

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 17649. A bill for the relief of Antonio Mascaro and Giuseppa Mascaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

H.R. 17650. A bill for the relief of Patrick J. O'Connor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 17651. A bill for the relief of Emile Georges Cochand and Marjorie Almo Cochand; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

480. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Pittsburg County Choctaw Council, McAlester, Okla., relative to repeal of the Choctaw Termination Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

481. Also, petition of the 22d Saipan Legislature, Saipan, Mariana Islands, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, relative to reintegration of the Marianas District with the U.S. territory of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

381. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve the reciprocal immunities of tax exemption, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

KNOW THE SEA

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, Rear Adm. O. D. Waters, Jr., Oceanographer of the Navy, delivered the keynote address Tuesday, May 12, at the opening of the U.S. Navy Symposium on Military Oceanography, held this year at the U.S. Naval Academy with the Naval Ship Research and Development Laboratory as host.

A year ago, it will be recalled, the annual symposium was held at the Seattle Center Playhouse, Seattle, with the Applied Physics Laboratory of the University of Washington as host. Admiral Waters also keynoted that symposium.

The admiral's address this year at Annapolis discussed in some detail budget cuts in naval oceanography which have resulted in programs being curtailed or slowed down, abandonment of new starts and retardation of coastal and deep ocean surveys.

On the other hand certain important technological improvements were noted and there have been major advances in forecasting services and increased emphasis on Arctic and Mediterranean requirements.

Mr. President, Admiral Waters has presented a factual, up-to-the-minute account of the status of naval oceanography which will, I am sure, interest all of us.

I ask unanimous consent that his keynote address before the U.S. Navy Symposium on Military Oceanography be printed in the RECORD.

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

KNOW THE SEA TO CONTROL THE SEA

(By Rear Adm. O. D. Waters, Jr.)

Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen: Last year at our Symposium in Seattle I promised you some beautiful spring weather for our meeting here in Annapolis and you can see that I delivered.

These predictions of course should be simple for me when I have able meteorologists on my staff to advise me. Actually however, for this long range stuff I depend mostly on the Farmers Almanac.

Once more I want to thank all of you who took time to research and prepare the papers to be delivered here and to all of you who

have traveled here to listen and learn and to take part in the discussions.

At this point I want to express my appreciation to Mr. H. V. Nutt, the General Chairman, and members of his staff from our host organization, the Naval Ship Research and Development Laboratory, and to Admiral James Calvert for making the fine facilities of the Naval Academy available to us.

As you know the stress this year is on the immediate problems of our Fleet operators and what oceanography can do to help solve them.

Fortunately, as sponsor of this 7th Annual Symposium, all I was asked to do was give a short keynote address. Keynote I take to mean a few words about the purpose of the meeting, and some optimistic generalities about past accomplishments and future prospects.

I don't intend however to do either.

What we have done in the past and are doing now is known to you and I suppose we must be doing something right or we wouldn't still be here.

As to the future I cannot speak with the optimism that I felt a short year ago.

The war we are fighting on two fronts—the bitter military battle abroad and the frustrating combination of poverty, pollution and inflation at home—has served to put us in a holding pattern in many areas.

I have no doubt that we will eventually solve our problems and win our wars, but meanwhile the keynote for the government is economy. Major budget cuts are being taken by the Defense Department and Oceanography has to take its share. This means that many new starts had to be abandoned, survey ships laid up and many programs that were near to fruition have had to be curtailed or slowed down.

I am going to say just a few words about some of those programs—for we seek to protect those most vital to the Fleet—and then I will let the experts take over.

First let me explain for the benefit of some of you new to the field, that Naval Oceanography spans a very broad range of effort—perhaps described best by our three major management categories of Ocean Science; Ocean Engineering and Development; and Oceanographic Operations, which includes our Environmental Prediction Services. All of these areas are represented on the agenda here, and many of the symposium subjects of course include more than one category.

I want to give the status of some of the highlight programs—efforts which we consider of major importance to the Fleet. Programs that we have worked on for a long time, programs where in some cases we are on the brink of significant accomplishments on the verge of putting the results at your disposal.

In the matter of surveys. We have reached what is known to the trade as Indian Springs Low Water in our capabilities for both coastal hydrographic surveys and deep sea oceanographic surveys, as the last of our military manned survey ships have been stricken this

fiscal year. We have four MSTs manned replacements being delivered in the next 14 months, but until they are well shaken down we will be pursuing only very limited coastal surveys, primarily off South Korea.

The next big increase in capability will have to await the completion of development of our high speed coastal survey system which promises to enhance such operations by a factor of 6 or more. We need it—JSOP requirements translate into hundreds of ship years of effort. ASW/USW surveys in support of the SQS-26 and BQQ-2 sonars will be intermittent. We will give full support to Project CAESAR, to insure timely data in support of that project, but as things now stand we will have few resources to apply against other oceanographic survey requirements.

We will continue our Polaris/Poseidon support at a steady level, although that level is not adequate to the need. We hope to obtain funds by FY-72 at the latest for the conversion of an additional survey platform which will help immensely in later years. We have contracted with the Coast and Geodetic Survey for about ten ship-months of effort this year, which has relieved the pressure, but next year's funding does not allow this option. Even to generate the contract funds this year we had to give up one of our two aging gravity survey ships.

We have also lost one of our two magnetic survey aircraft, and until fiscal year 1972 when a P-3 type aircraft is shaken down and replaces the remaining plane, we will be curtailing our magnetic surveys supporting ASW and nautical charting.

Many of you have heard that we have laid up relatively new ships, and indeed we do have three small ones in reduced readiness status at MSTs in Brooklyn. We will not be able to reactivate the ships very soon for their original purpose, but we are seeking to place them where the Navy, and if possible our oceanographic programs will benefit from them. We hope to see one operating directly for the Naval Undersea Research and Development Center, San Diego, supporting all that laboratory's projects, while others may go to universities if their operation can be funded by the National Science Foundation, or perhaps to our allies, where we will reap the benefit of the research they support, and perhaps be able to execute joint projects with them.

These have been the operational areas impacted. Let me speak briefly of R&D. Our efforts centering on Deep Submergence have noted milestones, but many have also undergone significant modification. Our man in the sea effort, for example, is no longer habitat oriented, but rather is being conducted as a cautious, three phase project utilizing a Mark II Deep Dive System. The modified project will achieve virtually all the original objectives, however. We do not intend to refurbish the habitat until we launch our extended depth Man in the Sea project, probably in 1973.

Our Deep Submergence Search Vehicle project has been redirected towards the long lead time technology, and fiscal 70 funding is being stretched to cover 71 effort. We feel confident that a successful development is within our grasp, but the fiscal climate is just not right. Our related Deep Ocean Technology, or DOT, project continues to receive emphasis, especially in the areas of hull materials, and auxiliary equipment, and we look to that project to keep us in maximum readiness to respond to many deep ocean system requirements when funding allows.

As you know the first DSRV was launched in January, and tests have been successful so far. We expect to implement an interim rescue capability by this time next year, if the current construction program for the catamaran ASR holds. The nuclear research vehicle NR-1 has also recently completed a highly successful shakedown cruise, obtaining much oceanographic data of interest.

Our salvage capability continues to improve, and last month, in a test of the Mark One deep dive system, Navy divers worked at 650 feet depths very successfully for three hours. We are attempting to implement a serious effort on a large object salvage system, a project which has been on the back burner for several years, for again the technology seems to be within our grasp.

The backbone of the submarine finding brigade, the USNS MIZAR, just excelled again by finding the French sub EURYDICE. It is remaining in the area at the request of the French to seek the sub MINERVE, lost over a year ago. MIZAR, with its NRL scientists, is a truly remarkable platform, but it is only one system and there is a big ocean out there. Disasters will have to occur serially, not concurrently, or our lack of resources will come home to haunt us.

In recent years we have been able to mount some really intensive field experiments concerning the environment and its relation to underwater sound. These in turn have led to substantial successes in modeling the environment, and we are on the verge of great things in this area. But progress will depend heavily on our continuing strong program of at-sea experimentation, as well as on an increased density of routine environmental data reports from ships at sea.

This improvement in modeling has been paralleled by a major step in forecasting services to the Fleet, with the introduction by the Naval Weather Service of its ASRAP and SHARPS products. We feel that we are on the right track and intend to concentrate on the further evolution of the systems.

Turning for the moment from functional to geographic areas, I'll mention that the states of our knowledge of both the Arctic and Mediterranean have recently been bucked against our requirements, and as a result both areas are to receive increased emphasis immediately.

To this decision, many of us say "high time," but in fact our low level programs have formed a solid foundation for the expanded effort. For example, there have been some exciting improvements in sea ice reconnaissance and forecasting, using both satellite and aircraft sensors and we have given a high priority in recent years to the military construction which has upgraded the Navy's Arctic Research Lab.

There are other important milestones on the horizon such as the coming into operational status of our two new submarines SEA CLIFF and TURTLE, and the delivery of our catamaran research ship HAYES, the AGOR 16, which will greatly enhance the acoustics research capability of the Naval Research Laboratory.

There are also a large number of requirements, both existing and forecast, with which we must come to grips. I have tried to set a background for you to use in the discussions to follow, for requirements are expected to permeate almost every agenda item. I have tried not to sound too pessimistic, for we still

wield a major capability. It is of the utmost importance that requirements continue to flow from the Fleet, for only through the knowledge of such requirement can decisions on the resources to fulfill them be made. However, it is equally important that the priority of those requirements be carefully assigned and regularly reviewed, and that requirements for such effort as the fleet deems most vital to its current and future operation be pushed by them and at every level of the Naval Establishment, in order to insure that the oceanographic program which is accomplished is of maximum benefit. As I've tried to indicate also, there is daylight at the end of the tunnel, but the tunnel is a long one—for us, probably, fiscal 73 will see the first relief.

I'll close by reiterating that our problems are no different from those of the rest of the Navy. We are all caught in the draw-down. However, in times like these we in Oceanography must really produce more, for knowledge and exploitation of the environment are one important key to improved performance by the ships which are left in the operating forces. Further, much of what we do can only be done in peacetime, when the environment is accessible. These factors dictate our continuing efforts to insure a place in the Navy for a strong oceanographic program.

IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF HUMAN LIFE

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, there has been a growing awareness in past months concerning the quality of human life, environmental decay, pollution, and associated areas.

Such growing awareness displayed by the public is necessary and praiseworthy in the support of needed programs and for effective involvement on a personal level. This notable concern and support should be a reassurance to many of my colleagues who have struggled for years to enact major new legislation to clean up the environment. It has been convincingly demonstrated that the American people are squarely behind such efforts.

I recall a number of years ago when I was in the California Legislature, our fight against polluters of our streams, rivers, and seashores. I was a member of the first Legislative Committee on Pollution and we wrote some of the basic California antipollution legislation now on the books. However, I distinctly remember the general public's sentiment at that time. Air pollution or smog was considered by many as only a Los Angeles problem. Water pollution was felt to be the normal result of a large number of people and industry and there was not much you could do about it.

I am pleased with today's general awareness of the pollution problem. In the short 17 months that I have been a Member of Congress, I have served on the Public Works Committee and the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors. Most of the water pollution legislation is sent to this committee. We have been active and have worked hard in studying and proposing much significant legislation.

A few weeks after I took office, and following the oil leak at Santa Barbara and the flood disaster in California, I went to California with a special committee and observed at firsthand the oil pollution in the Santa Barbara Channel. Shortly thereafter, I coauthored legislation which became the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969 which established, for the first time, liability of those responsible for oil spills. This act was basically a product of our Public Works Subcommittee.

Further measures upon which Congress has acted and I endorsed are the following:

Forty-five million dollars under the Clean Air Act for research on fuels and motor vehicle engines for the year 1970. This bill when implemented will help develop necessary facts and recommendations in the interest of low pollutant automobile emission.

Eight hundred million dollars for sewage plant facilities in cities and counties throughout the Nation. Since the administration had recommended only \$214 million, this was a significant step ahead.

The Endangered Species Act, prohibiting the importation and interstate shipment of endangered species of fish and wildlife.

Twenty-seven million dollars for research in saline water conversion.

The addition of two California forest areas to the national wilderness system.

The National Environmental Policy Act which established that it was the policy of the United States to create and maintain conditions under which man and nature can exist in productive harmony. To guide this policy we have created a Council of Environmental Policy. In the title of the act, we recognize that "each person should enjoy a healthful environment and has a responsibility to contribute to the preservation and enhancement of the environment."

The conspiracy suit against the automobile manufacturers was of major concern. A group of Congressmen, of which I was part, contended that auto manufacturers conspired to limit research and the production of effective anti-emission devices. Our effort to bring the case to an open trial failed, but our action, I believe, awoke manufacturers to the concern.

The above measures outline some of the major legislation Congress has passed and steps we have taken to insure environmental quality. My colleagues are aware of the environmental problem. Therefore, I am confident they realize the need to pass even more effective legislation. I urge them now to consider measures that are pending before various committees and to expedite their arrival to the floor of the House for consideration and passage.

I was disappointed in the failure of an amendment that would have established minimum standards and controls for jet airplane emissions. Nevertheless, those of us who worked and spoke on the floor for its passage were pleased to make the impression upon our colleagues of the necessity for discussing and considering such important proposals.

I submit to my colleagues a list of bills now pending before the House which I

am cosponsoring and I solicit their consideration for approval and final passage:

H.R. 14867, to provide national standards governing emissions from stationary sources and provide penalties for violation of these standards.

H.R. 10555, to provide for the Urban Mass Transportation Trust Fund.

H.R. 13339, to prohibit the distribution, sale, or shipment of the chemical compound commonly known as DDT.

H.R. 16713, to require the federal government to purchase a certain number of low-emission vehicles in order to encourage automobile manufacturers to start manufacturing such a vehicle.

H.R. 15290, The Environmental Quality Education Act which would authorize the Commissioner of Education to establish educational programs to encourage an understanding of policies and support of activities designed to enhance environmental quality and to maintain ecological balance.

H.R. 17516, the Low Emission Vehicle Act of 1970 which will ban pollution causing internal combustion engines in motor vehicles after January 1, 1975.

H.R. 17528, the California Marine Sanctuary Act which will prohibit further leasing for the extraction of oil and gas in those portions of the Outer Continental Shelf which are seaward of the California marine sanctuaries.

These bills, if passed, would be major steps in meeting the challenge to human life posed by the manmade causes of environmental decay. It appears there has been enough rhetoric on the subject of environmental quality. Congress is aware. The American people are aware. Now it is time for taking the necessary action and applying the means we have at our disposal. The people are looking to us for leadership. It is high time we acted upon those measures now pending before the House which would manifest that leadership.

CENTRAL ISSUE IN STUDENT WAR PROTEST

HON. FRANK E. MOSS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, Merlo J. Pusey, writing in the Washington Post today, has cut through the morass of comment and condemnation on student protest on the war in Southeast Asia and put his finger on the central issue as the students see it: Should young men be sent to fight in a military venture without the specific authority voted by Congress?

Mr. Pusey holds that the dissenters of today are traditionalists who would have been understood by Madison and Jefferson. They question the constitutionality of a Presidential war.

No one can condone the disorder, destruction, and outright anarchy which have been associated with the student protests. We all mourn the deaths which have occurred. But it would be unwise indeed to refuse to look beneath the protests for the reasons which have caused it—to refuse to face the central issue.

Mr. Pusey discusses this central issue with great perception. I ask unanimous

CXVI—986—Part 12

consent that his column be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

PRESIDENTIAL WAR: THE CENTRAL ISSUE

(By Merlo J. Pusey)

It would be a pity if the serious constitutional issue underlying the current protests against the war should be lost in the cyclone of threats, anti-Nixonisms and obscenities. However clumsy they may be in articulating it, the students do have a legitimate complaint. They face the possibility of being drafted against their will for service in a presidential war.

All the talk about pigs, revolution and smashing the establishment fails to alter the fact that, in one basic particular, the dissenters are the real traditionalists. Madison and Jefferson would have understood the anger on the campuses against the dispatch of young men to war in Southeast Asia at the dictation of one powerful executive. Madison and his colleagues wrote into the Constitution a flat prohibition against such a concentration of power. Yet it now seems to be accepted as standard American practice.

President Nixon reiterated his claim: to the war power the other night in his news conference. In explaining that none of his advisers was responsible for the invasion of Cambodia, he said:

Decisions, of course, are not made by vote in the National Security Council or in the Cabinet. They are made by the President with the advice of those, and I made this decision.

The question of going to Congress for the decision or even of discussing the matter with congressional leaders appears not to have been considered. The result of the decision was to extend the war to another country. By any interpretation that may be placed upon it, this was a grave involvement for the nation. Most of our Presidents would have deemed it imperative to go to Congress for authority to take such a step.

Now the administration is resisting the attempt of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to cut off funds for military operations in Cambodia. The committee has carefully tailored its restriction so as not to interfere with the President's avowed intention of clearing the sanctuaries and then withdrawing the American forces. But this has met with opposition from the State Department on the broad ground that actions of the Commander in Chief should not be subject to statutory restrictions.

There are several very interesting phrases in this letter which Assistant Secretary David H. Abshire sent to the Foreign Relations Committee. He contends that Congress should not limit military spending in such a way as to "restrict the fundamental powers of the President for protection of the armed forces of the United States." The implication seems to be that the President has authority to send our armed forces anywhere in the world, for purposes which he thinks appropriate, and then to take whatever additional action he may think necessary to protect those forces. Under this reasoning, it seems, no one can do anything to stop a presidential war.

This view of the war power is not, of course, unique with the Nixon administration. President Truman made even more expansive claims to unlimited presidential power, and LBJ was not far behind. Mr. Nixon's State Department is merely mouthing what has become accepted doctrine in the executive branch. But it is an outrageous doctrine that flies into the face of the letter and spirit of the Constitution and is repugnant to the basic concepts of democracy.

There is no principle about which the founding fathers were more adamant than

denial of the war power to a single executive. After extended debate they gave Congress the power to raise and support armies, to control reprisals and to declare war, which, of course, includes the power of authorizing limited war. The President was given authority to repel sudden attacks, but there is nothing in the Constitution which suggests that this can be legitimately stretched to cover military operations in support of other countries in remote corners of the world.

In a literal sense, therefore, it is the students—or at least the nonviolent majority among them—who are asserting traditional, constitutional principles. It is the State Department which is asserting a wild and unsupported view of presidential power that imperils the future of representative government.

Somehow the country must get back to the principle that its young men will not be drafted and sent into foreign military ventures without specific authority voted by Congress. That is a principle worth struggling for. Congress now seems to be groping its way back to an assertion of its powers, but its actions are hesitant and confused, as if it were afraid to assume the responsibility for policy-making in such vital matters of life and death.

Of course Congress is at a great disadvantage when it tries to use its spending power to cut off a presidential war for which it has recklessly appropriated funds in the past. In these circumstances, the President is always in a position to complain that the result will be to endanger our boys at the fighting fronts. Congress seems to have discovered no sound answer to that warning.

But Congress could stop presidential wars before they begin by writing into the law firm prohibitions against the building of military bases in foreign countries and the dispatch of American troops to other countries without specific congressional approval. If Congress is not willing or able to devise some means of restoring the war power to the representatives of the people, we may have to modify our system of government so that the President would become answerable to Congress for abuses of power. In the light of our Vietnam experience, it seems highly improbable that the country will long continue to tolerate unlimited power in one man to make war.

LEADING AMERICAN BUSINESSMAN EXPRESSES CONCERN OVER INDOCHINA POLICY

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD today a copy of a letter I received from Mr. Fred Stein, chairman of the executive committee of Standard & Poors Intercapital, Inc. Intercapital is among the Nation's largest investment-management organizations.

Mr. Stein's letter reflects the views of a number of America's business leaders who have voiced their concern over present administration policy in Indochina. There is an increasing willingness on the part of business leaders, like Mr. Stein, to courageously express their views and then follow up their opinions with positive and constructive action.

I particularly want to call to the attention of my colleagues the paragraph in Mr. Stein's letter that begins with the question—"What should be done here

and now?" The proposal made by Mr. Stein is certainly deserving of the attention of the concerned business community. Particularly relevant is the point he makes when he suggests:

I think that we, as businessmen and, to some extent, representing the leadership of the business community, must remove emotion from the issue and merely state the facts, so that every American can understand and comprehend what is really happening in this country.

I commend Mr. Stein's thoughts to my colleagues and to the leaders of America's business community:

STANDARD & POOR'S INTERCAPITAL, INC.,
May 6, 1970.

MR. HAROLD WILLENS,
National Chairman, The Businessmen's Education Fund, New York, N.Y.

DEAR HAROLD: This, I am ashamed to admit, is the first letter of this type I have ever written. Recent developments have created a sense of panic, shock and frustration in me and many of my friends and associates. My response to this condition is a strong desire for action—logical action which will make others aware of the state of the nation and possibly move many people in the country, aside from the students, to create such pressures on the Administration that it dramatically changes its present disastrous course of action.

The President's support base has been centered in what has been euphemistically called the "silent majority". This broad body of Americans has responded defensively to a variety of factors, more through a lack of enlightenment than through an endorsement of present policies.

I spent ten years in the labor movement prior to following a career in finance and feel that I have a reasonable understanding of the working man's attitude today. I submit that this is, to some extent, a self-serving comment, but my only intention is to do something that will benefit the country.

I think the "silent majority" has kept to his last and has worked hard to attain a reasonable level of creature comforts and living standards. I believe that his outlook is somewhat distorted and that much of his reaction to the Administration centers around the fact that a large portion of tax receipts goes to support welfare or similar programs and somehow makes its way into the hands of minority groups who get for nothing what he must work hard to achieve. I further believe that if he understood that the principal contributory factors to inflation and the present high tax structure are expenditures related to the military establishment and Viet Nam, his attitude could be easily altered.

The burden of the protest against the war has fallen onto the shoulders of the students, where, in many cases, radical elements have ascended to leadership positions. This immediately enabled the Administration to smear all of the students with the taint of radicalism. In my opinion, it is the failing of people like ourselves to make our voices heard more vigorously that has contributed mightily to the present polarization.

What should be done here and now? I believe that today the communications media provides us with a very effective method of getting the story across to the public, and I further believe that businessmen, educators and a variety of people of similar stature should now align themselves with the broad body of students, educators and Congressmen and really carry this appeal and our story to the public. Many of us interface with major corporations which can sponsor a program factually documenting the tremendously negative impact on the economy and on the society that the war in Indochina has

wrought. Further, this program could document the benefits to the economy and the relatively stronger position of the United States and its western allies vis-a-vis the red bloc, had we not been forced into this illogical confrontation in Indochina.

I think that we, as businessmen and, to some extent, representing the leadership of the business community, must remove emotion from the issue and merely state the facts, so that every American can understand and comprehend what is really happening in this country. I would be happy to do anything I can to find the people to create this program. I believe that they are available in objective areas, such as corporate economists, foundation economists, and people without a major axe to grind, but rather with a sense of dedication to the United States—a dedication that in no way, shape or form makes them sympathetic to communism. As you know, the Administration has been allowed to place all opponents of the war in a position which makes this opposition appear sympathetic to communism.

In short, I am saying it is time for us to put the issues as they really are, and I think a major, prime time program factually documenting the argument that can be set forth by a logical presentation could be an effective turning point. I look forward most anxiously to your response.

Sincerely,

FRED STEIN.

ARMED FORCES DAY SHOULD EQUAL ANY PROTEST

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's Capital has seen an outpouring of demonstrators against the war and against our leadership. Some have called our sons, who battle the Communists in Southeast Asia and who offer their lives, murderers. Some have desecrated our flag while shouting vile, four-letter abuse at honest patriots, and waved the Vietcong and Communist flags while burning our own Stars and Stripes.

I am already on record decrying this kind of Communist-led anti-Americanism.

I have no objection to protest with dialog as its aim as distinguished from anarchy, but to me it is about time for our young Americans to demonstrate faith in our country and respect for their fellow young Americans who serve in the peacekeeping forces of our Nation.

Saturday, May 16, is Armed Forces Day. I hope that every American remembers the spirit of '76, Tripoli, the hills of San Juan, the Alamo, Pearl Harbor, the beaches of Normandy, Iwo Jima, the cold winds of Korea—and will pause to honor the men of our Armed Forces who, when called upon, have never failed to protect our Nation wherever or whenever its people or security was threatened.

The display of the American flag is one way of our paying respect to those we honor. Fly it on Armed Forces Day—at your home, on your lapel, all over America—and be proud of it every day.

President Harry Truman declared Sat-

urday, May 20th of 1950, as the first Armed Forces Day, saying:

The Armed Forces, as a unified team, are currently performing at home and across the seas tasks vital to the security of the nation and to the establishment of durable peace.

President Truman noted we should spend one day a year "in paying tribute to the Armed Forces as the servants and protectors of our Nation."

Now, 20 years later, President Richard Nixon has declared Saturday another Armed Forces Day. Our military forces must still act to protect our shores and to bring peace and freedom to others who are attacked by the forces of communism which would subject them to totalitarian oppression.

The President said in his declaration to honor the Armed Forces:

The men and women who today wear a military uniform have earned the respect and admiration of the American people. In bitter combat in Vietnam, on lonely sentry duty in Korea, in countless other outposts around the world and at our important installations at home, they serve us all and they serve us well.

He continued, and I for one join in his statement:

For what they have done and will continue to do, we are all grateful.

On this Saturday, the hundreds of Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine, and Coast Guard facilities around the world will hold "open house" that the mothers and fathers, the wives and children, the friends, may see and understand a little more of our servicemen's daily work. I hope you take this opportunity to visit with them. I hope you take the time to meet these clean-cut youngsters who are our sons and daughters. Then the flag will fly with more meaning for you.

I cannot help but comment on the news that I have heard today that a few midshipmen at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy say they will refuse to march in the annual New York City Armed Forces Day parade that has been planned. These midshipmen are receiving a free education, at the taxpayers' expense, and indicated by their acceptance to the Academy full understanding of their responsibility to their country. Their action violates all sense of duty and responsibility. I hope their commanders act with dispatch and severity in meting out punishment for those who refuse to obey an order. Such attitudes, if permitted in wartime, could cost the lives of others.

More important than their action and attitude is that of those who would pass it off as a "sign of the times." It is dangerous and a radical, insurgent, and anarchistic, and traitorist type of approach contrary to one's responsibility as an American to our Nation and its people.

There is no longer room in America for this type of tolerance of this basis of freedom of speech or protest.

I urge the millions of patriotic Americans who are the great majority in this country to join with our President and other leaders in honor of our Armed Forces which is composed of those who are and have contributed to our national security and defense and upon whose loyalty all of us depend.

CAN AN "IRREVERSIBLE" TREND BE REVERSED?

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, one of the few bright aspects of countryside America is the work being done in our resource conservation and development projects.

One of the first such projects in the entire United States was the west-central Minnesota resource conservation and development group in our Minnesota Sixth Congressional District.

I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an article about the west-central Minnesota resource conservation and development which appeared in the St. Cloud Visitor of April 13, 1970:

CAN AN "IRREVERSIBLE" TREND BE REVERSED?
(By John Warren)

Deserted small towns. Ghost towns. And more and more family farms going out of business. More and more people leaving farms and small towns for the cities. Will this be the way things will go locally in the years ahead?

