we cannot see at all. Who in the 1930's could have anticipated the full impact of the population explosion? It is just as well that we had university professors interested in problems of demography. If relevance to the then current scene had been the sole criterion, we would now be trapped in the dark without a flashlight. Few in the 1930's anticipated that a thorough understanding of the USSR would be a condition of a peaceful world in the 1950's and 1960's. Few in the 1940's realized that a firsthand knowledge of the remote countries of Southeast Asia could be a critical asset in a $30-billion-a-year war. Few considered research on these areas relevant or worth the attention of a university.

Relevance too narrowly defined can be a trap to destroy our capacity to deal with the future. Relevance ignored can destroy the chance to have any future at all. The university's commitment to the pursuit of knowledge is the best guarantee that neither the present nor the future will be too heavily discounted. Somewhere in the ether of pure, unbridled research lie the seeds of the next decade's and the next century's crucial priorities. The university is the one place where our unseen priorities have a chance to be anticipated, where exploration can be carried on without deadlines or stop signs, without legislative pressure, without the necessity for solving some current problem. We can call this legitimized boondoggling if we wish, but my reply is that we haven't had enough of it in recent decades or we would not be caught so short today in the current crucial issues.

But concern for our priorities, old, new, and unforeseen, does not by any means exhaust the total responsibilities and opportunities of a university education. A great deal of university effort is spent on matters that have only an indirect bearing on problems of social advance and public affairs.

The university has become the home for the artist and the musician, the poet and the writer, the historian and the linguist, the chemist and the archaeologist. Much time must be spent in understanding history and culture, not only our own but that of other peoples as well. And creativity in the arts and sciences proceeds from the search for the true and beautiful without which man's nature would be truly impoverished.

For, after all, the whole purpose of the human exercise is to make it possible for every individual human being to grow to his own fullest dimension. It is the growth and maturing of the individual that is the overriding moral imperative of both the university and society. And who can doubt that the known imperatives are still the controlling ones? Knowledge *is* better than ignorance, love *is* more important than hate, compassion *is* greater than distrust, concern *is* more constructive than detachment, and our common humanity is more central to our future than our differences.

Some of these moral imperatives may represent matters of faith rather than human characteristics with which we are familiar, but can anyone really believe we have any choice other than to act on the assumption that they are true for us?

YOUTH GROUNDED

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, in response to my efforts here in the House to urge the Civil Aeronautics Board to reject Examiner Arthur S. Present's decision against airline youth fares, I have received many, many letters in my office. These letters are not only from students, but from parents, college professors, and a cross section of our population. I have yet to receive a single letter endorsing the recent CAB decision.

In recent weeks I have inserted a number of editorials and articles on this subject from papers across the Nation. Today I place the following articles in the RECORD:

Tulane University, "Up, Up and Awry";

Arizona State University, State Press, "Airline Youth Fares May Cease," "Standby Fare Question Still Classes as Mystery";

Kent State Stater, "Something Extra";

Tufts University Observer, "Elimination of Youth Fare?";

University of New Hampshire, the New Hampshire, "Youth Discrimination"; and

Indiana State University, Statesman, "Airline Youth Fares Elimination Reviewed," "Youth Grounded."

The articles follow:

[From Tulane University]

UP, UP AND AWRY

Many students may not know of the imminent death of airline youth fares. We didn't until we received notice from a conscientious Congressman—Arnold Olsen (D-Mont.).

Rep. Olsen informs us that Civil Aeronautics Board Examiner Arthur Present has ruled the youth fare elimination, considering it "discriminatory" to adult passengers who must pay full fare. Unless overturned by a hearing of the full board, the decision will take effect shortly.

The Hullabaloo believes that Present has missed the point entirely. His decision would lead to the grossest sort of economic discrimination against students as well as great hardship and inconvenience. Olsen urges interested parents and students to write to him at the House of Representatives and so do we.

[From Arizona State University, Feb. 6, 1969]

AIRLINE YOUTH FARES MAY CEASE

(By Patricia Carr)

The days of airline youth fare may be numbered, according to a Civil Aeronautics Board (CAB) examiner.

Examiner Arthur Present claims youth discounts are "unjustly discriminatory" against passengers paying full fare and should be abolished. He feels that since persons between the ages of 12 and 21 have the same physical characteristics as adults, they should pay the same fare.

A federal court-ordered investigation was started by a complaint by National Trailways Bus System and by TCO Industries Inc., formerly Transcontinental Bus System Inc. A long study by the CAB resulted in an 83-page decision by Examiner Present.

American Airlines, originators of the youth fare program, most vigorously opposed the recommendation.

F. J. Mullen, American's vice president in charge of marketing, said the lower rates gave young people an opportunity to see their native country.

Another spokesman for American said the airline believes such fares are constructive and should be continued.

The supervisor of American Airlines at Sky Harbor said ticket sales will drop considerably if the recommendation is passed by the CAB.

Examiner Present did rule that youth fares were reasonable in cost. Even though use of the fares has sharply increased since the program began, no airline has reported a loss from them.

A CAB council will review the fare question on Feb. 21 to determine whether those under 21 must pay full fare.

[From Arizona State University, Feb. 6, 1969]

STANDBY FARE QUESTION STILL CLASSED AS MYSTERY

(By Ted Ledingham)

The Civil Aeronautics Board (CAB) decision regarding youth fares is still a mystery to the Phoenix offices of the major airlines, State Press inquiries disclosed.

"We have been watching the teletype for the decision," said Lon Cooper of American Airlines, "but so far we have heard nothing."

CAB examiner Arthur Present claimed youth discounts are "unjustly discriminatory'" against passengers paying full fare and should be abolished.

A CAB council was to have reviewed the fare question Friday to determine whether those under 21 must pay full fare.

American Airlines is optimistic for the continuation of standby fares, said Cooper.

"If they were to be discontinued, there would be profound repercussions, as we have similar programs for the military and the clergy," he explained.

John Kozma, district sales manager of Air West, said if the youth fares were ruled discriminatory and abolished, "it would be a pretty good indication that the days of other special fares would be numbered."

[From the Tufts University Observer, February 4, 1969]

ELIMINATION OF YOUTH FARE

Youth fare discounts for airline travel will be discontinued this month unless the Civil Aeronautics Board overrules a decision by one of its examiners.

Although the law permits discounts to stimulate specific segments of the population to travel by air, the CAB examiner claims that age alone is not valid distinction between passengers.

Moreover, the examiner rejected contentions that the youth discounts are essential in spurring air traffic by young people who could not ordinarily afford it.

The advent of the youth fare also helped the airlines to fill seats which would otherwise remain vacant. This permits the airlines to more efficiently utilize its facilities and depend less on government subsidies.

Unless the CAB is convinced of the advantages of keeping youth fares, these discounts will not exist when we leave for spring vacation.

[From Arizona State University]

STANDBY STATUS MAY CRASHLAND

One glimmering privilege granted today's student may soon be extinguished if the Civil Aeronautics Board upholds a decision by Examiner Arthur Present to eliminate half-fare standby tickets for persons under 21.

In Present's 83-page decision, he judged the special fare discriminatory to adult passengers. If accepted by the five-member Board tomorrow, youth fares will be dropped in 30 days.

But there's one voice in Washington that has already spoken out against this unfair ruling. Representative Arnold Olsen (D-Mont.) has charged that elimination of airline youth fares would encourage young people to resume illegal hitch-hiking practices and attempting long, unsafe car trips.

The charge that the youth fares discriminate against regular passengers is ridiculous. How can permitting a young person to fly half-fare on a seat that would otherwise go empty be considered discrimination?

Other arguments have also been presented in favor of retaining the present system. Most passengers over 21 are restricted by personal demands or schedules from flying standby and a change to include all age groups on standby fares would mean general havoc for the reservation system.

A spokesman for American Airlines has stated that the half-price youth fares are constructive and ticket sales would drop considerably if the recommendation is passed by the CAB. The revenue loss resulting from elimination of the existing regulations could mean increased fares for all passengers.

We wonder if Examiner Present realizes that present youth fares also contribute substantially to the cause of education. The system has been an important factor in easing the travel burden of college students. Travel alone is a form of education and thousands of young Americans—students and non-students—have been able to see much more of their country through the youth fare program.

On the local level, too, we have seen the parallel example of special prices to encourage young people to attend cultural programs. Yet there has not been complaint from other patrons at such events.

Strict, imprudent application of the so-called "non-discrimination" ruling, if passed tomorrow, would threaten half-fare tickets for youngsters, military personnel, and other special fare categories now provided.

We hope the Civil Aeronautics Board takes a closer look at Examiner Present's decision, and then rescinds it.

If upheld, there will be so much lost and nothing gained.

[From the Kent Stater, Feb. 25, 1969]

SOMETHING EXTRA

Last Thursday, The Stater said in an editorial that the Civil Aeronautics Board (C.A.B.) was going to re-evaluate its ruling on the projected abolishment of youth-fare airline tickets.

The C.A.B. hearings begin tomorrow, February 25. In Thursday's editorial The Stater urged students to convince the Board that youth-fare should be continued. We said that the Board must be made aware that youth fare passengers do not receive the same services as full fare passengers.

They must receive evidence that students across the nation are upset. The Stater now has in its possession a petition, begun at Princeton University, which is available for student signatures.

The petition reads:

"We, the undersigned, are distressed by the recent announcement that proposes to terminate half-fare airline travel. We believe that the service afforded half-fare passengers is not 'substantially similar' to full-fare service. Therefore, we believe that the half-fare rates are not discriminatory. We request that the Civil Aeronautics Board net eliminate the half-fare rates."

Those who would like to add their name to the petition may do so in The Stater office, 100 Taylor.

For those who want to take more direct action, Western Union offers a 90 cent "Opinion Telegram." The 15 word telegram should be addressed to: The Civil Aeronautics Board, Mr. John H. Crooker, Jr., Chairman, 1825 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Wire today, or the airlines may be forced to charge present youth fare passengers "something extra"—full fare.

[From the University of New Hampshire]

YOUTH DISCRIMINATION

There are many disadvantages to being young. If you are under twenty-one you can't drink and you can't vote. Car insurance rates are higher. You're more likely to be drafted.

But, in all this discrimination there is a time when we are happy to be young—when we buy a plane ticket. Simply by proving we are under 22 we can fly anywhere in the country for half or two-thirds fare. Now, we may even lose that.

Arthur S. Present, a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board (CAB), has asked the CAB to eliminate the airline youth fare because it discriminates against older passengers who must pay full fare. If this decision is upheld by the CAB it will go into effect within 30 days.

Representative Arnold Olsen (D-Montana) is waging a strong battle against passage of the Present proposal. He has built an impressive argument showing that no one will benefit from a discontinuation of youth fares.

He says, "A change to include all age groups in the revenue loss resulting from elimination of the existing regulations could mean increased fares for all passengers; and that present youth fares contribute substantially to the cause of education.

"Thousands of young Americans," he continued, "have been enabled by the youth fare to see much more of their country. They have benefited from the current youth fare arrangement, and it has not been at the expense of full-fare passengers because space available seats are empty seats."

Although allowing persons of a certain age group a special discount is, in a sense discriminatory, it aids a particular group, not hurts them. Elimination of youth fares would be a disadvantage to everyone.

[From the Indiana Statesman]

AIRLINE YOUTH FARES ELIMINATION REVIEWED

Representative Arnold Olsen (D. Mont.) today charged that elimination of airline youth fares would "encourage thousands of young people to resume the illegal and dangerous practice of hitch hiking or to attempt long, exhausting automobile trips, frequently in unsafe vehicles."

He argued that no one would benefit from a discontinuation of youth fares.

Olsen said a Civil Aeronautics Board (CAB) ruling against the half-fare standby tickets for persons under 21 "failed to combine prudence and justice, the compatible format necessary to formulate any dictate of society, according to Oliver Wendell Holmes."

Examiner Arthur S. Present, author of the CAB ruling, judged the special fare discriminatory to adult passengers. If upheld by the five-member Board, youth fares will be dropped in 30 days. In a letter to CAB Chairman John H. Crooker, Olsen asked that the Tuesday decision be reviewed and rescinded.

"I fail to see how permitting a young person to fly half fare on a seat that would otherwise go empty discriminates against regular passengers," Olsen asserted.

Continuing, Olsen argued that "prudent justice in this situation would be influenced by the facts that most passengers over 21 are restricted by personal demands or schedules from flying space available; that a change to include all age groups in the standby fares would mean havoc for the reservation system; that the revenue loss resulting from elimination of the existing regulations could mean increased fares for all passengers; and that present youth fares contribute substantially to the cause of education."

"Persons under 21 cannot vote," he continued, "persons under 25 cannot serve in Congress; persons under 62 cannot receive Social Security retirement benefits; persons under 35 cannot be President of the United States; persons over 21 cannot enter our military academies; and persons over 18 cannot serve as pages in the U.S. Congress. In each of these cases there is some age discrimination."

Olsen said he does not argue that all these regulations should be changed. "There are prudent considerations supporting some of them. However, I do argue that there is equally prudent support for retention of the student fares."

Urging continued emphasis on education, Olsen cited the air fare as "an important factor in easing the travel burden of thousands of college students. I believe it has been in the spirit of the increased attention our government has given to improve education in the last ten years. On the local level, too, we have all seen the parallel example of special prices to encourage young people to attend cultural events."

"Further," Olsen went on, "travel alone is a form of education. Thousands of young Americans—students and non-students—have been enabled by the youth fare to see much more of their country. They have benefitted from the current youth fare arrangement, and it has not been at the expense of full-fare passengers because space available seats are empty seats."

Concluding, Olsen asserted that "strict, imprudent application of the non-discrimination ruling would threaten half-fare tickets for youngsters between 2 and 12 years of age (reservations can be made for such tickets), for military personnel and several other special fare categories now properly and prudently provided by the airlines."

Olsen called upon the Congress and the nation's parents and young people to assist him in carrying his protests to the CAB.

YOUTH GROUNDED

Many Indiana State University students may be affected by a recent Civil Aeronautics Board recommendation that airlines' youth fares should be ended. Unless the Board decides to review the decision of its examiner, the ruling will become effective Feb. 21.

To date, students use the reduced rates to travel to and from their homes, business and vacation. Spokesmen for Allegheny and Trans-World Airlines told The Statesman that several thousand Indiana students take advantage of the reduced fares with no reported loss to the airlines.

The examiner's rash decision is subject to review by the Board. In the past, the CAB has upheld youth fares as a legitimate way to promote airline traffic. The examiner's rationale rests on the premise that "equality is paramount."

The Statesman believes that discounts are needed to not only fill empty seats both on existing planes and the larger planes that will come into operation soon but also it permits already financially-burdened students an opportunity to travel at decent rates.

The current youth-fare case was triggered by complaints from several bus companies who fail to appeal to youth.

We encourage all students who oppose this infringement on their opportunity to travel via youth fares and the serious attack on an airlines right to fill its planes to contact the Civil Aeronautics Board, 1825 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009 and voice their protest against this unfair decision. It is important that this be done within the next 30 days so that a new hearing will be set, otherwise the ruling will automatically become law.

UKRAINIAN PATRIOTISM REGENERATED

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, stepping up the persecution of Ukrainians by the Soviets can only be interpreted as increased activity by the brave Ukrainians to escape their Communist bondage and regain their freedom.

Catholic priests are being arrested, synagogues are being burned, and every totalitarian device is being employed by the Soviets to inflict genocide on Ukraine culture.