Not if the active members of the West Central Minnesota Resource Conservation and Development Project have their way. In five years the group has helped develop 158 project measures which will provide 1557 man years of employment, increase the annual gross income of the area by \$35,310,700 and materially increase the quality of local life.

The West Central Minnesota RC&D was one of the first ten pilot projects awarded in the United States. The project ties in with the interest of area citizens in counteracting "diminishing population and a critical loss of young people due to the lack of good job opportunities and modern civic facilities."

IT BEGAN BY "ACCIDENT"

Just how did the West Central Minnesota RC&D get started? It all began by accident. Howard K. Peterson of Benson heard about legislation which approved the formation of groups to revitalize farms, small towns and even cities. Peterson realized that his area was a depressed area and had some real poverty problems. He also felt that the establishment of a local RC&D group would help solve the problems.

To get the whole thing moving Peterson, with the help of others, began by seeking the assistance of the county board and the soil conservation board. Since the original plan was to include five counties, this meant the meeting of ten different boards. (In some cases it was necessary to form non-existing boards so that the legal requirements could be met.)

The five original counties involved were Ottertail, Wadena, Pope, Swift and Kandiyohi. The newly joined group then applied to the governor for his endorsement. He approved, and later the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture also approved, the application. So the West Central Minnesota RC&D was formed. (Since then Grant County, Douglas County, Todd County and Stevens County have been added, to include more than 5 million acres of land.)

To serve as key employee of the group, Bill Oemichen was named project coordinator. "There were no guidelines. It was wide open. The possibilities for action were limitless. Yet the very breadth of opportunity made it difficult for Oemichen to know where to start," said Jerry Bechtold, project board member.

With the encouragement of the RC&D board, Oemichen resurrected some ignored resource studies and with other staff help updated and added to them. Then when the area situation was properly studied, the time came for improvement. Citizens were encouraged to come up with ideas. The challenge caused local people to suggest 400 possible projects. Already about half of these have been completed. Projects varied in nature: a dam for the improvement of a village park; a building complex for the low income groups; an extensive irrigation survey.

Once a suggestion for a project came from the citizens, the West Central Minnesota RC&D started the wheels turning. Research was initiated. Experts contacted. Studies of the prospects of proposed plans made. Bill Oemichen, the project coordinator, had to be a "living encyclopedia," knowing where to get facts and figures for the interested citizens.

THEN RC&D DROPS OUT

But once a project was started, the local people concerned took over from the RC&D. The people set up their own board and operated independently. "I can't overemphasize the uniqueness of this kind of grass roots development," said board member Bechtold. "The people find out that they work at all kinds of things that they alone are responsible for, and which they can do essentially by themselves, with whatever technical help they decide to ask for." Bechtold calls RC&D projects "flexible," saying they can take off in almost any direction "with a project constantly feeding itself as new elements are added."

AN EXAMPLE

One tremendously promising project of RC&D originated from the people of the Sebeke area. Those interested citizens wondered if the aspen forests of the area could be used to supply paper. They thought of the possibility of establishing a paper mill there. But there were problems. Aspen did not make a good quality paper. Still RC&D project coordinator Bill Oemichen told the citizens about a lab process which was being tested by government scientists. The process promised to convert aspen into an acceptable quality paper. The citizens had their aspen tested by the scientists. The result: good quality paper.

The citizens, encouraged, dug in with more planning, aided by the RC&D staff. Experts were called in to make studies. It was found a paper plant could be built in Sebeke. And the factory could operate independently of a water supply. Also, the supply of aspen was plentiful enough to justify a factory. The trees would require no seed beds or special labor to be replaced. And it would take only 40 years to grow replacements (as opposed to 70 years needed to regrow Northern pine).

So the Sebeke area citizens, after much work, along with RC&D assistance, are planning a \$35,000,000 pulp mill there. The increased annual gross income from this mill is expected to be \$18,000,000.

Twenty-four million dollars needed for the construction of the plant will be made available, provided that an applied-for loan of \$15 million is granted by the federal government.

Local RC&D board member Jerry Bechtold said, "I find it hard to get words to describe it. It's like a wild dream. The scope and magnitude of the projects so far has been fabulous. I just didn't think some of these projects were possible. The potential is absolutely fantastic. And it involved local people. People who didn't care before are going great guns on the projects."

OTHER EXAMPLES

And how much is "great guns?" At a meeting of the West Central Minnesota RC&D various projects came to light.

John Bohmer, a Brooten banker, said the soil of his area was formerly called a "scourge". Now irrigation has helped. One farmer reaped 90 bushels of corn last year while a nearby neighbor—without irrigation—obtained 10 bushels per acre.

Why? Studies began by the RC&D revealed a source of water underground which looked like a huge lake. The water supply would be enough for a dry year. Today more than 10,000 acres are under irrigation in the Bonanza Valley with more than 50,000 expected in the next ten years.

With the help of this project Bohmer said a great potential for other crops such as cucumbers, strawberries, potatoes and other vegetables could be developed. Then in turn the farmers could again turn to the RC&D for the prospects of local marketing. New plants and businesses could be built. And schools can teach agri-irrigation. There seems to be no end to the possibilities.

"The Brooten area may be a low income area now, but it will soon prosper," Bohmer said. "We see a potential increase of \$5,000,000 in the Bonanza Valley."

Staples is trying the irrigation project also according to Dr. Duane Lund, superintendent of schools in the community. Dr. Lund expressed his interest in "developing new crops that adapt to irrigation." He added that he will experiment with raising wild rice and cranberries.

The Staples educator talked about "the great untapped potential of teachers. They are no longer temporary citizens, but they settle down in the community. Use them, not only for Sunday School or CCD, but also in the Chambers of Commerce and industrial development projects. Make teachers feel a part of the community and its development," the educator said.

Staples teachers made the new paved lighted airport there. They helped develop the snowsled race track, ("The best in the USA"), the ski slip and ski jump; Dr. Lund said.

Other aspects of Staples are being developed, he added. The seventy-year old opera house will be restored, with opera returning to the town. Staples will also host the Minnesota Symphony.

The state's great potential for tourists was not being developed enough, claimed William Peters, Glenwood resort owner. "We must sell Minnesota recreation better," he said.

Peters reported how the West Central Minnesota RC&D helped him plan the renovating of his resort. A golf course was suggested as an added tourist tempter. The land for the golf course site was originally heavily wooded, swampy, with creeks and springs. With Conservation Department help (contour mapping) an artificial lake was created, offsetting the former water problem.

The golf course helped. "On July 4, 1966, room occupancy at our resort was 30%. On July 4, 1968, room occupancy was 100%, and people had to be turned away," Peters said.

Bruce Hommerickhaus of the forestry department gave further details of the proposed Sebeke paper plant. He said that the plant might well produce an estimated 720 tons per day. He added 1,100 to 1,200 people will have a direct economic return from this mill. Speaker Rife said the paper mill would stimulate "other collateral business interests, including a satellite converting plant, a ready mix cement plant, a new blacksmith machine shop, a trucking firm to operate 24 hours a day—decreasing the state's welfare role and increasing income taxes both state and federal in these counties."

FUTURE PROSPECTS

Such fabulous projects as the Sebeke paper mill highlight the vast possibilities for local development, aided by the RC&D task forces. So the immensely promising RC&D unit seems headed for even more powerful impacts on the development of our local resources.

And people are hopeful about RC&D. Said Orville Berry, area conservationist, St. Cloud, "I think this is the way we have to approach our rural and urban problems. We've got to get the local people to analyze the resources and to develop them. I think it's the greatest thing to ever hit the rural communities."

Father Elmer Torborg, diocesan director of rural life, is enthusiastic about the local RC&D. "It has made tremendous progress in just five years. The future is very bright, and the projects promise unlimited possibilities," said the priest. He could foresee the possibility that small family-type farmers of the area could make a livelihood from trees, and feels RC&D not only helped to develop the area economically but in all aspects.

Farmers, small town businessmen, small town concerns—all working together to build up and revitalize the rural economy. Can some of the unhealthy rural economic signs be reversed.

Local RC&D supporters think so. "This is it," said one fervent farmer. "This lets us do it, and gives us a chance to roll up our sleeves and go to work. At last, we have a say. And I'm gonna have plenty to say. I tell you it'll save us all."

Today West Central Minnesota RC&D projects is one of 54 operational projects in the nation. They are all designed to improve predominantly rural areas through a combination of local initiative and leadership with technical and financial assistance from local, state and federal sources.

A PRESIDENT'S RESPONSE TO STUDENTS' DEMANDS

HON. LOWELL P. WEICKER, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. Speaker, I would hope that as many as take the time to read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would spend a few minutes in evaluating the recent remarks of President Homer Babbidge of the University of Connecticut. At a time when so many of our leaders in education, Government, business, and labor seem to construct their utterances on foundations of the angers around us, it is to the credit of this sensitive educator that he continues to work for solutions within the boundaries of compassion, commonsense, and the democratic process.

The remarks follow:

STATEMENT OF PRESIDENT HOMER D. BABBIDGE, JR.

Last Thursday I told the people of Connecticut that in my judgment "the quality, scope and motivation of the present student strike movement are dramatically different . . . from previous demonstrations of student protest." I acknowledged then that it was "evident to me that recent national and international developments (had) caused intense concern among a very substantial number of university students," and I made a point of reassuring the public that the student efforts were "being responsibly led."

I have already responded, in a telegram to the President of the United States, to the central national issues which I believe prompted the strike on this campus. I am on record with my conviction that "the ability of our universities to continue to function

responsibly and peacefully will . . . depend largely upon speedy disengagement" in Cambodia and Vietnam.

Since that time, however, I have received from the University of Connecticut Strike Coalition Committee a list of additional demands, and, despite the tenuous connection of some of these demands to the original strike motivation, I have promised to respond.

Several items in the Committee's document call attention to an area of concern which, though scarcely mentioned by the leaders of the strike at its inception, I am pleased to respond to. I am referring to those additional passages which note the educational, economic, and employment disadvantages suffered by many of our citizens.

I should like to remind the community that the educational and economic inequities that interfere with decent human opportunity and racial respect are at the top of my personal list of concerns.

I would also remind the community that for some months now, the highest official priority of our Board of Trustees has been to work for better educational opportunities for minority group students, to increase financial aid capabilities for the economically disadvantaged, and to improve employment opportunities for members of minority groups at all levels of the University. In our efforts to work out these policies and put them into effect, we have been guided by responsible leadership from the black community here—students, faculty and staff.

Three of the latest demands on this general subject refer to matters on which we can already report real progress. As an institution we have increased minority group enrollments dramatically for the past several years; we are providing supportive programs now, and we are developing still others; we are now seeking additional funding for economically and physically handicapped students. We have doubled our commitment of financial assistance for disadvantaged students for next year.

Vigorous efforts to recruit minority group professional staff are yielding results; we are now one of the largest employers of minority group professional people in the state. Our efforts to recruit non-professional minority group people have been less successful, and I am quite prepared to commit the University to a yet more vigorous effort. We have for some time been working with leaders in the black community to devise a construction contract policy to ensure the employment of minority group workers on state projects. All these efforts continue, and will, with community support, be accelerated. Our black community has systematically been kept informed of our progress.

But in all of these minority-group-related demands, and especially in the first, I see not a local but a state-wide problem. The need for special institutions of higher education for minority group people in urban locations is properly a concern not just of the University, but of the entire state and its full system of higher education. Because I have been impressed by their ability, I am convinced that the whole state could benefit from the help of our black leadership. I have therefore conferred with the Chancellor of the Commission for Higher Education, and he has assured me he will provide for our black leadership a statewide forum in which to present its views, a forum to include the Commission for Higher Education itself, the state college system, the state community college system, the State Scholarship Commission, and all the other agencies which must share in the solution of these massive problems. We cannot solve all of these problems alone, but we can now and we will contribute importantly to their solution.

For my part, I wholeheartedly endorse these minority-group-related demands.

Of the war-related group of demands, two items are of especially intense concern to the

University Community: defense research and ROTC.

I have directed the University's Officer of Research Development to stop immediately the submission of any new applications for research support from agencies of the Department of Defense. Such new submissions will be renewed only if a policy governing them which is generally acceptable to the University community at large is formulated.

The discontinuation of ROTC is not so simple a matter. Quite apart from my personal view that ROTC is appropriate on this campus, the University Senate has rejected a motion "to abolish ROTC" by a vote of 41-14, with 4 abstentions.

In accordance with another action of the University Senate, efforts are under way to bring credit instruction in ROTC-related courses wholly under the academic control of civilian faculty. Chairman John Brand of the Senate Committee on Curricula and Courses and Dean Kenneth Wilson have conferred with the Department of Defense officials in Washington, and they assure me they are confident that we can accomplish this shift from military to academic control of all credit work related to achieving military commissions, as stipulated by the Senate.

I think I can predict with confidence that any ROTC program in which such control is not established will be discontinued.

In the face of these considerations, it would clearly be improper for me to take any unilateral action at this time to change our relationships with the two ROTC programs.

The proposal for a day care center is one to which I am quite prepared to commit myself. Although the University is not a foundation and cannot divert public funds to an independent agency, it should be in a position to offer necessary services to its employees. I will do all I can to see that the need for a day care facility is met.

The strike committee has also expressed fear of academic losses for students facing final examinations, now only a week away. The University Senate at its meeting on Friday allayed the fears of most students and adapted its academic procedures so that the involved, the confused, and the uninvolved alike will be protected. These regulations are being distributed separately, and every student should familiarize himself with them on Monday. The Senate has responded more than fairly.

The students have also entered in their document a plea that legal responses be withheld in cases of unlawful behavior. They attach this plea to their demand that persons already arrested be similarly exempted from customary processes in the courts.

It is strange to me that persons whose sense of outrage or anger is such that they are moved, in the face of clear policy and warning, to break the law or to violate university policies, are then reluctant to accept the consequences. Whether this demand is born of regret or an effort to have it both ways, I cannot tell. Those who do mean to bargain for immunity are perhaps at best second-guessing their resolve. I could recall from Mahatma Gandhi or Martin Luther King, Jr. no such nervous appeals for exemption from the hardships which befell their efforts to correct more oppressive and severe human injustices. But I do recall that Dr. King observed:

"In no sense do I advocate evading or defying the law. . . . That would lead to anarchy. One who breaks an unjust law must do so openly, lovingly, and with a willingness to accept the penalty."

The strike leadership has also raised questions about the possible effects on University employees, if they were on their own initiative to suspend performance of their ordinary duties. I should point out that this

matter has been raised only by students. To the best of my knowledge thus far, our staff have themselves in no way suggested any such dereliction. Any employee of the state who purposely fails to meet his obligations to the state will, of course, be held accountable by the state.

Having responded to the demands of the Strike Coalition, let me offer a word of warning. When people say they seek to make this an institution for all the people, or one that will serve the interests of all the people, I hope they mean it. Any unilateral presumption on the part of students to speak for all the people of Connecticut will predictably earn the resentment of the people of this state. I trust that members of our community will not make the supreme error of trying to force upon others—within or without the University—their notions of what all must believe in or support. That kind of arrogance can first close minds and then institutions.

Many earnest students have asked that I reveal to the community more than I have of my personal views on the issues that most concern our striking students. There are many reasons, ranging from what is called personal style to a perhaps old-fashioned sense of official responsibility, that discourage me from trying to influence the views of those who are here to learn and discover for themselves.

But lest they think me unfeeling or uninterested, let me say this much:

I am painfully conscious of the social, racial, economic and other inequities that characterize the world of human affairs. I seek peace. I know that our legal system is an imperfect bridge to justice. I know that many institutions—including our own—are unresponsive. I consider that in choosing the life's work I did, I was contributing to the remedy of these deficiencies. I consider that in trying to preserve the sanity of this community, and to keep this University functioning, I am in fact, working toward those ends.

I can honestly say that I believe I understand the foundation causes of the student strike, I support many of them, and in either public or private capacities will continue to support them.

But I cannot support the strike.

In October of 1968 I spoke the following words: I repeat them tonight because I still believe them:

"As President of the University of Connecticut, I must believe that this institution deserves to be preserved; that it embodies essential values that must endure. I regret of course, that I cannot, in the pursuit of my duty to preserve and strengthen the University, be anybody's hero. I regret that I cannot give emotional satisfaction to those of you who want me to lead the protest or to those of you who want me to squelch it. My job is to keep the doors open—to treat with decent respect the views of protestors and squelchers alike—and to try and keep either one or both from destroying the institution and the institutional values I am pledged to serve."

A CHRISTIAN'S DUTY TO GOVERNMENT IN TURMOIL

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share a very thoughtful and timely message delivered recently by the Reverend Ben Haden at the First Pres-

byterian Church in my hometown, Chattanooga, Tenn. I insert the following in the RECORD:

[From the Chattanooga News-Free Press, May 12, 1970]

A CHRISTIAN'S DUTY TO GOVERNMENT IN TURMOIL

(By Ben Haden)

There's a great deal of confusion today about all the translations of the Scriptures. But perhaps no translation has brought the Scriptures more alive than the Living New Testament. It is to that translation that I turn so that no word because of Old English will be misunderstood:

"Be careful how you behave among your unsaved neighbors; for then, even if they are suspicious of you and talk against you, they will end up praising God for your good works when Christ returns.

"For the Lord's sake, obey every law of your government: those of the king as head of the state.

"And those of the king's officers for he has sent them to punish all who do wrong, and to honor those who do right.

"It is God's will that your good lives should silence those who foolishly condemn the Gospel without knowing what it can do for them, having never experienced its power.

"You are free from the law, but that doesn't mean you are free to do wrong. Live as those who are free to do only God's will at all times.

"Show respect for everyone. Love Christians everywhere Fear God and honor the government." First letter of the Apostle Peter, Chapter 2, Verses 12-17.

BIOPSY OR AUTOPSY?

It's a good time to take a biopsy from a living organism—before we do an autopsy on a dead organism.

Most people who do a biopsy on this nation come to the conclusion of the doctor who says, "It's idiopathic." And "idiopathic" means he doesn't know. Nothing like it before—not a semblance of anything similar to it—it's unnamed; it's not denied; it just can't be specified what it is.

Let's do the biopsy. Kevin Moran—you must have heard of Kevin—senior—University of California. Involved in the riots just last month.—April, 1970. Shot—at first report, by a sniper; but then it developed it was by a policeman. Shot while he was trying to prevent the burning of the Bank of America in the little town of Isla Vista adjacent to the University of California at Santa Barbara. Trying to prevent the burning of the same Bank of America that had been completely burned 60 days earlier by the same students.

INNOCENT

Kevin Moran—you must have heard about him. He has a mother who loved him—a father who had centered hopes in his life—only 60 days from graduation—an innocent. But strangely enough, no flag was lowered on any campus. No high official interrupted the duties of his office to attend the memorial service. The name passed us by and isn't even included in the biopsy that most of us will do on this nation.

Police brutality? No, as a matter of fact, quite by accident. Did they honestly think at first it was a sniper? Yes, they did; but it turned out not to be. Strangely enough, doing what was right, trying to prevent arson.

Kevin Moran—you must have heard about him. But you didn't.

KENT STATE

Now then, there's been further tragedy. Two girls and two boys—the same age as Kevin—attending Kent State have died. Television and newspapers have joined in saying,

"They were slain for the right of dissent." But from that biopsy I totally dissent.

And that biopsy is what worries me about our nation. On Sunday, May 3, 1970, the highest official in the state of Ohio—James Rhodes, governor—issued an emergency decree applying to the town of Kent. "No outdoor meeting of any description in the city or on the campus will be allowed." At the request of local officials, National Guardsmen were sent in.

Early Sunday evening, 1,500 students attempted a march on the campus. They were dispersed with tear gas. Later the same evening at an intersection, 1,200 of them had a sit-in. They were finally dispersed by the same National Guardsmen.

Monday breaks. A good clear day—and the weather has a lot to do with it. May 4, 1970. Again in apparent violation of the same emergency order by the highest official of the state, an estimated 2,000 students have a meeting—congregate—on the campus of Kent State.

For 45 minutes by bullhorn—that electronic medium that you can't ignore—they are told, "You have no right to be here. You are in violation of the decree of the governor of this state. You are ordered to disperse. You are not to remain."

They do not disperse. Then for five minutes they are told, "If you do not disperse, tear gas will be used." They do not disperse.

GUARDSMEN

Then the guardsmen advanced on the campus. I don't know why, but all guardsmen apparently are assumed to be my age. I've never figured that out, but I realized how "over the hill" I was at that point. These guardsmen, as I understand it—19, 20, 21, 22, 23—were exactly the same age as the students they were confronting.

Now then, we turn to testimony. I don't know the reliability of the testimony, but he is a student. From 150 yards away with a kaleidoscopic view from the window of a dormitory, this is what he says he saw—dateline: White River Junction, Vermont (Associated Press), James Young—20.

"Thirty of the guardsmen separated from the others, marched up the green and down the hill and were confronted by 2,000 students. The guardsmen surrounded those actually discharging the tear gas. They discharged it toward the students. The students pitched the tear gas grenades back and forth on several occasions. The guardsmen ran out of tear gas. The students had not dispersed.

Now then, the guardsmen turned in apparent terror and started back up the hill from whence they'd come. Thirty guardsmen. And before they got to the top of that hill—according to James Young, 20, Kent State student—they were met by students at the top of the hill and suddenly surrounded. And from a distance of 20 feet students then lobbed at them pieces of concrete, lengths of pipe, and rocks.

They were out of tear gas. In the opinion freely expressed by this student, "If it came to hand to hand combat, I feel they would have been torn limb from limb."

"I SAW THEM FIRE"

"At that point," he said, "I saw them fire in the air. I was unaware that some had fired straight ahead."

Are these innocents?—and I am not talking about the tragedy—please remember that! My heart would be just as broken as the heart of any parent. After all, he's not my child because he's where he's supposed to be. He's simply my child.

But were they where they were, supposed to be? Were they "slain for the right of dissent"? Were they where they were in violation of law?

Why is it necessary that a governor issue an emergency decree unless it is foreseeable that masses of people charged up on any

subject are likely to act in an irrational and dangerous manner? For what protection was the decree issued? Property? or people? or both? That's a good question.

Kevin Moran—never heard of him! But you've heard of Kent State. The news media can't seem to determine the size of their student body. The lowest estimate is 19,000; the highest, is 22,000 students. Whatever the accurate figure is and I've seen four estimates—never more than one-sixth of the student body was involved in any of it.

ANOTHER STRIKE

You say, "Have you ever seen anything like this?" Yes, I was on a campus where all the students shut down the university and where hatred flared as I have never seen it. There were only two students on that campus who did not participate in that strike or endorse it. They knew the venom of the tongue, pressure; and it wasn't easy. I can testify to it because I was one of the two.

In October in Chicago two blocks from where I was staying—one man made a tragic mistake. The mistake was to step out of his building. Thirty-five, two children, attorney by profession. He was hit by a pipe in the back of the neck. Then by a college student from an Ivy League college—he was kicked in his back and the front of his body so that he will be paralyzed for the rest of his life from the neck down. No one lowered the flag to half mast; and he was where he was supposed to be—on the streets of a protected city in the United States.

And the Illinois commission that has investigated the 74 injuries and the 284 arrests during those two days have concluded this was insurrection—and that's their terminology.

THE LEADER

I can remember a fraternity brother—smartest man I ever knew. He publicly told off his high school principal when he was 14. He drank rum when he was 14. He was an alcoholic when he was 14.

Now later at the University of Texas it was announced that most of the men were being called into military service. So they had a beer party. These men toasted every city they could think of—particularly Berlin and Tokyo, where they all swore they'd meet. Just an innocent beer party in the basement of a fraternity house.

But would you believe that this same fraternity brother—for all his brilliance—was the one who suggested, "Let's go to the Kappa sorority house." Everyone responded to his leadership.

Well, now, it so happened, it was past midnight. When the men got to the sorority house, the leader had no idea what he wanted to do. He looked around and suggested, "Let's get a stepladder." He got a stepladder. He determined he was going to enter forcibly, if need be, the sorority house on the second floor and get himself a girl. Just drunk talk—but he was ready to do it.

And the girls frantically yelled, "Get away, get away!" Somebody pushed the ladder; he fell and broke his arm. Twenty-five young men were there—most of them seniors, and most of them seeking a commission and eligible to receive a commission. All but this man suffered expulsion or suspension; but he had "pull." He was graduated and commissioned.

RESULT

To this day I will periodically run into someone from that party—who followed the lead of one drunken man—but whose life is not the life he was cut out to lead—or earning what he was cut out to earn—and who lost the commission for which he had worked for four years. All because of the suggestion of one man.

I know the tragedy of mob rule and the end of such men. At 42 this dear, dear friend of mine—the drunk—was finally eaten up from the inside by the rum.

What is the Apostle Peter talking about? He says, "Listen—you're Christians"—Christians today are faced with exactly the same problem. "You're Christians—if you don't watch how you act—you'll discredit Christ. You claim you're free and not under the law. That's right—you're free and not under the law. Your freedom is the freedom to obey the law, not to violate it. And you are to fear God and you are to honor the government, and you are to obey the king and you are to obey his underlings."

WHAT KIND?

"Well," you ask, "was it a good government?" No, it stank. It was decayed. "Was it a Christian government?" No, it was pagan. "Were the laws always just laws?" No, many of them were unjust laws.

For instance, with impunity a father could look at a newborn child as though it were a cat. He could decide he didn't want a girl and turn his thumb down, and they would drown her just like a cat. That's what you could do under the government.

Yet the Apostle Peter says "Obey every ordinance of this government—under which you live—this Roman, pagan government." Why? "Because you have the freedom to obey under Christ and this is the order of the Lord." Does that make sense.

Are businessmen the only men threatened today by disorder? I think you would be interested in knowing the results of a University of California poll. A research team polled 60,447 faculty members across the United States. You know what the faculty members across the United States said? 80 per cent of them said, "We consider violence on the campus a threat to academic freedom." Get that. Then, I feel like saying, "Just a little honesty please!"

THREAT

Let me say they are completely right; it is a threat. In Japan they have gone to the ultimate. There a Ph. D. has to sneak into his room. It's not a union card—it's a sneak card! And when he gets to his room, he has to defend the chair in which he sits—he has to defend his right to teach the class. The Ph. D. has to defend against the accusations: "You're stupid! Why do you teach us? Why shouldn't we be teaching you? Why do you run this class? Why do we pay tuition to come to this university?" Absolute violence in the classroom in Japan today—among these people most noted for discipline and progress in business.

Yet the faculty members in the U.S. say something quite different in public, don't they? And I somewhat feel like the Bostonian who observed, "Frankly, if it comes right down to the guts of it—I would rather be ruled by the first 1,000 names in the Boston telephone directory than by the Harvard faculty." And I'm not sure he doesn't have something.

DISHONESTY

You see, it's a threat to everyone. And this dishonesty has permeated all of us—not just the campus. The biggest businesses in this nation have spent millions of dollars on television trying to communicate one basic idea—"You can trust us because we have integrity in our business." In the past few years many have signed consent decrees to the effect we have fixed prices against the public and the government. And that's dishonest; and it's time we called it what it is—crooked!