Communism is crumbling—as those who know and have lived under communism work unceasingly to free themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I include clippings from the Ukrainian Catholic Daily for February 27, 1969, so our colleagues can be apprised of the terror being perpetrated against the brave Ukrainians:

ARCHBISHOP WELYCHKOWSKY ARRESTED IN LVIV—NEW WAVE OF PERSECUTION SWEEPS OVER UKRAINIAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

PHILADELPHIA.—According to reports received from reliable sources, the Soviet police (MVD) on January 27, 1969, arrested in Lviv Most Rev. Wasyl Welychkowsky, Ukrainian Catholic Archbishop of Lviv. The Archbishop had gone to confess a woman in her home. Police agents followed him to the woman's home and arrested him. The Archbishop was then taken back to his apartment where a thorough search was made. When the Archbishop was being taken away, members of the sick woman's family heard one of the agents say: "You'll never see him again."

On the same day a host of other Ukrainian Catholic priests were arrested. Their names have not been disclosed as yet.

It is said that about a month and a half before the Archbishop's arrest he was visited by a man, who called himself a tourist. The man spoke French and said he was a priest. He told Archbishop Welychkowsky that he had come with a tourist group and had instructions from the Vatican to find out about the activities of the underground Ukrainian Catholic Church in Ukraine. The man said that he would need to have the information recorded on paper.

It soon turned out that the man was no tourist, but an agent of the MVD. Following Archbishop Welychkowsky's arrest he was shown the written notes which he had made for the "tourist."

Following the arrest of the Archbishop, searches and arrests were made in the homes of other Ukrainian Catholic priests in Lviv and in other West Ukrainian cities.

In Stanislaviv, members of the Communist Party, on instructions from the MVD, gave out lists of instructions to Ukrainian nuns. The instructions warned the nuns not to attend Masses, receive priests in their homes, baptize children, or persuade people to go to confession.

Failure to comply with the instructions would bring three years imprisonment and the loss of all civil rights.

POCHAYEV SYNOD

Last fall a synod of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church was held in Pochayev. The Orthodox priests, who are under the jurisdiction of the Moscow patriarchate, complained that the underground activities of the Ukrainian Catholic priests make it difficult for them to carry out their activities among the people. They made a joint appeal to Moscow to help them in liquidating the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Western Ukraine. The reply came immediately: "By 1970, the 100th anniversary of Lenin's birth, the Ukrainian Catholic Church will be completely crushed."

In addition, an Orthodox bishop arrived in Western Ukraine from Kiev, and in a meeting with the Orthodox priests attacked them for not having liquidated the Catholic Church in the 30-year period of their activity. The bishop then handed out small tokens of encouragement to the Orthodox priests: watches, clothing, and money.

KILLER OF STEPAN BANDERA LIVES IN THE UNITED STATES, BONN REPORTS

BONN, GERMANY.—A Soviet assassin convicted in 1961 of slaying two Ukrainian emigre leaders with a poison gas gun has been released from prison, and a West German magazine says he is living in the United States.

The West German Justice Ministry confirmed that Bogdan N. Stashinsky, 37, was released from prison two years ago after serving five years of an eight-year prison term and left West Germany. The ministry said he was eligible for release because he had served two-thirds of his sentence.

LIFE IN DANGER

The ministry said he was allowed to leave West Germany because his life was in danger here. It would not say where he went.

The Hamburg weekly magazine Stern reported in its current issue that Stashinsky and his wife went to the United States, accompanied by Central intelligence agents.

"He was met by agents of the U.S. intelligence service CIA and immediately taken to the United States in a military plane," the magazine said.

LIGHT SENTENCE

In October, 1961, the West German Supreme Court sentenced Stashinsky to eight years for the killings in Munich of Ukrainian nationalist leaders Lev Rebet in 1957 and Stepan Bandera in 1959.

Stashinsky, who turned himself in, said he had killed on orders of the Soviet secret service with pistols that sprayed potassium cyanide and caused instant death.

UKRAINIAN MYSTERY: LIBRARY FIRES—ARCHIVE DESTRUCTION LINKED TO STRUGGLE OVER NATIONALISM

WASHINGTON, February 19—There was an explosion, and then a fire. Historic collections of Ukrainian and Jewish archives were destroyed as the blaze swept through a 17th-century monastery library in Kiev, capital of the Soviet Ukraine.

An obscure paragraph in a local Kiev newspaper, Kyivska Pravda, reported the destruction last November of the Church of St. George in the Vydubetsky Monastery, along with its priceless Slavic and Hebrew manuscripts.

Strange coincidences attach to this event, which otherwise could have been only a tragic but routine incident. The same night, Nov. 26, 1968, another mysterious fire was reported to have destroyed the Great Synagogue in the Ukrainian port of Odessa, destroying a library of Jewish documents.

And the fire at St. George's Church was the second time in recent years that archives of Ukrainian history had been destroyed by a large fire of obscure origin.

In the first fire, in 1964, documents on Ukrainian history and culture were destroyed in the library of the republic's Academy of Sciences.

POLITICAL IMPLICATIONS RAISED

To Ukrainians living in this country and Canada, and to many analysts of Soviet affairs, the fires have political implications of national minorities under Soviet Russian rule.

Cultural and religious suppression of the Jews of the Soviet Union has been widely noted through the years. The Ukrainian nationality and heritage has been a more intermittent target of the Kremlin's drive for cultural assimilation.

Starting with the arrests and secret trials of dozens of Ukrainian intellectuals in the autumn of 1965 there is mounting evidence of a Soviet police drive to clamp down on dissident writers and teachers whose calls for cultural freedom are blended into their pride in the Ukrainian national heritage.

Soviet spokesmen often denounce this interest in the prerevolutionary culture as "bourgeoise nationalism," anti-Soviet and subversive. The existence of nationalist dissent in Ukraine is cited by Western analysts as one of the main reasons why the Kremlin decided to occupy Czechoslovakia last August and reverse the liberalization movement in Prague, before its effects spread across the Carpathian Mountains to the western Ukraine.

It is this context that gives the fires of Nov. 26, 1968, their political overtones, for irreplaceable archives of the Ukrainian heritage and that of Jews settled in Ukraine were reported to have gone up in smoke. Exactly what manuscripts were destroyed in Odessa is not yet known here.

ARCHIVES FROM JEWISH CENTERS

The Hebraic collections of the Vydubetsky Monastery consisted mainly of archives from two Jewish institutions that were closed in 1933–34, the Vinchevsky Hebrew Library and the Scientific Research Institute of Hebrew Proletarian Culture of the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences.

These institutions had over 150,000 volumes in their libraries when they were liquidated. The collections were transferred to the Vydubetsky Monastery in 1934.

The Slavic collection included Ukrainian archives from the Czarist and Hapsburg past, when Ukraine was divided between Russian and Austro-Hungarian rule.

The collection contained some of the manuscripts that had escaped destruction when, four and a half years earlier, the library of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in Kiev was set afire.

The Odessa synagogue fire originated from a short circuit in an adjoining matzoh bakery, according to a report from Moscow released by the Soviet Embassy in Washington. The Vydubetsky Monastery fire is under investigation, the Ukrainian press agency said.

But the first fire, on May 14, 1964, was acknowledged by officials in Kiev to have been arson. A library employe named Pohruszhalsky was tried in Kiev in August, 1964, sentenced to 10 years imprisonment on a court finding that he was emotionally unbalanced.

The official version was that he had set the blaze in anger over a feud with the chief librarian.

George Luckyj, professor of Russian and Ukrainian literature at the University of Toronto, was in Kiev at the time and witnessed the fire.

He wrote this description in the academic journal Problems of Communism, published by the United States Information Agency.

"Standing in a crowd of rather apathetic spectators," Mr. Luckyj wrote in a recent article, "I was struck by the magnitude of the blaze (it was still burning the next day). When no word about this disaster appeared in the local press, I talked to some Ukrainian writers who told me that they thought the fire was an act of sabotage, but they had no answer as to who might be the saboteur."

Many months later an anonymous pamphlet reached the West, one of the first of the so-called "underground" documents to be smuggled out of the Soviet Union, describing the trial and charging that the arson had been a deliberate maneuver of the Soviet secret police, the KGB, to wipe out archives that could have been a rallying point for Ukrainian nationalist sentiments.

Among the manuscripts destroyed were records of Ukrainian folklore, literature and history, including documents of the short-lived anti-Soviet Ukrainian regime of 1918–19.

The library of the Academy of Sciences, in downtown Kiev, had the largest collection of Ukrainian writings known to exist. "A portion of those archives was not even catalogued yet so that no one knows what there was and exactly what burned," the underground pamphlet said. "They are lost forever to history."

Whatever was left when the fire was extinguished was moved to the Vydubetsky Monastery near bluffs overlooping the Dnieper River.

CONGRESSMAN FRANK HORTON CALLS FOR SUPREME SACRIFICE MEDAL FOR FAMILIES OF MEN AND WOMEN KILLED IN VIETNAM

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to introduce legislation today which establishes the creation of a Supreme Sacrifice Medal for presentation to the survivors of American service men and women who have lost their lives in Vietnam.

This medal is dedicated to the next of kin of sacrificed heroes as an expression of tribute and sorrow from a grateful Nation. This medal is designed to be displayed in the home or place of business as a reminder that our Nation is aware of the terrible sacrifice that families and loved ones make in shouldering the burden of their loss.

Retroactive to December 1961, this award in no way detracts from any personal honors or decorations which may be awarded to deceased servicemen and women who have responded above and beyond the call of duty.

Enactment of this legislation would be an important expression of the high esteem that Congress holds for those at home who pay the high cost of a cold war in Vietnam.

THE AMERICAN LEGION: THE FIRST 50 YEARS

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, March 15–17, 1969, will mark the golden anniversary of the founding of the American Legion. On those dates, 50 years ago, in Paris, France, a caucus of World War I veterans, responding to the idea of Col. Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., met and laid the foundation for what is now the world's largest veterans organization, with 2.6 million members in 16,300 posts scattered throughout the United States and 28 foreign countries. A special commemorative stamp is being issued by the Post Office Department to mark this event. The Legion itself is giving, as a gift to the Nation, a permanent lighting system for the Tomb of the Unknowns in Arlington Cemetery.

What is that mystical thing, that special bond created among those who have worn their country's uniform? What drew those men together in 1919? Shakespeare's Henry V, exhorting his soldiers before the battle of Agincourt, spoke what were probably the noblest words ever written to describe it:

> He that outlives this day, and comes safe home
> Will stand a tip-toe when this day is named,
> . . . he'll remember with advantages
> What feats he did that day . . . we in it shall be remembered;
> We few, we happy few, we band of brothers;
> For he today that sheds his blood with me
> Shall be my brother. . .

So the "band of brothers" met in Paris in March 1919. The guns of "the war to end all wars" had been silent for only 4 months. Less than 2 years before, on June 13, 1917, a grimy English Channel steamer had landed the first of what was to be 2 million American soldiers in France: 177 men, headed by a tall, slim, cold-eyed major general named John J. Pershing.

March 1919—the first year of what all hoped and, at that time, had reason to assume was perpetual peace, but no man knew that it was only the beginning of a 20-year armistice. Behind the "band of brothers" were the green fields around a sleepy little village in Picardy called Cantigny; the surrounding plots of forest had sheltered 90 German artillery batteries. On the night of May 3, 1918, the 18th Infantry of the American 1st Division, soon to get its immortal name of "Big Red 1," was hammered with 15,000 rounds of artillery. Two hundred died; 600 were wounded or gassed; long lines of Doughboys stretched back to the rear, led like blind men, hands on shoulders of the man in front.

At Chateau-Thierry and Belleau Wood the French were just beginning to dig up the first of thousands of brass machinegun cartridge cases from their fields and orchards; they would swear the metal tainted the fruit for years afterward. The grass was soon to come up again on hill 231, overlooking the Marne at Varennes, where the German 5th and 6th Grenadiers had smashed themselves to bits against McAlexander's 38th Infantry Regiment.

Soissons lay gloomy and gray under the last few weeks of the French winter. On July 18, 1918, the French General Magnin had wired the American troops that "You rushed into the fight as to a fete."

An American Army and American airpower had been born at St. Mihiel. As the first caucus got down to business in Paris, the rusting wreckage of Lt. Frank Luke's Spad still marked the spot where the Texas Balloon Buster, who had racked up 14 victories in 8 days, and five of them in 8 minutes, had made his last stand. Shot down and confronted by a German patrol, the wild and undisciplined flying genius had shot it out rather than be taken prisoner, and died with a Colt .45 in his hand.

The Meuse-Argonne was quiet that March of 1919. Hill 223 had been a wasp's nest of machineguns, but "every time a head came up, I knocked it down," said corporal, later sergeant, Alvin York. Returning from the hill with his bag of German prisoners, York's battalion commander ordered him to report directly to the brigadier. "Well, York," said the astounded General Lindsay, "I hear you have captured the whole damned German army." "No, sir; I only have 132."

The men who met in Paris in 1919 to found the American Legion could not foresee that within 50 years the ranks of their Legion comrades would be swelled by veterans of three more wars. Their love for their country, their belief and faith in its ideals, and their hopes for its future had been forged and strengthened in the fiery crucible of World War I that had dragged the United States for all time into the position of major world power. Whether they knew the direction their country would take in the years to come, no man knows. But we can be sure that they knew of the latent potential strength and possibilities that lay within the "band of brothers" and, so, as the preamble to the Legion constitution states, they determined that "For God and Country we associate ourselves together for the following purposes." Let us reflect on this preamble, for within its phrases and what they mean lie the objectives and forces that have made the American Legion the powerful and moving force for good that it has become.

To uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America.

What could be more fitting for an opening phrase? Our country stands upon its Constitution, that document termed by the great English statesman Gladstone "the most remarkable work known to me in modern times to have been produced by the human intellect, at a single stroke—so to speak—in its application to political affairs."

To maintain law and order.

This is one of the eternal truths of our American Republic, and it was cited in President Thomas Jefferson's eighth annual message to Congress when he said: "Love of liberty, obedience to law, and support of the public authorities, a sure guaranty of permanence of our republic."

To foster and perpetuate a 100 percent Americanism.

This idea is one often scorned in some circles. It is charged that there is no such thing as Americanism, let alone "100 percent," but to those who carp, and mock, and criticize, I would respond in this fashion: It is true that our country is a melting pot, of all races, creeds, and nationalities. But it is also true that this has been distilled into something found only in America; it is a national will, a national ethic, a national goal. It shows itself in a country that goes all out and at the expense of much blood and treasure to defeat its enemies, then turns right around and feeds these same one-time enemies and helps them regain their place in the community of nations. It is manifested in that country whose citizenry gives voluntarily more of their private time and resources in attempts to do good for others than any other country on earth. Yes, it is real, and, yes, certainly, it is worth fostering and perpetuating.

To preserve the memories and incidents of our associations in the Great Wars.

"We band of brothers." That mystical bond and kinship felt among men who have worn their country's uniform, and have borne the weight of its battles, is like nothing else on earth. Those who have seen the face of war are also those most eager and dedicated to preserving the peace they have helped to secure.

To inculcate a sense of individual obligation to the community, State and Nation.

"Individual obligation"—something all too often cast aside today, trampled in the dust by the new theories that the individual is neither responsible for nor owes his community, State, and Nation anything, but that society collectively both owes the individual all, and is morally guilty of whatever transgressions the individual commits. This is a sentiment totally alien to all enlightened concepts of human nature. Restoration of this sense of individual obligation is what the country needs now more than at any other time in its history.

To combat the autocracy of both the classes and the masses.

Dictatorship, despotism, can come like thieves in the night, under banners that proclaim, falsely, equal justice and liberty and prosperity for all. It is not restricted to one certain political creed, this danger; is not confined to one social or economic class alone, and not to be found in another. The danger is demagoguery in all forms, that rends a nation, divides its people, fills them with fear and foreboding, and then sees them turn to the first mountebank and charlatan who promises them relief from their troubles. All have a role to fulfill; none has a right to impose tyrannical rule on the rest.

To make right the master of might.

None need fear the power of another if those who wield it do so only in the name of what is right, and at the call and plea of those who are oppressed. When a country is granted power, it also takes on the solemn obligation to use it only for honorable causes and in defense of the rights of free men.

To promote peace and good will on earth.

No nobler objective could be cited, and, sadly enough, at times it seems that nothing can be farther from achievement by mankind than good will among all and the blessings of peace. But it is a goal to be kept eternally fixed and worked for, and never to be forgotten.

To safeguard and transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom and democracy.

If these principles, strong and untarnished and shining, can be passed on to future generations, then that generation which has gone before will know their work was well done, and their duty to those who come after them has been faithfully and conscientiously carried out. If these principles endure, then so does the Nation and its people. If they fail, then the Nation and people decline and ultimately fall. And a sacred trust will have been betrayed.

To consecrate and sanctify our comradeship by our devotion to mutual helpfulness.

When men band together, no matter what the reason and no matter what the bond, they take upon themselves responsibilities and duties that make this very association an outstanding and special thing. "Mutual helpfulness" is a simple term, but as is so often the case with simple and uncomplicated statements, it speaks more truth then volumes of empty rhetoric.

SO THIS IS THE AMERICAN LEGION AFTER FIFTY YEARS

Fifty years have gone by, and the men of three more wars—World War II, Korea, and now Vietnam—have joined the ranks begun by their comrades-in-arms who went "over there." Cantigny, Soissons, the Marne, Chateau-Thierry, the list has lengthened to include Pearl Harbor, Guadalcanal, Halfaya Pass, Anzio, Salerno, Omaha Beach, St. Lo, Okinawa, Tarawa, Pusan, Inchon, the Chosin Reservoir, and the newest additions of the Rock Pile, Da Nang, Khe Sanh, Plei Me, and the Mekong Delta.

The American Legion represents some of the finest of America's sons; its ideals, goals, and objectives reflect the highest strivings of our Nation; its role in our Republic's life has a value that can never be calculated. With its first 50 years of service "to God and Country" behind it, the American Legion and the country it serves can look ahead with confidence to many more years of the Legion playing a significant and important role in the life of the Nation.

RACE AND VIOLENCE IN WASHINGTON STATE

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, "Race and Violence in Washington State" is the title of a 65-page study produced as the result of a 6-month, statewide survey of racial tensions. The study was effected by the Washington State Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Civil Disorder.

The commission originated with Gov. Dan Evans' Advisory Council on Urban Affairs. The council directed Secretary of State A. Ludlow Kramer to form a 19-member commission which first met in May 1968, and completed its work in December 1968. The study was turned over to Governor Evans on February 26, 1969.

Mr. Speaker, the specific goals assigned to the commission were—

To educate a cross section of the public, black and white, and public leaders in particular, about the potential for racial disorders in the State.

To describe, as the Kerner Commission largely failed to do, what actions—public and private—citizens have taken to prevent civil disorders from occurring.

To set down a list of recommendations for additional action at all levels of public and private endeavor.

To cultivate a greater sense of determination in public officials and private individuals to make substantial positive exertions that racial peace and justice require at this time in history.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the commission's report is of concern to all Americans and for this reason I submit, under unanimous consent, for printing in the RECORD excerpts of the report prepared by the Seattle Post-Intelligencer's Hilda Bryant:

RACE AND VIOLENCE IN WASHINGTON STATE

In this report we are concerned with the causes and prevention of racial (i.e. black) disorders and the wider matter of racial violence.

The Commission believes that there is a complex chemistry in the causes of civil disorders and terrorism. Some causes are underlying causes, some are contributory, and some are the trigger or spark of disorders.

Basic to the underlying causes is long-term, pervasive exclusion of those who are different from white middle-class America. This exclusion, which is founded in both racial and cultural discrimination, has become rigidified and institutionalized over time, permeating the social, economic, political, legal and education life of America.

Other underlying causes are black poverty and the black poverty culture, a psychologically debilitating environment which originated in white exclusion and whose present makeup is still conditioned in part by white discrimination.

Another underlying cause is the presence of large numbers of poor and underemployed blacks in a segregated and confined area, particularly when the grouping is not entirely by choice; when the area is, in other words, a ghetto. The situation is worsened when such people are unable to participate in city-wide economic, educational, recreational, social and governmental life.

Among other causes of disorder, some more important than others, are:

Awareness of the exclusion referred to above.

Lack of understanding of the machinery of the democratic system and the possibilities for change within it.

Failure of government to provide firm, bias-free police service in the ghetto, police service that has the confidence of the ghetto.

Lack of availability and equality of justice before the law and the courts such as disparity of bail requirements, sentencing, parole procedures and unavailability of good legal service.

Legitimization of violence in the rhetoric of black extremism, a loose-tongued, loose-minded apologia which is self-defeating to the real interests of black people as white racism is to the interests of whites. (Black extremism, of course, should not be confused with the positive attitude of black pride.)

Overselling of the potential of government programs aimed at ending poverty, with resulting frustration and cynicism.

Rising expectations brought about by the real gains in civil rights and in economic conditions, which heighten a sense of urgency and a feeling of impatience, thereby resulting in increased frustration.

The unintentional and sometimes irresponsible glorification and advertisement of riots by the media, particularly television and radio.

Boredom and lack of constructive outlet for energies of the young.

Rumors, which spread false alarms and increase tensions in both white and black neighborhoods.

Weather, as when hot, muggy days and nights tend to bring ghetto people living in close quarters out of their houses—uncomfortable and irritable—and onto the streets.

The ambivalence and confusion with which the majority in society react to black language and acts of violence. White people's sense of support for certain black goals and their sense of guilt for society's past injustices, sometimes prevent them from responding with consistent firmness to destructive acts by criminal elements in the black community. On the other hand, whites often are inconsistent in distinguishing constructive militancy from criminality.

Finally, like the Kerner Commission, we did not find evidence of organized agitation playing a role in causing major civil disorders. However, there seems little question that it has played a role in individual criminal acts in our state and there is no discernible obstacle to its also playing a role in civil disorders in the future.

By organized agitation, we do not mean a large conspiracy; there is no hint of that.

What we do mean is organized criminal activity which falsely parades in the guise of civil disobedience and civil rights; that, of course, must be recognized for what it is and dealt with accordingly.

CAUSES PRESENT

While we have avoided major disorders so far, the Commission has found ample evidence of riot causes in the state and in some ways the situation is deteriorating rather than improving.

The overall economic position of black people in Washington State is slowly improving, but the difference is so small between our cities and those that have had riots as to be nearly negligible.

Granted that white and black citizens in Washington have a higher personal income than most citizens elsewhere. But the disparity between the races—the comparison of standards of living—in many ways may be as productive of racial resentment as absolute deprivation.

All the attendant features of poverty which make up the poverty culture—crime, low employment, extreme examples of bad housing, health backwardness and educational difficulties—are present in Washington, however one may quibble with matters of degree.

Further, the element of white discrimination is not missing. On the other hand, it should not be surprising that some black people, who suffer real discrimination often enough, should sometimes misconstrue encounters with white people.

What was significant in the Commission's field trips and hearings was that most instances of discrimination seemed to derive as much from the victim's economic and cultural position as his race. It would seem that many in today's society and some of society's institutions are economically and culturally prejudiced as much or more than they are racially prejudiced.

Black people suffer most from this prejudice because most blacks, by American standards, are poor. Moreover, since most are poor, even those who are not are often assumed to be and are treated accordingly—which is not so with whites.

The most damaging aspect of discrimination against the black poor is its institutionalization by an unwitting society.

Most of society's policies are designed according to middle class standards of equality which result in demanding more of ghetto residents than they are able to give and provide less protection and help than they deserve.

It is our judgment that Civil Service test requirements for some jobs seem too high and unachievable for persons otherwise qualified. The same is true of many private job standards. It is unhealthy for society to exclude its culturally different. In fact, the Commission discovered a great many handwringing officials who want to hire more of the poor, especially the black poor, but are held back by job profiles.

Theoretically the law makes only "equal" demands on the poor (black) in other ways. The law of wage garnishment is applied evenly but only the poor are likely to experience it. In Washington State's concept of "equal" justice, a creditor may garnish the wages of a debtor before the courts have even rendered a judgment in the case.

Similarly, the tenant in Washington State may not refuse to pay his rent even if the landlord fails to keep up maintenance of the apartment; under the law the landlord has no obligation to perform that maintenance. In all common law, this is perhaps the only instance where legal obligations are not mutual.

The most pervasive and critical catalytic cause of civil disorders, of course, is tension between certain residents of the ghetto and the police. In most of the Washington cities visited by the Commission, police-ghetto relations are the single most common source of complaints and agitation.

The white police are the most tangible symbol of white power in the ghetto, and as such, no matter how competent and sensitive they might be, bear the brunt of black resentment. They are the pressure point of confrontation.

There undoubtedly are a certain number of racist officers in the police departments of Washington State. The Commission heard too many respected black citizens with no axe to grind make too many specified charges of police brutality, rudeness and callous indifference to totally disregard them.

Testimony was also heard concerning policemen who conduct searches without a warrant—and not merely in cases where the search is made incidental to a lawful arrest. Plainly, lower-class ghetto residences are not respected to the same degree as white, middle class residences elsewhere.

It is extremely difficult under the present structure of complaint procedures in all Washington cities visited by the Commission to ferret out prejudiced policemen and have them suspended.

One reason that more ghetto residents are more dissatisfied with the police than are other people is that the high crime rate in the ghetto brings the police and local residents into more frequent—almost necessarily unpleasant—contact.

The dilemma is complicated by the differing cultural outlooks of most policemen, who are white, and most ghetto residents, who are black. The police are charged with enforcing the law, but the middle-class morality standards of behavior of society are sometimes confused with the law itself.

Many in the white middle-class, for example, take a more tolerant view of traffic violations than does the law and a less tolerant view of personal demeanor and attire. Unfortunately some policemen not only identify with these standards but try to enforce them in the ghetto. Others, recognizing that their outlook and those of the ghetto differ, are unsure as to what kind of enforcement to maintain and err on the side of nonenforcement.

How to strike the balance? The white, middle-class policeman in the black, lower class ghetto is confounded. Police and ghetto dwellers in most Washington cities' ghettos have reached a point where communication is nearly impossible on some matters.

THE DANGERS POSED

The Commission concludes that sufficient preconditions do exist in Washington State to cause major civil disorders. In the past certain arms of government and business have made notable progress in dealing with the root and secondary causes of disorders. But the swelling chorus of black indignation and threats has not been stilled.

Some of the violent actions of late, particularly in Seattle, clearly are the planned work of certain extremist blacks. Much has been made of the fact that these extremists avowedly employ terrorism against policemen, firemen, stores and apartment houses as an alternative to rioting.

The terrorist element even has stated that the era of riots is over, at least for a while, and have hinted at "guerrilla warfare." But if there are not riots, it will not be because the extremists have turned to "guerrilla warfare." In truth, the terrorism of recent months does not preclude open civil disorders, for while the extremists may not start a civil disorder themselves, others may.

Indeed, the Kerner Commission found no evidence in the major race riots of the East that the initial incident or incidents had been planned. What the extremists do manage, besides their separate crimes, is to contribute to an atmosphere of violence which can encourage and sustain mob action, and that they are doing.

Daily tension and sporadic incidents might at any time develop into full-fledged riot. It might be an isolated outbreak. It might also, however, be encouraged by news of similar outbreaks in other cities. Minor strife in Washington usually increases at those times major violence takes place elsewhere.

For example, Seattle, Spokane, and Tacoma all had small disturbances and civil disruptions in the days of April 1968, following the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., when sizable riots were occurring in the

East. Incidents of arson, false alarms and transit vandalism shot up noticeably in Seattle, Tacoma, Spokane and even Yakima had riot scares communicated from Seattle.

Indeed, it was reported by many officials in Washington cities outside of Seattle that if a riot occurred in their respective localities it probably would come, by contagion, after one had started in Seattle.

Certain blacks repeatedly told representatives of this Commission that white society only learns from violence. The truth is that if riots or terrorism were ever effective instruments of remonstrance, they aren't today. At the very most, they are swords that cut the wielder (and his neighbors) more than his reputed antagonist. Indeed, civil disorders represent the single most dangerous threat to the long term advancement and liberation of poor people, particularly the black poor, in a country overwhelmingly middle-class and white. Instead of forwarding the cause of the black poor, civil disorders threaten to disrupt and retard the numerous efforts that blacks and their white allies have undertaken in the ghetto.

Not only would a riot in, say Seattle or Tacoma, probably result, as in Newark and Detroit, in far more black injuries and deaths and property damage than whites, would suffer, but it very likely would threaten to loose the violence of some whites who are racist and alarmists.

Indeed, both city officials and black leaders in Yakima confessed to the Commission that their primary fear was not of a black riot, but of white vigilantes who might stage a "preventive attack" on local blacks after a word of a riot elsewhere. Similar qualms were voiced in other cities.

THE IMPORTANCE OF ATTITUDES

Attitudes, factually based or not, are often the reality with which we must deal.

Overt bigotry is present in Washington State, but the more widespread problem is prejudice which is subtle, and sometimes, therefore, more cruel. The basis is lazy thinking, a combination of ignorance, over-generalizations and indifference.

The Commission found that the prejudice of individual whites does not represent the most serious obstacle to the black advance. What does is institutionalized prejudice, the cementing of the middle-class values into the economic and governmental structure in ways which effectively discriminate against the disadvantaged blacks. Industrial seniority systems in unions, once used against employers, now effectively keep down blacks, as does recruitment by referral, though they may not be overtly discriminatory, nor even viewed in that light by many union members.

Similarly, prohibitions against hiring anybody with a criminal record is effectively prejudicial to graduates of the ghetto.

The Commission also must report it found ample evidence in Washington State of a developing black bigotry which already is nearly as much a threat to progress as is white bigotry.

Just as the terrorism of the Ku Klux Klan and other open, radical rightest movements prosper until decent opinion rallies against them, the black counter-bigots must be confronted now by people of all races.

To a large extent the ideology of black racism is imported. Many otherwise well-meaning persons have been seduced by its half-truths, overgeneralizations, and false absolutes. Moreover, just as some non-racist whites have defended the outright bigots as "honorable men," there are blacks who excuse the excesses of the black bigots on the ground they are building black "pride."

A racial generalization the Commission repeatedly encountered, that "violence is all that white people understand," is a slur that attributes the stupidity of a faction or a race to the whole and is unwitting parody of remarks made by white bigots. Indeed, it sometimes appears that the black racists merely have turned white racist arguments on their heads.

THE SILENT MIDDLE

Perhaps there is a tendency to overestimate the influence of the extremists. A University of Washington study of Seattle's Central Area showed that most blacks there tended to consider their "leadership" to be the established moderates, not the extremists. Such ordinary citizens found Seattle a cold city, but found whites in the Central Area friendly. They seemed afraid both of neighborhood hoodlumism and excesses of the police.

What the special studies of the Kerner Commission most graphically demonstrate is the variety of opinion among both blacks and whites—the point confirmed by this Commission's analysis of Washington State, and the truth that confounds the demogogues and racists.

There is a vast overlap, however, of well-meaning whites and well-meaning blacks. They disagree on some points of analysis and proposed solutions. But they both have a stake—and an obligation—in fending off the extremes.

Those blacks who believe in violence and those whites who believe in repression make the headlines. But if both races are to progress, the silent middle will have to raise its voice.

GHETTOIZATION

Washington's cities since World War II have been recipients of the last major wave of "immigrants" in this country. These immigrants, Negroes, have moved within our own nation. Their reasons for coming to Washington were the same as the European immigrants and Easterners who preceded them, the search for opportunity, economic achievement and an escape from social injustice.

Though in-migration still continues, most of the present growth in the black community is from natural increase. However, three-fifths of blacks in Washington were born elsewhere. Half of these immigrants came from the South, the others mostly from Eastern and California cities.

They overwhelmingly tend to settle in cities forming clusters of blacks in single areas, effectively ghettos. East-Pasco is all black, Seattle's Central Area has shifted from one-quarter to three-fifths black and Tacoma's Hilltop area is following the same pattern.