And union hands are not clean. Every man who called in recently in the "sick out" of the air controllers was committed as an employee of the federal government not to strike. And that was dishonest.

Now in the New York Times in the composing room during this negotiating period, they are getting production for seven out of 24 hours. The rest of the time on the job is spent in "extended chapel meetings." The

New York Times estimated this past week that it has lost in advertising revenue—from ads that could not be set with that limited available production—\$2.5 million. That's not honest.

And the logical extension of it you can see in the Paris riots of two years ago. There the men in certain Parisian composing rooms took this position: "You will not set into type any stories except those stories that we approve to be set in type. We'll be the editor—we'll be the publisher—we'll be the newspaper." That's the logical extension. And that's not honest.

And it didn't begin in the streets. It began in the Christian Church. That's the tragedy of it all. You're doing a biopsy?—begin here. Because we preach the grace of God—you can violate the law because you're not under it?

Any man looking to the keeping of the law for his salvation is up the creek. He should be grateful he is not under the law, because he can never meet the standard. The standard under the Biblical law is perfection. But any man who is out from under the Biblical law is under the command of Christ. But this does not mean he can violate the law—as the Christian Church has so often taught. It obligates him to obey the law.

HONOR IT

This is why the Apostle Peter says, "Listen, you fear God and you obey the government. It is not the government you elected. It is a tyrannical government. It's a dictatorship. You don't have any say—any feedback. But it is the government. And you honor it."

Does that sound strange? My stomach has been turned in the past few years when I have heard people say, "Johnson's not my president"—he was mine. "Kennedy was never my president"—he was mine. "Eisenhower was never my president"—well, he was mine. "Nixon is not my President"—well, he's mine. And his successor will be mine—independent, Republican or Democrat—and he will be the commander in chief of the nation of which I am a part.

Honor thy father, honor thy mother. Honor thy mother? Because she's always rational? Because she never gives you an order that is not proper? Because she never makes an illegitimate demand upon you? Because she never overreacts? Or simply because she's your mother? Because you see, it's of her bone that you have bones! It's of her flesh that you have flesh!

Any man who does a biopsy on this nation and comes up with "idiopathic"—doesn't know his history. Any man who claims he doesn't know what's wrong doesn't know the Christian Church. The Christian Church is teaching today that a Christian should not obey an unjust law. That's not what the Christian's Bible says. That makes every man his own president—his own commander in chief—his own Congress—his own Supreme Court.

FALLACY

I know the fallacy of man. I know the fallacy of law. I know the fallacy of politics. And so do you. But you know something? As long as we choose to be ruled by men, we live under fallacious men subject to all the weaknesses we have in our own lives.

Fear God and honor the government or you will soon do an autopsy on the whole nation. We have a God who has promised: a nation that dishonors him, he can wipe as clean as a dish so that when it is remembered—even the United States of America—people's ears will tingle just at the remembrance.

When we speak of the innocents—let's be sure they're innocent. When we speak of law—let's obey it. And when we speak of Christ, remember, he's the one that taught it. Let's be honest with ourselves. If we don't obey, we will perish.

THE WHY BEHIND CAMPUS
DISORDERS

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, in recent days our interest and concern has been dramatically drawn to the Nation's campuses. Through the impressive influx of students to Capitol Hill, we have learned much about the feelings of college students. But we also struggle to understand why the very institutions to which we entrust the rational search for truth have erupted with violence, dangerous emotionalism, and organizational breakdown. Before we can be sure how best to remedy these unfortunate events, we must gain better insights into the reasons behind them. Adequate prognosis must precede therapy.

One of the very best analyses of the why behind the unprecedented activities we see on many campuses was prepared by Dr. Alex C. Sherriffs, professor of psychology at the University of California, Berkeley. Dr. Sherriffs presented the paper which follows at a recent Rational Debate Seminar sponsored by the American Enterprise Institute on May 6, 1970. He is qualified not only as a psychologist, but as a former vice chancellor of student affairs at Berkeley.

Mr. Speaker, for all those who seek to understand the traumas of adolescence in a society of adults preoccupied with "youth adulation," who wonder how we have come to confuse the three look-alikes of the American right to dissent, adolescent rebellion, and revolution; and who are puzzled about the vacuum left by the well-meaning but silent majority, I heartily recommend that they give serious thought to this brilliant and timely paper.

The paper follows:

IS THE PRESENT ANXIETY ABOUT PUBLIC EDUCATION JUSTIFIED? (EMPHASIS: HIGHER EDUCATION)

(By Dr. Alex C. Sherriffs)

The American citizen has learned to expect much from his educational institutions. This is a high compliment to the performance of these institutions in the past.

Our institutions are expected to carry out high societal purposes:

(1) to transmit man's knowledge of man, his make-up, his environment, his culture, his history, his ideas, his dreams, and his failures. Human beings, unlike the monkey, do not need to start from scratch with each successive generation. Man can ensure a continuity of civilization, and his educational institutions are among the most important vehicles for doing so.

(2) to stimulate curiosity so as to open doors to learning, to teach students how to ask useful questions, to explore with them ways to seek and to evaluate evidence, and to communicate the significance of bias in the process of reaching conclusions.

(3) to develop in the young the basic tools necessary for learning, for communicating, and for effective living.

(4) to function within a framework which accepts and values individual and group differences, which shuns as goals indoctrination and homogenization, and which works to provide for each individual the opportunity to develop to his capacity.

(5) to account for the fact that man has always needed to believe in, belong to, or work for something bigger than himself.

(6) to provide rich experience with mature teachers and scholars who serve youth as models for adulthood.

The American citizen learned to value highly his educational institutions. They functioned importantly for the society, the culture, and the individual growing student. As a reward to educators and to ensure that their job could be well done, three significant privileges were given: tenure, academic freedom, and unusual independence in hiring and promoting individual faculty members. We entered the 1960s with the academic profession in highest esteem. Its requests were seldom denied; its budget needs grew—and were met substantially, and in good spirit.

Thus it was. But it isn't now. Why?

The answer is, in part, because of the words and behaviors of a highly visible few in the education establishment. The public has no way of knowing how many these few represent, but the public does know that it doesn't hear from those who feel as it does. It is as though the intellectuals have turned against the very functions of education which they had helped educate the public to value and expect. The public reads in the newspaper, hears on the radio, and sees on television professors who only deride and mock the very culture which they were expected to transmit. And the public hears too often from those who are receiving or have just received the best education our society can provide, that this same society must be destroyed.

The public becomes aware, as it reads the college newspapers brought home by its student young, that there are many who are not working to open doors to learning but who, rather, are demanding conformity to their own personal positions and who will shout down, harass, and in some cases even refuse to teach those who express independent thought.

Instead of hearing of the needs for developing the fundamental tools necessary for learning, the public now hears from the campus an emotional call to action by youth—even before they are prepared through rational means to know why or how. Emotions are touted by too many as a legitimate substitute for reason.

Appreciation of individual and group differences—with all the richness that they provide a society—rather than a demand for a homogenizing conformity is characteristic only of a mature democratic society composed of mature citizens. At least, this is what most of us were taught in the past. It is not surprising, then, that the public is now confused, and often shocked, by the demand from intellectuals (of all people) for a one-think foreign policy, one-think sexual codes, simplistic explanations of racial tensions—and the demands of so many of these intellectuals that we be just like them.

The public sees its children being overwhelmed by totally negative attacks on U.S. institutions and officials, on democratic principles, and on campuses. In some quarters, even God is dead. What is left when the cynics, the critics, and the activists are done? Man needs something bigger than himself. The public does not know how few nor how many cynics there are, but there is only silence from other educators in rebuttal.

Those who have had delegated to them the important tasks of representing a society and of providing models of adulthood for youth have been most prone to imitating the young, emulating them, and seeking popularity rather than respect.

One cannot say often enough that those who engage in behavior patterns which disillusion the citizens of a democratic society are probably a "small percentage." "Probably", for the voices who speak for democracy are an even smaller percentage. The names

of Riesman, Hook, Bettelheim, and Hayakawa are now well known, but mostly because they sing solo parts.

The changes in education have gone along with changes in society as a whole, to be sure. But, education's changes have preceded, rather than followed, society's. The changes have been dramatic, they have been massive, they are for our society quite unprecedented, and they have occurred in a very short period of time. Within an autobiographical frame of reference, I find it sobering. . . .

It is sobering to feel a need to remind audiences of certain fundamentals of human nature, and of the alternate ways that man can live together—in some form of democracy, totalitarianism, or anarchy.

It is equally sobering to need to point out—and not only to youth—that without shared values, attitudes, codes, and some restraints, man is no more than an animal.

We are fortunate to have a society in which we determine our own restraints. In this democratic society, we make our own laws and can change them at will—majority will. We also choose our own leaders and can remove them by majority vote. In short, we determine our own goals within a remarkable system. Perhaps fewer than one percent of all human beings have experienced the degree of self-determination that we enjoy. How strange that today we are forced to argue for the survival of that dignity.

Perhaps the basic challenge to our society has always been to balance freedom for the individual with freedom for others, too. The danger is that we will not work together to maintain that delicate balance, but will, as we today become polarized, allow ourselves to be represented only by those who advocate license—or freedom without responsibility—and by those who say we must have no freedom at all.

Democracy is fragile. Even in the best of times, its health requires that the majority participate actively in its processes. When too many "drop out," then those extremists who never could have won in fair competition for the political and social stage may find themselves on that stage alone—and in charge. It is no accident that in his *Republic*, Plato's most pessimistic dialogue was on democracy, and that the one which followed immediately was on despotism.

Who does not feel concern who compares our situation six years ago with our situation today?

Six short years ago in California, for example, higher education had universal respect. But today, we find a public outraged by, and fearful of, those on the campus—for they have organized and launched political and social action from within the people's own educational institutions.

Six years ago, no one dreamed that buildings would be captured, property destroyed, and official files rified by some of the most educated of our youth.

Six years ago, neither students nor members of the faculty had kidnapped, captured, or held hostage representatives of a democratic society, whether Trustee, college president, or dean.

Six years ago, no one dreamed of a bombing on a campus. Recently, there was a fifteen-month period during which we had nearly ninety campus-related bombings in California alone. By 1969, members of the faculty of the University of Washington found themselves compelled to say in "the Seattle Statement":

"... To condone acts of physical violence on the ground that they are mere exercises in freedom of speech is therefore to strike at the very foundations of academic freedom. The use of force and violence for purposes of intimidation is not freedom of speech but its very antithesis. To blur the distinction is to call in question the whole theory of democratic discussion. . . . Arson, assault and battery, the deliberate destruction of

scientific and other equipment, the looting of files of research notes and personal papers, the forcible occupation of buildings to obstruct the performance of university functions, the invasion of classrooms and the intimidation of students—these are not forms of speech at all, they are overt acts, obviously punishable as such. In society at large these are felonies or misdemeanors. In a university community, they are something more—they amount to a betrayal of freedom itself."

Six years ago, leaders on our campuses were working to effect an "open forum policy" so that students could hear firsthand the widest variety of opinions and attitudes from visiting speakers, including Communists. Today, on those same campuses, it is extremely difficult for the moderate, the responsible liberal, or the conservative to be heard at all.

Six years ago, it would not have occurred to a speaker that in almost any adult audience there would be a sizable number whose children were on drugs. Today, a speaker is uninformed if he does not maintain that assumption.

In six short years, our campuses have moved a long way—a long way from their original definition and high purpose, a long way from their position of public respect and confidence. How did this happen?

There are, perhaps, as many explanations offered for our recent societal upheaval as there are observers to it. Each individual will weigh heavily those factors which he, because of bias, training, or life experience, sees of greatest import. But it has become clear to most of us that our anguish does not arise from a single cause. In my own analysis, I would stress at least five aspects which had to be present for our campus problems to have exploded with such apparent suddenness.

First, there had to be a majority of the public who were silent, confused, and even misinformed about matters as fundamental as the meaning of the behavior of their own children. But also, for the seeds of unrest to have found such fertile soil on the campuses, there had to be highly motivated, hostile, and articulate cliques of irresponsible faculty members on a number of them. These exercised unusual influence because of the immobilization of their general preoccupied and timid colleagues. It was necessary, in addition, that the campus administrators be generally incapable of coping with irresponsibility and militancy both because of personal factors and because of currently accepted "styles" of administration. It was necessary, too, that extremist groups and individuals, always present in our society, find themselves essentially without competition for the political stage, and thus achieve for themselves success upon success—often to their own great surprise. Finally, there were and are the actions, reactions, counter-actions, and counter-reactions that developed from this brew and which spiral the issues and the people into new and increasingly dangerous arenas.

What is the silent majority? Even a casual look reveals some things that are different these days about the citizens of our society—both young and old. There are too many examples of a lack of participation in normal affairs by great numbers of people, and of large numbers failing to support cultural values. Cultural values survive only when the people support them. One need not be a profound student of democracy to understand the implications of the following:

Two hundred classmates observed a bully taunt one of their number, then kneel him in the groin, and finally use his toe repeatedly to remove that boy's eyeball. Not one of the two hundred cried "Stop", not one tried to get others to help separate the participants, and not one went for help. Ten years ago, it could not have happened. Two

hundred classmates at a middle-class school would not have watched as though observing a television screen, and they would not later have explained their behavior as did these two hundred: "I am not my brother's keeper", or "It was not my fight", or "I didn't want to get involved."

Age is not the explanation, for equally clear were the implications when thirty-eight adults in New York simply watched from their apartment windows as a woman was stabbed to death. Three episodes of stabbing were involved, it all took thirty-five minutes, and the woman died horribly. Yet not one of the thirty-eight known observers so much as phoned for the police.

The fact that a very small percentage of students votes in student body elections should concern us deeply. So should the voting record of adults in school district elections.

The tiny attendance of students at campus meetings for outside speakers (except for extravagantly controversial ones) is paralleled by the usual nonattendance of most faculty at meetings of their colleagues, and by the nonparticipation of the public at most meetings of college boards of trustees or of local school boards.

Can we say anything about the "silent majority" other than the fact that it is silent?

There has been considerable research about youth. It tells us of current characteristics which partially explain how it is that so many have neither the strength nor the equipment to stand up individually for their convictions. Though better trained intellectually, they are found to be more isolated as individuals and more lonely. Their friendships are shorter in duration and more superficial in nature. David Riesman, author of *The Lonely Crowd*, reports that, during the past ten years, students average fewer friends each year. Thus, they lack the experiences to mature socially and emotionally as rapidly as generations did before.

Researchers also say that more youth show themselves less capable of postponing gratifications, less able to tolerate probabilities and shades of gray, and more demanding of absolutes.

Investigators generally agree that youth, as a group, is having problems with authority. And, as one of these investigators noted, how could it be otherwise when they have had so very little experience with it? Too many parents act with permissiveness not resulting from a particular theory of child rearing, but rather as a response to uncertainty and fearfulness about their own roles as adults.

And the communication between the young is poor indeed. An illustration in my own experience says a great deal:

One Saturday afternoon, a rooting section crowd became a mob and behaved in ways far beyond the acceptable. On the following Monday, I asked a class of four hundred—many of whom had participated—to indicate their attitudes about the debacle. I was a psychologist whose specialization was youth. I asked them to indicate by show of hands, "was the rooting section great", "could it stand a teeny bit of improvement", or "was it poor"? I took the vote on "great" first. A number of hands went up here and there; the other class members were anxiously looking around like the audience at a tennis match during a fast volley. "What was in?" was clearly the question on their minds. Soon, hands were going up around hands that were already up—the "ripple effect". In three minutes, eighty-three percent were voting "great".

Then I asked for an anonymous paper in which they were to tell me how it was great and how it might be greater. In the secrecy and privacy of those papers, eighty-six percent now stated that the rooting section was

so bad it should be abolished! And over fifty percent stated, "But what's the use of my feeling this way when I'm the only one?"

I could give all too many examples of this kind of behavior—"in" voting before the group, standing for positions absolutely contrary to personal and private belief.

Let me note here that youth is not without cultural values, but merely is too often unable to express them. A number of factors have worked together to cause our young to be so immobilized in standing for their own feelings, to cause them to be so oriented to what is "in" for the group, to cause them to be incapable of dealing with the minority who now dominate the stage—political and social; the stage that they, the majority, have deserted.

It is worthy of note that:

(1) These youngsters are the first children raised by parents who were unsure of their role as parents—even of their rights as parents; the first parents in history who, instead of depending on their feelings, had to "look it up" in a book!

I can give an illustration of the effect:

I gave an anonymous questionnaire to almost 1,000 sophomores. Two of the questions asked were: "Do you love your parents?" and "Do you respect your parents?" Ninety-three percent checked "yes" to the first question. Only fifty-one percent checked "yes" to the second question. I called in every eighth student to ask, "Can you help me to understand the differences between ninety-three percent and fifty-one percent?" One girl's response covers most of their answers:

"Sure, I love my parents. They mean well. But respect . . . ? When I was in a social club at Berkeley High, I came home one day and told my mother that our club was going to have its overnight party at our house. Mother turned pale. I told her that chaperones were no longer 'in', and she turned paler. I hoped she would say, 'No, you aren't,' and get me out of it, because I didn't have the courage to say no to the others of my own age. If she said 'no', I could have blamed her—I thought that's what mothers were for.

"Instead, Mother phoned the parents of the other girls and asked what she should do. I listened. She thought it was wrong, but . . . she was afraid I'd be unpopular. She thought it was wrong, but . . . she didn't want me to be 'different'. She thought it was wrong, but . . . she didn't want my fifteen-year-old girlfriends to think she was 'square'. In short, my mother had to discover what her values were—and what mine were to be—by a telephone poll."

Youngsters need adults to be models, to respect, to argue with, and to test. They need a point of view. They need adults who believe in themselves and in something. The young can decide what to become, and what not to become, only by observing real adults. They can learn little that is good from observing Jello—whether in the form of parents, deans of students, teachers, or even clergymen.

(2) Also very difficult for youth—and hard on adults, too—is a current cult: the adulation of youth in America. For a child to become an adult, he must, of course, go through what we call "adolescence". This is a period during which the youngster learns where his parents leave off and he begins. He must develop a separateness which enables him to know whether he believes something or is merely imitating his parents' belief, whether he desires something or has been told by his parents that it is desirable. All of us learn from parents much of what to be like and what not to be like. But, to the adolescent struggling with his dependency needs, it is a matter of "is it me speaking, or am I speaking for them?"

To go through an adolescent separateness—which is often more symbolic than real—the age group members tend to conform to one another, especially in matters which

are almost "tribal" in nature: for example, in costume, dance, folk heroes, music, and language. The particular expressions of each adolescent generation have caused parents and teachers alike to shake their heads in dismay. This is as it should be, for it gives the adolescent a kind of independence in action, but without total revolt.

My own parents were ideal during my adolescence. Mother thought my dirty cords meant that I was unclean; she fussed. Both parents believed my swing music to be loud and barbaric, and Mother would often play a little Brahms hopin' it would rub off on me. Both were embarrassed by the jitterbug, and they worried that I would never learn to use the King's English. It was ideal. We had our separateness. And it was not necessary for me to take drugs to get a reaction. Later, when I felt that I had discovered "me", I noticed that my parents had "matured" during my psychological absence.

But how is it today? Too often, adults imitate their adolescents. Daughter puts on a mini-skirt, Mother follows suit. Likewise, Father says "cool" to prove he is one of the boys. Both parents learn the Twist and progress to the Watusi.

Adolescence is a time when youngsters should be somewhat separate, but it is also a time when they need to know that there is strength and understanding in the adults. Now, instead—and for the first time in our history—the youngster looks over his shoulder and feels, "My God, here they come again."

By their imitative behavior, adults are saying to youth, "You've got it made", and this is unnerving to the young. To become adult is almost to lose position and status.

And, outside the family, other adult models—many teachers, clergymen, school and college administrators including deans of students—behave in the same imitative ways; and they are representatives of our society and its institutions. They claim expertness as well as adulthood. Yet too many of them prefer peace and popularity to respect. Too many think of the normal expression of authority as a burden, though delegated to them because of the position they hold by a democratic society. A number confuse authority and authoritarianism; they reject the former in a manner that smacks of the latter.

(3) Progress has brought great good for young and old alike. It also has had its costs. At the turn of the century, most youngsters in growing up had experience with real responsibility and real challenge in relation to the family's work. Over ninety percent of American families were engaged in agriculture. Their children had experience with a variety of adult models doing real work for real purposes and goals. Today, only seven percent of families produce all of our goods and fiber.

At the turn of the century, there was also ample opportunity for youth in commerce or industry, for work with purpose. It was even necessary to pass child labor laws to keep them in school or at home. Today, if all students wanted such experiences, we would fall them, for, thanks to automation and business know-how, we scarcely have jobs for all heads of household.

In 1900, only nine percent of seventeen-year-olds were in school; now there are well over ninety percent.

Today, for many, responsibility and challenge are found only in relation to grade point average. And for many, work is only for one's own pleasures—a transistor, a record player, a sports car.

The cost in judgement, in confidence born of experience, and in the concept of earning one's way or of work well done when this has not been a meaningful part of life, can be measured only indirectly. Observation tells us that the cost is high.

(4) Affluence has contributed to some of our problems. Particularly, affluence leads to a certain arrogance in some youth—an expectation to receive, even though giving little in return. And the comforts and certainties of affluence also result, sadly, in an unsureness that one could succeed if faced with a challenge.

Middle class youngsters generally are given what they want—sometimes even before they know they want it. Parents too often can't think of reasons to deny them. In giving, parents tend to forget it is more satisfying for youngsters to build, to grow, to contribute, and to participate than simply to be spectators, and recipients of the accomplishments of others.

Affluence, of course, has affected adults as well as children, and it should not be surprising that like spoiled children we also have spoiled adults who simply and irresponsibly take what they want without comprehending what they are doing. It should not be surprising, either, that some middle class youngsters on the campus take the law into their own hands and interpret our value for freedom as granting them personal license.

(5) Another of the forward moves in our society which has produced its own backlash is the explosion in man's knowledge about himself and the world around him. It has been estimated that man has learned more in the past decade than in his entire previous history and that he will learn more in the next decade than in all that went before.

It is not necessary to dwell on the many good things that have accrued to mankind because of informational advances. But, ironically, the silencing effect of this same knowledge explosion too often goes unmentioned. More and more, individuals are becoming dependent on the so-called "experts" for judgments rather than trusting their own information and wisdom.

(6) These days, Americans act as though change, even when it results in instability, is an end in itself. Paradoxically, human beings need a sense of permanence and stability in order to be strong enough to be adventurous, to stand apart from a group, and to take a chance—even though it might result in ridicule or error. Down through the ages, man has sought and profited from identification with a purpose bigger than himself. He has sought immortality, real or symbolic.

When it becomes modern and stylish for members of the clergy to become activists in pursuit of their own personal socio-political beliefs, while still identifying themselves with their religion, then many become less sure of themselves and of their relation to religion, but not!—astrology then becomes the mode! Why else the intense fascination with the zodiac? When representatives of the church attack the very symbols of the church, youth does not become irreligious. Human needs don't disappear, and so youth's search turns to Zen, mystical experience, drugs, and quasi-private cults.

(7) Increasingly large, aloof, and distant government has led to a citizenry whose members are becoming less and less involved. It is no wonder they are called "the silent majority".

There are other important factors, too, which have reduced the level of participation—on and off campus. I believe the public's confidence in its schools has been shaken because, in part, the symptoms of the silenced generation have been particularly evident on the campus. The faculties who were assumed by the public to be the leaders and societal representatives among us have shown up very poorly. Further, there are those in the academic community who have chosen to exploit the majority. Those on the campus know it. Those off campus are fast learning it. I think it is important,

too, to recognize that the voices from the education establishment are often mouth-ing only simplistic explanations for campus politicization and turmoil—explanations which the public does not find plausible and which the public sees as self-serving.

It is correctly said that the quality of our educational institutions depends upon their faculties. What has been the quality of faculty behavior in relation to the unrest which has so reduced public confidence?

It requires little thought to conclude that, for a campus to be in trouble, there must be members of the faculty who are both irresponsible and influential. It should be obvious that administrators do not fear students, for students have an average stay on a campus of a little over two years, they are young, relatively inexperienced, and easily influenced. The fiction that our campus problem is simply a student problem is a fiction born because of its convenience to both the faculty and the administration. Too often both would have the public believe that society was facing a "new breed" of student rather than a power grab by certain elements within some of our faculties. It is estimated that, at one time or another, one in every ten students has become involved in campus disorders—but often as a tool for his elders. On this point, David Riesman notes:

I can think of very few colleges that have had serious student movements without faculty participation. Even though students on both the left and the right like to feel that they are independent of us adults, they are in some ways dependent on adult support. What one finds in some universities is that faculty members have tended to exploit student protest in pursuit of their own grievances or their own settling of scores with administrators. (*Psychology Today*, October, 1969)

In order to understand how an element of the faculty could behave in ways alien to the whole tradition of the academic community, it is necessary to understand that never before have our faculties been so pampered—nor so young.

Since Sputnik, and until recently, the faculty stood upon a pedestal of public adoration. Education was America's answer to Russia's challenge for the minds of men through scientific achievement. Then with student populations exploding and the production of PhDs several years behind the need, the recruiting of faculty became an endeavor competing favorably with the recruiting of football players. Young scholars who had been singled out because of their brightness during early school years were sought and fought over as graduate students—with fellowships, scholarships, and teaching-assistantships as the bait. As their PhDs were completed, these young scholars were wooed once again by institutions which competed with offers of high salaries, tenure, and, significantly, lower and lower teaching loads.

In the late fifties and early sixties, some of our major institutions added to their faculties as many as a third of these intensely pursued youngsters each year. It was not long before a prevailing majority on the faculties on many of our campuses were "young Turks" who had no investment in the traditions or history of the campus which employed them. Too often, they came in search of a congenial research setting with an aura of prestige, but without a compensating desire to either serve or teach more than necessary. They soon had tenure and thereafter felt little concern for administrative response to irresponsibility.

It is human, when so sought after and so favored, to accept one's own importance. Humility is not nurtured by such conditions. There is yet another occupational hazard that we should note here. PhDs know about one specific area as much as, or more than, any other human being—at least for a few months after writing their theses. And PhDs,

like other people, because they are human, tend to generalize. There is a strong tendency for them to think that their expertise in a specific area automatically relates to a broad general wisdom. Probably no profession is more prone to making absolute pronouncements about general matters on which it has no more specific information than the rest of the population than academia.

Given these characteristics, and recognizing that the silent majority exists in the faculty as well as in the rest of society, those faculty members, often the younger ones, who believe that the world is too complex for the average citizen, or who associate themselves with particular social or political movements, can and have used their genius—and their students—to further their own ends against the best interests of both their more passive colleagues and our society.

They also have used their influence to recruit new faculty members who share their ideological persuasions. In many institutions, new faculty members are nominated by present staff members, and administrative rejection of such nominations is extremely rare.

A final comment to the layman who has been so patient and who has tried so hard to understand. The academic society is a remarkably closed society. It has its own codes, and demands conformity on many matters. There are few professions that can compete with this one in the exercise of discipline on its members. It also is a profession whose members readily band together, regardless of whatever internal differences, against all outside intervention—even constructive criticism. Already feeling superior to those of less intellectual achievement, criticism from the outside is seen, even by many of the more moderate members, as without justification, wrong, and a dangerous precedent.