Recent open housing legislation enacted nationally and locally will aid to some degree in breaking down patterns of residential segregation. However, there are other problems that contribute to the segregation that must also be dealt with. According to the Seattle Urban League, they are:

Limited choice confined to approximately 3 houses compared to the white buyer's choice of 20.

Equal treatment offered by only four per cent of realtors.

Unpleasantness or strain involved in two of three contacts.

Twice as many false starts as the white buyers; i.e., cancellation of arrangements.

Lack of preferred housing the Negro buyer can afford. The majority of houses made available to Negroes are in the $20,000 to $40,000 range, the majority of buyers are looking for houses in the $15,000 to $25,000 range.

The conclusion reached by the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders apply to this state. They found that although the incomes of both blacks and whites have been rising rapidly:

"Negro incomes still remain far below those of whites. Negro median family income was only 58 per cent of the white median in 1966.

"Negro family income is not keeping pace with white family income growth. In constant 1965 dollars, median non-white income in 1947 was $2,174 lower than median white income. By 1966, the gap had grown to $3,036."

A Central question regarding income is that of parity. When will Negroes or other minorities make as much money as their white counterparts? The answer is: not for a long time. Negroes have such a low level of income now that even if the rate of increase in income for Negroes were three times that for whites, it would take 10 years to reach parity, and an increase rate as rapid as that is unrealistic.

It would appear that if Negro income is to be increased through more education for Negroes, money to pay for that education will have to be found. The Negro today is in a bind, admonished to seek higher education and then denied the resources necessary to obtain that education.

CRIME

In Seattle, the census tracts that make up the Central Area have the highest crime rates in the city and would have so even without race-related crimes.

Says the Kerner Commission: "Within larger cities, person and property insecurity has consistently been highest in older neighborhoods encircling the downtown business district.

"High crime rates have persisted in these inner areas even though the ethnic character of their residents continually changed."

The same pattern essentially has been true in most Washington cities. One distinction does exist. Negroes who had prospered enough to acquire other housing found it very difficult, if not impossible, to leave these areas because of residential segregation.

Therefore, the Negro who possesses the resources to seek a more secure environment for his family is forced by discrimination to remain amidst the chaos of the ghetto.

In short, the greatest victims of crime are the poor and disadvantaged residents of the ghetto. There is little applause for this crime in the black communities of Washington. Residents have been frightened by the rise in crime and have become indignant about what they feel to be a lack of police protection in their neighborhoods.

This raises a double problem. The residents of the Negro communities are insecure because of the existence of high crime rates, but also, they, like their white counterparts, have abrasive relationships with the police whenever they come in contact.

This combines with a feeling of a double standard of justice and helps to erode police-community respect.

HEALTH

In Washington, the infant mortality rate among Negroes is approximately 2.5 times that of Caucasians. In 1967, the rate among whites was 17.8 infant deaths per one thousand live births. The rate among blacks was 42.8 deaths per one thousand live births.

This represented an increase in the mortality rate for blacks over the last decade, while the rate for whites decreased over the same period.

The ratio of tuberculosis, as between the white and Negro population gives further evidence of the poor health conditions of residents of the ghetto. In Seattle, the incidence of tuberculosis among non-whites was 2.4 times that of whites in 1967.

We must examine our medical system in order to determine why health care remains unobtainable. One problem is lack of information about services available among those who need care. Knowledge about free immunization clinics, dental services, charity hospitals and consultation services does not reach many of the people who desperately need these services.

Lack of professional sensitivity to the problem is another reason services don't reach the poor. The physician who travels from his suburban home to his suburban clinic or his downtown office rarely witnesses the critical needs of the vast number of people who either are not able or not inclined to come to him.

Our health professional schools have not done enough to train members of cultural and racial minorities and at present, there are only four Negro dentists and only 19 Negro physicians practicing in our state.

EDUCATION

The State of Washington may well take pride in the quality of its public education system which, by almost any standard, is one of the best in the nation. A National Education Association publication shows Washington first in the number of students passing the Armed Forces mental test and second in the median years of education completed by students for 1966.

The schools, then, prepare a majority of students to become successful members of society. But this has not been true for many minority group members.

Tests given at schools in Seattle with enrollments of over three-quarters Negro point out the disparity in the educational attainment of these students when compared to other students in the city.

Washington Junior High School in the ghetto, shows achievement scores far below the mean for the city.

The following table, using selected pupil indices for 1967–68, is illustrative:

Grade 8:	Washington Junior High	City Mean
Reading	23	62
Spelling	34	54
Language arts	16	41
Arithmetic computation	19	36

The lack of achievement in education by Negroes is further illustrated by the scarcity of Negro students attending college. The University of Washington last spring estimated black enrollment at only .005 per cent when the black population of the state is 2.0 per cent. Recent recruiting efforts by the University have tripled the Negro enrollment at the school but Negroes still make up only .015 per cent of the total.

This past year, 90 per cent of the new teachers entering a major school district in the state requested that they not be assigned to schools with black students. The fears of teachers and their lack of training in teaching the disadvantaged adds to the problems of educating the ghetto youth.

ORGANIZING FOR ACTION

To establish equality of opportunity will necessitate a state-wide commitment, with county and municipal governments setting up new organizational apparatus and providing new leadership, and with the private sector doing the same.

Tax reform is needed to provide more money, to remove tax inequities and to provide tax incentives that will aid in, rather than impair the economic progress of the ghetto.

We would point especially to the State Board Against Discrimination as a State operation in need of reorganization. The considerable accomplishments of the Board to date have come in spite of its structure, rather than because of it. Clearly, more staff are needed to handle present functions, particularly in the area of complaints.

The Commission believes that the only agency capable of functioning as an over-all coordinator of anti-poverty efforts in the state is the State Office of Economic Opportunity. If necessary it should fund its OEO in order to manage this function.

We recommend that the state establish an office in Washington, D.C. to serve an information and liaison role with the federal government. An office in the national capital would provide the state with fast, thorough information on legislation and policies of the national government and also would give the state greater influence on the shaping of such laws and policies.

We indorse the concept of an ombudsman in state government officially designated to hear complaints against the state by private individuals. The ombudsman would possess a staff to investigate charges made against decisions of the state or its employees.

We recommend that the legislature allocate block grants of money to cities and communities to improve law enforcement, the delivery of services, the protection of human rights and the development of the economic resources of depressed areas.

We recommend that the State Liquor Control Board adopt a regulation prohibiting discrimination in the use of a state liquor license.

Such a regulation would include the use of a license by a private club when the club does not factually open its membership, regardless of race or religion.

The State Board Against Discrimination should be empowered to help implement this regulation by investigation, with subpoena power, to make its findings available to the Liquor Control Board, and to make recommendations relative to the acquisition or retention of particular liquor licenses.

As a corollary, we recommend that any organization officially sanctioned by any higher institution of the state, such as a university fraternity, be prohibited from factually denying membership because of race or religion.

We recommend that counties develop employment programs for both minority groups and disadvantaged young people.

BUSINESS AND LABOR

We recommend the establishment of Urban Coalitions of business in metropolitan areas.

We recommend the establishment by labor unions of Urban Action Teams to focus the efforts of unions on the problems of the disadvantaged.

EMPLOYMENT

We would like to believe that adequate recruitment and training alone is sufficient to bring about higher black employment. But it isn't. Most businesses and unions profess policies of non-discrimination, but many companies and unions are still effectively segregated.

Consequently, we recommend that the state and local government require all businesses and unions under contract or sub-contract to those governments or supplying services to such governments, or enjoying government licenses, meet a reasonable standard of racial integration established by state and local anti-discrimination boards.

Companies and unions failing to meet those standards would fail to acquire contract or licensing cooperation from the governments.

We also recommend that the state appropriate funds for county and municipal governments to employ and train the disadvantaged.

We further recommend that the State Department of Commerce and Economic Development expand its work with the private enterprise sector and the minority groups to assist in the development of entrepreneurial skills in businesses among minority racial groups in Washington.

We recommend legislation which will prohibit the garnishment of wages prior to the entry of judgment and the increase of wage exemptions to enable debtors to maintain an adequate standard of living.

We recommend that the State Department of Employment Security be provided with funds and work with the State Banking Association to create a less restrictive program to provide fidelity bonds for those formerly prevented from working.

We recommend that government and private employers' testing and interviewing procedures be re-examined to eliminate cultural bias.

HOUSING

We concur in the recommendation of the Urban Affairs Council that the importance and scope of housing be recognized through the establishment of a State Housing Agency.

We urge that one of the chief functions of the new Housing Agency should be to promote the establishment of non-profit development corporations to construct quality low-cost housing for the poor both inside and outside the ghetto.

Furthermore: The state should assist non-profit housing corporations in rehabilitation and new construction by endowment of a state low-cost revolving fund of at least $5,000,000.

We recommend that the state, through the proposed new housing agency or the Planning and Community Affairs Agency, actively encourage the founding of multi-racial New Towns in Washington State.

We recommend the Legislature approve the State Insurance Commission's program, authorized by the Federal Housing Act of 1968, to make property insurance for residential and business properties in potential disorder areas available to all.

We urge the passage of a law to provide expeditious processing of complaints against landlords who delay making needed repairs. A housing code is a necessary antecedent to such a law.

EDUCATION

Several school districts in the state have begun to take impressive steps toward solving the problems of cultural deprivation and other bad effects of segregation. Both Seattle and Tacoma have embarked on plans to integrate the schools. Their efforts to date have not been entirely successful, several schools experiencing difficulties in their first encounter with integration.

The shock of black meeting white, poor meeting affluent and the motivated meeting the unmotivated is a most natural and predictable occurrence.

Other schools have experienced more serious occurrences. The political activities of students in school are properly the province of the officials, teachers and students of those schools. However, unlawful occurrences in and around schools are the concern of everyone. The steps necessary to prevent unlawful activities in and around schools should be taken at once.

We must, however, recognize the difference between unlawful acts and those acts which are purely political. The existence of a Black Student Union with open membership in a school represents an opportunity for dialogue between students. It is not an unlawful act.

Non-disruptive demonstrations by students are not unlawful acts. Situations such as these are best handled by students, faculty and administration. We believe that individual schools should exercise their autonomy and continue to determine school policy.

Integration should continue.

We recommend that all school districts, with the financial aid of the state, establish programs that will result in the meaningful integration of all schools by the fall of 1970.

The question of the relevance of present education must be answered. We recommend the establishment of a think tank designed to bring experts in various fields together for the purpose of improving educational policies and programs.

Regardless of what other steps are taken there must be the immediate inclusion of the role of the black American in the history of this country, and of Washington State, utilizing both primary and secondary sources.

We recommend that the teacher education programs at the state colleges and universities be altered to include training in teaching the disadvantaged.

We recommend that a tax reform proposal

be adopted which will eliminate the necessity for yearly school levy elections for operating funds.

We recommend the establishment of a State Scholarship Program for economically disadvantaged young people.

SOCIAL WELFARE AND HEALTH

We urge that the next Legislature make the following reforms in state assistance law:

(a) Raise the wholly inadequate $325 limit on funds a family may receive (very large families should get more.)

(b) Make permanent the current temporary exemption of earned income of children in determining family assistance allotments.

(c) Provide more funds for those on welfare to attend to medical needs and to dental needs in particular.

(d) Provide stipends for day care and transportation for those in job training.

We strongly indorse the health recommendations of the Urban Affairs Council and, in particular, those calling for local health departments to hire the poor to work with the poor; for a state law requiring fluoridation of the water; for a State requirement of socio-cultural sensitivity training of all students of medicine; for more recruitment of Negroes by the medical profession; for a State-sponsored educational-informational program to acquaint the poor with medical services which are already available.

MEDIA

We recommend that each metropolitan newspaper, magazine, radio or television station employ at least one reporter to specialize solely on problems of the core city.

The Commission recommends that newspaper, magazine, radio and television station ownership develop training programs of their own in cooperation with academic institutions for potentially qualified black reporters.

Not nearly enough is being done in this key area. However, while blacks must obviously not be excluded from reporting in the ghetto, the criteria for assignment of personnel in black communities must be based on the abilities and qualities of the people for the job—regardless of color. If a white reporter can do the best and most honest job in the ghetto, he should be assigned there. If a black reporter can do the best job in the white community, that should be his job.

People need not only to be told what is happening but why. When children between the ages of nine and 12 are out in the streets of Seattle throwing rocks and creating problems both whites and blacks must have that story developed not only as an event but as part of an overall picture.

We strongly recommend that newspapers pay careful attention to headline writing as an aspect of their racial coverage.

We recommend that if it is not already a formal policy, the media indentify no person by race in a story unless it is absolutely necessary to the understanding of that story.

We recommend the media, particularly radio and television, pay greater attention to the thousands of blacks and whites across this state who are working to further racial harmony and progress.

POLICE

We recommend that police departments renew their efforts to eliminate every trace of prejudiced behaviour and that they enforce this policy with stiff penalties for violations.

Further, we recommend the establishment of "sensitivity training" in each police department and for every level of officer, to inculcate a true understanding of cultural differences between the races and the ability to distinguish behaviour that is illegal from that which is merely non-conforming.

We recommend that whenever probable cause exists that a policeman has committed an assault upon a citizen, the matter to be referred first to the courts for appropriate legal action, rather than being settled by internal discipline alone.

Only when the law is fairly applied to all citizens alike, policemen and black militant, can extremists' attempts to justify illegality be answered.

We believe it should be the publicly stated and explained policy of the police to assign patrols to any given area in direct proportion to the crime rate and population density of the area.

Policemen attending social events where alcohol is consumed ought not to have their firearms with them. This rule should be established publicly and firmly enforced.

Another policy of more than ordinary public concern is the "warning shot." Employed by policemen after a verbal command to halt has been given a fleeing person, the warning shot is fired in the air to afford the person a chance to stop.

Supposedly, it is only to be used when a felony has been committed, when the fleeing individual is thought to be the felon and when he has not responded to the verbal command to halt.

Where allowed, the warning shot is left largely to the discretion of the police officer.

Unfortunately, in practice the warning shot tends to be used occasionally when individuals are suspected only of a misdemeanor and when the policeman is not absolutely sure the person fleeing is the guilty party.

Consequently, this Commission adopts the position held by most administrators—with Seattle as a major exception—and the International Association of Chiefs of Police, that the warning shot should not be allowed.

The citation has much merit from all points of view, and not just for use in mass arrests. We recommend those police departments which have adopted the citation and recommended it to others.

We would like to see, in highly populated areas, more beat patrolmen.

We concur in the International Association of Chiefs of Police's view that any acceptance or gratuities by policemen is unprofessional and should be firmly prohibited.

The Commission heard many complaints, earlier reported, of police payoffs, particularly in Seattle. The undeniable existence of prostitution, dope and gambling in the Seattle ghetto, at least, tends to feed this popular belief.

We recognize the difficulty of enforcing some laws. We would say only that we believe it is within the power of the police to keep a successful vigilance against the vices mentioned above in residential areas, at least, and that includes most of the ghetto.

We recommend that each police department in our major cities employ an attorney, part time or full time, as appropriate.

We recommend the hiring of more black policemen. Pre-professional training with adequate pay is especially needed to help blacks qualify in the present police Civil Service tests.

Greater advantage should be taken of the armed services military police program which allows an early release for those men going into civilian police work.

We also indorse the concept of lateral-entry into police department leadership positions.

We recommend that policemen be encouraged to seek higher education in police-related fields through the state's colleges. Encouragement would include free tuition and pay promotions if not rank promotions for successful completion of coursework.

FIRE DEPARTMENTS

We recommend that every metropolitan fire department study and implement the Kerner Commission's detailed suggestions on planning, training and equipment needs as related to civil disorders.

We also recommend that all metropolitan fire chiefs be brought into policy planning at the state level for civil disorders.

THE QUALITY AND EQUALITY OF JUSTICE

We recommend that judges, like other public officials, undertake programs of sensitivity training including confrontation and dialogue with ghetto residents.

We also recommend that sensitivity training and poverty law be provided in the law schools, and integrated into the curriculum to prepare a broader base of the legal profession to meet poor, black clients with deeper understanding.

Law students should be encouraged to assist in poverty area legal programs as part of their practical legal education. While juries obviously cannot be given sensitivity training, it would be quite proper for the juror's handbook to include a section devoted to helping the average juror understand the culturally different.

We recommend the adoption of city and county public defender systems to handle the criminal cases of the poor.

As regards civil cases, we urge stronger Bar Association, state and city financial support for the operation of OEO Legal Services program. Salaries of attorneys need to be upgraded to keep competent personnel.

We recommend that the coroner's jury system be revised to allow a legal representative of the deceased or his family to participate in the hearings, to ask questions, to present evidence, etc.

We further recommend that the jury be picked in the ordinary way that petit juries are selected in Superior Court.

Finally, we recommend that the State Judicial Council should study the advisability of retaining or abolishing the coroner's jury.

We believe that bail procedures should be set up so that any person who resides within the community and is not accused of committing a crime of major violence against a person, is presumed ready and willing to appear at the court proceedings.

We recommend that the State Board of Prison Terms and Paroles be authorized by statute to extend its jurisdiction to all courts, on all levels, in the state. Uniform parole and probation practices, properly funded and administered by properly trained personnel would be available to all persons.

WHAT YOU CAN DO

(NOTE.—This excerpt from the civil disorders report is directed to the individual citizen of the State of Washington.)

We urge every citizen to involve himself personally in the improvement of race relations and the advancement of equal rights.

Advises one Office of Economic Opportunity organization in Seattle:

"If a volunteer approaches his service as a learning experience rather than as an offering of his superior material or educational advantages, the voluntary act becomes a sharing of mutual concern rather than a one-sided bestower-receiver relationship."

There must be personal relationships developed between individuals if understanding is to develop between the races.

Personal encounter may be called for. Seattle's East Madison YMCA operates a Crisis in Black and White program to encourage Caucasian and Negro families to exchange visits and views. Rev. Mineo Katagiri's "Friendly Town," also in Seattle, is a similar experience. The Council of Churches sponsors dialogue sessions.

If you are a businessman you can contribute significantly to lowering black unemployment by getting into any of the programs operated by the National Alliance of Businessmen, the Chamber of Commerce, Seattle Opportunities Industrialization Center or the Multiservice Center. Hold your next job opening for a black.

Anyone can help develop Green Power for blacks by investing in one of the black cooperatives in the State. Housewives can start an investment club to invest in black-owned businesses.

Are you a banker? How fair are your loan policies for people living in the ghetto?

Can you offer a summer or a part-time job? The Multiservice Center, the Central Area Youth Association, "Rent-A-Kid," or the OEO can surely find you eager help.

Are you an officer of a charity or social organization? You might consider making an effort to get a black young person into your office to learn administration and other skills with a future.

In the housing field, how committed are you to multi-racial living? Perhaps you live outside the ghetto and have a moderately priced house. Would you list it with the Urban League's Operation Equality?

Get the facts on what really happens to property values when a black family moves in. Talk to your local realtors and let them know how you feel. Get a petition circulated through your neighborhood as was done in Bellevue, advocating open housing.

You might start a scholarship fund, designating support for a disadvantaged youth with a record of risk in his background.

Does your church operate a summer camp? Is there a scholarship for disadvantaged youth? Or you could contribute to Community Campership Committee (Seattle) or the YMCA.

Perhaps you want to get deeply involved on the human level. Adoption agencies need parents and foster parents.

Most of the great accomplishments of this country were effected by individuals working together cooperatively without coercion. The best hope of peaceful racial progress may lie with the energies of the average citizen of good will.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

The study commission instructed to study the causes and prevention of civil disorder in the state consisted of 19 members. They were:

Secretary of State A. Ludlow Kramer, Chairman; J. D. Braman, Mayor of Seattle; Warren Chan, Judge, Superior Court, State of Washington; Goodwin Chase, Chairman of the Board and President of National Bank of Washington, Tacoma; William H. Cowles, III, President and General Manager, The Spokeman-Review, Spokane; The Very Reverend John A. Fitterer, S.J., President, Seattle University.

Ronald L. Hendry, Prosecuting Attorney, Pierce County; Donald J. Horowitz, Attorney, Seattle (Mr. Horowitz originated the idea of this Commission and made the initial contacts with Governor Dan Evans and Secretary of State Kramer which resulted in its formation.)

Charles B. Brink, Dean of School of Social Work, University of Washington; John M. Larson, Mayor, Yakima; Joseph McGavick, Chairman, Washington State Board Against Discrimination; W. Lester McIntosh, President Central Area Committee for Peace and Improvement, Seattle; Louis H. Pedersen, Secretary-Treasurer, Pierce County Central Labor Council, AFL-CIO.

Charles Z. Smith, Judge, Superior Court, State of Washington; David G. Sprague, State Representative, 37th District, Seattle; Mrs. Robert J. Stuart, Past National President League of Women Voters; The Rev. Jack M. Tuell, Pastor First United Methodist Church, Vancouver; William P. Woods, Chairman of the Board and President, Washington National Gas Company; Charles B. Zittel, Chief, Tacoma Police Department.

Staff members included:

Bruce K. Chapman, Seattle, executive director of the Commission. (Chapman is the author of The Party That Lost Its Head, and The Wrong Man In Uniform and is a former editorial writer for the New York Herald Tribune.)

Frank D. Raines Deputy Director for Research. (As Secretary Kramer's Administrative Intern in 1967, Raines was responsible for much of the research for the Govornor's Committee on Constitutional Revision).

Editorial assistance for the report, "Race and Violence In Washington State," was provided by 11 part-time staff members. A special study of the racial disorders of Seattle's Central Area in July, 1968, was produced by Seattle Municipal League and is included as Appendix B in the Report.

MID-AMERICA INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT HAS DRAMATIC SUCCESS STORY

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, this morning the members of the Oklahoma congressional delegation had the opportunity to view a film which does an outstanding job of telling the story of what may be the most successful Federal-State-local economic development venture in the Nation.

The film tells the story of the transformation of a World War II munitions plant, the Oklahoma Ordnance Works, into the highly successful Mid-America Industrial District.

When the ordnance works was abandoned after World War II, Oklahomans began to seek ways to utilize the 10,000-acre site south of the city of Pryor, Okla. Considerable discussions and negotiations in the State capital and in Washington led to the creation in 1962 of the Oklahoma Ordnance Works Authority, an independent State trust, which purchased the ordnance works from the Federal Government with $1.7 million in private loan money.

Under the capable leadership of Gene Redden, a member of the authority and administrator of the property, the mammoth job of clearing was started. The job was complicated by the fact that the structures were permeated in many cases with gunpowder, and were of heavy construction. The job was started, and during the first years the operating costs and loan payments were made with money made selling salvage materials.

When Congress created the Area Redevelopment Administration, the Oklahoma Ordnance Works Authority immediately saw the promise this program held, and filed the first application for public works loan and grant funds received by ARA.

In December of 1963, the application was refiled with the Economic Development Administration. Approval of a $1 million grant and $477,000 loan to the authority came in August 1966, and President Johnson came to Pryor to break ground for the project. At this point, the Federal-State cooperative effort began to move at full speed.

All work is now complete, and the film Mr. Redden showed the Oklahoma delegation this morning shows the finished result. There are four separate industrial parks on the property, so that industries of different types with different needs may have different services.

The parks are served by hard-surface streets and roads; water lines which can carry up to 25 million gallons of water per day; a sewage collection and disposal system which can collect and treat up to 10 million gallons of any type waste—a claim which can be made by few, if any, similar industrial park developments.

What are the results? Twelve industries are now located on the parks at the Mid-America Industrial District. They employ 785 hourly workers with an annual payroll in excess of $4 million. Capital investment is $15,900,000. The Pryor area, largely as a result of the initiative furnished by the Oklahoma Ordnance Works Authority, now has 20 industrial plants employing 1,538 hourly workers. Mr. Redden advises me that expansion plans now on the books will increase this total by more than 300 in the next 24 months, and he believes total employment at the district—which will become even more attractive with the completion of the Arkansas River navigation project—10 years from now will be in excess of 5,000. That will mean the size of the city of Pryor will be at least doubled.

Mr. Speaker, this success story is the result of farsighted men in Oklahoma and Washington who had an idea and turned it into a success. Russell Hunt, of Tulsa, has worked tirelessly on this project since the time it was only an idea. He was named chairman of the Oklahoma Ordnance Works Authority when it was created, and still holds that post.

Mr. Redden has been with the authority since its creation, as has another member of the board of trustees, Burke Webb, of Oklahoma City. Robert H. Breeden, director of the Oklahoma Industrial Development and Parks Department, is a member of the board, and Philip H. Viles, of Claremore, represents the Grand River Dam Authority on the board.

Mr. Speaker, we owe these gentlemen a salute for providing the initiative, effort, and energy to create this success story at Pryor. It is one of the finest examples of local, State and Federal cooperation, making constructive use of a Federal program, that I have seen anywhere.

CONFRONTING THE CUBAN ISSUE

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, with the nonproliferation treaty a subject of current debate, a nuclear agreement between Havana and Moscow signed on January 8, 1969, should be given serious consideration. Ostensibly for oceanographic and meteorological research, Cuba's new endeavor is being aided by the Soviet Union which is supplying not only scientific material but also technicians. According to John F. Lewis, coordinating editor of the American Security Council's Washington Report, there are now a total of 231 top Russian scientists now serving in Cuba, with 222 more due to arrive at the end of this year. In addition, an estimated 300 scientific specialists in all fields of advanced research have settled in Cuba from the Communist satellites in Eastern Europe.

Cuba's aspirations in the nuclear field make it all the more imperative for us to consider what steps we should take regarding the increasing Cuban threat to our security. My good friend, Meldrim Thomson, reminded us of this urgent issue in an editorial in the Manchester, N.H., Union Leader of February 10. In addition to offering a number of recommendations, Mel directed our attention to an article on Cuba by Dr. Bernardo Figueredo, formerly office manager in Cuba's leading law firm of Lazo y Cubas and now residing here in the United States. We are fortunate in having knowledgeable sources such as Dr. Figueredo who will not let us forget that a very real danger faces this Nation not many miles off our Southern shores. No longer can we afford the luxury of letting the Cuban question drift unattended by an aimless and directionless foreign policy.

We can begin a positive program of coping with the Cuban threat by persuading our allies to joint in a trade quarantine of Cuba. It is indeed ironic that we have joined in military alliances with nations which in turn carry on trade with Cuba as usual. It seems to me that this is a sensible first step in eventually returning that beleaguered island to its rightful owners—the Cuban people.

I insert in the RECORD at this point the above-mentioned editorial by Meldrim Thomson, Jr., along with the article by Dr. Bernardo Figueredo entitled, "The Other Side of Cuba."

[From the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, Feb. 10, 1969]

A NIXON DOCTRINE URGENTLY NEEDED

When President Kennedy junked the Monroe Doctrine during the Cuban missile crisis, he deprived the Americas of a mighty international doctrine that had effectively guarded the New World for more than a century against the piratical intrusions of Old World nations.

Even worse, President Kennedy, because of what many believe to have been a secret agreement made with Khrushchev, at the time of the missile crisis, consigned millions of helpless Cubans to a living death of slavery under Castro by preventing Cuban Freedom Fighters from organizing in the United States.

From the missile crisis we have reaped a full blown conspiracy to frock Castro in the spurious robes of a benefactor of mankind while, in the admonitory words of Dr. Mario Lazo, great Cuban lawyer and tireless worker for Cuban freedom, he holds a dagger in the heart of America.

Evidence of a concerted effort to dupe Americans into believing that Castro is the essence of bearded benevolence in the pearl of the Antilles, is graphically told and its insidious propaganda eloquently refuted in the important article appearing today at the top of the back page by Dr. Bernardo Figueredo, formerly of Havana and now living in Oxford.

On December 28th Dr. Figueredo noted an article appearing in a New Hampshire paper entitled "A Full Decade of Castro" by Richard Spong, a professional columnist whose work is distributed by Editorial Research Associates of New York City. The identical article, excepting only the first two paragraphs, appeared on December 26th in the Wilkes-Barre Record (Pennsylvania) as an editorial.

Dr. Figueredo was office manager in Cuba's leading law firm of Lazo y Cubas before he was compelled to flee from Cuba with his wife and three children, leaving behind all of their worldly possessions.

He and his wife have started life anew in New Hampshire where they have applied for American citizenship. They know first hand, as few people in our state do, that there never can be any compromise with tyranny, no matter what guise it wears. As an intelligent and concerned student of the Cuban and American scenes, Dr. Figueredo has had the courage to speak frequently of the menace to us of a Communist Cuba.

In the presidential campaign of 1960 Richard M. Nixon had an opportunity to speak out against the Castro evil which by then was apparent to American leaders, but for political reasons best known to him he remained silent.

Now as President, Nixon has an opportunity to take positive action against the continuing and deepening menace of Castro.

One of his first official acts should be to repudiate all secret agreements with Russia that might have been made during the missile crisis. He should make it clear that our government will not in the future, interfere with the activities of Freedom Fighters when they in no way violate any laws of our country.

And, most important of all, President Nixon should announce his own protective doctrine for the Americas—a doctrine to supplant the discarded Monroe Doctrine.

He should tell the world that under no circumstances will the United States tolerate the existence of atom or hydrogen missile bases in any part of the New World.

Such a Nixon Doctrine would make it clear to all that the United States means to live in peace by eliminating the danger of having an atomic holocaust ignited in the New World.

DEADLY BENEFITS OF CASTRO GOVERNMENT: THE OTHER SIDE OF CUBA

(By Dr. Bernardo Figueredo)

In the Dec. 28, 1968 issue of a local newspaper I read an article by Mr. Richard Spong titled "A Full Decade of Castro," and a few days later I received a photo-copy of an editorial titled "Castro's Tenth Anniversary" taken from a newspaper of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., which circumstances would be of little significance were it not for the fact that excepting the two opening paragraphs of Mr. Spong's article, the rest of his article and the Wilkes-Barre editorial are exactly alike.

It seems that, in the best of the cases, somebody is copying someone, which would be a very ugly thing; or it could be a concerted propaganda in favor of Castro, which could be a very grave thing.

But—be it just a coincidence or a concerted effort—that is a fine example of the type of propaganda, based on half-truths and distorted facts, that is being carried throughout the United States (perhaps with the hope that in many places there is no one who knows, or who dares to expose, the other half of the truth) with the purpose of alienating the friendship and the trust of the American people in favor of Castro-communism in particular and communism in general. And that might be very dangerous, for a friendly and unsuspecting people is an easier prey than an alert people. Remember, Khrushchev's dictum "We will bury you" has not yet been written-off from communism's blueprint for world conquest!

I answered at length Mr. Spong's article and the local newspaper published my answer in its Jan. 3, 1969 edition—for which courtesy I am most grateful to it—and for that reason I am not going to reproduce my answer fully. However I want to comment on two or three of the supposed benefits that, according to Mr. Spong's article and the Wilkes-Barre editorial, the Castro regime has bestowed upon the Cuban people. But before doing that I feel it is my duty to correct one gross misstatement contained in those writings.

MORE MISSILES

There are in Cuba, today, more missiles than during the so-called 1962 Cuban missile crisis, with a striking capability that poses a real threat to large areas of this country (to the north as far as Washington, D.C.). Therefore, Castro's Communist Cuba, in its 10th anniversary, is not, as Mr. Spong and the Wilkes-Barre editorial say, a thorn in the flesh of the United States, but a veritable dagger dangerously aimed at the heart of this country.