We find today a clear illustration of self-fulfilling prophecy. Some faculty groups act almost compulsively to upset the citizens who are the parents of the children on their campuses and the providers of their facilities and livelihoods. All the while, these same educators utter grave predictions of a "right-wing reaction" against the campuses. As some of the faculty escalate their insults, the public becomes ever more ready to lash out—but it is the public as a whole, and not a special element within it, not just parents or the anticipated "right-wing reactionaries".

A third critical element in our campus problems is the campus administrator. Here the difficulty is as fundamental as who he is, and where he comes from. Most administrators were functioning with apparent success only a few years ago. But not today. One must realize that administrators, to be successful for their institutions and for the society whose institutions these are, must be able to wear two hats with relative comfort: They must represent the public interest and the well-being of their students and faculty. This was not difficult when the public interest coincided with faculty goals—unbiased quality education. In those times, the administrator was a coordinator, an interpreter, a fund-raiser, often a mediator within the campus community, and generally a figurehead. Now, the situation is more difficult. The public's basic desires haven't changed, but a visible segment of the faculty is using the institution for political purposes, is demanding the right to exercise its bias in the classroom, and is milking the prestige of the institution for its own personal goals.

Through the administrators, members of the faculty were able to convince a friendly public that it was in the interest of society that they be allowed to pursue the truth wherever it might lead, just so long as they did not tip the scales in the direction of personal bias. The public's acceptance of this was described as "academic freedom". Today,

the public is being asked by some to redefine academic freedom in order to grant license to the widest range of behaviors for the faculty and even for students. But a counter voice is absent.

What has happened to the role of an administrator is easy to see. Almost all present administrators have been chosen from the ranks of the faculty, after faculty screening. The wives of these administrators have friends who are, for the most part, faculty wives. The administrator himself was hired originally as a faculty member by faculty members. He depended on them for increases in rank and salary. He, like the faculty member, has been subject to the demands of the academic subculture all of his adult life. It is a rare human being who can wear two hats effectively in an emotionally and ideologically polarized situation, especially when he sees himself as a member of only one of the parties in conflict.

His role is even more difficult because the faculty distrusts administrators, aware of the other hat they might wear. The public tends to distrust academic administrators because it sees them as ignoring their responsibility to the public interest.

A fourth ingredient is made up of the coercive groups which have often been visible leaders of episodes of violence. Tactically and motivationally, the similarities between these groups are greater than their differences. They are alike in that they would never have held the stage if the majority were functioning, if the faculty were united and responsible, and if the administrators had wisdom and courage. They are alike in that they intend to seize power, or to destroy. They advance causes not to achieve them, but to produce conflict. They are, by and large, well organized and disciplined, and apparently have means of communication and travel superior to that of those they attack. Their pattern has been first to analyze friction points on individual campuses, then to seek out support in strategic places on the campus and in the surrounding community. Certain faculty members, clergymen, sympathetic media people, and indigenous radicals or reflex liberals fill the bill. They push constantly, and they push for more than is possible. They wait for a mistake. As soon as it's even slightly credible, they invoke some greater "cause". The issue may have been visitation rights in girls' rooms; it soon becomes an issue of freedom of assembly, or speech, or academic freedom. They simplistically paint the administrators and those of society who would support lawful processes as rigid, authoritarian, and out of step with the times. Usually, they set up the battle plan so they win either way: for example, if there is capitulation in relation to a sit-in, they control the building and move forward with new demands; if the administration holds firm and eventually calls for outside help, the militants contrive and then point to police brutality. They are willing to nibble, one issue at a time, because each success ensures a greater likelihood for the next success. This is a strategy of takeover. It is, in their own words, revolution.

The public watches in fear and anger, for the progress of the militants has been rapid and far-reaching—far-reaching enough so that many thousands of parents have youngsters who have been caught up in the tactics, if not the ideologies. The public's response becomes less dispassionate with each passing month.

Some faculty members have begun to voice their concerns, too. In the January, 1970, issue of *Measure*, we read:

Not that we believe that violence has stopped, will stop, or will be stopped without a hard, protracted struggle. The wrecked office of the President of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology is one of the newer reminders that violence walks in our midst; and for those Professor Hope-for-the-Bests

who think that red-painted obscenities in the Institute's rugs should be explained away as mere aberrations of prolonged adolescence, there is the equally reprehensible and hideous reminder put before us by Princeton's 34-year-old revolutionary sociologist Charles W. Wheatley, who is quoted in *Time* as saying: "Older faculty are ineducable when it comes to the revolution, the movement. They won't be shot, you know; a little island will be found for them some place."

I think it is vital today to differentiate between three look-alikes: adolescent rebellion, the American right to dissent, and revolution. They may look alike, but they are not, and many people who should know better get them confused.

I have described adolescent rebellion as an essential, healthy stage between childhood and adulthood. It can only be destructive if, on the one hand, it is treated with total rigidity, or, and this is more likely these days, it is not resisted at all and thus misses its value for teenagers who must go to more extreme behaviors to achieve an appropriate adult response.

The American right to dissent is worth preserving at any cost. It represents the strength of our society. It is dissent which ensures that there are civil liberties and civil rights, that there is individuality, and that there can be the potential for constructive change.

Revolution is neither growth nor a form of dissent. It is something far different. In this society, it is an effort by a few to thwart the will of the majority and to do so by destroying the democratic system itself.

Finally, there are myths which circulate in society and are supported by too many people of influence who simply parrot them without thinking things through. Some of these myths are given credibility by sincere individuals who simply cannot or do not wish to comprehend what is happening. This all-out attack on our democratic system is a "first" for us, after all.

Though the public has been remarkable in its ability to sense the basic problem, some of the myths that the public believes, or half believes, have served to make people unsure enough of themselves to keep them from responding consistently or appropriately.

I have already talked to the facts which belie several of the more prevalent fables of our time. For example, the myth that it is primarily the students who are engaged in unrest is both an oversimplification and a distortion.

The myth that we are experiencing a "generation gap" that is nearly a chasm has done great harm. It has caused many people of all ages to become self-conscious in their relationships rather than to be themselves. If one will but listen, youth's dilemma is almost the opposite. Adults have put youth in the role of leader, have tried to remove a gap essential to the process of maturation—that is, adolescence.

Somewhat related is the false belief that students are falling over themselves in their desire to participate in governing the universities. An anonymous faculty member describes it this way:

"... delusion that trouble will never come and that having come, it will do no permanent harm are, in fact, children in a large family of sturdy misconceptions. None among them has led to stranger consequences than the supposition that the majority of students are deeply interested in governing every aspect and dimension of the schools at which they enroll. Columbia's experience in this respect would be pathetic, if it were not also heroic. Administrators, faculty and students at Columbia came away from their great ordeal of May and June 1968 persuaded that a university is a community of sorts, that it should be governed by a body of elected representatives, and that these representatives

should include elected student representatives empowered to vote. But in October 1968, a well-advertised meeting called at Columbia to air the question of the proposed University Senate was attended by less than 100 persons. In November 1968, the student turnout at elections was the lowest in recent years.

"According to the *Columbia Forum*, 'Only 14 percent of those eligible in the College (394 students) and 4 percent of the graduate students (166 students) voted.' The faculty Executive Committee leading the drive to place Columbia under the rule of a Senate accommodated to the imagined fact of student interest took these warnings to heart and so conducted its subsequent operation as to develop student interest. In the course of creating the very thing they had believed already existed, the Committee distributed 25,000 48-page pamphlets concerning the future Senate. A faculty leader is quoted in the *Forum* as having said: 'Someone from the Executive Committee . . . spoke to groups from every student body in every division. I remember one night when there was one member of the Executive Committee on every floor of the dorms, right before the vote.' By such means, student participation in the vote to ratify the Senate scheme was raised to 40.9%.

"What would have happened, it may be asked, if the Executive Committee had not haunted the dorms and strained the mimeograph machines? The answer appears to have been given this autumn at a neighboring institution, Queens College, in the City University of New York, which has strong claims to being the campus most disrupted in 1969, its administration building having served as a traffic center and dormitory for student 'activists,' both white and black, for weeks on end, with time out for Easter recess. In consequence of its troubles, Queens conceived an Academic Senate, to be ratified or rejected by a week-long vote. The vote was conducted with the help of the Honest Ballot Association. The polls were open from 9 to 9 through five weekdays and till noon on Saturday. The issue was thoroughly publicized. Yet out of 24,429 students, 2,724 voted, or about 11%. Asked to comment on the turnout, a member of the Queens faculty said, for publication in these columns, 'The idea that most of the students want this change is baloney—if I may call the sausage by its name.'" (*Measure*, December 1969.)

We hear over and over again that "students have real grievances". The statement is usually followed by another, "Though, of course, I don't condone their tactics." Involved here is a half myth, half truth. But those who speak of student grievance usually have been fooled, at least partially, by the issues put forth by the militants. These issues are not the real grievances.

It is becoming increasingly clear that students do have real grievances, for they suffer an unconscionable neglect by faculty members on many campuses. The meaning of the ever-lighter teaching load does not escape students. The office hour so often unmet by the faculty member says something, too. The absentee full professor and the more often present teaching assistant attest to the same thing. Teaching students is not, in the minds of many faculty members, the primary purpose of the university or of their careers.

Research and scholarship which bring status in academe have left little time for students. However, there has yet to be a "demonstration" or violence around this issue. It would seem more likely that, feeling frustrated and disappointed after working for years to get to college only to find there an impersonality born of disinterest, these students are more likely to be caught up in somebody else's "demonstration", if only to let off steam in relation to the "system" which has failed them.

For some time, we have listened to a chorus which tells us that in the younger generation

there is a "new morality". Usually, we are also told that we should adjust to it. The "new morality" has been preached so effectively that the new generation, as well as the old, believes it to exist. The *College Poll* finds that seventy-five percent of students believe that most students, whether male or female, engage in sex relations before marriage. In surveys of my own, I have found that senior college women, for example, when asked to estimate the percentage of senior women who have had premarital sexual intercourse also predict on the average that same seventy-five percent. However, recent studies by Freedman and Halleck, as well as others, indicate that the percentages are in fact between twenty and twenty-two. In the 1950s, Kinsey—and later Ehrmann—reported similar findings. If the data on sexual behavior in the sixties surprise you, then this, itself, is evidence of the effectiveness of a myth.

There are other data on youth which stand in interesting relation to popular belief. For example, from the *College Poll* we learn that eighty-seven percent of students stated in 1968 that they did not believe violence of any kind is ever justified in bringing about change in the college or university. Eighty percent believed that students who break the law on campus should be arrested and expelled. Seventy-three percent reported believing in God or in a Supreme Being. Eighty percent believed that voluntary ROTC belongs on the campus. Seventy-six percent favored campus participation in defense contracts. And sixty-seven percent voted favorably on the CIA.

It becomes clear that generalizations have been made on the basis of the behavior of student extremists and by the wishful thinking of some emotionally involved observers of the campus scene.

It is important to note, however, that there are some startling differences in the attitudes of the thirty percent of the seventeen-to-twenty-three age group who are in college as compared with the seventy percent of the same age group who are not. According to the Yankelovich poll for the Columbia Broadcasting System, when asked whether they would welcome more emphasis on law and order, fifty-seven percent of college students said yes, while eighty percent of those youths not in college so responded. Twice as many in college indicated they would welcome more sexual freedom—forty-three percent as compared to twenty-two percent. While sixty percent of those not in college believed patriotism to be very important, only thirty-five percent of college youth agreed. Saying that they easily accept the prohibition against marijuana were forty-eight percent of college students, while seventy-two percent of noncollege youth so responded. Where we are given data on the parents, we find that youths not in college are quite similar to their parents in those attitudes which relate to our mores. Those in college are less so. It can be said that, though there is generally little evidence of a generation gap, there is considerable evidence of a cultural gap effected by only a few years on the college campus.

As 1969 closed, there were predictions of efforts among the militants to "cool it" for the time being. An election year, a desire to get public support for the eighteen-year-old vote, and recent effective legal actions against violence were among the reasons. Also, man's growing concern with his environment and with the disastrous effects of drugs on his children will occupy much of his attention.

As we all know, the "cool" was short-lived, and campuses and their surrounding communities are now being subjected to even worse violence than before. And the public is more afraid and more angry than before.

I have taken some time to say that the causes of our present discontent are several and complex. Because time is limited, some

aspects have been neglected and exceptions to generalizations sometimes have been ignored.

The public's confidence in higher education is lower today than probably ever before in this country. Many of our institutions have in fact been deflected from their pursuit of society's highest goals.

When we address ourselves to the all-important question, "How do we improve this difficult situation?" our behavior will depend on our understanding of the causes of the symptoms we hope to treat.

To the extent that confusion within the public is a part of our problem, the people should be provided accurate information. Evidence must be substituted for fantasy, facts for myths. The full complexity of the campus crisis must be communicated. We have suffered too long with simplistic interpretations. The majority must be allowed to learn, where this is the case, that it is in fact the majority. It is important that the public see that those who represent them are individuals who are spokesmen for basic educational and societal values. The variety of channels for citizen effectiveness must be made apparent to those who have for too long remained uninvolved in their social institutions. It is ironic that while some groups have developed sophisticated ways to get around or even to injure our democratic system, all too many citizens need a course in Applied Civics I-A.

To the extent that the representatives of the people have been preoccupied with the activists and have related to their "demands" as a point of departure, it becomes evermore important that educational boards and commissions become effectively accountable to the citizenry.

To the extent that administrators are part of our problem, appointments to such positions should take into account the difficulties of the position for those who are too closely dependent on a constituency at one pole in a societal difference of opinion. Possibilities for finding administrators who are management-oriented and above politics must be improved.

To the extent that elements of the faculty represent an important part of our problem, appropriate administrative support for the many responsible faculty members, a reevaluation of tenure policies, and a program to ensure a better acceptance of the teaching function are all essential.

Many administrators have been reflexly responsive to the demands of the militant faculty few. If only they would listen to the many—and there are many. On April 23, 1970, we read of a survey of the attitudes of 60,447 university and college faculty members: "More than 80 percent of the respondents held that 'campus demonstrations by militant students are a threat to academic freedom'. More than 76 percent agreed either strongly or with reservations that 'students who disrupt the functioning of a college should be expelled or suspended'. . . . the survey was taken during the 1968-69 academic year."

Coercive groups must be controlled so that they do not interfere with the rights of others. Implementation of relevant legislation and regulations is important, as is the education of students and the citizenry as to the true meaning of the militants' behavior. Policy decisions by campus leaders must not result from coercion. Otherwise, matters become far worse.

Students in general need to be educated as to what present seventeen-to-twenty-three year olds are like. They don't know. They must receive appropriate interest and attention from faculty members and administrators. They must see that even those who behave normally will be listened to. They should be used in advisory capacities where they have competence. But they should not find themselves being pandered

to. Giving them responsibilities for which they are not ready and in relation to which they cannot represent other students is not a kindness. They know that those who would buy their support are insincere.

Further, institutions should never require students to belong to organizations if those organizations are ones which will take positions in their name on political or social affairs. The authority of the state or community must not be used to force a student to support attitudes alien to his own beliefs. In this regard, the present requirement on many campuses that students belong to a "student government" and support a so-called "student press" becomes suspect.

These are some of the directions necessary, in my opinion, if there is to be a reduction in the present anxiety about public higher education. As has been made abundantly clear, I believe that the anxiety has real bases and will not disappear as a result of any token solutions. In the months ahead, many constructive steps must be taken both on and off the campus. Neither town nor gown alone can solve our crisis.

The presumably broader question has been raised, "How relevant is education in America today?" Whatever one's answers might have been in normal times as to curriculum, course content, class size, teacher training, student mix, and academic goals, answers today depend upon the prior questions: will education be free of violence, coercion, and bias, and will it be appropriate to a free society committed to majority decision.

CONGRESS VETOED BY BUDGET
BUREAU ON REA FUNDS

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of the Budget, that leviathan of the executive branch, has again turned a deaf ear to pleas to release electric loan funds to the Department of Agriculture for use by rural electric cooperatives throughout the country. It must be pointed out again that this program was established by the Congress, that these funds were appropriated by the Congress and, it was the will of the Congress that these funds be used for their specified purpose.

Instead, these funds and, indirectly, the will of the Congress has been vetoed.

The REA has contributed much to the development of our country. It has not only made life easier for hundreds of thousands of rural residents, but it has probably made the most significant contribution of any group or organization in this country to the goal of population stabilization. The REA has also made a significant contribution to a national understanding and appreciation of rural America and rural Americans.

Recently, a series of advertisements were placed in national publications by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. These advertisements discussed factually, succinctly, and informatively the conditions faced in rural America. I would like to include one of these advertisements as an example of the contributions being made by this outstanding organization and these dedicated people.

WHEREVER YOU LIVE

You have a stake in rural America.

Fifty years ago our nation was half rural, half urban. Now 70 percent of our people are crammed onto just one percent of our land.

Through the years, as millions have deserted the countryside in search of a better life in the city, problems have been heaped on problems.

And what have we got today? Smog, pollution and traffic jams in the cities. Abandoned farmsteads and empty stores in the country. And economic and social ills in both. We could have planned more wisely.

Now is the time for us to decide on our national policy . . . what we want our country to be like 30 years from now when we'll have 100 million people added to our population.

We must decide if we want to go on piling more and more people into small amounts of space . . . or if we want to provide a better balance of opportunity . . . creating more jobs and building community facilities where millions want to live, work and play . . . in the countryside.

The consumer-owners of America's nearly 1,000 rural electric systems call upon our President, our Congress, and our country's leaders to adopt An Agenda for Rural America—a national agenda relevant to the total welfare of our nation . . . relevant to the future . . . relevant to the great potential of America's spacious countryside—with these priorities.

We urge the President to appoint a National Coordinator for Rural Community Development . . . and we urge consolidation and upgrading of existing community development programs now administered by many different Federal agencies.

We urge development and implementation of programs to meet the following urgent problems of rural America and its people.

Rural Housing. Over half the nation's substandard homes—more than four million—are in rural America. Many who live in these homes are old. Many are poor.

Community Facilities. Nearly 30,000 rural communities are without adequate water systems . . . about 45,000 without sewer systems. Thousands lack medical centers, libraries, good schools, recreation programs.

Jobs and Training. Few of the nearly 14 million new jobs created in the last 15 years were in rural America. And rural unemployment figures in many areas run nearly 18 per cent, compared to a national average of about four per cent.

Low-Cost Credit. The effects of high interest are most sharply felt in the countryside when there is a chronic shortage of capital for housing and community and industrial growth.

Action now on this Agenda for Rural America will lead toward the solution of many of our nation's ills—in the cities and in the rural areas. The urgency of these problems demands the best efforts of us all, acting together with Federal, state and local governments, as well as the private organizations in urban and rural America.

Across the land, the members, directors and employees of the nation's nearly 1,000 consumer-owned rural electric systems are providing leadership in their communities . . . leadership to develop central water systems, start housing programs, spearhead drives for community colleges and recreation projects, and much more. And all the while rural electric systems continue to supply low-cost, dependable electric power to even the most remote areas.

But the welfare of America—all America—is everyone's responsibility. So, wherever you live . . . whatever you do . . . whoever you are . . . you, too, have a stake in rural America.

These people deserve our support. The Congress has recognized the contribution being made by our rural electric

cooperatives. In my opinion, it is time for the administration to come to the same realization.

TRIBUTE TO CHAIRMAN DULSKI

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, few Members of this House have had heavier responsibilities in the last 16 months than the able chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, our colleague, Mr. DULSKI of New York.

The future of the world's biggest business, the U.S. Post Office system, and hundreds of millions of dollars are involved in the deliberations of his committee. Understandably, the administration, the well-organized mail user groups, transportation interests, and the several employee organizations which represent 700,000 postal employees have pressed hard for inclusion or exclusion of specific provisions which each considered harmful or helpful to its own interests. There have been sharp arguments and widely divergent views, all of them pressed with vigor upon our chairman. Buffeted by all these pressures and in the midst of perhaps the most difficult and responsible job of his life, he has remained fairminded, open to reasonable suggestions, and has presided with dignity and honor.

I believe that before this year is out we will have substantial, significant, and meaningful postal reform, and Chairman DULSKI will deserve much of the credit.

Writer Mike Causey in today's Washington Post pays high tribute to Chairman DULSKI for his patience in handling a potentially explosive situation. Mr. Causey's column follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 14, 1970]

MAIN NAVY PERSONNEL TO BEGIN MOVE
(By Mike Causey)

Who Goofed? Rep. Thaddeus J. Dulski (D-N.Y.) is upset because a lot of people have said and written that the March postal strike wouldn't have happened if his Post Office and Civil Service Committee hadn't dragged its feet on postal reform.

Dulski, who normally has a low boiling point, ought to be mad. The fact is that the strike probably would have happened anyhow, and Dulski's group didn't prompt it.

This time a year ago, several postal employee unions were loudly proclaiming that the administration's postal corporation plan would mean the end of the world, cut their ties with Congress, and probably lead to a strike.

The Nixon administration announced its plan to veto any pay bill that didn't have the White House brand of postal reform attached, and the stage was set. If Dulski's group had approved an administration-style bill when some people think it should, the strike probably would have come during the Christmas rush, and have been even worse.

Because Dulski was a model of patience, nursing the postal reform bill for over a year despite some rebuffs by his Committee, it appears that the unions and the administration will get most of what they want this year.

This isn't a fluff piece to get in Dulski's good graces. This column has a long history of locking horns with Dulski and other members. We've knocked them about bill-writing procedures, travel expenses and the like. And it is bound to happen again.

But this time we'd like to come to Dulski's defense. He has probably done more than any man in the House to get the administration and unions to smoke the peace pipe and head off future strikes. If he deserves anything on this one it's a medal, not brickbats for supposedly triggering a mail strike.

THE COURAGE OF THE PRESIDENT

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, the air is heavy with voices that are challenging the wisdom of President Nixon in cleaning up Vietcong sanctuaries along the Cambodian border.

Once in a while, however, a message with a ring of recognition rather than condemnation pierces this heaviness, sounding out loud and clear. One such message written by Mr. Charles Gould appeared in the May 1, 1970, issue of the San Francisco Examiner under the title "The Courage of the President." Because this article presents a unique viewpoint on President Nixon and the Cambodian situation, I insert it into the RECORD so that it will come to the attention of a broad range of citizens:

THE COURAGE OF THE PRESIDENT

(By Charles L. Gould)

President Nixon did not take the fighting to Cambodia.

The Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese did.

In both world wars hundreds of thousands of American troops fought across Europe.

They were not concerned with invisible national boundaries. They were concerned with meeting the enemy and destroying him.

In 1917 and again in 1941 our nation made open declarations of war. War-time rules were imposed at home. Dissent was stifled. Battle goals were established. And power at our command was used to achieve them.

Had we fought Hitler as we have fought Hanoi, our troops would still be mired down in the battlefields of Europe. Or—we would be saluting the swastika.

For six long years our men have fought in Vietnam under a weird, one-sided code of Marquis of Queensbury rules.

Our men were not permitted to fight to achieve victory. Our fighting men and their allies were not permitted to pursue the enemy into North Vietnam. They were not permitted to pursue the enemy into Laos and Cambodia.

Thus the enemy was given the right of initiative. He could pick the time and place and method of his attacks. He could strike and run.

Our men could lose but they could not win.

The danger of the fighting escalating into a world-wide conflagration was our alibi for not defining the enemy's defeat as our goal.

The danger that the war would erupt on a global scale was present the moment we committed our first fighting man to the conflict.

The same danger is implicit in each of the pacts we have with fifteen nations of Europe

and with numerous other nations in Asia and the Middle East.

These pacts were established to protect weak friends and allies from the repeatedly declared aggressive aims of the communists.

All should recognize that the danger of a third world war is ever-present. This danger was born the moment following World War II that the Communists again restated their goals of global domination.

If World War III comes it will come when the Communists believe the time is right.

They may believe the time is right if our country is so hopelessly divided that we—as a people—fail to support our President in supporting our fighting men as he did last night.

Let it be clear that President Nixon has not established victory as a goal in Vietnam. Months ago he mapped plans for honorably extricating our troops from the conflict and turning the defense of South Vietnam over to the forces of that nation. He has not changed those goals.

However, if the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese were permitted to expand and perpetuate their sanctuary in Cambodia, President Nixon saw grave danger that his carefully planned timetable of de-escalation would be destroyed.

He saw a stepped-up threat to the safety of our fighting men. He saw the danger of expanded war through failure to act.

He acted with courage and statesmanship. He merits our support.

REFERRING THE NEUTRALITY OF CAMBODIA AND THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF THE CAMBODIAN PEOPLE TO THE UNITED NATIONS

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing, along with the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROOMFIELD) and the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COWGER), a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that North Vietnam's violations of the neutrality of Cambodia and the human rights of the Cambodian people be referred to the United Nations.

On May 7, 1970, I introduced a resolution reaffirming Congress' role in matters affecting grave national issues of war and peace. The resolution I now introduce represents a positive exercise of our constitutional mandate.

President Nixon and Secretaries Rogers and Laird have repeatedly stated that our present involvement in Cambodia is for the sole purpose of protecting allied forces in South Vietnam as they withdraw. I have concurred in the carefully delineated steps taken by the President. However, when American troops withdraw from Cambodia in the next few weeks, they will leave behind them the unresolved threat to international peace posed by the presence of North Vietnamese and Vietcong troops in violation of Cambodian neutrality and the human rights of the Cambodian people.

I believe these unresolved threats to Cambodia and her people should be referred to the United Nations, the body created to maintain international peace

and promote human rights. Article 34 of the U.N. Charter states that "any member may bring any dispute to the attention of the Security Council." Mr. Speaker, I feel the United States, pursuant to article 34, should bring the Cambodian matter to the Security Council with the objective of formulating a plan to assure the neutrality and territorial integrity of Cambodia and the human rights of the Cambodian people.

NORTH VIETNAM VIOLATES CAMBODIAN NEUTRALITY

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BROTZMAN) and the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COWGER) in introducing a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that North Vietnam's violations of the neutrality of the Cambodian people be referred to the United Nations.

As a former U.S. delegate to the United Nations, I have frequently emphasized the need for greater U.N. involvement in the conflict in Indochina since that organization was created to maintain international peace and promote human rights.

The President's decision to move against North Vietnamese forces in Cambodia was the result of long and repeated violations of Cambodian neutrality by the Hanoi government. When our present involvement in Cambodia is ended within the next few weeks, the threat to international peace and the human rights of the Cambodian people posed by the presence of North Vietnamese and Vietcong forces will remain.

The United Nations has devoted a great deal of its energies since Human Rights Year in 1968 to steps which could be taken to secure the better application of existing humanitarian international conventions.

The 24th General Assembly received recommendations for implementation of such steps.

The 23d General Assembly, acting upon the recommendation of the International Conference on Human Rights, established an investigatory committee to look into alleged violations of human rights in the occupied territories of the Middle East following the June 1967 war. It would appear that similar action would be appropriate in Cambodia.

Article 34 of the U.N. Charter states that "any member may bring any dispute to the attention of the Security Council." In keeping with its constitutional responsibility, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Congress should recommend that the President request the Security Council to take up this matter with the objective of formulating a plan to assure the neutrality and territorial integrity of Cambodia and the human rights of the Cambodian people.

RESIGNATION OF ANTHONY J.
MOFFETT

HON. LLOYD MEEDS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, the extent to which the administration has lost touch with the youth of America may be exemplified by the resignation of Anthony J. Moffett as Director of the Office of Students and Youth in the U.S. Office of Education. Mr. Moffett supported young people who sought to change American education constructively. He tried to give them and their ideas access to and impact on Federal education policy. Unfortunately, the increasingly repressive character of the administration undercut his efforts.

I sympathize with the feeling of frustration which Mr. Moffett must have experienced in carrying out, under severe handicap, the duties of his office. His statement of resignation sums this up very well. Since some of my colleagues may not have had an opportunity to see Mr. Moffett's statement, I am inserting it in the Record at this point:

STATEMENT OF ANTHONY J. MOFFETT

In September, 1969, Commissioner of Education, James E. Allen, Jr., established an Office of Students and Youth. I was named director of that office which the Commissioner called "an advocate for youth within the Office of Education." Events since then, and particularly within the past ten days, have convinced me that this advocacy function is untenable within the Nixon Administration. I am today resigning from my position.

When the Office of Students and Youth was created, it appeared to offer young people a unique opportunity to influence both Federal education policy and the educational system as a whole. Since September a large number of young people—students, drop-outs, and others—have worked within the office, within the system to be sure. Most of our attention has been focused on giving support to young people seeking to constructively change education. We have met with youth throughout the country, given technical assistance to youth-run education programs, placed young people on Office of Education committees, worked to increase student involvement in other education agencies, public school systems, and universities. Most important of all, we have sought to give young people and their ideas access to and impact on federal education policy. But the increasingly repressive character of this administration has undercut our efforts.

The recent remarks by the President concerning student protestors were most instrumental in my decision. For they confirmed what thousands of students have believed or suspected for some time: namely, that the President and his most trusted advisors do not view themselves as leaders of all of the American people; that they do not have the best interests of youth in mind; and, most tragically, that they will sanction even the most vicious tactics against young people and other legitimate political dissenters.

In the midst of this disastrous Administration posture, the most natural ally for youth within the Federal government, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has failed to play enough of a leader-

ship role. High-ranking Department officials have often been more concerned with protecting what they perceived to be the political interests of the President, the Secretary, and the Commissioner of Education, than with effectively serving the Department's constituents—the young people of America. But our staff has been generally satisfied with the Secretary and Commissioner.

As recently as March 31, 1970, the President, in a memorandum for heads of executive departments and agencies stated:

"How well we communicate with youth and seek the advantage of their abilities will influence our effectiveness in meeting our responsibilities."

Through his irresponsible statements of the past week—the labeling of student protestors as "bums," the attempt to blame the Kent State tragedy on violent dissent—the President has exposed the above statement as mere rhetoric. He has demonstrated that he does not understand young people, and that he does not wish to communicate with them. And students across the country are saying "enough, enough" to his short-sighted policies. I support their non-violent protest and can no longer continue to serve in an Administration which seeks to discredit it.

THE BREMERTON SUN ON
CAMBODIA

HON. FLOYD V. HICKS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, at a time when our Nation is deeply concerned over President Nixon's expansion of the war into Cambodia, one of the most thoughtful appraisals of the President's decision I have read appeared in the May 5 edition of the Bremerton, Wash., Sun. I wish to bring the Sun's editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

ARE WE COMMITTED TO A NEW "DOMINO THEORY"?

President Nixon may have, as it seems, convinced a majority of Americans on the wisdom of his decision to expand the Vietnam War into Cambodia. In spite of the elaborate and careful arguments cited in its support, some aspects of the President's announcement are more perplexing the longer considered.

One day he was on television assuring us that Vietnamization of the war is proceeding apace and that 150,000 more American troops would be returned home within a year. Ten days later, he was on television again to announce a whole new direction to the war—an assault on North Vietnamese sanctuaries inside Cambodia—citing no development significant enough to warrant such a reversal. Subsequent announcements confirm the renewal of bombing of North Vietnam—later terminated—and additional waves of U.S. assault troops in Cambodia.

The administration explains that the new military operations were taken in order to defend a country from aggression. The North Vietnamese, it is said, are now attacking Cambodia from sanctuaries. Yet the President acknowledged the North Vietnamese have been in Cambodia for more than 5 years.

The North Vietnamese attacks on the Cambodian army seem not properly construed as an invasion. This military action results from the changed political relationship between the Cambodian and North Vietnamese governments brought about by the

overthrow of Prince Sihanouk. This is a matter between those two countries; the dispute does not necessarily demand U.S. involvement.

An additional reason—and perhaps the compelling one—given by the President is that the North Vietnamese sanctuaries in Cambodia present a real danger to United States troops in South Vietnam. Still, he presented far from compelling evidence that American lives are more endangered now than in the past.

The President said the offensive would save American lives and shorten the war by forcing North Vietnam to agree to a negotiated peace.

That is the same false logic which has dictated every other American decision in this conflict, such as the decision to commit American combat troops in 1964 and the decision to bomb North Vietnam in 1965.

Unfortunately, the result of all of them has been only to increase American casualties and prolong the war. If the Russian attitude expressed yesterday by Premier Kosygin is genuine, that seems likely to be the case again.

It is also unfortunate that the President chose to couch his announcement in terms of America's honor and its position as a first-rank world power. His words were disturbingly reminiscent of Lyndon Johnson's statement that he was not going to be the first American President to lose a war.

At the end, if this offensive is no more effective than all those others, we may be required to accept a settlement without a victory, surely, and possibly without honor except in our own eyes. Eventually, it seems almost certain to us, the President is going to have to prepare the nation for that kind of settlement.

But Mr. Nixon's decision to mount large-scale attacks against Cambodia and to renew the bombing of North Vietnam makes it clear that that time is not in sight.

Instead, we are committed apparently to a "domino theory" of sanctuaries; that is, that as an assault on one sanctuary proves fruitless, we seek out another sanctuary.

And the last domino, obviously, is Red China.

FREMONT POLICEMEN HONORED

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday evening, May 9, I was honored by being selected as the keynote speaker at the awards banquet honoring the top 20 police pistol marksmen in the State of California. This fine group is honored yearly after arduous competition as the "Governor's 20." The contest was sponsored by the California Police Combat Shooters Association.

The awards banquet was especially pleasing to me this year because eight of the Governor's 20 pistol marksmen were members of the Fremont Police Department whose chief of police is that splendid officer, John Fabbri.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to share my thoughts on this occasion with my colleagues in the House of Representatives because of the extraordinary achievements of these eight police officers. Fremont is a city of approximately 100,000 inhabitants and yet these eight officers

of the Fremont Police Department won out over police officers of every city in California, the largest State in the Union with a population in excess of 20 million people.

My congratulations go to all of the Governor's 20 but especially to the eight outstanding officers of the Fremont Police Department whose names follow: Sgt. Robert Pellern, Sgt. Robert Meyers, Detective Richard Cox, Reserve Officer Jerry Teixeira, Patrolman Dan Feliciano, Patrolman Karl Trettin, Detective Ed Montgomery, and Patrolman Cal Robertson.

ISRAEL NEEDS JETS

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, with the introduction of Russian pilots and crews into the forces of the United Arab Republic, the situation in the Middle East is rapidly deteriorating. The arguments advanced previously for selling, and I emphasize the word selling, these planes to Israel are more relevant now than ever before.

The presence of a credible Israeli deterrent in the Middle East is necessary to convince the Arabs and their Russian patrons that peace talks are the only path to a meaningful settlement of that conflict. This deterrent, experience has proven, discourages the possibility of a wider war and improves the chances for peace.

I also caution those who draw parallels between the Middle East crisis and other international problems. While the U.S. ambition has consistently been peace through negotiations, our national interests dictate the use of sophisticated and various responses in pursuit of this goal; measures which are relevant, applicable, and effective in the region concerned.

With the unanimous consent of my colleagues I commend to their attention an editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of Thursday, May 14, entitled "More of Same in Mideast":

MORE OF THE SAME IN MIDEAST

Tuesday's lightning armored strike by Israel against the "al Fatah" corner of Lebanon, on the southwestern slopes of Mount Hermon, may or may not have accomplished its military objectives, but it just set off more of the same, tired routine in the United Nations.

Acting on Lebanon's request for an emergency meeting, the Security Council went through its paces and came up with a demand that Israel withdraw forthwith.

It voted 13-2 against an American amendment which would have required both sides—including the Arab guerrillas based in the area—to cease the fighting.

Now that Israel has withdrawn its forces, it would seem that chapter has been closed. But the regularity with which the Security Council ignores raids by Arab guerrillas and chastises Israel will continue to bear witness to U.N. bias.

All of which might be shrugged off, except that this time Syria, Iraq and the Lebanese Government participated on the side of the guerrillas (although with what effect is moot)

and the action was hotter and more damaging.

Coincidentally, it has been reported that U.S. Sixth Fleet commanders are becoming genuinely worried about the Soviet naval squadron in the Mediterranean.

The latter has recently become more than a token "presence": it is an active threat to North Atlantic Treaty Organization forces, whose role in a real Mideastern blow-up would be vital.

Among other conclusions to be drawn from this juxtaposition of events and potential events, it seems to us, is that this country would do well to reconsider—quickly—the continuing delay in the sale of Phantom jets to Israel.

With Russian pilots already flying what are nominally United Arab Republic MIGs, those Phantoms in friendly hands—before, not after, they are needed—could be an important factor in keeping the "balance" balanced.

The U.N., it appears, will never do anything in that line of its own volition.

TWO BUFFALO, N.Y., WINNERS FOR MEDICAL REPORTING

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, there were two Buffalo, N.Y., winners today as the annual Albert Lasker Medical Journalism awards were presented at a luncheon in New York City.

Buffalo's educational television station, WNED-TV, was honored for its program "Smoking and Health: The Tar Factor." This station has been providing an outstanding service for our area with its many special programs. Clearly, the award is richly deserved.

Miss Judith Randal, a native of Buffalo, won the award for her weekly syndicated newspaper column which is distributed to newspapers across the country by the Washington Star Syndicate.

Miss Randal is an excellent medical reporter for the Washington, D.C., Evening Star and I am including with my remarks an article published in the May 13 edition of the Star:

STAR'S MEDICAL REPORTER WINS LASKER AWARD
Judith Randal, medical reporter for The Star, was named today as winner of the \$2,500 Albert Lasker Medical Journalism Award in the newspaper field.

Miss Randal and other Lasker award winners for 1970 will be presented their awards at a luncheon in New York tomorrow.

Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, D-Mass., will be the luncheon speaker, substituting for Walter P. Reuther, United Auto Workers president who was killed in a plane crash Saturday.

The 1970 Lasker award for newspapers goes to Miss Randal for her weekly column, syndicated as part of the "Washington Closeup" column published in The Star and other newspapers served by The Washington Star Syndicate.

Other award winners were Gene Bylinsky, associate editor of Fortune magazine, for his article, "Biochemical Clues to Mental Illness"; Isaac Kleinerman, producer of the CBS program, "The First Ten Months of Life"; Station WNED-TV, Buffalo, N.Y., for the program, "Smoking and Health: The Tar Factor"; Lester Cooper, producer of the program, "Heart Attack," for the ABC television network, and Station WITI-TV, Milwaukee, Wis., for the program, "A Change of Heart."

Miss Randal came to The Star in 1967 from the Newhouse National News Service in Washington, where she covered medicine and the biological sciences. Before that, she had been a freelance writer in New York City, contributing to Harper's, Think, The Reporter and other publications.

She is the author of "All About Heredity," a book for children on genetics, and served for a time as children's science editor for Macmillan Co.

A native of Buffalo, N.Y., Miss Randal grew up in New York City. She is a graduate of Wellesley College and was a fellow in the Columbia University School of Journalism's advanced science writing program.

Earlier honors for Miss Randal include this year's Claude Bernard Science Journalism Award, given by the National Society for Medical Research in the category of newspapers of more than 100,000 circulation.

MERLO PUSEY ON PRESIDENTIAL WARS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following article by Merlo Pusey, which provides a penetrating discussion of the current debate over the role of Congress in foreign policy:

PRESIDENTIAL WAR: THE CENTRAL ISSUE
(By Merlo J. Pusey)

It would be a pity if the serious constitutional issue underlying the current protests against the war should be lost in the cyclone of threats, anti-Nixonisms and obscenities. However clumsy they may be in articulating it, the students do have a legitimate complaint. They face the possibility of being drafted against their will for service in a presidential war.

All the talk about pigs, revolution and smashing the establishment fails to alter the fact that, in one basic particular, the dissenters are the real traditionalists. Madison and Jefferson would have understood the anger on the campuses against the dispatch of young men to war in Southeast Asia at the dictation of one powerful executive. Madison and his colleagues wrote into the Constitution a flat prohibition against such a concentration of power. Yet it now seems to be accepted as standard American practice.

President Nixon reiterated his claim to the war power the other night in his news conference. In explaining that none of his advisers was responsible for the invasion of Cambodia, he said:

"Decisions, of course, are not made by vote in the National Security Council or in the Cabinet. They are made by the President with the advice of those, and I made this decision."

The question of going to Congress for the decision or even of discussing the matter with congressional leaders appears not to have been considered. The result of the decision was to extend the war to another country. By any interpretation that may be placed upon it, this was a grave involvement for the nation. Most of our Presidents would have deemed it imperative to go to Congress for authority to take such a step.

Now the administration is resisting the attempt of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to cut off funds for military operations in Cambodia. The committee has carefully tailored its restriction so as not to interfere with the President's avowed in-

tention of clearing the sanctuaries and then withdrawing the American forces. But this has met with opposition from the State Department on the broad ground that actions of the Commander in Chief should not be subject to statutory restrictions.

There are several very interesting phrases in this letter which Assistant Secretary David H. Abshire sent to the Foreign Relations Committee. He contends that Congress should not limit military spending in such a way as to "restrict the fundamental powers of the President for protection of the armed forces of the United States." The implication seems to be that the President has authority to send our armed forces anywhere in the world, for purposes which he thinks appropriate, and then to take whatever additional action he may think necessary to protect those forces. Under this reasoning, it seems, no one can do anything to stop a presidential war.

This view of the war power is not, of course, unique with the Nixon administration. President Truman made even more expansive claims to unlimited presidential power, and LBJ was not far behind. Mr. Nixon's State Department is merely mouthing what has become accepted doctrine in the executive branch. But it is an outrageous doctrine that flies into the face of the letter and spirit of the Constitution and is repugnant to the basic concepts of democracy.

There is no principle about which the founding fathers were more adamant than denial of the war power to a single executive. After extended debate they gave Congress the power to raise and support armies, to control reprisals and to declare war, which, of course, includes the power of authorizing limited war. The President was given authority to repel sudden attacks, but there is nothing in the Constitution which suggests that this can be legitimately stretched to cover military operations in support of other countries in remote corners of the world.

In a literal sense, therefore, it is the students—or at least the nonviolent majority among them—who are asserting traditional, constitutional principles. It is the State Department which is asserting a wild and unsupported view of presidential power that imperils the future of representative government.

Somehow the country must get back to the principle that its young men will not be drafted and sent into foreign military ventures without specific authority voted by Congress. That is a principle worth struggling for. Congress now seems to be groping its way back to an assertion of its powers, but its actions are hesitant and confused, as if it were afraid to assume the responsibility for policy-making in such vital matters of life and death.

Of course Congress is at a great disadvantage when it tries to use its spending power to cut off a presidential war for which it has recklessly appropriated funds in the past. In these circumstances, the President is always in a position to complain that the result will be to endanger our boys at the fighting fronts. Congress seems to have discovered no sound answer to that warning.

But Congress could stop presidential wars before they begin by writing into the law firm prohibitions against the building of military bases in foreign countries and the dispatch of American troops to other countries without specific congressional approval. If Congress is not willing or able to devise some means of restoring the war power to the representatives of the people, we may have to modify our system of government so that the President would become answerable to Congress for abuses of power. In the light of our Vietnam experience, it seems highly improbable that the country will long continue to tolerate unlimited power in one man to make war.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, last week millions of Americans joined in paying tribute to the proud and brave people in Poland on the occasion of the 179th anniversary of the adoption of the Constitution of Poland. That inspiring document, modeled after our own Constitution, has, since May 3, 1791, demonstrated the democratic ideals and zeal for liberty that have been a part of the heritage of the people of Poland, as well as those of Polish descent living here in this country.

This year Polish Constitution Day happens to coincide with the 25th anniversary of the Katyn massacre, that vicious slaughter of some 4,000 Polish officers and intellectuals by the forces of the Soviet Union. That massacre was just another incident in the long and tragic history of Poland's repression by neighboring totalitarian governments who have at various times regarded the traditional love of freedom in Poland to be a threat to their dictatorial regimes.

So on May 3, Constitution Day, we have all paused to reaffirm our belief in the validity of that spirit of freedom which is still active behind the Iron Curtain in Poland, and our conviction that that spirit will ultimately triumph. We all look forward to the day when the democratic Constitution of Poland will again govern that land and when the brave, proud people of Poland will once again be free.

TWENTY-TWO YEARS OF ISRAELI STATEHOOD

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, on May 15, 1948, the establishment of the State of Israel was proclaimed by David Ben Gurion, head of its provisional government. To observe the sovereignty of Israel, the last of the British garrison withdrew on that date.

I should like to mark Israel's anniversary by reminding my colleagues of the current situation in this beleaguered nation. Israel, a small state with 2½ million people, has to contend with the aggression of the Arab world. Since its independence, to which it was entitled, it has been attacked thrice in joint actions by its Arab neighbors, who have pledged to drive Israel into the sea.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the Arab's willful destruction of Israel will not occur. We in the Congress are reminded of the almost 6 million European Jews eradicated by the Nazis. Such inhumanity must not be repeated in the Mideast.

It is known that Soviet pilots are manning squadrons of jet interceptors within the United Arab Republic. These Russian pilots are reported to be part of an 8,000 to 10,000 military advisory force sent by Russia to assist the Arabs. Moreover, Mig-21's and SAM-3 air defense missile sites are also reported to be part of the Arab defense system.

The administration has considered the sale of F-4 Phantom jets and A-4 Skyhawks to Israel. I hope it will recognize that the Israeli-Arab dispute is not a question of territory or politics or economics, but of existence, Israel's existence.

The Arabs have admitted their unwillingness to negotiate a peaceful settlement with Israel, and seek only to destroy her. Furthermore, the Russians are the UAR's willing ally.

Mr. Speaker, the promised land of the Bible, the Canaan to all Jews, is Israel. For more than 18 centuries world Jewry was in the Diaspora, dispersed everywhere. But always their thoughts and hopes centered on Israel.

Now they have a sovereign nation, and she asks only to be permitted to live peacefully and without threat in a land she has turned from arid desert into fruitful abundance.

Let us, then, on the occasion of Israel's 22d anniversary of her independence, do more than pay lip service to her needs.

SENATOR WILLIAMS SAYS "THANK YOU" FOR HOUSING HONORING "JAY" SMITH

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, many public housing projects throughout the Nation bear the names of individual citizens who, in one way or another, worked to provide more adequate shelter for moderate- and low-income individuals.

On May 10, it was my good fortune to participate in the dedication ceremonies for Jeannette Smith Village in Carteret, N.J. Like others there, I was deeply moved. The decision to honor Jeannette—or "Jay" as she was nicknamed—Smith was a thoroughly appropriate action which warms the hearts of all those who knew Jay and of her work here in Washington.

Mrs. Smith was well-known in the Capitol City for her work with Mrs. Marie McGuire in the public housing programs first in the Housing and Home Finance Agency and later in the Department of Housing and Urban Development. She was also known as a good citizen with a keen eye for social injustice and skill in efforts to overcome those injustices.

And she was the sister of Senator HARRISON "PETE" WILLIAMS.

Together, they worked for better housing. Senator WILLIAMS, a member of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, took a deep and personal interest in all forms of housing and urban development; and he showed special concern for housing for the elderly.

Jay Smith was one of those Federal executives who seemed always to go to the heart of the matter when she saw an application for housing. She always asked: What will these units mean for the people who will someday live in them?

For these reasons, I was pleased indeed when the Housing Authority of Carteret decided to dedicate new housing for the elderly in honor of Mrs. Smith. The ceremony on May 10 was especially poignant because within the past year Jay Smith was taken from us. Vital and very much concerned about the work that yet remained to be done, she fell victim to a stroke.

Senator WILLIAMS was the principal speaker at the ceremonies in Jay Smith's honor. He offered thanks for himself and for his family. His speech should be remembered. I include it in this RECORD at this point:

REMARKS AT THE DEDICATION OF JEANNETTE SMITH VILLAGE—CARTERET, N.J.

(By Hon. Harrison A. Williams)

My first duty here today is to extend my heartfelt thanks to John Sudia, Director of the Carteret Housing Authority.

I have been told that John has worn out two automobiles running back and forth between Carteret and Washington, D.C., to get approval on housing projects here within the last few years.

And now that he's deeply involved in an urban renewal project, he fully expects to have a third loss on his hands any day now.

Ed Patten knows just how persuasive John can be when he *does* get to Washington. When we see Sudia coming, we know that he wants to put us to work.

But we know that John's work is *worth* doing.

And then, too, John, Ed, and I have a friend in Washington.

She is Marie McGuire, and she has two precious gifts.

She can move bureaucratic mountains. She can see people through the paper work.

Those of you who knew my sister Jay, may know that she worked with Marie.

And what a team they were.

Jay was never one to let dust gather on an application for a housing project. She would look at it all: the statistics, the criteria, the financing requirements. And somehow she came back to only one question:

What will this project mean to the people it is meant to serve?

Marie always asks that question, too.

In fact, Marie, you can take credit for making a sometimes singlehanded effort to bring the human touch to public housing.

Marie and Jay weren't overwhelmed with paper and red tape—they cut thru it all to its meaning of people in homes—homes they didn't have and needed so much. They wouldn't settle for mere shelter. They insisted that life, and hope, thrive in these buildings.

The close working relationship between Marie and Jay was accepted, I suppose, as an everyday fact of life in Washington over the years.

But Marie, at the memorial services to Jay on that hilltop overlooking the Potomac just a few months ago, you told us what it was all about.

You let us know what Jay had contributed to your life.

You let us know what Jay had contributed to her work.

And now here today, we dedicate housing which bears my sister's name.

I know her concern about people will be felt here.

She is a partner with all who thought to plan and construct these buildings.

She is a partner with everyone who will ever live here.

You know, perhaps my personal involvement in today's ceremonies has made me see more clearly that any successful project depends upon good faith by good people.

We in Washington can authorize all the programs in the world, but it takes more than Congressional intent to make them work.

Unless neighbors work for neighbors, we can't have successful housing or anything else that is intended to meet local needs.

And unless a man like John Sudia can work day in and day out to help municipal officials and county officials to see why a clear need exists—and why it must be met—we'll have much spelling out of goals, but no action.

I know that this is a dedication, and that you have done Jay and her family great honor by remembering her today. And perhaps I should speak only of pleasant things. But somehow I feel that I would violate the spirit of this day if I did not talk about several matters that trouble me.

You may know that I serve on the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

We have the responsibility to act on many programs related to community development, housing among them.

Over the past 11 years, I have heard the witnesses at hearings. I have read the reports about housing shortages. I have worked on the bills. And the Committee has acted time and again to broaden our national commitment to housing. And we paid special heed to the needs of the elderly. We know that they are caught in unique pressure.

But, after these 11 years, I must say that I am deeply concerned about the yawning gap between our needs and our progress.

Worst yet, I am concerned about what appears to be a waning of commitment over the past year and a half.

Within recent months I have come face to face both with need and with evidence of watered-down commitment.

It began when I asked the staff of the Senate Committee on Aging to look into the problems faced by churches and other non-profit organizations in general when they try to provide housing for the elderly. We looked into other programs, too; but our major focus was on housing.

Here's what we found. Potential sponsors of housing from many parts of the nation have told us of their troubles:

Unsympathetic municipal governing bodies who saw no need at all to "subsidize" housing for the elderly.

Federal red tape and unresponsive jargon issued in the name of policy.

Confusion about federal intentions: Just last year, the Department of Housing and Urban Development made a major power play to end one very useful program for non-profit sponsors and substitute another which had drawn widespread criticism.

Despite the criticism, however, that older, and better, program is being phased out.

There are many other difficulties. But let's think for a moment about what happens when the sponsors are unsuccessful—and the project never does get off the drawing board.

Just a few weeks ago in Ocean Grove, I received direct evidence on that subject.

There, at a hearing by the Committee on Aging, we heard from churchmen and officials who know that for every such failure, many older people in their communities live in mounting desperation.

We heard about widows and widowers who lived alone in old houses on which they paid high taxes.

They cannot keep up with all the house-keeping needed for the home. They are just about able to pay the taxes, and so many cut down on prescription drugs and even food to pay those taxes.

Many would like to move into smaller quarters.

But there are no places to be had at prices they can afford.

Three different witnesses at the Ocean Grove hearing told us of finding persons dead in their homes. They were living lives of isolation. They were living in want. And they died alone and unnoticed.

That is what housing for the elderly is all about. It is literally a matter of life and death.

Waiting lists on housing for the elderly can be tragic documents. Names are crossed off, not because they have been accepted, but because their waiting time had run out.

I've spoken about the dark side of the housing picture because I believe that every American should know what may be happening in his own community.

Today, however, we are celebrating a success story.

We are celebrating a partnership of government and people.

And, in the years ahead, there will be other success stories, other people served, other needs seen.

But for me and my family—this Village—these buildings—will have special meaning. You have given your good will to someone who was dear to us, and we thank you.

CAMBODIAN INVASION WEAKENS OUR MIDDLE EAST POSTURE

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, today's New York Times reported that the Soviet Union has sent approximately another 100 pilots to the United Arab Republic to man three or four squadrons of Mig 21 jet interceptors. This brings the total Soviet strength in Egypt to 8,000 to 10,000 men, plus 20 SAM-3 air defense missile sites which, when completed, will contain 160 missile launchers.

Meanwhile, the Nixon administration continues to refuse to sell Israel the planes she desperately needs and which would insure that the balance of power in the Middle East would be maintained despite Soviet attempts to upset it. And, by its preoccupation with the misguided invasion of Cambodia, the administration is encouraging these new and dangerous Soviet moves in the Middle East.

The passive reaction of the administration to the introduction of SAM-3 missiles in Egypt and the deployment of Soviet pilots in the Egyptian air is extremely dangerous. The tragedy is that now, combined with the "evenhandedness" guiding the State Department, there is also the Cambodia affair which ties the administration's hands. As Joseph Kraft writes in his column today in the Washington Post:

Delay is necessary because the Nixon Administration has been too obsessed with Cambodia to think about anything else.