And, by the way, the foregoing constitutes a flagrant breach of the "Kennedy-Khrushchev" agreement: You remove the missiles from Cuba and we will see that Castro is not molested.

And now let us examine some of the benefits, namely, "jobs for almost everybody throughout the year" and "free of charge, education at all levels (including textbooks) . . . electricity, local telephone service . . . and a funeral."

CASTRO'S JOBS

To say that in Castro's Cuba there are jobs for almost everybody without exposing the miserable compensation paid for those jobs and the inhuman exploitation of the workers by the government (which controls all the jobs) reveals either a lack of knowledge of the real situation or a willful design to mislead the readers.

Before Castro all the workers had the 44 hour week with payment equivalent to 49 hours; enjoyed one full month vacation, with pay, for every 11 months of work; they were paid time and half for any work in excess of 44 hours a week, and could not be dismissed, except for the causes specified in the law, after a six-month trial period.

Today, under Castro, workers must work 12 hours a day in order to be paid the equivalent of 8 hours, and must devote most of the off days and holidays doing "voluntary work" (which means for free) for the government.

HERDED LIKE CATTLE

Castro's regime is relying more and more on "voluntary work." Whenever it is needed, the government literally herds hundreds and thousands of workers who are transported like cattle in trucks to where they are needed, and there they are subjected to an inhuman exploitation which is tantamount to slavery by any standard.

Public elementary education was free before Castro (including textbooks and free breakfasts). The tuition at public high schools was as low as $12 per academic year and at the state universities (there were 5) the average was $60 per year. In addition to that, 15 per cent of the total number of students enrolled was admitted entirely free of charge, and there was no distinction as to race, creed, economic or social standing or political sympathies. Today the students are indoctrinated rather than educated (one compulsory subject is hating the U.S.A.), and the minute anyone shows any lack of enthusiasm toward the regime, out he goes.

Electricity and local telephone service are not free. Electricity is rationed but must be paid for. What is free is the use of public telephones. But whoever uses them must be extremely cautious, because there is always a G2 agent eavesdropping.

FREE FUNERALS

And as to funerals, well, that is the very least that Castro could give to the Cubans after underpaying them and over working them to death.

The other benefits—a banquet for wedding guests, tickets to sport events and the use of public bicycles (?)—are really so ridiculous that they do not deserve any further comment at this moment.

But this point is that even accepting those "benefits" as such, the showing of the Castro regime, after 10 years of absolute rule, at the cost of destroying the Cuban nation physically, politically, economically and socially, is a very poor one indeed.

On the other hand, the Cubans would gladly pay for all the things they could have before Castor (today everything is rationed), and are most willing to exchange the few free things that Castro has given them for all the rights and freedoms he has snatched from them, such as freedom of expression, freedom of assembly, freedom of worship, freedom of movement, the right to FREE elections, and the most cherished of all freedoms, that of being a FREE nation, for one of the achievements of Castro-communism has been to transform Cuba into the first Soviet satellite in the Americas.

THE BOUNDARY LINE

Those freedoms—the lack of which the Castro panegyrists avoid mentioning—are precisely the boundary line between living as "slaves" under a dictatorship or as "human beings" in a democracy. And those are the freedoms that disappear the minute communism captures any place, for communism and freedom are incompatible.

But even assuming that Castro has brought some benefits to some part of the Cuban population, the fact is that he is a dictator. He has been 10 years in power. By election and reelections? No. The free elections he promised time and again during the struggle against Batista (and which were the main goal of said struggle) have never been held. He introduced communism in Cuba by sheer deceit and has remained in power by ruthlessly suppressing any form of opposition.

REJECTED BY MAJORITY

The majority of the Cuban people struggled against Presidents Machado and Batista the very minute they became dictators, and just because Castro is a dictator, he is rejected by the majority of the Cuban people. Why then do not those self-styled panegyrists instead of praising Castro on this tenth anniversary in power, tell him "Stop, Fidel, step out and let the Cuban people freely elect their own leaders and their form of government?"

And if conditions are so good in Cuba according to Castro's propaganda, why are the Cubans so desperate to leave the island, which is much easier to say than to comprehend? For Cuba had never been a land of emigrants but of immigrants, and never before, not even during the depression of the 1930s, or during the dictatorships of Machado and Batista, had there been such an appalling exodus.

Furthermore those who leave Cuba have not only to endure countless inconveniences and humiliations, but do so at the price of relinquishing everything they possess—I repeat, everything—to the Castro regime. And at this point I ask you: Would you be willing to leave your country under such circumstances? And perhaps you would say: "No, unless some unendurable situation compels me to do so."

FLIGHT CONTINUES

Yet, since Castro took over, more than 600,000 Cubans have abandoned the island; about 4,000 are leaving regularly every month by means of the Freedom Flights; over 1,300,000 have already applied for permission to leave the country, and an average of 100 leave each month through clandestine means, using anything that floats. And all that out of a population of 7.8 million people. Apparently 10 years of intensive propaganda have not been enough to convince the Cubans that they are living in a paradise:

And if the Castro-Communist regime has been so beneficial, why the need of the 2,400,000 members—out of a population of 7.8 million people—of the "Comites para la Defensa de la Revolucion," that is to say, "Committees for the Defense of the Revolution," charged mainly with spying on their neighbors?

KNOCKING AT DOOR

This country has always been ready, no matter the price, to help other countries preserve their freedom, in Europe, in Asia and other parts of the world.

But how about preserving your freedoms? Do not think that communism is still 90 miles away. It is knocking at your door. Do not be deaf to those knocks. Answer them by fighting Communism.

The place is here and the time now. Do not wait until the "Comites para la Defensa de las Revolucion" knock at your door! Fight now. Later it might be too late!

P.S.: At this writing I read in the newspapers the details of the most recent mass escape to freedom: That of 81 Cubans to the U.S. Naval base at Guantanamo.

Those who succeeded told stories of up to 100 persons who recently failed to make it over the six-foot high fence encircling the Base. But they keep fleeing. . . .

And Willis Jessie, who hijacked a plane last August and fled to Cuba with his three-year-old daughter, has returned to the U.S.A.! West Virginia Congressman Ken Hechler, who negotiated Jessie's release, said: "Jessie decided almost immediately upon arriving in Havana last August that he would rather risk prosecution as a plane hijacker than have his three-year-old daughter raised in a Communist land."

VIRGINIA RADIO STATIONS APPEAL TO FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, as most Washington area residents are aware, radio stations WAVA-AM and WAVA-FM, in Arlington, Va., have for some years operated a special news format completely different than the programing of other area radio stations.

United States Transdynamics Corp., which owns the WAVA stations, took a long gamble in 1962 by converting to an all-news format over advice that no one would listen to continuous news. But not only the response in Washington but the subsequent decisions of stations in other cities to begin similar broadcasting is testimony of their success.

Now the Washington Post Co., which during the past few years has acquired the Washington Times-Herald newspaper, radio stations WTOP-AM and WTOP-FM, television station WTOP-TV, and Newsweek magazine, with economic power that can only strangle any competition, intends to move into the all-news programing field via its radio stations.

The owners of WAVA have protested to the Federal Trade Commission, Mr. Speaker, against the intent of the Washington Post Co. to force this small news broadcaster into competition with a conglomerate broadcaster which will inevitably result in its failure. I have joined their protest, and I ask permission to insert a letter I have addressed to the Commission as well as an editorial broadcast recently by the president of WAVA, at this point in the RECORD:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 12, 1969.

Hon. PAUL RAND DIXON,
Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you know, I have long been mindful of the problems of small business, the preservation of which I consider vital to a free and competitive business society. Especially in this era of increasing economic concentration, its problems have been compounded, and the importance of the role of the Federal Trade Commission as an arbiter of commercial conduct has correspondingly increased.

In this connection, it has come to my attention that an application for a complaint has been filed with the Commission by United States Transdynamics Corporation, 1901 N. Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, Virginia against the Washington Post Company. I have read that application for complaint and commend it to your attention. While I have understood that the Washington Post Company was a dominant force in local news and broadcasting media, I am disturbed to learn that it now assumes what is quite clear to me to be a predominant position in the market area that it serves.

It does not seem to me that it could be seriously argued that the Washington Post Company attained its apparent ability to restrain and perhaps to foreclose competition in the mass media market as a natural consequence of a superior product, business acumen or historic accident. I do not believe that this power to intimidate or to curtail competition which the Washington Post Company possesses was thrust upon it. Rather, I am of the opinion that it was obtained by plan and design. Foremost in this growth pattern, there should be considered the acquisitions by the Washington Post Company of the Washington Times Herald, radio stations WTOP (AM) and WTOP-FM, television station WTOP-TV and Newsweek magazine. These acquisitions give rise to the irresistible inference that the Washington Post Company embarked some time ago upon a course of action calculated to accomplish a monopoly power.

Now we find that the Washington Post Company through its radio stations WTOP (AM) and WTOP-FM expects to duplicate a specialized all news format created and developed in this area by United States Transdynamics Corporation for its radio stations WAVA (AM) and WAVA-FM. In doing so, the inevitable result will be that this small news broadcaster will be unable to compete with the conglomerate broadcaster, and the Washington Post Company's share of the market will be additionally increased.

I take the position that at some point the Washington Post Company's arrogation of economic power must be interdicted and that that point has been reached. It would be ironical if the Washington Post Company, which professes to be the nation's social conscience, were permitted to move forward without legal fetter to eliminate its competitors one by one as its history reveals it has been doing.

Within the broad ambit of the authority invested in and entrusted to the Federal Trade Commission, I am confident that there are remedies available that you can and should invoke.

Before the competitive injury is accomplished, I would respectfully request that the application for a complaint made by the United States Transdynamics Corporation receive your early and studied consideration. Please favor me with an early report of the action which the Commission intends to take in this matter.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

JOEL T. BROYHILL,
Member of Congress.

[WAVA editorial, February 24, 1969]

WASHINGTON POST COMBINE: A QUESTION OF EXCESSIVE POWER

Over recent years, the news industry has passed through a revolution of change, which, looking back upon it, has been truly breathtaking. Television, ten years ago dominated by a few VHF stations on a small 13-point dial, has expanded into some 83 channels with UHF.

Radio, which in 1960 was little more than a glorified juke box, has broadened its horizons to include an increasing range of specialized public-service programming, including stations devoted entirely to talk and information, or to all news. The number of competing daily newspapers has shrunk to a point of near non-existence.

As one case, WAVA made its break from the cacophony of spinning records into the beckoning field of solid news as a service to this area in January, 1962. It was a long gamble for this station, told then that no one would listen to continuous news on a 24-hour basis; but we made it and your warm response and the subsequent decisions of stations in other cities across the country to begin all-news programming, is testimony enough to its success.

Now the Washington Post station, WTOP, has by an announcement in its newspaper disclosed that it is considering changing its programming to all news. If this move here were by another independent radio station, it would be welcomed in the healthy growth of all-news broadcasting.

In the case of the Washington Post Company's WTOP, however, this has raised a large new question—the huge and growing combined resources of a company which now has acquired and owns Washington's largest daily and only morning newspaper, also one of Washington's three powerful network television stations, also one of its largest FM radio stations, also its biggest news magazine, Newsweek, and Washington's most powerful standard radio station, 50,000-watt WTOP Radio.

In all, these various Post Company media already make 4,900,000 impressions each week on the some 2,000,000 people in greater Washington. Four out of every ten things people read, see, or hear, come from the Post Company. On top of all this, the Post is now moving to publish special localized sections of its newspaper aimed into suburban Virginia and Maryland, a move toward separate local Post editions, which the few remaining local community newspapers acknowledge may be impossible to compete with.

After taking a long breath, you realize that the Washington Post Company not only now dominates the news industry here but is inexorably suffocating its competition. The important issue is not whether one agrees with the Washington Post Company editorially; it is that the nation's capital is steadily losing the availability of diverse news sources and diverse editorial opinion.

As a practical matter, the Washington Post Company, though not by intent, possesses now the raw power of resources to effectively crush anything in its path, including smaller competitors. A laissez-faire day response would have been, "That's tough, Joe." But there is more to it than that.

We have here a developing concentration of power under which the Washington Post Company is establishing an effective monopoly of news control in the nation's capital area—centrally owned news power, the hard daily impact of which ranges through homes and government to indeed being a working catalyst as well on other news organizations here.

It is interesting to note that the Federal Communications Commission has just denied a television license in Boston, WHDH, to the Herald-Traveler Newspaper which had created a similar concentration of power over major news and communications outlets in the Boston area.

The Washington Post Radio change, if made, to all news would carry this corporate giant over the divide to an effective near absolute monopoly of news in Washington. So the time has indeed come for Congress and the people of this area to question the FCC, Justice Department, and Federal Trade Commission, whether on legal and administrative grounds, this is in the public interest.

Politically hazardous as tangling with the Washington Post giant is, further extension of its media power in the nation's capital is not acceptable. At stake here is an issue of the public interest as well as the right of smaller companies to have reasonable protection against monopolistic abuse by the newday corporate barons of power.

Lest the Washington Post Corporation lose perspective behind its own editorial pledge to justice, it might remember that it is itself not exempt from responsibility—and have the wisdom to recall that "power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely." If the Washington Post Corporation has grown beyond this realization, then it has got to be challenged and its media separated. The Washington Post Company is being invited to respond to this WAVA editorial.

JOHN STEWART SPEAKS FOR DEMOCRACY

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, a young friend of mine, John P. Stewart, of Brighton, Colo., came to Washington today to participate in the final judging of the annual Voice of Democracy Contest of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

His speech was judged best from among the entrants from Colorado—and upon reading it I can understand why. It is a moving and eloquent statement of pride in our Nation and what it stands for.

Sometimes, Mr. Speaker, I think we have to be reminded that not all of our young people believe in the destruction of our Nation and its heritages. Some days it does seem that way. But I happen to know that John Stewart's appraisal of what America means is the rule, rather than the exception.

So that all of the Members may get to know John Stewart and his very refreshing outlook, I am herewith submitting a copy of his speech for reproduction in the RECORD:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

(By John P. Stewart)

I stood in our National Cemetery in Arlington. The view was one of peace and beauty. All was calm. I first noticed the green, rolling hills and the rows and rows of almost identical white tombstones, each marking the identity of an American soldier, in all probability a young man, a soldier who had fallen as he fought to preserve his country's freedom.

After a short walk I stood directly in front of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. I watched with keen awareness the precision of the immaculately dressed Marine as he marched forward, clicked his heels, turned and in the same flawless motion retraced his steps, back and forth, hour after hour, guarding a tomb symbolic of all who have made the supreme sacrifice for their country.

Many feelings went through me as I watched the awesome sight. I recalled the dramatic history of our country, the supreme sacrifices of our forefathers. I thought of our heritage and how grateful I was to be an American. I thought of our vast and glorious country from the shores of the Atlantic to the blue peaceful waters of the Pacific. I thought of our flag, the immortal stars and stripes. I realized then that I would willingly give my life for any of the many principles and freedoms it represents. I knew that my feeling of patriotism is as strong as that of any of these young men. I knew that I must never falter in protecting the priceless privileges and opportunities of our country.

And then, to break the stillness of that hallowed place, a bugle sounded "Taps" as I had never before heard it played. In solemn tribute two of my friends placed a wreath on the marble slab of the Tomb. It was an emotional experience for all who watched.

I turned to walk away and I saw several rows of freshly dug, open graves, awaiting the bodies of more young men who had seen another challenge and had given their lives to meet it. No one could walk away from such a setting without a definite determination to preserve our freedom at any price.

Life continues. History is made. The past can never be forgotten. Perhaps the same questions will be asked year after year. But each time the answers are different. The conditions under which these questions were asked yesterday present an entirely new solution today. We, as young men and women, must try to find these new answers. Our nation's destiny is held in our hands. The challenge we face is greater than it has ever been before. Our future depends upon the stability of the individual to adequately and firmly face up to his great responsibilities.