And Joseph Kraft correctly concludes that, contrary to the administration's claim, the Cambodia decision has weakened America's position around the world, especially in the Middle East. As he says:

One weak response, to be sure, doesn't mean the end of the world. But it shows

May 14, 1970

that the claim about Cambodia strengthening the American hand around the world is contemptible. It is, in fact, only slightly less contemptible than the suggestion that the blame for this country's weakened condition should fall on those who protested, rather than those who undertook, the wholly unnecessary move in Cambodia.

Because it is highly relevant to the decisions that are being made at this time, I include at this point in the RECORD Joseph Kraft's informative article from the May 14, 1970, issue of the Washington Post. In particular, I call attention to the last three paragraphs, in which Mr. Kraft zeroes in on the relationship between the invasion of Cambodia and our inability to deal effectively with the Middle East situation. The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 14, 1970]
CAMBODIA WEAKENS U.S. HAND AS SOVIET GAINS IN NEAR EAST

(By Joseph Kraft)

The quaint conceit that President Nixon's Cambodian plunge strengthens this country's global stance encounters reality in the Near East. And the result of the meeting is dismal.

For the Russians are blandly deepening their penetration of Egypt in ways that cause Colonel Nasser to flex his muscles anew. But the United States faces this challenge from a position of weakness unmatched since the Moscow-Cairo axis started building 15 years ago.

The basic facts are well known. In the past few months the Russians have become the mainstay of Egyptian air defense. They have set up new surface-to-air missiles—the SA-3—around Cairo and Alexandria. They have supplied crews to man these weapons.

In addition, Soviet pilots are flying MIG 21 jets on operational, as distinct from training, missions. While the exact nature of these missions is in some doubt the Soviet pilots are rising whenever Israeli pilots penetrate Egyptian territory beyond the Suez Canal Zone. In effect, the Russian's are protecting Egypt's hinterland.

Thus protected, Colonel Nasser, after the usual fashion of the gambler, has had a sudden access of confidence and courage. He has stepped up the attrition raids that take such a heavy toll of Israeli manpower. "We've been here for seven thousand years, and we'll be here seven thousand more," he boasted to one recent visitor.

The Israelis have so far been cautious in response. They have not flown sorties in the area now patrolled by Soviet pilots. Defense Minister Moshe Dayan has expressed interest in getting a cease-fire. But this restrained attitude will be maintained only if there is some indication that Israel does not stand alone—that she has American support.

As to Washington, nobody here doubts that the latest Soviet move represents a challenge and a potential threat to the peace. Nobody doubts that Israel will once more act alone if some kind of American help is not forthcoming. Nobody doubts that if Washington sits on its hands there will be some further Soviet move to penetrate Egypt—perhaps the stationing of the SA-3 missiles and their Russian crews in the Canal Zone within easy range of Israeli guns.

But with all these dangers implicit in inaction, Washington has been looking the other way, dodging conclusions, playing for time. Thus a massive intelligence analysis is under way to determine exactly the nature of the new mission assigned to Soviet pilots in Egypt. Moscow was asked by Ambassador Jacob Beame—who doesn't exactly have the clout to make strong demands—for an explanation of the new assignment for the Soviet pilots. When the first explanation was

found to be too vague, he was sent back for more.

In the long run, everybody concedes that the President will be obliged to take some action. The best guess is that Israel will be offered more planes and credits, and perhaps a closer working arrangement in defense. But this will be done quietly and with little public stir—slipped over the transom, as it were.

What this means is that the American response in the Near East will be a weak response—slow in coming and almost invisible. No doubt there are good reasons for this weakness.

Delay is necessary because the Nixon administration has been too obsessed with Cambodia to think about anything else. The Congress and much of the country have been so upset by Cambodia that any blaring forth of new undertakings would excite a hostile reaction. But that only says that the weak response in the Near East is rooted in conditions created by the Cambodian strike.

One weak response, to be sure doesn't mean the end of the world. But it shows that the claim about Cambodia strengthening the American hand around the world is contemptible. It is, in fact, only slightly less contemptible than the suggestion that the blame for this country's weakened condition should fall on those who protested, rather than those who undertook, the wholly unnecessary move in Cambodia.

DEDICATION OF RICHARD B. RUSSELL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH CENTER

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, on last Saturday, May 9, ceremonies were held in my hometown of Athens, Ga., dedicating the new Federal Food Utilization Laboratory. It was not only a program for that purpose but was also an occasion to honor our senior—and beloved—Senator from Georgia, the Honorable RICHARD B. RUSSELL, for whom this Agricultural Research Center has been officially named. Master of ceremonies was Dr. C. H. Neufeld, director of the Richard B. Russell Agricultural Research Center.

After a pleasant presentation of music by the Georg Telemann University of Georgia Baroque Ensemble, Mayor Julius F. Bishop of Athens, welcomed the crowd of some 400 people and Dr. Fred C. Davison, president of the University of Georgia, thanked Senator RUSSELL for his long and devoted service to advancement of agricultural research in Georgia and in the United States.

The main address of the day was delivered by Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. Clifford M. Hardin. Secretary Hardin was appropriately introduced by Dr. George W. Irving, Jr., administrator in Washington of the Agricultural Research Service. Because of the fitness of Secretary Hardin's dedication remarks, I include them in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Secretary Hardin introduced his comments by reading the following telegram from President Nixon:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
May 9, 1970.

HON. CLIFFORD M. HARDIN,
Care Richard B. Russell Agricultural Research Center—College Station Road, Athens, Ga.:

The Richard B. Russell Agricultural Research Center bears an illustrious name—one which stands for much that has brought pride and honor to the State of Georgia and to the Nation. I know that the results achieved at this center will improve the quality of living for people of the Southeast and indeed, throughout the world during the years ahead. It is fitting these benefits should continue to come to us in the name of an outstanding and dedicated public servant, RICHARD B. RUSSELL.

RICHARD NIXON.

ADDRESS OF SECRETARY HARDIN

It is appropriate for us to gather here today to dedicate a superb new laboratory for agricultural research in honor of the man who has made its existence possible.

Years ago, Senator Richard B. Russell foresaw the need for a laboratory such as this in order to meet the new and very difficult problems caused by changing to a different kind of agriculture here in the Southeast. He maintained interest in this facility when it seemed that it could never possibly materialize as he envisioned it. He persisted in his efforts to make others see the need . . . and the benefits . . . of such a laboratory.

And once the decision was made to build, Senator Russell fought for money for personnel, for programs, and for additional unforeseen expenses as the need arose.

This splendid facility—with all that it promises for the agriculture of this area and the Nation—is a lasting tribute to Senator Russell's long concern for agricultural research. He has been a strong friend of the Department of Agriculture and a strong supporter of agricultural research.

The Richard B. Russell Agricultural Research Center is the newest of five regional laboratories of the Department's Agricultural Research Service. Their primary mission is to conduct utilization research on agricultural commodities—to develop new and expanded uses for these commodities, including greater efficiency of usage. Included in this work is the search for methods of preserving and protecting the native good qualities of farm products. The research explores all outlets for processed products—for foods, feeds, clothing, shelter, industrial chemicals and equipment, the whole vast range of man's needs.

Let me review briefly how this Center came into being.

Eight years ago, during Fiscal Year 1962, the Senate at the request of Senator Russell began hearings on the need for a facility in the Southeast to conduct utilization research on the agricultural crops of that region. In September 1963, Senator Russell officially proposed the Center to the Senate. Arguments for a new facility in the Southeast were based on (1) the shift from cotton to diversified agricultural crops, (2) the rise of meat and poultry production and the simultaneous needs for more vital foodstuffs, (3) the changing labor supply with a consequential need for mechanical harvesting and new crop varieties suitable for such practices, (4) the increasing production of oilseeds, (5) the growing need for more processing of agricultural products to give farmers additional returns, and (6) the need to supply processed products tailored to meet the specific needs of domestic and foreign markets.

Funds for the new Center were included in the 1964 Agricultural Appropriations Bill. Architectural plans were developed and construction was begun late in 1966. The build-

ing is now essentially complete. A skeleton staff of 19 people moved into the building last May. Now, one year later, I understand that the staff consists of about 100 people. When completely staffed, the Center will employ about 500 people, 150 of whom will be senior scientists.

A few words about the organization of the Center. The Richard B. Russell Agricultural Research Center is a part of the Agricultural Research Service under Dr. George Irving. The work here is divided into seven groups. There are three commodity groups—fruits and vegetables; animal products; and feeds, forages, and oilseeds. And there are four groups that might be called support groups—engineering, pharmacology, biochemistry, and product evaluation.

Even though work will be concentrated on crops and on poultry and livestock products important here in the Southeast, the findings will have an impact across the Nation and the world.

This Center will have a strong cooperative State-Federal program under which the Southern State Agricultural Experiment Stations and other divisions of the Agricultural Research Service will work jointly toward the solution of major regional problems.

In this effort, scientists from other State and Federal organizations will work at the Center where this is feasible and advantageous to the research. This kind of close cooperation will enable us to bring an unusually wide range of scientific disciplines to bear on solving agricultural problems. In fact, I understand that this Center will include the widest range of scientists of any laboratory in the Department of Agriculture.

As Dr. Davison (Dr. Fred C. Davison, president, University of Georgia) has indicated earlier, a very close cooperation already exists with the University of Georgia. Some 23 faculty and graduate students of the University's Botany Department are housed in the Center, conducting cooperative research with the scientists here. The programs of the Center and of the University are adding up to be more than the sum of the individual efforts as a result of this cooperation.

Dr. Neufeld (Dr. C. H. Harry Neufeld, Director of the Center) has contacted the other Southern State Agricultural Experiment Stations to explore the possibilities of their also joining this exciting research adventure. These relations with the other Stations will make the work of this particular Center more meaningful to all the States of this region.

Cooperative State-Federal ventures such as these have long been encouraged and emphasized by the Agricultural Research Service. State-Federal research cooperation has been basic to Department policy, and to whatever success we have achieved in agriculture. It will be basic to any success that we may achieve in the future.

Athens, Georgia is an ideal site for this Center. It has the advantages of close association with the University of Georgia, including its excellent academic staff and atmosphere, library facilities, and graduate school. It is centrally located with respect to the Southeastern region, to existing Department field stations, and to the strong research underway in Georgia and nearby States.

As far as this facility itself is concerned, surely it is one of the most splendid and best equipped of its kind in the world. It cannot fail to impress. I understand this white limestone building houses 145 laboratories and 58 constant temperature rooms, several of them completely equipped for low-temperature studies. I also understand that the pharmacological facilities here are among the most advanced in the world. And, of course, this very attractive 400-seat auditorium that we are in speaks for itself. The location of this Center, on top of the highest hill in Athens, is superb.

The Richard B. Russell Agricultural Research Center is indeed a magnificent struc-

ture—a fitting tribute to the man who played the predominant role in its inception, development, and realization.

And now it is my special pleasure to unveil a portrait of Senator Russell. This portrait, which was painted by Mrs. Carolyn Heery Berry, was a gift of the architects Heery and Heery, who did such a splendid job of designing the building. Mrs. Berry is the daughter of Mr. C. Wilmer Heery. Senator Russell's portrait will be mounted in the lobby of the Center.

Senator RUSSELL was recognized after the address and he expressed his appreciation for the honors accorded him. He gave the epitome of his philosophy on research when he stated that he had always advocated the ideal of the need to "develop new things and expand old ideas."

To conclude this impressive ceremony another Georgian of whom we are all proud was called upon by Dr. Neufeld. This was my friend and constituent, J. Phil Campbell of Oconee County, Ga., the Under Secretary of Agriculture for the United States. He told of the help that Senator RUSSELL had always been when Mr. Campbell was Georgia's Commissioner of Agriculture and how fitting it was to dedicate the new facility in the name of RICHARD B. RUSSELL.

Among those who attended the event were Mrs. Clifford Hardin, wife of the Secretary; Mrs. J. Phil Campbell, Jr., the Under Secretary's wife; Mr. Michael McCloud and Mr. Dan Tate of Senator TALMADGE's staff; Charles Campbell, Powell Moore, Proctor Jones, and Mrs. Phil Pritchett of Senator RUSSELL's staff; Cecil Chapman, head of Georgia's Soil Conservation Service; L. W. Eberhardt, head of Georgia's Cooperative Extension Service, Paul Holmes, ASC program head; C. Wilmer Heery, senior architect for the building, and Mrs. Heery, John McDuffie, farmers home administrator for Georgia, and a host of other dignitaries and friends of Senator RUSSELL.

The entire program was a wonderful tribute to a great American. I am glad to have had a part in honoring Senator RUSSELL.

WHY GOD!

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, the full tragedy of war never completely reaches our hearts until we hear from a relative or neighbor who has lost a loved one on the field of battle.

It brings home forcibly the need for bringing to a rapid and complete end the military action in the Far East and the launching of an all-encompassing effort to prevent future wars.

I believe that most know that I am firm in my convictions that we, as a nation and a people, should not be in Vietnam and Cambodia and should never have gone there militarily, but it has not made me forget those who did answer the call of their country and in many instances when they did not believe in our participation in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, these men and their loved ones are the heroes and victims of this turbulent era—the victims of what I consider the poor and questionable judgment of too many chief executives of this Nation.

For those who seem to forget the youth who have been sent to Vietnam and their loved ones at home, I place before them in the RECORD the following letter and poem received from a constituent and neighbor, Mrs. Helen W. Vander Heide, whose 20-year-old son, Pfc. Gerard J. Walker, was drafted on July 16, 1969, and killed in Vietnam on December 26, 1969.

DEAR MR. HELSTOSKI: It is the worse event a mother can endure when her only son is killed in battle. Part of this is what I went through when I first heard of it and as time goes on I just can't forget.

It can't be classified as a poem and I am sure there is many a one who wouldn't read it, but I'm sure every mother in my position will understand.

Perhaps, you can publish this for Memorial Day and make parents realize while they still have their children talk, listen, be interested in their whereabouts, guide them and most of all show them love and respect, I am

Respectfully,
HELEN W. VANDER HEIDE.

WHY GOD

When a man in uniform knocks upon your door and asks,
Are you the mother of,—you know he need not say no more.
For you just stand in shock and cry, Oh God please, God no!
It's at this very moment that life seems so unreal
You look at him and say, are you sure that it's my boy?
With heavy heart and bowed head, he says just one word, yes.
You walk away in a daze with just one thought in mind.
Oh, God, please answer me, why did it have to be.
It's now that I must realize his future dreams are past
But the twenty years I've had with him will never, never pass.
As time goes on I'm remembering more and sometimes hate comes through
But I know I should be grateful for he is now at peace.
Although my heart is heavy as I ask God to help me through
Perhaps some day he'll answer me why it had to be.

A MEANINGFUL INVOCATION

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, at a recent public function in my Congressional District, one of my outstanding constituents, a civic leader in her own right, Mrs. Nettie Kemp of East Kingston, N.H. was called upon to give the invocation. Her prayer was so significantly appealing in all humility and wisdom that I include it in the RECORD at this point so it may be shared with others who realize that in this time of enormous stress the citizens of this great Nation still seek and depend upon divine guidance:

Dear Heavenly Father, We thank thee for the privilege of meeting here in these pleasant surroundings. We pray for our President and those who have been elected to Public Office. Help them to exert moral leadership and to stand visible and uncompromising for what is right and decent in government. Keep us mindful that Liberty is not only to be loved but to be lived; that Freedom does not mean the right to do as we please, but rather the responsibility to do what is right. Protect us from our enemies without and from weakness and self destruction from within. In all decisions and crisis of the coming days, grant that we may remain one nation under God indivisible with liberty and justice for all. Amen

JOHN F. KARCH

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a more constructive approach to the sentiment now being expressed by some of the young people today. First Lt. John F. Karch, USMC, has returned from a combat tour in Southeast Asia. While he is not in support of the administration's policy in Southeast Asia, the primary purpose of his suggestion is in the hopes it will help the young people in a more civilized and constructive approach in expressing their disagreement in the future.

The remarks follow:

REMARKS BY JOHN F. KARCH

One year ago, I returned from a combat tour in Southeast Asia. I did not agree with the former Administration's policies in that theater, and I am stunned at the systematic blundering and the periodic refighting of the same battles which is even more prevalent in this Administration's strategy. Now we have even further involvement in Cambodia. Still, I am highly indignant toward criticism without constructive suggestion.

Having been on the receiving end of both "bitch speeches" of youth leaders, and NVA and VC ordinance on numerous occasions, I equate these factors but draw the distinction that while the former breeds bitter resentment, the latter inspires sheer terror. Neither is enjoyable or tolerable within the limits of acceptance as generated by life in this country. And for those who are unable or just too stubborn to recognize fact, this is a relatively damn fine country.

I certainly feel, as do many of the "silent majority" who have undergone the same experiences, that there does exist a meaningful realization of what freedom and life are, and which is being lost amid present youth unrest. I feel quite strongly that it is extremely unfortunate that the university "intelligentsia", sheltered beneath the non-responsible shield of idealism afforded by the environment of academic security, have lacked such fundamental perception in attempting to come to grips with reality. Herein lies the Administration-Youth gap.

Students must bring their education and idealism to bear upon experience, and government should encourage this and provide opportunities for it to be accomplished. It is only in this way that constructive alteration of social injustices may be facilitated by channeling and controlling youthful assertiveness and free thought. The continued rape of our society and its institutions by a few emotionally aroused radicals is not the answer.

There must be a way of rectifying such a situation at an expense which certainly would not surpass that created by damages, police forces, clean-up, and so forth caused by present massive demonstrations, confrontations, and killings. One suggestion would operate on the principle of learned experience similar to government intern programs, but with an optimal representation of campuses throughout the nation.

Some guidelines for such a program, hereafter referred to as SAFE—Student Association For Education—are as follows:

1. Each class—sophomore, junior, and senior—would elect one or two campus representatives to SAFE.

2. The graduating class, prior to graduation, would elect an appropriately oriented representative to the SAFE Nation's Congress.

3. This national member would reside in Washington for one year and would participate in Congressional and Senatorial functions, under the cognizance of their state's representatives in the Capitol.

4. National representatives would periodically meet to pass resolutions on relevant issues arising from feedback from the campus representatives, and would submit a valid referendum to Congress.

5. National representatives would be paid by the government a predetermined salary and allowances. This is not to imply government control of the stabilizing attitude and esprit of the organization.

6. The responsibilities of the organization and the national representatives would be enumerated in an appropriate constitution drafted by SAFE and primarily encompass the coordination of campus and national issues and activities.

Thus, dissenting students have a responsive voice in government among their own generation, while other students, who want to receive the education for which they have paid, are afforded a safe opportunity without fear of federal or faculty responsiveness to a relatively few obnoxious protestors creating such further social injustices as closing down our institutions of learning.

The present situation of students and sympathizers who are infatuated with a fad of revolutionary hysteria, demonstrating about the streets of Washington and other cities, emotionally exercising their freedom of expression while confining the freedom of others toward business, entertainment, and so forth, appears a rather inequitable way of providing a point of contention. The place of the student, initially but certainly not entirely, is primarily in the classroom where knowledge can be gained to combine with realistic experience; and then changes in the social environment can be effectively made. At present, this country has a minority of loud-mouthed "maggots" who are feeding, although superficially healthfully, upon the decaying flesh of the festering wounds of our society without providing a constructive healing process. Changes must and will come about, but not within the present divisions of dissention. This is one suggestion in the right direction.

**THE 179TH ANNIVERSARY OF
POLISH CONSTITUTION**

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Congress and the American people to this 179th anniversary of the May 3 constitution in Poland. This constitution was adopted in 1791. It created one of the first constitutional governments on the

continent of Europe. The significance of this holiday should be understood by every American.

The history of the Polish people has not been one of continued individual freedom. They have been subjected to numerous invasions and tyrannous foreign dictatorships. Their struggle has often been quiet. Even today they are fighting to regain the natural rights and liberties which have been denied them by the tyranny of communism.

But the will of the people as the source of political power in civil society has survived even under Communist domination. The ideals of local government and judicial autonomy of private ownership and free enterprise, of religious freedom, of access to public office and the responsibility of elected officials, are still valued highly by the people of Poland. These are the concepts of government which the Polish people first wrote into their constitution in 1791, and which they have continued to uphold since that time. It is important for Americans to remember a constitution as old as our own which to millions of Poles still symbolizes freedom.

**HOUSE RESOLUTION 91 ADOPTED
IN DELAWARE**

HON. WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, in Dover, Del., the House of Representatives of the 125th General Assembly of the State of Delaware recently adopted House Resolution 91, which, among other things, supports the right of every human being to express his faith in God and Bible publicly without fear or threat of censure.

This resolution, in my view, is deeply significant and of far-reaching importance and I consider it an honor to be among those to whom a copy of this formal expression of the will of the representatives of the citizens of Delaware was forwarded.

It is also my pleasure at this time to commend to all Members the full text of the resolution which follows:

**HOUSE RESOLUTION No. 91, RELATING TO
DECISIONS OF ASTRONAUTS REGARDING
RELIGION**

Whereas, the attention of the House of Representatives of the 125th General Assembly has been called to the efforts of Madeline Murray O'Hara to invoke censure upon America's astronauts; and

Whereas, Mrs. O'Hara recently obtained 27,000 signed letters protesting the decision of the astronauts to read the Bible as a Christmas message to the world from their spacecraft while orbiting the moon in December of 1968; and

Whereas, Mrs. O'Hara plans to present these letters to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration with a demand that the astronauts be publicly censured for their act, and that any further demonstrations of faith by public leaders be prevented; and

Whereas, Mrs. O'Hara has been successful in earlier efforts to influence national policy on behalf of her "religion" which she avows to be atheism; and

Whereas, the House of Representatives of the 125th General Assembly is disturbed by the efforts of Mrs. O'Hara to impose her personal crusades upon the general public;

Now therefore, be it resolved, by the House of Representatives of the 125th General Assembly of the State of Delaware, that it make known its deep appreciation and whole-hearted support of the Astronauts' decision to read the Bible from the Spacecraft as they orbited the moon during December of 1968, and

Be it further resolved, that the House of Representatives of the 125th General Assembly supports the right of every human being to express his faith in God and Bible publicly without fear or threat of censure; and

Be it further resolved, that a copy of this Resolution be entered upon the Journal of the House and a copy forwarded to National Aeronautics and Space Administration, to President Richard M. Nixon, and to U.S. Senators J. Caleb Boggs and John J. Williams, and to U.S. Representative William V. Roth, Jr.

EDITORIAL ON INCOME SUPPLEMENTS

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call your attention to a recent editorial by WCBS-TV which casts new light on the question of income supplements. A study cited in the editorial indicates that supplementing a poor worker's income may actually provide him with motivation to work more, not less. I commend it to my colleagues and to include it in the RECORD:

WCBS-TV EDITORIAL: WELFARE REFORM

One misconception about people is that they are basically lazy. For years, it has been assumed that given the choice between more work and more leisure, most workers would choose more leisure. But that's not really the case.

Now, it is true that back in the days when Warren Harding was in the White House, steel workers put in a twelve-hour day, and an eighty-four hour week. Today, of course the 40-hour week is standard. But statistics show, that the work week for most people is getting longer because of overtime. In 1941, for example, the average work week in manufacturing was slightly over 40 hours. In 1965, it was 41 hours, and rising.

What's the reason for this? Well, according to some economists who have studied this phenomenon, the reason is this: Men are likely to choose more work than more leisure when extra income is the reward. People these days tend to place a higher value on goods that they can buy than on time off.

This fact is not only pertinent for understanding what motivates the industrial worker, or the white-collar worker but it also appears to be meaningful in terms of the low-income workers, even the welfare family. For recent studies of low-income families in New Jersey suggest that they, too, will choose to work harder when extra income is provided. This study by the Office of Economic Opportunity tests one of the basic concepts in President Nixon's welfare reform program. That concept is that direct federal assistance should be provided, up to a point, to supplement the income of the working poor.

Some people feared, reasonably enough, that if poor workers received income supple-

ments from the Federal Government, they'd simply get lazy, and work less. Though results of the study are not final, they do suggest that poor people are as motivated as most of us. Those receiving experimental income supplements tended to work harder, not less, the study showed.

In our opinion, the implications of this study weaken the long-cherished notion that income assistance stifles ambition. New data suggest the opposite is true. They suggest another reason why Congress should approve without delay legislation providing income supplements as a reform of our welfare system.

ILLINOIS EDITOR ON KENT STATE

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Coles County Times-Courier in Charleston, Ill., last week commented editorially on the tragedy at Kent State University. I would like to share his views with my colleagues in the House.

The editor, Buryl F. Engleman, made this observation:

We do not mean to sit in judgment of the administration of Kent State University. But the failure of many institutions to act with firmness has made it easier for the revolutionaries to expand their efforts.

Elsewhere in the editorial Mr. Engleman notes that the tragedy affected him probably more than anyone else in his community because three generations of his family "have been connected with Kent State."

Mr. Engleman was being modest about his family's "connection" with Kent State. The fact is that his late father, Dr. J. O. Engleman was president for 10 years from 1928 to 1938 and Engleman Hall on the university's campus in northeastern Ohio is named for him. Buryl himself taught for several years at Kent State and his wife Thelma is a graduate of that university. His son Jim also has been a member of the Kent State faculty. The editorial follows:

MUSINGS OF AN EDITOR

(By Buryl Engleman)

Perhaps no campus violence in the United States has had a more shocking and saddening effect on the nation than Monday's incident at Kent State University in northeastern Ohio in which four students—two of them coeds—were killed in gunfire from National Guardsmen.

Half a score additional students were seriously wounded and others were injured in the general melee. The eye-witness account of the disturbance in yesterday's newspaper was both sickening and frightening.

The incident no doubt affected the writer more deeply than anyone else in the community, although several Kent State alumni and former faculty members have served or are serving on the Eastern Illinois University faculty. However, three generations of our family have been connected with Kent State.

Educators, politicians, and others are seeking to fix the blame for the tragedy, as if some one individual were to blame. This, of course, is absurd.

President Nixon said that the tragedy "should convince educators and students that when dissent turns to violence, it invites tragedy."

There is no comfort in the President's remarks, but it tends to broaden the basis for blame. Certainly university administrators who have shown more inclination to yield to demands of lawless revolutionaries rather than place the highest priorities on protecting the rights of the vast majority of students who came to college to learn, has made it easier for lawless militants to stir up campus after campus.

We do not mean to sit in judgment of the administration of Kent State University. But the failure of many institutions to act with firmness has made it easier for the revolutionaries to expand their efforts.

The National Guardsmen cannot be blameless, for they fired without an order to do so, according to their commander, who added—perhaps in mitigation—that they felt their lives were endangered.

The rioters assembled contrary to rules and refused to disband when ordered to do so. The National Guard had been summoned by business men to restore peace after rioters had damaged the downtown district.

It hasn't been made clear whether the victims of the shooting were bystanders or part of the mob. When armed troops are required there's no such thing as a safe spot in the area for onlookers.

There are a great many obvious lessons to be learned from the incident—lessons for the revolutionaries, rioters, university administrators, guardsmen and onlookers.

"When dissent turns to violence, it invites tragedy."

SOME STUDENTS ARE DOING CONSTRUCTIVE THINGS IN THEIR COMMUNITIES

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that there are students in America who are doing constructive things in their local communities rather than being out in the streets trying to tear our country down.

I insert at this point the following letter I recently received from members of the Sunray High School Health Council of Sunray, Tex., which is in the heart of the congressional district I represent:

SUNRAY INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Sunray, Tex., May 5, 1970.

HON. BOB PRICE,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRICE: The students in our school are in the process of organizing the Sunray High School Health Council. Our purposes are to educate ourselves, the students in our grade schools, and the adults of our community in areas of smoking, drug abuse, alcoholism, pollution, cancer, heart disease, tuberculosis and emphysema.

We have borrowed "Smoking Sam" from the top of Texas Tuberculosis and Respiratory Disease Association and are now demonstrating to our students the amount of smoke, tar and nicotine that "Smoking Sam" has in his clear glass lungs as the result of his smoking. "Smoking Sam", a mannequin, actually smokes filter-tipped cigarettes.

We are planning to sponsor a "No Smoke Day" in Sunray. We plan to ask all smokers in Sunray to give up cigarettes on that day. We will ask that these smokers donate the money they save to our organization. A part of the money will be used to take care of our local expenses. The rest will be donated to a health organization, possibly the Top of Texas Tuberculosis and Respiratory Disease Association.

We are hopeful that our idea for high school health councils will "catch on" and spread to other schools. We plan to seek invitations to visit surrounding schools to give our "Smoking Sam" program and we plan to offer our assistance in helping students of other schools organize similar high school health councils.

We tell you these things so you will know the request we are making of you is a well founded one that may be conducive to much good on the scene in America today.

Our request is for free materials concerning the areas of health indicated above. We must build a library for ourselves so our information is accurate and reliable. We believe you will be willing and able to assist us in this.

Very truly yours,
SUNRAY HIGH SCHOOL HEALTH
COUNCIL,

MARGARET WALKER,
President.
KATHY GAMBLIN,
Vice-President.
LESLIE TEAFF,
Secretary.

SPEECH BY SENATOR BIRCH BAYH

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I insert the following remarks delivered by Senator BIRCH BAYH of Indiana, before the Anti-Defamation League in New York City on May 11, 1970:

SPEECH BY SENATOR BIRCH BAYH

These are trying times in which we live. The institutions of America are under extraordinary attack. I need hardly remind this audience of the decade of violence behind us—from Selma to Detroit, from Berkeley to Columbia—and of the terrible cycle of violence breeding repression and repressions breeding violence.

Surely, America cannot tolerate the constant threat of violent revolution. But every intelligent American must realize by now that we cannot, merely by imprisoning a few extremists in our society, respond to the voices of question and criticism—honest questions, legitimate criticisms—which a great many Americans have raised.

It has often been said that this administration is in tune with the policies of our time, that America is exhausted from the efforts we have made in the cause of social progress over the past decade. Go slow is the word in the legislative area of people programs. But history tells us that leaders who abdicate their responsibility to lead, who refuse to face problems when they should be faced, eventually reap a bitter harvest of contempt for their lack of forthrightness. Frightened by innovation and dismayed by dissent, the present administration strives for mediocrity. Unable to break free of conformity and conventionality to deal effectively with the nation's problems, it becomes ever more obsessed with security. That this administration might fear revolution is understandable. For as President John F. Kennedy once said:

"Those who make peaceful revolution impossible will make violent revolution inevitable."

When year after year this nation seems incapable of arresting the deterioration of its cities; incapable of cleaning up its streets; incapable of halting a war that has cost us 40,000 men; incapable of stopping the growth of crime and the fear all of this breeds, it

is not unreasonable to expect that a good many citizens will explode in violent rage as a result of persistent and apparently hopeless frustration.

Undeniably the violent war on society is being escalated by those who insist the only way to reform the system is to destroy it and start afresh. Those who engage in such violence must be dealt with firmly. But the most serious danger to America today comes not from the activities of young militants, but from the magnitude of the backlash that may result from the increasing polarization of our society.

The first symptom of insecurity is unrealistic fear of unorthodoxy. It attaches itself to administrations that lack any clear sense of purpose and direction and it spreads like a malignant growth in the body politic. Because of fear there is public acceptance of seemingly small sacrifices and insignificant relaxations of time honored rules of law and justice. Zealous men in well intentioned law enforcement shortcuts undermine the very foundations of liberty.

History has shown that oppression very frequently has innocent origins. For as the great Justice Louis D. Brandeis once observed, "The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well meaning but without understanding."

Certainly President Nixon, Vice President Agnew, Attorney General Mitchell and other leading members of the administration are well meaning men. But they are also zealous men and the zeal of this administration exceeds both its wisdom and its understanding.

I do not minimize the need to put the full force of the law against terror and violence. But more vigorous law enforcement is at best a partial palliative, not a permanent cure for the problems of crime and violence. The cure is to eliminate the causes of frustration before it builds to explosive proportions. Unfortunately the remedies of this administration are essentially designed to suppress, not to relieve.

The New York Times recently quoted one of President Nixon's domestic advisers as saying, "We are facing the most severe internal security threat this country has seen since the depression. It wouldn't make a bit of difference if the war and racism ended overnight. We're dealing with the criminal mind, with people who have snapped for some reason." Such a statement indicates both lack of wisdom and lack of understanding.

A recent Harris poll conducted for CBS disclosed the disturbing fact that more than 50 percent of those Americans interviewed indicated a willingness to dispense with the Bill of Rights. So we cannot count on a frightened populace to restrain those well meaning, zealous men in high places who might be tempted to engage in insidious encroachment on our constitutional rights through lack of understanding.

But many of us in the Senate and in the House of Representatives are disturbed by what we perceive to be an unhealthy trend toward suppression. My colleague Senator Ervin of North Carolina is a man with a very hearty respect for the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. After a detailed examination of the Administration's 400 page D.C. Crime Bill, Sam Ervin labeled it "the most repressive, near-sighted, intolerant, unfair and vindictive legislation that the Senate has ever been presented."

Why was Senator Ervin, certainly no knee jerk liberal, so disturbed? Because the Administration's bill provides for preventive detention, no knock searches, extensive wire-tapping, lowered age limits for juvenile court and changes in the burden of proof in juvenile cases. The bill even includes a provision requiring every citizen who sues a policeman for false arrest to pay the policeman's lawyer—even if the policeman acted illegally and the citizen wins his case.

In its zeal without wisdom approach to

combating crime, the administration has recently given serious consideration to a proposal that the state begin massive psychological tests of all six year olds to uncover "delinquent character structure." This 1984 scheme, reminiscent of some Orwellian nightmare, called for those children in whom the government detected "violent and homicidal tendencies" to get treatment and guidance and finally, if they failed to respond, a place in a government camp. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare eventually rejected the proposal because it could all too clearly result in pre-ordained doom for a child because of what he saw in an ink blot. But the frightening thing is that the President took the proposal seriously enough to ask HEW Secretary Robert Finch to study it and report on the "advisability of setting up pilot projects embodying some of these approaches."

One provision in the Organized Crime Bill authorizes federal grand juries to issue reports on "noncriminal misconduct" by public officeholders, on organized crime and on proposed changes in laws or governmental policies and to report publicly. By allowing grand juries to make public evidence that falls short of what is required for a criminal charge the proposal allows men to be tried in secret and presents opportunities for prosecutors to use grand juries for political harassment.

Since the function of law is to assure liberty it is imperative that each of us scrutinize carefully each official request for more authority undertaken in the name of security. Arrests for investigation have been held unconstitutional, but the Attorney General has recently proposed something that looks ominously similar in purpose.

He has asked that the police, on obtaining a court order, be empowered to require anyone they have reasonable grounds to suspect of a crime "to submit to nontestimonial identification procedures." These procedures would include fingerprints, palmprints, footprints, measurements, blood specimens, urine samples, hair samples, handwriting examples, voice samples, photographs and line-ups.

The Fourth Amendment says a person can be arrested only if there is probable cause to believe him guilty of a crime. And currently, only after a person has been arrested can be subjected to identification procedures such as those described. Our society has an obligation not only to protect itself, but to protect a heritage of individual freedom. The vagueness of the term "reasonable grounds" which is substituted for "probable cause" and the broad range of the proposed examinations make the possibility of federal investigators using the law for fishing expeditions aimed at citizens they consider undesirable all too likely.

There was a time in America when if you paid the postage to send a first class letter you could be relatively sure no one would read it until it reached the person you sent it to. And there was a time in America when it was accepted that a gentleman was someone you could count on not to read someone else's mail. Of course, in those days you could also talk on the telephone with considerable confidence that no one was listening to what you said. And you could conduct confidential conversations in the privacy of your office or home without fear that a policeman had planted a bug there to record the conversation.

But times change and recently the Postmaster General issued a new regulation authorizing the opening of mail without the addressee's permission.

Army Captain Christopher H. Pyle, who served for two years with the Army Intelligence Command has disclosed that almost 1,000 plainclothes Army investigators have been keeping tabs on civilian political activities throughout the country. The surveillance

program includes the collection and analysis of data on almost all forms of political protest activity and their leaders. According to Captain Pyle, Army intelligence agents attend political rallies, protest marches and other gatherings disguised as newsmen and students. Indeed, the existence of a microfilm file on civilian dissenters maintained by the counter-intelligence division of the office of the Army Chief of Staff for Intelligence has been confirmed by Thaddeus Beale, Undersecretary of the Army.

The Civil Service Commission maintains a blacklist containing the names of at least 1.5 million Americans who *might*, at some time, have been involved in what federal investigators term "subversive activity." No fixed standards are used in compiling the list. One does not have to be either arrested, charged or convicted of subverting the U.S. Government to be included on the list. And inclusion on the list effectively disqualifies you for federal employment. Much of the information gathered by investigative agencies and stashed away in government files is evaluated, uncorroborated, untrue and unimportant. The potential for misuse of this information is immense and frightening.

And Americans will not sleep any easier for the knowledge that a White House political operative, Clark Mollenhoff, has indiscriminate access to confidential income tax returns despite federal law and regulations designed to protect the individual taxpayer's right to privacy.

History has taught us that whenever any nation allows the freedom of its press to be circumscribed by government, the liberty of its people has suffered.

It was Thomas Jefferson who said, "Were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers, or newspapers without government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter."

But this administration has a deep seated mistrust of the press and has worked assiduously to undermine public confidence in a free press while at the same time launching a concentrated effort to intimidate the news media. The Vice President in particular has specialized in attacks on the press.

In the wake of the Senate's rejection of Judge G. Harrold Carswell's nomination to the Supreme Court the Vice President ascribed that rejection to the fact that the "liberal media" had "snowed" a lot of unsuspecting Senators.

The International Press Institute, representing some 1,600 publishers and editors in non-communist countries, has had considerable experience with the fragile nature of the concept of freedom of speech. Last January, in its annual review of press freedom around the world, the institute said Vice President Agnew presented "the most serious threat to the freedom of information in the Western World."

The intimidation inherent in the Vice President's attack on the news media is reinforced by the actions of other members of the Nixon Administration. Members of the White House staff, Ronald Ziegler and Herbert G. Klein have routinely called television stations in advance of presidential speeches to ask about plans to comment on the speech and inquire about what any planned editorial commentary is likely to be.

When Eric Sevareid gave an interview to a station in Phoenix, Arizona, following the Agnew speech attacking the networks some months ago, a member of the Federal Communications Commission, Leonard Weinless, called the station personally to ask for an audio tape of the interview. Just three days after he took office last October, Dean Burch, Chairman of the FCC, telephoned TV network executives personally to ask for transcripts of their commentaries on President Nixon's November 3 Vietnam speech.

In 1969 and 1970, the Justice Department has served subpoenas demanding records from reporters of the *New York Times*, *Life*,

Newsweek, CBS and *Fortune Magazine* concerning the sources of their information.

In view of all this, it is easy to understand why newsmen everywhere might feel intimidated—despite denials by the administration that any intimidation was intended.

There has been an insidious effort made to equate dissent or disagreement with criminal attitudes or lack of patriotism.

Lacking understanding, well intentioned men zealously pursue a course that endangers both our nation's stability and the liberty of our people. President Nixon took office promising to bring us together. But the specialty of this administration seems to be polarization of the American people by playing on their frustrations, prejudices and fears. We were promised lowered voices, but we receive the shrill, divisive rhetoric of the Vice President. We were promised an end to an odious war, but we receive an expansion of the conflict. We were promised an end to domestic turmoil, but we receive an escalation of violence that leaves a University campus littered with the bleeding bodies of dead and dying students. And when we protest all of this well meaning men, lacking wisdom, move to stifle dissent.

To be sure it is not always popular or good politics to speak out, to object. All of us might do well in these troubled times to remember the comment of Pastor Niemoller a quarter of a century ago in Nazi Germany.

"... They came after the Jews. And I was not a Jew. So I did not object.

"Then they came after the Catholics. And I was not a Catholic. So I did not object.

"Then they came after the trade unionists. I was not a trade unionist. So I did not object.

"Then they came after me. And there was no one left to object."

Let the record show that I object. I object to the demagogic divisive, and dangerous course we are pursuing and I hope that you do.

I object to the effort to pit one American against another, black against white, young against old, poor against affluent, North against South. I object to efforts to mute those who disagree. I object to anything less than an all out effort to finish the unfinished business of America—the business of making this country truly beautiful again, truly a land of equal opportunity for each and every mother's son and daughter the business of restoring love, not hate, compassion, not selfishness—the business of finding meaningful peace in our neighborhoods, our nation and our world.

PRESIDENTIAL WAR: THE CENTRAL ISSUE

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, in today's Washington Post there appeared a column by Merlo J. Pusey concerning the growing constitutional threat posed by the expanding powers of the executive branch of our Government.

Because his views are well stated, I am now inserting them in the RECORD so as to share these important considerations with my colleagues.

The article follows:

PRESIDENTIAL WAR: THE CENTRAL ISSUE

(By Merlo J. Pusey)

It would be a pity if the serious constitutional issue underlying the current protests against the war should be lost in the cyclone of threats, anti-Nixonisms and obscenities.

However clumsy they may be in articulating it, the students do have a legitimate complaint. They face the possibility of being drafted against their will for service in a presidential war.

All the talk about pigs, revolution and smashing the establishment fails to alter the fact that, in one basic particular, the dissenters are the real traditionalists. Madison and Jefferson would have understood the anger on the campuses against the dispatch of young men to war in Southeast Asia at the dictation of one powerful executive. Madison and his colleagues wrote into the Constitution a flat prohibition against such a concentration of power. Yet it now seems to be accepted as standard American practice.

President Nixon reiterated his claim to the war power the other night in his news conference. In explaining that none of his advisers was responsible for the invasion of Cambodia, he said:

"Decisions, of course, are not made by vote in the National Security Council or in the Cabinet. They are made by the President with the advice of those, and I made this decision."

The question of going to Congress for the decision or even of discussing the matter with congressional leaders appears not to have been considered. The result of the decision was to extend the war to another country. By any interpretation that may be placed upon it, this was a grave involvement for the nation. Most of our Presidents would have deemed it imperative to go to Congress for authority to take such a step.

Now the administration is resisting the attempt of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to cut off funds for military operations in Cambodia. The committee has carefully tailored its restriction so as not to interfere with the President's avowed intention of clearing the sanctuaries and then withdrawing the American forces. But this has met with opposition from the State Department on the broad ground that actions of the Commander in Chief should not be subject to statutory restrictions.

There are several very interesting phrases in this letter which Assistant Secretary David H. Abshire sent to the Foreign Relations Committee. He contends that Congress should not limit military spending in such a way as to "restrict the fundamental powers of the President for protection of the armed forces of the United States." The implication seems to be that the President has authority to send our armed forces anywhere in the world, for purposes which he thinks appropriate, and then to take whatever additional action he may think necessary to protect those forces. Under this reasoning, it seems, no one can do anything to stop a presidential war.

This view of the war power is not, of course, unique with the Nixon administration. President Truman made even more expansive claims to unlimited presidential power, and L.B.J. was not far behind. Mr. Nixon's State Department is merely mouthing what has become accepted doctrine in the executive branch. But it is an outrageous doctrine that flies into the face of the letter and spirit of the Constitution and is repugnant to the basic concepts of democracy.

There is no principle about which the founding fathers were more adamant than denial of the war power to a single executive. After extended debate they gave Congress the power to raise and support armies, to control reprisals and to declare war, which, of course, includes the power of authorizing limited war. The President was given authority to repel sudden attacks, but there is nothing in the Constitution which suggests that this can be legitimately stretched to cover military operations in support of other countries in remote corners of the world.

In a literal sense, therefore, it is the students—or at least the nonviolent majority

among them—who are asserting traditional, constitutional principles. It is the State Department which is asserting a wild and unsupported view of presidential power that imperils the future of representative government.

Somehow the country must get back to the principle that its young men will not be drafted and sent into foreign military ventures without specific authority voted by Congress. That is a principle worth struggling for. Congress now seems to be groping its way back to an assertion of its powers, but its actions are hesitant and confused, as if it were afraid to assume the responsibility for policy-making in such vital matters of life and death.

Of course Congress is at a great disadvantage when it tries to use its spending power to cut off a presidential war for which it has recklessly appropriated funds in the past. In these circumstances, the President is always in a position to complain that the result will be to endanger our boys at the fighting fronts. Congress seems to have discovered no sound answer to that warning.

But Congress could stop presidential wars before they begin by writing into the law firm prohibitions against the building of military bases in foreign countries and the dispatch of American troops to other countries without specific congressional approval. If Congress is not willing or able to devise some means of restoring the war power to the representatives of the people, we may have to modify our system of government so that the President would become answerable to Congress for abuses of power. In the light of our Vietnam experience, it seems highly improbable that the country will long continue to tolerate unlimited power in one man to make war.

UNITED AIRCRAFT AND THE ENVIRONMENT

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the concern about the environment and our Nation's continuing efforts to build toward the future deserve full attention, for it is only through the efforts of all of us that we can succeed. I was therefore pleased when an industry in my district—the United Aircraft Corp.—recently sent to me a statement by its president, Arthur E. Smith, to make me aware of activities which the corporation has engaged in with respect to the environment and I offer it for the RECORD so that all Members may know of what one corporation has done in more than 25 years:

UNITED AIRCRAFT AND THE ENVIRONMENT

Environmental pollution has become a matter of overriding public concern in recent months.

For United Aircraft Corporation, it has been an area of concern, attention, and action for more than 25 years.

Specific measures by United Aircraft to control emissions from its industrial processes began in the mid-1940s with the installation of special equipment to remove atmospheric contaminants resulting from machining operations.

We have been active in pollution control ever since then. It was 20 years ago, for example, that we built facilities to treat liquid industrial wastes in an effort to safeguard waterways from pollution.

As our operations have grown in size and complexity, we have regularly reviewed, extended, and strengthened these programs. Today we believe United Aircraft's anti-pollution activities are unmatched in scope and sophistication by any in the state and in our industry.

We have spent millions of dollars on pollution control, and plans are already being implemented which call for our expenditure of several million dollars more on measures to further refine and improve these controls. Because Connecticut is where most of our operations are carried out, the main thrust of our anti-pollution efforts understandably has been in this state.

Counter-pollution work is in progress at all our plant sites. In time, money, and manpower, our heaviest anti-pollution investments have gone into our plant in East Hartford because it is our largest, with more people, more processes, and more machines than all our other Connecticut facilities combined.

Let us consider, first, smoke emissions. There are two main sources of such emissions at United Aircraft. One is the exhaust from our jet engines while they are on test. The other is from our central boiler houses, used primarily for heating our facilities.

We constantly monitor and control smoke emissions from our boilers to make sure that, barring temporary equipment failure, they fall well below limits fixed by state regulations. At our largest boiler house, in East Hartford, we have put in such smoke control measures as photoelectric sensing, automatic alarms and recorders, closed-circuit television, particle collectors, and the use, in part, of natural gas as fuel during much of the year.

Automatic devices measure the density of smoke going up the stacks and sound an alarm to alert operators when the density is rising so that necessary adjustments can be made while the emissions are still within permissible limits. The time, duration, and density of the smoke are recorded automatically, providing a permanent record for use in making any improvements that may be shown to be necessary.

These are not new measures by any means. Smoke density indicators and recorders have been on our boilers since 1943.

When we undertook a major expansion and modernization of the powerhouse in 1965, at a cost of \$4.7 million, pollution control was a key consideration in the planning and design. The two large boilers we bought then were ordered with mechanical collectors that remove tiny particles from the exhaust before it goes into the air outside. A centrifugal effect is imparted to the exhaust, forcing solid particles out of the gas stream for collection before the exhaust is released into the air.

These two big boilers also were equipped at that time to burn natural gas in addition to fuel oil. More and more, we are using natural gas because of the clean exhaust that it yields. Our plans call for equipping our older boilers, too, with natural gas capability. When this is done we plan to use fuel oil only during those periods when the supply of natural gas is insufficient to meet our needs.

In 1965 we initiated an engineering program to reduce the smoke sent out in the exhaust from the engines we manufacture. The project was highly successful. It resulted in the redesign of the combustion chamber for our most widely used commercial engine, the JT8D turbofan, so that now those being delivered exhaust hardly any smoke. Engines with the new combustion chamber entered production in early 1970, and the airlines are beginning to retrofit their jet fleets with the improved combustor in a program to reduce smoke around airports.

United Aircraft spent more than \$6 million on the research and development that went into the reduced-smoke combustion

chambers. From what they learned in this work, our engineers were able to incorporate smoke-reducing advances in the design of our newest commercial engine, the JT9D turbofan, which powers the big Boeing 747 superjet. As a result, the 747s now flying are virtually free of engine smoke.

Our success in reducing the exhaust smoke from airborne engines is paying off on the ground, too. The engine that gives off less smoke in flight also emits less smoke while undergoing ground tests. Through this single step, the company has reduced emissions from engines being tested at the East Hartford plant by about 75 per cent.

The most conspicuous emissions from our plant are the large white billows that rise from the test cells. These plumes are actually only steam, not smoke at all. They result from the testing of certain military engines equipped with afterburners. When these engines are tested, the temperature within the test house stack reaches a level that would cause the concrete house to break up if it were not cooled. For the brief period that the afterburner is operating, water is injected into the exhaust for cooling. The water quickly turns into steam and creates the mushrooming white billows so conspicuous to observers. This steam is harmless and, despite reports to the contrary, does not hide smoke, since afterburning engines are not smoke producers.

Perhaps it should be pointed out here that an aircraft gas turbine engine produces only about one-tenth of the pollution produced by an automobile engine per pound of fuel. The reason for this is that the aircraft engine represents a much cleaner and more efficient combustion process. That is why many persons concerned with pollution from motor vehicles are showing such interest in the turbine as an eventual replacement for the internal combustion engine.

The manufacturing processes that are conducted with our plants are classified as light industry, with machinery driven by individual electric motors that do not contaminate the environment in which they operate. Where certain processes create dust and oil mists, control devices have been installed to remove contaminants. We began installing these devices more than 25 years ago. The Pratt & Whitney Aircraft division alone has more than 800 air pollution control units in operation in its factory areas, representing a total value of about \$6 million.

Mechanical scrubbers have been installed, and more are on order, to cleanse gaseous discharges before they are released into the air. The plant engineering staffs constantly monitor the sources and points of industrial emissions. This enables them to spot and correct potentially troublesome areas quickly.

Even as United Aircraft contributes to the cleanup of Connecticut's air, the corporation is simultaneously embarked on a large-scale project in water pollution control to augment the extensive measures we have had in force for years. This program involves substantial improvements and advances in the industrial waste treatment systems at our plants in East Hartford, North Haven, Southington, and Middletown.

I think the corporation can take a modest pride in what it has done for years as a matter of normal practice on this subject of waste treatment. We have long had special plants and programs for treating and disposing of liquid industrial wastes, and these have had the approval of state and local authorities. We built these plants in 1950. They are valued at about \$3 million.

In 1963 a Congressional committee touring New England on the water pollution control problem visited our facilities and rated them among the most advanced in the region at that time.

With passage of the Clean Water Act by the Connecticut General Assembly in 1967,

new standards were established for use of the state's water resources. To meet these standards, we are now planning to spend another \$6 million on a modernization program that will incorporate the latest pollution control techniques. This new construction is directed toward updating our pretreatment and treatment systems so that they conform in all respects to the higher state standards. In developing plans for these projects, we have worked in cooperation with the state's Water Resources Commission, which has given its approval to our program. The new facilities are scheduled to go into operation beginning in 1971, providing even greater filtration, screening, and contaminant removal than at present. They will cost about a million and a half dollars a year to operate, in addition to the capital expenditure.

In all that we are doing and planning, we do not claim to have solved all the problems. But we do emphasize that anti-pollution is a continuing and concerted undertaking at United Aircraft, as it has been for many years. We have an effective program that is producing good results. We believe we have made significant progress and we are confident that additional progress will continue to be made.

THE PROPER WAY

HON. W. C. (DAN) DANIEL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD an exchange of letters between a father and son from my district. These letters come to grips with many aspects of a serious issue in our Nation today. This parent demonstrated the kind of patient understanding, yet firmness, which I believe his son sought. By responding promptly, intelligently, and seriously, the father proved that he was proud of and appreciated his son's maturity in seeking in the proper manner answers to questions which disturbed him.

I would encourage parents and others to use their knowledge and wisdom to bridge the generation gap.

The letters follow:

DEAR MOM AND DAD: As you know, this week has been one of strife for our country. Many demonstrations have occurred and 7 student lay dead at Kent State in Ohio, 4 of them as innocent bystanders. Here at W and M we have just finished a memorial service for these seven students. I am not a campus radical as you know but I do ask you this one thing: Please notify Dan Daniel and Sen. Byrd of your dismay of the action taken by the National Guard and urge them to take some action against the National Guard so that a tragedy like this may never happen again. It could happen here at W and M and I could lay dead in the streets, instead of seven people that we have never known.

I would also like for you to take under consideration the question of the U.S. invasion of Cambodia. Remember when Russia invaded Czechoslovakia and how everyone here screamed bloody murder? In essence I think that we have done the same thing even though Pres. Nixon says that it is only a short war. Dad, as you know this country does not need to overextend itself again as it has in Vietnam. At the present time the stock market is falling and there is a general recessionary period in our economy. We can not afford another 1929 because the tension among the people is too great to withstand

such. I really think that if we had a depression that our form of government could not prevail. This is not good. We must as Americans stand up and fight for our Nation.

Therefore, I am asking you two as voters to carefully consider the present actions of our government both in Cambodia and Kent State. I ask you this out of honor because I am myself baffled at the present situation and I think that with your guidance that we can work out something in order to help our nation get back on its feet.

May God always be with us as we pray for Peace in the world today.

Your son,

DEAR ———: Received your very fine letter and feel proud that you are doing some adult thinking about the conditions and changes in our country. The incident at Kent State was a very serious and tragic thing and should not have been allowed to happen, but who could have prevented it? Not the National Guard, not your mother or I, Nor your President. Only students, faculty and college officials can do that. What would you have done if you had been one of the National Guardsmen surrounded by several hundred students throwing rocks, bricks and closing in on you? You speak of innocent students, what were they doing in the front line of the mob? Are you sure none of these demonstrators haven't been used by some elements who would destroy America?