I personally want to become involved. I want to help those less fortunate than I. I want to perpetuate the rights of speaking, worshiping, and learning. There is no greater challenge than this—the concern we must have for our fellow men.

We all must strive for the betterment of humanity. We must work for the benefit of the individual. We must stand taller than we have ever stood before. Because we are reaching out toward new frontiers. Our challenge no longer deals with the conquests of this world alone. But it concerns unfathomed mysteries of outer space. It has become evident today that the knowledge we can have in science and technology is unlimited. We realize now that the barriers in reaching for the impossible grow smaller each day. We must not falter in attaining greater knowledge in every field of human endeavor, in all the areas of American conquest.

These were among my thoughts as I stood in reverence in our National Cemetery at Arlington. I knew that I too had an intense desire to make my small mark by proving that I, as a young man with a will to try, would uphold, protect and preserve this unique life, our American way of life. This is freedom's challenge!

FOUNDATION TAX LOOPHOLES SHOULD BE CLOSED BY CONGRESS

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, our Select Committee on Small Business has done landmark work in the exposure of tax avoidance abuses by many foundations.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN), chairman of our Foundations Subcommittee, deserves commendation for the effective pioneering work by this committee.

In this connection, and because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in tax reform, I place in the RECORD my recent newsletter entitled: "Congress Investigates Tax Evasion Tactics of Many 'Charitable' Foundations."

The newsletter follows:

CONGRESS INVESTIGATES TAX EVASION TACTICS OF MANY "CHARITABLE" FOUNDATIONS

As the Committee on Ways and Means continues its investigation and hearings on tax abuses and reform, the effective and productive work of our House Small Business Committee is playing an important role. For the past six years the Foundations Subcommittee of the Small Business Committee—which I am honored to serve as Chairman—has conducted detailed and exhaustive investigations and studies into the use of foundations for tax evasion and avoidance.

My friend and Colleague, Representative Wright Patman of Texas, Chairman of our Foundations Subcommittee, was the first witness to testify in the current tax reform hearings. He outlined the results of the hearings and investigations of the House Small Business Committee, documenting instances in which foundations, operating under the guise of charity, are being used to avoid income taxes and estate taxes by shifting assets to foundations where they remain in the control of a few persons and are not being used for charities.

The Small Business Committee has made thorough studies of almost 600 of the 30,000 foundations in the United States. These studies showed that the assets and economic power of these foundations are expanding enormously. Assets of these 600 foundations were 50 percent greater in 1966 than 1962—up from $10.2 billion to $15.1 billion. Receipts have increased from $560 million to $1.3 billion during that period—and disbursements were only half the total of receipts.

These foundations invested in private companies, gobbled up small businesses, dealt in stocks and securities, in land and in many other fields of investment—and they paid no taxes while reaping great profits.

PRACTICES BROUGHT TO LIGHT

Some of the practices brought to light by the Small Business Committee investigations include these:

Foundations are used to perpetuate family control of large business. One foundation in California owns 53 percent of its "parent company" which in turn owns one-fifth of the land area of populous Orange County surrounding Los Angeles.

One wealthy individual made substantial contributions to a "health" foundation, deducting his contributions on his income tax return. He then proceeded to control the investment of his "contributions" through the foundation and used these tax exempt funds for his personal benefit—tax free.

Another foundation built its assets from a half-million dollars to $28 million by operating as securities dealer, banker, money broker, business broker, buyer and lessor of real property and recipient of gifts resulting from business deals.

Many foundations have acquired small businesses, such as service stations, and leased them back to the former owners—thus increasing economic concentration and weakening the small business community.

Some foundations spend more in foreign nations than in the United States despite the many opportunities and needs for charity at home in impoverished areas. One foundation spent almost $18 million abroad in a single year and $10.9 million at home—while spending $5 million to finance its elaborate offices and headquarters.

Many foundations fritter away their donations on useless projects that do not fall within the scope of charity or relevant education. One foundation, for example, expended funds to finance studies on the "origin and significance of the decorative types of medieval tombstones in Bosnia and Herzegovina," research into an ancient Roman cult, and studies on rural Europe in the Middle Ages, among others.

One firm was established to advise attorneys on the tax avoidance possibilities of foundations.

These are but a few examples—detailed studies of such abuses and tax evasion fill volumes. Certainly many foundations are legitimate and worthwhile and the investigation of the Ways and Means Committee should not become an assault on all tax-free foundations.

However, the use of foundations for purposes other than charity, education and philanthrophy must be made subject to federal income and estate taxes. Many foundations are simply "fronts" for big business enterprises which pay no taxes while small businessmen and other Americans pay through the nose.

Congress must take action to close these loopholes.

DESIGNER OF U-2 QUESTIONS AMERICAN AIR SUPERIORITY IN FUTURE

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, a recent news story has quoted the great aircraft designer, Kelly Johnson, as saying that the United States is making a great mistake if it goes ahead with the new Navy F–14A and the Air Force F–15. These planes are only in the design stages now, but Mr. Johnson feels they will be outstripped by Soviet combat aircraft by the time they are built and flying.

In other words, in his view, we are planning to start off with planes that are already behind those of the Soviet Union.

The following story from the New York Times of February 20, 1969, tells just who Kelly Johnson is, and cites his arguments for his point of view:

DESIGNER DOUBTS NEW PLANES WILL GIVE THE UNITED STATES CONTROL OF AIR—LOCKHEED'S JOHNSON FEARS RUSSIAN FIGHTERS WILL OUTFLY F–14A AND F–15

One of America's foremost aircraft designers asserted yesterday that two new fighter planes the United States now had on the drawing boards could be outmoded by superior Soviet planes long before they fly.

Clarence L. (Kelly) Johnson, a vice president of the Lockheed Aircraft Corporation and designer of some of America's most successful planes, suggested that a fighter be developed that could fly faster and higher than any that the United States now planned.

Mr. Johnson was in New York to receive the 1969 Billy Mitchell Award from American Legion Post 743. He was cited for aviation contributions reaching from the P–38 fighter of World War II to the U–2 and SR–71 high-altitude aircraft that have played significant reconnaissance roles since then. He also designed the F–104 fighter plane.

The Lockheed engineer-executive, an intense man of 58, was interviewed in Lockheed's 42d-floor suite in the Chrysler Building.

"There hasn't been a true air-superiority fighter developed by this country since 1958," he declared.

The Pentagon has recently moved ahead with two fighter projects—the Navy's F–14A and the Air Force's F–15. But Mr. Johnson questioned whether they would give the United States total air superiority during the nineteen-seventies.

PERFORMANCE A SECRET

The F–14A is a carrier-based craft that the Navy recently ordered from the Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corporation, and hopes to have in service by about 1972. The Air Force recently took steps to begin development of the F–15, which would be lighter and faster than the Navy plane, and would be in service about 1975.

Performance goals of both planes are classified. But according to military sources their top speed would probably be 1,400 to 1,600 miles an hour. Maximum combat altitude would be about 60,000 feet.

It may be, Mr. Johnson said, that neither plane will be able to cope with Soviet fighters of the mid-seventies.

The best existing Soviet fighters, he said, already can outclimb and outmaneuver present United States fighters, and by the time the two new American craft come along, the Russians would almost certainly have improved planes.

"I think we need a new fighter for air superiority, beyond the F–15, that can go at least Mach 3 [three times the speed of sound, or about 2,000 miles on hour] and be able to operate up to 80,000 or 90,000 feet," he said.

"I'm sure the other side will have a plane that can operate up this high, and I don't think we should let the enemy have this airspace all to himself."

JAMES FARMER: UNTOUCHABLES REVOLUTION HEIR

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, when it becomes politically profitable for national leaders to utilize violent revolutionary agitators to exploit the citizenry then the American people should begin asking why and start making demands of their own.

And so the untouchables—bipartisan—and without valor continue to congregate in an unelected bureaucratic establishment to further their punitive attacks against the American people.

The untouchables parade adds up to one objective—danger to the lives, liberties, and property of our people.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent

of the House, I submit the Herald of Freedom, Zarephath, N.J., for March 7, 1969, and several articles for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

[From the Herald of Freedom, Mar. 7, 1969]

JAMES FARMER

"If you can't beat 'em, join 'em," goes the old saying and President Nixon is giving his opponents the opportunity to do just that. His supporters are ignored for jobs with the new administration while his political enemies get the offers. While some have turned down proffered positions, others have searched their souls and found it possible to accept a job under the man whose election they actively opposed and to whose political party they do not belong. One of the newest in this bi-partisan bevy is James Farmer who spent his working career helping to bring about the black revolution, now in progress, and furthering the Communist-socialist take-over of the United States, now in its advanced stages.

On Lincoln's Birthday, February 12, 1969 the appointment of the first Negro to a high position in the Nixon Administration was announced. James Farmer, the grandson of a slave was named to the position of Assistant Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare for Administration on the birthday of the Emancipator. The last two words are important for through them is evaded the necessity of having this appointment submitted to the Senate for its consent. This would presumably take Farmer out of the field of policy-making and thereby out of the reach of the Senate questioners. However, Robert Finch, Secretary of HEW has stated that Farmer would have "considerably upgraded status" and a powerful voice in planning a reorganization of HEW. Farmer will have "a voice across the department," according to Finch.

James Leonard Farmer was born January 12, 1920 in Marshall, Texas, the son of James Leonard Farmer and the former Miss Pearl Marion Houston, a school teacher. The elder Farmer was a college professor at Wiley College in Marshall, the first Negro in Texas to hold a Ph.D. degree (from Boston University) and a scholar who read Aramaic and Greek. The son graduated from Wiley College at the age of eighteen with a B.S. in chemistry. He had planned to become a doctor but, upon discovering he could not stand the sight of blood, switched to the ministry. He attended the School of Religion of Howard University in Washington, D.C. and obtained his B.D. degree in 1941. He was never ordained as a Methodist clergyman because the Methodist Church in the South was segregated and, according to Farmer, he did not see how he could "honestly preach the Gospel of Christ in a church that practiced discrimination."

Farmer was an activist from his student days. He was active in the Christian Youth Movement, having been vice-chairman of the National Council of Methodist Youth and the Christian Youth Council of North America. In 1942 with a group of students at the University of Chicago he organized the first chapter of CORE, Congress of Racial Equality, which developed out of the Committee of Racial Equality previously established. Although CORE was staging sit-ins back in those days it did not receive national publicity until it was supported by the Kennedy Administration in the Freedom Rides into the South. This put it on a paying basis and Farmer was able to receive a salary of $11,500 per year as National Director, a post he held from 1961 to 1966.

Upon graduation from college with his Divinity degree, Farmer went to work for the left-wing Fellowship of Reconciliation, serving as race relations secretary from 1941 to 1945. From 1946 to 1948 he was a union organizer for the Upholsterers' International Union. From 1948 to 1950 he was a lecturer on race and labor problems. From 1950 to 1954 he was student field secretary of the League for Industrial Democracy, a Fabian-socialist organization. From 1954 to 1959 he served as international representative of the State, County and Municipal Employees Union. From 1959 to 1961 he was program director for the N.A.A.C.P. and in 1961 returned to CORE where he remained until 1966. During this time he was also a commentator on radio and television programs sponsored by the United Auto Workers in Detroit. Current Biography 1964 states: "He also lectured extensively and wrote for many publications, including Crisis, Fellowship, World Frontiers, and Hadassah News."

In July 1966 he went to work for the State of New Jersey. The N.Y. Times of July 6, 1966 stated:

"James Farmer, former national director of the Congress of Racial Equality, has been hired as special consultant on adult illiteracy for New Jersey's antipoverty program.

"Mr. Farmer broke angrily with the Office of Economic Opportunity, the national antipoverty agency, over the weekend when he charged that it had failed to support the new Center for Community Action Education, an organization he headed in the belief that it would be backed in its first year with $860,000 in Federal money. . . .

"A spokesman for the state program said there was no connection between Mr. Farmer's break with the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity and his appointment by New Jersey. . . .

Mr. Farmer is expected to work nearly full time for much of July and August at a consultant's fee of $80 a day."

Since 1966 Mr. Farmer has taught at Lincoln University in Oxford, Pa., and the New York University School of Education. He also joined the Education Affiliate of the Bedford-Stuyvesant Development Corporation, set up to plan an educational complex. Bedford-Stuyvesant is a focal point of the black revolution. The late Robert Kennedy set up a private corporation "to revitalize the Bedford-Stuyvesant section of Brooklyn," organized in December 1966. The N.Y. Times of April 2, 1967 described the Kennedy operation:

"The Kennedy project, organized last December, set up two corporations to channel foundation, government and private funds into a concentrated program to improve slums.

"One group—the Development and Service Corporation—is made up of prominent bankers, businessmen and lawyers who will provide managerial and fiscal advice. . . .

"The other—the Renewal and Rehabilitation Corporation—was to be made up of community leaders. . . .

"Eight businessmen and civic leaders were also announced yesterday as directors of the Development and Services Corporation.

"The other new directors are C. Douglas Dillon, former Secretary of the Treasury; David Lilienthal of the Development and Resources Corporation; Andre Meyere of Lazard Freres & Co.; George S. Moore, president, First National City Bank; William S. Paley, board chairman, Columbia Broadcasting System; Benno E. Schmidt of J. H. Whitney & Company; Thomas J. Watson Jr., president of the International Business Machines Corporation, and Roswell L. Gilpatric, former Deputy Secretary of Defense."

(Six of the eight directors are members of The Council on Foreign Relations and one is a partner in a Rothschild Banking firm.)

With such a good revolution going, everyone wants to get into the act. Farmer thought his popularity in the Bedford-Stuyvesant area was such that he could be elected to the Congress of the United States from that area. He ran as a registered Liberal on the Republican ticket but supporting the Democratic presidential candidate, Humphrey. He got only twenty-five percent of the votes, losing to another Negro, Mrs. Shirley Chisholm who ran as a Democrat. But Farmer won in the long run as he now has a better government job than Mrs. Chisholm.

In taking his new position which will pay him $36,000 per year, Farmer told newsmen that taking a position with the Nixon Administration "was a very easy decision" because he felt he had a choice between criticizing from the outside or an opportunity to "get inside and try to influence the course of events." He has said that he will continue to work for the same ideals and causes he has always supported, so it will be of interest to the people of the United States to know what these are.

U.S. News and World Report tells us that: "'Freedom rides,' protest sit-ins, massive demonstrations, and jail are all part of James Farmer's background in the nation's civil-rights movement.

"But, he says, there is a 'great need for some people to get on the inside and to try to have some influence.'"

The N.Y. News of Feb. 17, 1969 quotes Farmer as follows: "I sympathize with many of the demands which are being made and the things that the youngsters, the beautiful youngsters, are groping for, but I don't always agree with the tactics which are used. I discuss those tactics with them in private and sometimes modify them." The article states further:

"Asked about his duties, Farmer said he had received assurances from his immediate boss, Secretary Robert Finch, that 'I'd be heard and that I'd be listened to.' He added that he will be one of Finch's chief advisers on urban affairs and that he will try to lead qualified blacks toward government service."

Farmer has been associated with CORE from its inception, having been one of its founders. Current biography 1964 describes his activities:

"As national director of CORE, Farmer not only plans projects but also participates in carrying many of them out. He was one of the original Freedom Riders and, like most of the group, he spent forty days in jail in 1961. . . .

"As a result of his imprisonment in Plaquemine, Farmer was unable to take part in the March on Washington on August 28, 1963. . . . CORE was one of the organizations sponsoring the March on Washington . . .

"On the housing issue CORE has sent squads of Freedom Dwellers to try to obtain homes for Negroes in all-white communities, has staged sit-ins against discriminatory rental agents, and has organized rent strikes to force slum landlords to improve dilapidated buildings."

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 25, 1961 Sen. James Eastland stated:

"Mr. President, the agent provocateurs who have descended upon the southern States in the name of 'peace riders' were sent for the sole purpose of stirring up discord, strife, and violence. 'Peace riders' is a revered Communist term, an old Communist technique. The movement was masterminded and directed by an organization known as the Congress of Racial Equality, called CORE. This organization is the war department of those who sell hate, collect donations, and sow the seeds of discord in this country. Since its inception, its creed has been lawlessness and its tactics have followed the pattern set by Communist agitators the world over. . . .

"Mr. President, since CORE has started directing its operations into the southern areas of the United States, other leaders in organized labor have joined the directorate of CORE. Foremost among these is Walter P. Reuther. Reuther has spent years trying to obtain respectability since those days in 1934 when he and his brother worked in an industrial plant in Russia. The words that they transmitted back to the United States in a letter which appeared in the August 14, 1948, issue of the Saturday Evening Post are well worth repeating today. The letter ended with the statement: 'Carry on the fight for a Soviet America.'

"Mr. President, that is what CORE is doing today. It is carrying on the fight for a Soviet America. . . .

"Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary, by special resolution, has been instructed to investigate the Communist conspiracy in our country and the administration of the Internal Security Act. From investigation and examination of the facts and records there can be little doubt, in my judgment, but that this group is an arm of the Communist conspiracy. They are agents of worldwide communism, who sow strife and discord in this country."

Now that the pot of strife and discord is bubbling nicely, CORE has gone on to a new objective. In a recent column Willard Edwards stated:

"Twenty-four hours before he came to Washington last week to become the Nixon administration's highest ranking Negro official, James Farmer attended a New York meeting where 'a new United States Constitution' was named as the long-range goal of the Congress of Racial Equality (C.O.R.E.)

"As the founder of C.O.R.E., Farmer sat beside Roy Innis, national director, and added his indorsement of a program for racial restructuring of American society. . . .

"Innis, who cited Farmer's continued ties to C.O.R.E. as an adviser who will be frequently consulted, said Nixon's appointment of Farmer was 'the best thing he has ever done.'

"'We are calling for a new U.S. Constitution,' he declared in summarizing C.O.R.E.'s new long-range program. 'A new social contract is needed to help guarantee peaceful co-existence between the two races . . .'"

Another group which is working on the disruption of America is the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). This was spawned by the League for Industrial Democracy which lists Farmer as a Vice President and for which he was student field secretary, going about the country recruiting college students for this Fabian-socialist organization. Clark Kissinger, former president of SDS, states in New Left Notes:

"In 1959, the Student League for Industrial Democracy (SLID) changed its name to Students for a Democratic Society. As the youth arm of the League for Industrial Democracy (LID), SLID could trace its origins back to the founding of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society in 1905. . . . Throughout much of its history it maintained a close relationship with the Young People's Socialist League (YPSL), the youth arm of the Socialist Party."

(In 1966 LID had to sever its official tie with SDS to protect its tax-exempt status.)

The Fabian Society began in 1883 in England to develop and promote Socialism. The Fabians aided the Russian Bolsheviks long before the "Revolution" in 1917. In 1907 the Fabians played host to Lenin and his Bolshevik followers. George Bernard Shaw sent the following message to his fellow members of the Fabian Society on the occasion of the Society's diamond jubilee in the fall of 1946: "The only message I have for the moment is that the Fabian Society, having made Russia a great Fabian state, has now to make Wallace succeed Franklin Roosevelt as President of the United States." This did not come to pass fortunately although the Communists and fellow-travellers worked hard for the election of Henry Wallace who ran on the Progressive Party ticket in 1948.

The Alabama Legislative Commission to Preserve the Peace cited the SDS as subversive stating:

"We conclude from the foregoing evidence that Students for a Democratic Society has as its aim the overthrow, by violence and subversion, of the institutions of our society and our society and our government; that its aim is identical with that of the Communist Party, U.S.A., and the various splinter communist groups; that it has actively and overtly conspired with known communist groups in this purpose and has attempted, and is attempting, to prosecute this course of action.

"We further conclude that Students for a Democratic Society has received, and is receiving, aid and financial support, knowingly, from communist groups; that it is under substantial direction and control of one or more communist groups."

In Report No. 10, February 11, 1969, the Joint Legislative Committee on Un-American Activities of the State of Louisiana published the following Conclusions after an investigation of the S.D.S.:

"1. Students for a Democratic Society is a part of the New Left and is spearheading the New Left Movement to disrupt the campuses of educational institutions throughout the U.S.A.

"2. Although SDS in its incipiency refused membership to Communists, it has since dropped this clause from its constitution and will now accept anyone for membership who will further the disruptive and anarchistic principles and activities of the Organization.

"3. That SDS has close contacts with such organizations as The Southern Student Organizing Committee, Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, Communist Party USA, Young Socialist League, Socialist Workers Party, Progressive Labor Party, and a number of other groups. . . .

"8. The Committee feels that there is no place in the educational system and institutions of learning in the State of Louisiana for 'The Students for a Democratic Society' and urges that all institutions of learning thoroughly investigate and consider the aims of The Students for a Democratic Society should they receive applications for a chapter charter of this organization."

James Farmer has been on the board of the directors of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), and the Americans for Democratic Action (ADA) and is listed as a Sponsor on the letterhead of the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, Inc. (Sane). He was a member of the National Executive Board of the American Committee on Africa and a recipient of the John Dewey Award of the L.I.D. He was vice chairman of the Liberal Party of N.Y. County 1954 to 1961. He is listed on the Advisory Committee of M-REIT (Mutual Real Estate Investment Trust) "established to invest in housing open to all." He was listed on the board of directors of a similar company called Modern Community Developers, Inc. of 7750 Roosevelt Blvd., Philadelphia, Pa. Besides pushing integration these last two organizations hoped to make money.

That Farmer is a trouble maker there can be no doubt. Two incidents have been publicized in which Farmer spread false and malicious stories to inflame his hearers. During the Harlem riots in 1964 Farmer met with other Negro militants and claimed he personally saw a policeman shoot a Negro woman who had only asked for information, stating that she was shot in the groin and wound up in the hospital. Investigation revealed that no such incident occurred but the desired damage was done before it was found that Farmer had lied. Another incident involved a New York policeman who had shot a Negro boy who attacked him with a knife. Police Lt. Thomas R. Gilligan filed two libel suits in connection with the case, one against Martin Luther King and others (including Farmer) and one against James Farmer alone which charged that Farmer "in the presence and hearing of other persons said that the slain youth was shot in cold blood" and that Gilligan "must be charged with murder." Another charge was that Farmer said that "information has come to me that Thomas Gilligan is presently in a mental institution receiving treatment," a statement for which there was no basis in fact.

Farmer has been arrested many times in connection with his civil-rights activities. He, like his co-worker Martin Luther King, seems to be almost immune to punishment, however. Congressman John R. Rarick, a former state district judge in Louisiana before being elected to Congress, issued warrants for the arrest of Farmer who had been cited by Rarick for contempt of court. Another Louisiana judge also cited Farmer who, according to Congressman Rarick, "later scoffed at both citations."

Farmer makes liberal use of the Communist cry of "Police Brutality" to rouse his followers. He has been quoted as stating: "I do believe police brutality in this city (New York), Mississippi and other such places should be an issue placed before the United Nations." Although he claims to be "non-violent," CORE has cooperated with and Farmer has gone out of his way to praise the Deacons for Defense, an armed Negro group. He was an early advocate of a Negro third party which blossomed in the form of the Freedom Parties in the South which try to usurp the role of the legitimate Democratic Parties. A news article contained in the report of hearings before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee entitled "Communist Youth Program" stated that Farmer had felt bold enough to threaten the President of the United States:

"Negro Civil Rights Leader James Farmer today threatened a second nationwide march on Washington unless President Johnson orders Federal marshals and FBI agents to protect voting rights demonstrators in Selma, Ala. . . .

"'The President has not lived up to our expectations in Selma,' Farmer said. 'We have to keep up pressure even to keep our friends honest.' . . .

"'I consider our Nation is facing a grave constitutional crisis,' he said. 'The Federal Government has not lived up to its responsibilities.'

"He said the Government must bear responsibility for attacks on three white ministers in Selma and the Federal court also must bear responsibility for its refusal to issue a court order restraining State police from turning back Negro marchers.

"'This was encouragement to hooliganism.' Farmer said. . . .

"He compared the Alabama State troopers to white mercenaries he saw on a recent trip to the Congo Republic.

Farmer's use of the word "hooliganism" is interesting as it is not generally used in this country but is used in the USSR. The crime wave which swept through Russia before the Communist take-over was known to Russian sociologists as "Hooliganism." The Russian writer, Menshikov, stated: "All over Russia we see the same growth of 'Hooliganism,' and the terror in which the Hooligans hold the population. . . . The police are agonizing in the struggle with crime—a struggle which is beyond their strength. . . . It is not only degenerates who enter upon a life of debauch and crime; already the average, normal masses join them. . . ." This described the conditions which led Russia to fall prey to the Communists . . . it sounds menacingly like conditions existing at the present time in the United States.

Farmer was divorced from his first wife in 1946 and married Lula Peterson, a white girl from Chicago, in 1949. She was a graduate of Northwestern University and met Farmer at a CORE meeting in 1945. They have two daughters, Tami Lynn, age 10; and Abbey Lee, age 8; and they live in an apartment complex behind City Hall in New York at 165 Park Row. Farmer has been described as "an old line Norman Thomas Socialist and pacifist" but his activities and associations are not that respectable; he has called himself "Outside Agitator No. 1." He is also an intellectual and an eloquent and persuasive speaker. These things add up to danger when combined in the person of an important unelected bureaucrat.

[From the Washington Post, February 17, 1969]

FARMER CALLS FOR SLUM AID—EXPECTS NIXON WILL SUPPORT CORE'S PLAN

(By Robert C. Jensen)

Negro leader James Farmer said yesterday that he had "every expectation" that the Nixon Administration "will support" a billion-dollar-a-year legislative proposal pushed by CORE to promote "black capitalism" in the Nation's slums.

Farmer referred to legislation to create a national Community Development Bank that would guarantee and float loans to local development banks to finance business enterprises through Community Development Corporations in the city slums and poor rural areas.

Farmer is the founder and longtime director of the Congress of Racial Equality. He was chosen last week to be assistant secretary for administration in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. He spoke yesterday on the CBS interview program "Face the Nation," carried here by WTOP.

Farmer noted on the program that President Nixon had spoken approvingly of various "black capitalism" programs for economic development during the campaign.

The Community Development Bank program, which was first proposed by CORE, has been introduced by a number of Senators and Representatives. It is being pushed most actively in Congress by Republican members. The cost is estimated to be $1 billion a year for the first two years.

Farmer, who will take office about April 1, will be the highest ranking Negro in the Nixon Administration.

He comes as a registered member of the Liberal Party in New York, who ran unsuccessfully for Congress on the Republican and Liberal tickets and who endorsed the presidential candidacy of Democrat Hubert H. Humphrey.

He said his main job at HEW will be recruiting qualified members of minority groups for important Government positions. He said he expected to have a strong staff at HEW that would handle the administrative details of his job, "while I concentrate on other things."

Farmer also said he expected to be "the prime adviser" to HEW Secretary Robert Finch on urban affairs and that he would be in liaison with the Urban Affairs Council in the White House and with Daniel P. Moynihan, the President's adviser on urban affairs.

The longtime civil rights leader said he did not think his acceptance of a post in the Nixon Administration would hurt his credibility with Negroes, who were overwhelmingly opposed to Mr. Nixon's election.

"I don't think I am an ambassador from the Administration to the black community," Farmer said. "I would put it the reverse way and say that I am an ambassador from the black community to the Administration—perhaps a little of both."

Farmer said he was not named to his post to win Negro voters to the Nixon Administration. "This is not one of my job descriptions at all," he said. He added that "I have made no commitments of campaigning for anyone yet."

But Farmer said if the Nixon Administration's "performance is meritorious, as far as the black community and other minority communities are concerned, then there will be a larger segment of those communities voting for the Administration."

He said he supported most demands being made by minority students at colleges for ethnic studies. But "I don't always agree with the tactics which are used," he said.

He indicated that he favored cutting off Federal scholarships and grants to students convicted of breaking laws during demonstrations.

"I think that anyone who breaks the law has to expect to suffer the consequences," Farmer said. "This has always been my belief, even the times I broke the law deliberately in Mississippi and elsewhere, when I went to jail for it. I did not say 'don't arrest me.' ".

However, Farmer added that he thought each case must be considered on its own merits and the law should be enforced with "some flexibility."

[From the Chicago Tribune, Feb. 17, 1969]

FARMER BACKS CAMPUS GOALS—BUT HE FROWNS UPON STUDENT TACTICS

(By Glen Elsasser)

WASHINGTON, February 16.—James Farmer, the highest ranking Negro in the Nixon administration, said today he sympathized with many demands black students were making on the nation's campuses, but not with their tactics.

In an interview on the television program, Face the Nation, the former national director of the Congress for Racial Equality said, "It is terribly important that official America and unofficial America understand the kinds of demands which are being made by the black community now."

PREFERS BLACK TEACHERS

Farmer, who last week was named assistant secretary for administration of the department of health, education, and welfare, said until recently the movement among Negroes was toward integration—color blindness. But the emphasis now, he observed, is on ethnic cohesiveness.

In the new departments of black studies, established on many campuses as a result of protests, Farmer believes it would be better that the classes are taught by blacks because of the polarization between blacks and whites in our society.

Farmer made it clear that protesters on the nation's campuses must face the consequences of breaking the law, including the loss of government financed scholarships. However, he said, "Each case must be decided on its own merits."

The most critical problems facing the Nixon administration, Farmer said, were the cities, improving the quality of education, and making sure that welfare reaches the poor and helps them get out of poverty.

Altho he received the support of the Republican party in an unsuccessful attempt for election to the House of Representatives from Brooklyn, Farmer said he was a member of the Liberal party in New York and not a registered Republican. He indicated he would take office here around April 1.

In his new job, Farmer said his major tasks would consist of recruiting qualified minorities, coordinating community action programs financed by the department of health, education, and welfare, and advising HEW on urban affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Wednesday, March 5, 1969*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Chaim B. Seiger, Baron Hirsch Congregation, Memphis, Tenn., offered the following prayer:

O continue Thy loving kindness unto them that know Thee; and Thy righteousness to the upright in heart.—Psalms 36: 11.

קודשא בריך הוא, שכינתה ומלכותה, מליא כל ארעה זיו יקרה.

"May the Holy One, blessed be He, His divine presence, and His kingship abide in this place and fill this land."

O L-rd, Author of our lives and Giver of our wisdom, we seek Thy blessing. Let us do the right with loving kindness. Let us do the right with pride in our deeds and not in ourselves. Let us guide with courage that the hand of the wicked drive us not away. May we be the instruments of freedom and truth.

O G-d, as all men are precious unto Thee, so may they be precious unto us. As Thou seekest the good for all Thy children, so may we. May we prize highly and protect carefully the gifts of conscience and principle that were handed to us from Sinai through Lexington and Concord. May we transmit these values and virtues to our children that they become their possession. Accept our service that we may achieve; that through us man may know an additional measure of freedom and security.

Upon the President and Vice President of these United States, upon this body of distinguished leaders, grant Thy blessing as spoken in the Psalm:

"O continue Thy loving kindness unto them that know Thee;
And Thy righteousness to the upright in heart.
Let not the hand of the wicked drive them away and give them to drink of the river of Thy pleasures."

May you mark these men of integrity and behold their uprightness for the future of these men shall be peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill and concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1022. An act to provide that future appointments to the office of Administrator of the Social and Rehabilitation Service, within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and to certain subordinate offices, be made by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; and

S. Con. Res. 5. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of hearings on the nomination of Walter J. Hickel to be Secretary of the Interior.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE U.S. GROUP OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 689, 84th Congress, as amended, the Chair appoints as members of the U.S. group of the