About Vietnam and Cambodia. I have to ask you to please draw your own conclusions but only after you have given it more thought. Neither you or your schoolmates have had to fight yet and I hope you won't ever have too. But if we do not stop the communists World march in places like Vietnam we'll have to try and stop it here in this country. Read back over the U.S. History and see similar actions Spanish American War over Cuba, War with Mexico, French and Indian War, showdown with Russia over missiles in Cuba, Berlin airlift, etc. Our America can not afford the luxury of isolation, if it does it will be surrounded by a sea of communism. You compare the invasion of Cambodia with Czechoslovakia. Would you permit someone to kill your friends and relatives and run into a house in which you were forbidden to enter. This was not happening in Czechoslovakia and still isn't nor will it. Communist forms of government cannot tolerate close inspection, people are not allowed to think for themselves. If your university were located in Czechoslovakia would you be allowed to demonstrate?

Your concern over a possible depression is noteworthy. I agree we cannot afford another 1929. I only ask you to dig far enough back to note that the 1929 depression was worldwide, not just in the U.S. It may be that this decline is a temporary thing; let's hope so anyway. Our government can prevail through any recession, the first was 1789, some in the early 1800's and how about the aftermath of the Civil War, the early 1900's and more recent about 1950. Look over the economics of these periods, I believe your confidence will rise.

Your recognition of need for guidance is the first step in becoming a good citizen and a leader of the world of tomorrow. This is part of growing in stature and maturity. Surely you must question, but the right to question also carries the obligation to support the decisions of your country once they are made. Isn't this the democratic way of life? This is the greatest nation on earth and it can overcome any crisis it faces if the people of the country will support their elected officials. You can make your voice heard by such letters as you have written and believe me, we do take you seriously. . . . I am sure if every young person at Kent State had taken the time to write his parents such a letter no one would have been killed.

In this letter I have not given you the answers to all the things that are baffling. I don't have all the answers. Only by discussing these questions and looking for answers together can we achieve what you and all people desire—peace. We must stand up and fight but as a nation and not a divided people.

Again let me say I am proud of your letter.

Love always,

FSU PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS
RELEVANT FOR OUR TIMES

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Stanley Marshall has been inaugurated as the president of the Florida State University in Tallahassee, Fla.

This proud institution has found the right man at the right time for the right place in this period of challenge for our colleges and universities. In his inaugural remarks, Dr. Marshall pointed out the role of the university in contemporary society in its relations with its students, its faculty, and the world at large.

Stan Marshall is an outstanding educator and brilliant administrator. Under his direction, I believe that our great Florida State University will continue on its path to greatness among the educational institutions of our Nation.

Because I feel that he has so much to say to the Nation at large, I commend his remarks for your reading and contemplation:

THE PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS BY DR. STANLEY MARSHALL

My subject this morning is taken from a verse by John Masefield and first spoken by him at the University of Sheffield, England in 1946. The title is "There are Few Earthly Things More Splendid than a University." Mr. Masefield wrote: "In these days of broken frontiers and collapsing values, when the dams are down and the floods are making misery, when every future looks somewhat grim, and every foothold has become something of a quagmire, wherever a university stands it stands and shines. To be a member of one of these great societies must ever be a glad distinction."

I believe that the university in America, even though subjected to greater stresses and facing greater challenges than it has in the past hundred years, still stands and shines and I count it a glad distinction this morning to be the President of the Florida State University.

I shall not attempt to conceal my disappointment at President Wexler's absence here today, for I had looked forward eagerly to hearing her speak on the future of the university in America. She is a creative thinker and a brilliant speaker who, as a college president and longtime college administrator, has had experience in every significant phase of higher education administration. Her sensitivity to people and issues and her quick and fertile mind have enabled her to acquire in a few years more genuine wisdom and understanding about higher education than many presidents acquire in a lifetime. It is unfortunate for the University and for our guests and a little sad for me that the unfortunate events of this past week at Hunter College have caused her to cancel her plans to be here.

In my remarks I shall express some of my views on the presidency of the Florida State University and the quality of leadership I hope to provide. I will do this in the context of some of the most pressing problems confronting the University today.

I am certain I speak for both President Wexler and myself when I say that most college presidents today have a larger stock of problems than of solutions. My preoccupation for most of the past year has been problem solving, and there has been too little time for thoughtful reflection—a situation which I hope will not continue indefinitely. But I have decided to speak more of problems than of solutions and this decision is based on more than the way I have spent my time in recent months; it is tied up with my belief that most of the problems facing the universities today will not be solved at the president's desk. If they are solved at all, it will be by the action of students and faculty and staff working with the administration—yes, and with parents and alumni and Regents and legislators and the public. For the concerns of the American university are bound up with the concerns of society and the solutions to our problems on the campuses will very likely come with the solutions to other, more pervasive problems.

As a preface to my statements on some of our problems, I would like to emphasize that the *contemporary university* is an institution that is in serious need of *contemporary administration*. There has been a tendency in the past to view the university as so different from other agencies of society as to stand apart from them in terms of its management needs. It is an organization of scholars, by definition, more interested in scholarship than in the internal workings of the institution. In fact, many institutions have subscribed to the doctrine of "the less administration the better". If ever that principle applied that time has surely passed. For the university today stands as a highly diversified and complex organization that is as much in need of management as any other such organization. It is true that the university differs in important ways from other institutions that produce products or render other types of services, and these fundamental differences shape our policies and influence our decisions. But neither these differences nor other factors can be permitted to obscure the simple fact that the university too is in need of efficient and effective administration. We now see clearly that to deny a university effective management is indeed to impede its function as a community of scholars.

Administration of a university refers to its direction as an institution and does not imply any interference with individual inquiry or ideas on the part of students or faculty. Indeed the function of management is to facilitate teaching and research and service through effective resource allocation and the provision of adequate equipment, facilities and efficient supporting services. Effective administration, therefore, requires responsible long term, as well as shorter range institutional planning, including the development of objectives and programs. The organization must be appropriately structured and responsibilities carefully assigned. There must be systems to provide for gathering, processing and communicating information for evaluation and analysis. The many publics of the university must be fully informed. Adequate financial resources for the operation of the institution must be determined, justified, obtained and efficiently utilized.

Most important of all are the people in the university. Not only must we continue to have outstanding faculty and students, but also exceptional administrators who possess the capacity, the energy and the motivation to help lead the university in America, and this one in particular, into the very forefront of American educational institutions.

The effective management of a large and complex institution in the context of today's restless and changing environment is a challenging assignment. The present administration of this University, mindful of its responsibility and respectful of the problems we face, welcomes the challenge. There is much to be done and this is a time for action. This administration will endeavor to shape events and not wait to be shaped by them.

This is not a time for timidity in the administration of our universities. We will plan, organize, analyze and consult. But, we will also act and I suppose that it will surprise few in this audience to hear me say that this administration may commit more sins of commission than omission.

Of the major problems now facing universities, I should like to call your attention to four of the most important and most troublesome:

- (1) The need for institutional and system-wide planning.
- (2) The role of students in university governance.
- (3) The difficulty of keeping the university free from partisan politics as it becomes increasingly involved in social action.
- (4) The problem of obtaining the necessary public support—financially and otherwise—for higher education.

First, I should like to discuss the matter of *Institutional and System-wide Planning*.

The essential first step in any effort at institutional planning is to define the university's central mission. Historically, universities have done too little of this—they have generally grown in whatever direction seemed natural. The points of growth have been determined by the strength and influence and aggressiveness of individual members of the faculty or, in some cases, of departments. This method has not been all bad for it reflected to some degree a kind of academic organic evolution in which the fittest survived and prospered. In some cases, however, growth and prosperity were a function not so much of the strength of the faculty as they were of the availability of financial support from various agencies outside the university. It is commonly recognized in American universities that programs in the natural sciences have been stimulated by the massive support provided by the Federal Government since about the mid-fifties.

The time has come when we in the University must plan our own future. Difficult as it will be, I see no alternative to a system in which faculty and administration with student participation will undertake an analysis of the roles of the university—the roles it is uniquely qualified to fill and the strengths it brings to each role in terms of people and resources. This will require us to make harder decisions than we have ever before been called upon to make.

The decisions to be made on a system-wide basis will hardly be any easier. Such a decision, for example, may result in resources being channeled to one university in support of a specified program. On the other hand, support for a similar program may be withheld from another institution on the basis that there are resources available for only one strong program of that type in the entire university system.

This does not imply, of course, that there is room in our state university system for only one strong program in each of the major fields of study. We have two law schools and we are now building a second school of medicine. We have and will continue to need schools of education, for example, in all of our universities. But one does not need programs, especially graduate programs, in some of the fields where the occupational needs are less in every university in the system and, in some cases, one program for the entire system will be enough. Only in this way can the system develop the peaks of excellence it must have for only in

this way can the necessary level of financial support be provided.

While this kind of cross-program comparison and analysis will require a new level of system-wide involvement, we must be very careful to preserve the ingredients which give to this and all other universities their own peculiar character, their distinction; in fact their very mission. For it has been the university in America that has been the central focus and the genius of higher education, not a consortium of universities. The university itself must retain its viability and to a considerable degree its independence for these elements are very important at the personal level and are an inseparable part of the spirit of intellectual curiosity and free inquiry.

From an operational standpoint, the task will be to bring administrative officers and faculty and students together from the several universities to engage in planning which will surely test our maturity and patience and our commitment to the common good—and our understanding of the financial and political facts of life.

I am certain from this description that you understand now why I have chosen to focus on problems today rather than their solutions.

Related closely to the mission of each university are its policies on the admission of its students. The two are tied together in this fashion: a university which admits a student ought to have an academic program suited to his needs and interests and if it does not, it probably should encourage the student to go elsewhere. It is this match between the university's students and its programs that constitutes its mission.

A good deal is being said today about open admissions' policies; these are generally defined as policies which grant admission to any student who has a high school diploma. The great concern is that the colleges and universities, having admitted a more heterogeneous group of students, will not be able to match them with meaningful academic programs. When the university fails to do this, many students will drop out or perhaps even worse, will stay in and pursue programs of study which meet neither the needs of society or the student's interests.

Our obligation, it seems to me, is to do something purposeful and constructive for all of the students we admit. We must make it clear in advance what it is we think we can do and then accept only those students who will likely benefit from what we have to offer. This would be too narrow a policy, I suppose, for a single university to adopt, but for a state system, it seems to me to be eminently logical, fair, and economical. If the needs of an applicant cannot be met here, there should exist in a system as large and diverse as ours, something for him at another institution.

What I am arguing for then is a system of education that is broad enough and based on a philosophy of education for all, which will solve the problem of open admissions by providing something for everyone. Let me hasten to add that I do not believe everyone should go to college. I believe, in fact, that too high a percentage of our young people are probably going to college now. We have neglected vocational and technical training in this country to a shocking degree with unhappy consequences both to the individual and society. Society needs more and better services in plumbing, brick laying, auto repair and certainly in the more highly technical fields needed to support the professional scientists and engineers. But that is a separate, if closely related matter, and one I shall not explore further here. My point is that if we are committed to education of our young people as a worthy enterprise, the choice we face should not be between accepting students for study in programs they do not need or want and rejecting their applications; instead we should define the missions of our

institutions clearly enough that we will know and the students will know just who it is we are prepared to serve. If the educational system is viewed in total in our state; that is, if all of the post-high school institutions are involved together in a coordinated plan of education to meet the needs of the individual and of society, then the problem of open admissions shouldn't be a problem at all. The problem should simply be one of getting the students enrolled in the right program in the right institution—and that, in a society that is able to send men to the moon, ought to be manageable. In Florida where we have an outstanding program of junior and community colleges within commuting distance of virtually the whole state, an emerging and very promising program in vocational and technical education, and a large high-quality system of senior universities, it most certainly ought to be manageable. Such a concept is based on the belief that society will benefit from more education, not less, and that the people will be willing to pay for it if they can see its benefits.

Let me now talk about *Student Involvement*.

I should like first to make some comments about the involvement of students in the governance of the university. I start with the premise that student involvement is essential. If one accepts this it follows that a formal student government organization is highly desirable. There is no doubt in my mind that if we did not have a student government—as some institutions do not—the faculty and administration would create one. Certainly it is better to have that organization come from the students.

But that raises the very serious question of how a greater percentage of our students can be involved in the governance of their university. Decisions are made in the administrative offices every day which relate directly to the well-being of our students. The opinions and desires of students are paramount considerations and in many cases we assume that we know what students want and need, but history has shown that we are not always right. The same thing applies to a considerable degree, I am sure, to decisions made by student government.

It is understandable that students who come here for an education prefer to spend most of their time getting it. Many feel they cannot take time from serious academic pursuits to serve on committees or devote significant time to student activities. Others, of course, refrain from this kind of participation for less serious reasons. But the question remains: How can this university improve the quality of the students' educational experiences by more meaningful involvement in decision making in the university?

The interest I have in this question is based not only on my desire for fair and dignified student representation in university governance; it is in part self-serving for I believe that a university that is governed with student participation is likely to provide a more progressive and orderly educational environment.

A second problem in this area is that of change in the method and relevance of education. The most compelling messages I hear from students are those asking that we do a better job in their education. They recognize that the world has changed dramatically and they are concerned whether formal education can change rapidly enough to prepare them to make a contribution in this world. They respect the faculty for their professional competence and they admire the role faculty play at the cutting edge of progress in their fields of specialization. They are disappointed, however, at the slow rate of change in which the ways teaching and learning occur. The question then is how can we change educational content and method fast enough to accommodate to the changes in society and the demands of our

students without risking serious damage to the university, to the things it does so well now, and to the invaluable contributions it makes in our society.

I believe the answer lies in increasing student involvement, not with "keeping students in their place."

In Gian Carlo Menotti's play, "The Leper", the queen, speaking to the townspeople about her leper son who has been banished from the kingdom and now returns to protest the terrible ostracism, he says, "Having failed to make him useful you have made him dangerous." Those words seem to apply both to the role of the university and to the students in it. There are those who believe we have failed to make the university useful in the sense of maintaining it as an institution relevant to the world in which it exists and responsive to the needs of the society of which it is a part.

They believe that it is this absence of usefulness that has made the university dangerous as they believe it to be. Much the same thing can be said for student involvement.

Whatever our view of students, they are a highly significant segment of society and in a short time will sit in the chairs we now occupy. Surely we can involve them in meaningful and proper ways in running the enterprise for which they will soon have full responsibility.

The picture nationally seems to me to be more hopeful than a year ago. The hope lies both in the evidence displayed by society in general and universities in particular in being more responsive to young people, and in a growing realization on the part of young people that change can be both orderly and effective. My own experience with students convinces me that their basic values are very much the same as those of my generation, and I have a feeling of confident optimism for the future of the university and the country. The third problem is that of *The University in Society*.

In speculating on the role of the University, I find myself in a mild quandary. My inclinations are those of the activist; for reasons having more to do with my personal physiology than anything else, I think, I am blessed—or plagued, depending on your point of view—with a rather strong tendency to be personally involved in whatever is going on—and I might add that the tenets of good administration demand that I curb this to some degree and I try continually to do so. As an extension of my activist outlook, I feel the need to involve the University in the problems of the world at large. The University, I reason, is a collection of very able people with expertise in a very large number of specialized fields which relate directly to society's problems. Its faculty and students have social consciences that are easily pricked and many of them are by nature easily moved to action. The concerns of universities generally include such pressing problems of society as education, health and welfare, business, economics, law enforcement, labor relations, and many others. So the place of the University, as an agency to deal with society's problems, has considerable appeal and my own propensities support such a role.

At the same time I recognize serious limitations on the University as an agent for social change and the constraints upon it in this regard come more sharply into focus almost daily. Thus, my quandary. It is a dilemma that I share with others in the academic community and it is not likely to be resolved easily or soon. There are few problems of greater importance to the health and well being of universities and I should like, therefore, to analyze this one at some greater length at this time.

At the heart of the matter is academic freedom, which by my definition is the right which the university must guarantee its faculty to pursue truth and to speak it re-

gardless of the views of society on the matter at hand. This right derives from the advanced state of knowledge and understanding that scholars possess in their own areas of expertise and is not related to the fact that they work in something called a university. If such people are threatened or coerced, the university must vouchsafe their freedom as academicians; for if we failed to do so, freedom would be curbed, the university would be prostituted, and society would be the loser.

Academic freedom then must be defended at all costs—and from whatever direction the danger comes. There has always been danger from certain elements in society whose vested interests would be served by curtailing truth. These oftentimes, but not always by any means, appear in the form of politicians who believe their role in government gives them the right to regulate the professional actions of faculty. For the most part, the universities and those who would restrict their rightful freedom seem to have accommodated to one another pretty well. There is no doubt that academic freedom in this country is far more secure than it was a generation ago.

The danger I want to discuss now—and thus I introduce problem number three—is the threat to the university that comes from the responses of faculty to popular issues. The threat to the university comes when any group in it with special interests attempts to turn the university into an instrument for its own cause. If the university is a community of scholars with the freedom to differ with anybody, including their colleagues, and to express their beliefs as individuals whose individual scholarship is their license to profess, then I do not see how the university can adopt any collective or corporate position on public issues not related to the operation of the university itself, no matter how strong are the merits of a given position.

Ever since the birth of the university in the Middle Ages, the rights and freedoms of scholars have been of vital importance to the university and to society. For a very long time the position has been widely accepted that individual faculty freedoms rest on the firm tradition that the collective university does not take stands on ideological and political issues and that there is no freedom for the individual if a group within the university by one means or another commits the whole of the university to one political or social cause. In line with this doctrine, faculty may take group stands only on those matters directly related to their own group mission and on which they presumably have group expertise.

It has always been assumed that scholars have the same right not to get involved with worldly matters as others have to do so. Irving Kristol, who is Henry Luce, Professor of Urban Values at New York University, put it in these terms. ". . . I do not see how a 'community of scholars', he said, 'can collectively and institutionally decide either to abstain from politics or to participate in politics in a particular fashion. That kind of decision making is precisely what a 'community of scholars' is incapable of if it is to remain true to its self definition. For in order to make such decisions it would have to become a political community—which is to say that power would be the focus of organization. A leadership would have to be instituted; modes of selecting this leadership would have to be established; formal channels of communications between leaders and members would have to be defined; a system of judicial restraint, constraints, and punishments would have to be erected; an administrative hierarchy would be needed to carry out the decisions—and so on and so on."

So I have no doubt that many, indeed most, of those who ask that the university become involved in political issues are, indeed,

moved by strong social consciences and an urgent sense of crisis—the first commendable and the second accurate. They believe that the learned men in our universities should be contributing more to the solution of our problems. In this I join them, but I believe resolutely that to engage the corporate university in political issues will serve both to divide and to confuse it and will destroy the freedoms it has earned down through the centuries.

But this analysis leaves completely unanswered the question of how the university can use its resources collectively for the betterment of society. I believe there are ways this can be done and I believe that we should move more promptly to increase such involvement.

If the University is to train and educate people to serve in the real world, it should be engaged actively in the problems of the real world—indeed, it is. Medical interns treat real people; prospective teachers practice on real students in real classrooms; and I have observed that our law students spend a good deal of time in the courtrooms in Tallahassee and in the halls of the Capitol. Thus, the principle of using the world as a laboratory is well established. What we need to do now is to use it more broadly and more effectively. There is no community in the land where the resources of the university—its faculty and students—could not be profitably used to help solve people's problems: Illiteracy, more intelligent consumership, help in starting small businesses, urban planning, improved law enforcement—and so on. If we have been able to send our students into the schools to teach children, to participate in faculty meetings, to help develop curriculum materials, without getting them involved in the educational issues in those communities which have political overtones—and there are many—I do not see why we cannot do so in many other areas. I will concede that extending the range of community laboratory experience may cause us to exercise some restraint when we become involved in some areas of public concern, but I am convinced it can be done and the benefits to the university and to society would be well worth the risk.

There is another way in which the universities can serve society and this too has been well tested. It is by contracting to provide services. This often takes the form of research but in addition, universities have historically provided a wide variety of services to the public schools, for example, assistance in development of curriculum materials. The colleges of agriculture have down through the years played an important role in the improvement of farming in this country by the services they have contracted with the state and federal governments to provide to farmers. This kind of service has recently been extended to a variety of services in urban settings, particularly in dealing with the problems of the ghettos. Some of these projects, no doubt, are the products of political decisions and may indeed involve politics in one way or another. I am not suggesting in this section, that universities be so timid as to refuse to touch anything that smacks of controversy; I am only proposing that we be prudent in the things we do in the community at large.

SUPPORT FOR THE UNIVERSITY

The fourth and last problem to which I should like to call your attention has to do with the support universities must have if they are to continue the job of educating our young people and contributing to the progress of the nation through research, development, and other services.

If the universities are to meet the demands made upon them, they will require expanded resources. But educational programs will be competing for resources with programs in other vital areas. Programs for medical care, for housing, for cultural facilities, for recre-

ation, and for improving the quality of the environment will be heavy claimants on the national pool of money and talent. Education, it appears to me, will be less likely in the future to lay special claim to a share of the nation's resources on the basis of some unique character or relationship to our people. We will have to compete with other agencies in the most direct sense and the burden will rest primarily on those of us who are teachers and administrators to explain to the public the benefits to be derived from supporting the educational system we represent. We can expect to be judged critically, and in some cases harshly, and in all candor it is my opinion that the climate generally is less friendly to education today than it has been in some time. The reasons for this are another matter and represent another set of problems which I shall make no attempt to discuss today.

The meaning of this, though, is that we must find better ways to have people understand the missions and the methods of our institutions. My contacts with Florida Legislators this spring have convinced me that we have not done a good job of defining our needs and describing our purposes to the legislators or the public in our own state. I suppose it is true to some degree with all of those whose programs depend on legislative appropriations, but I have observed over the years that those of us in education sometimes seem to believe that somehow money will be made available if our cause is just. What we fail to take into account is that the people of Florida have just as much right to have poor universities as to have poor highways. Just as those who believe in good highways, including the professional highway people, are energetic in convincing the legislature and the public of the benefits of good roads, we must be persuasive with respect to the benefits of good universities.

Let there be no misunderstanding of the present quality of Florida's universities. The legislators, on behalf of the people, have made it possible for us to establish a quality system of higher education, and I see no reason to believe there will be a willful change of sentiment in this regard. If we are effective in expressing the case for good education, I have no doubt that the people of Florida will see to it that the university system is supported in such a way as to carry on a solid, adequate program of instruction for our students. But I am equally confident that only when substantial private financial support is added to tax support can we create a distinguished university system. The difference between a good university and one of distinction—that which I call the margin of excellence—must come from funds from the private sector—from individuals, foundations, and corporations. Florida State University has begun an aggressive pursuit of funds from private sources and it will continue and accelerate its efforts along those lines. In my opinion, there is no reason for us to be timid about this or to apologize for asking for private support. By the end of this decade, over 80% of Americans who go to college will be in publicly supported—more accurately called publicly assisted—colleges and universities. This simply means that if we are going to provide high-quality education for the majority of our students, we must provide it where they are—in the public universities.

In the past it has been widely believed that private individuals and businesses and industry should be the private hunting ground of the non-public universities since the public institutions get their monies from taxes. In my opinion this rationale is completely without foundation today. This year Florida State University will receive 53% of its support from the state Legislature, and the figure nationwide is about 50%. Some of the nation's private universities in some years obtain considerably more than half of their operating budgets from tax sources. The main source, of course, is the grants and contracts they have with the Federal Government, but

in many cases state governments also provide support to private colleges. It is clear, therefore, that substantial tax monies are going to private institutions and I have no quarrel with that. I only make the point that the public ones have the moral right now to seek private funds, and if they expect to achieve excellence most will have to do so.

This is not so much a problem as a challenge. There appears to be no real difficulty in knowing what to do or how to do it; it is largely a matter of tooling up for the effort and of applying the hard work and good salesmanship to make it succeed.

Finding solutions to the four problems I have described and many others will be the agenda for this administration for some time to come. I hope there is no misunderstanding my optimism about the prospects for finding solutions. For optimistic and confident of Florida State's bright future, I am. No small part of my confidence rests upon the shoulders of the University's new vice presidents who are as able and dedicated a group of university administrators as I have ever seen. The problems of the transition of the presidency here have been compounded by the changes in the offices of the vice presidents, but the opportunity for a new president to build anew from the group up is rare among American universities. Clearly, it places upon me a greater responsibility for the welfare of the university in the years ahead. The high quality of the other administrative officers enables me to accept this responsibility with eager enthusiasm.

Much of the dialogue within and about the university by those outside, including the media, has in recent months dealt heavily with the transition in leadership, the selection of new administrative officers, and with some of the important changes in student life on the campus. The hour has now come for us to devote our attention to the challenges that lie ahead. I hope we will look upon today, especially the media, as a turning of the corner in our view of the university and from this point forward our thoughts and energies should be directed to the future.

In my opening comments in referring to John Masefield's verse, I said that I count it a glad distinction to serve as the President of the Florida State University. The existence of the problems I have described in this presentation, if anything, makes it more so. I earnestly believe that; and I contemplate my service to this institution, at a time when the problems are heavy and the job demanding, with joyous anticipation. My reasons for feeling this way are expressed in precisely the right words in the rest of John Masefield's verse which I quoted from earlier and which I shall now read to you in its entirety:

"In these days of
broken frontiers
and collapsing values,
when the dams are down
and the floods are
making misery,

"When every future
looks somewhat grim
and every ancient foothold
has become
something of a quagmire
Wherever a University stands,
it stands and shines,

"Wherever it exists,
the free minds of men,
urged on to full
and fair enquiry,
may still bring wisdom
into human affairs.

"There are few earthly things
more beautiful
than a University. . . .

"It is a place where
those who hate ignorance
may strive to know,

"Where those
Who perceive truth
May strive
To make others see;

"Where seekers
And learners alike,
Banded together
In the search for knowledge,
Will honour thought
In all its finer ways,

"Will welcome
Thinkers in distress
Or in exile,

. . . Will uphold ever
The dignity
Of thought and learning
And will exact standards
In these things.

"They will give
To the young
In their impressionable years,
The bond
Of a lofty purpose shared,
Of a great corporate life
Whose links
Will not be loosed
Until they die.

"They give young people
That close companionship
For which youth longs,
And that chance
Of the endless discussion
Of the themes
Which are endless,
Without which youth
Would seem a waste of time.

"There are few things
More enduring
Than a University.

"Religions may split
Into sect or heresy;
Dynasties may perish
or be supplanted,

"But for century
After century
The University
Will continue,

"And the stream of life
Will pass through it,

"And the thinker
And the seeker
Will be bound together
In the undying cause
Of bringing thought
Into the world.

"To be a member of one
Of these great societies
Must ever be
A glad distinction."

And I pledge to you, the members of the University community, the Board of Regents and the people of Florida, that I shall endeavor to make this University endure and to stand and shine; for indeed there are few earthly things more beautiful than a university.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—
HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental

genocide on over 1,400 American prisoners of war and their families.
How long?

THE GOOD OLD DAYS?

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, recently there was published in the Manchester, N.H., Union-Leader, an anonymous poem addressed to "old folks, USA." Both humorous and nostalgic in a dual aspect I commend it to readers of the RECORD:

Remember when hippie meant big in the hips,

And a trip involved travel in cars, planes and ships?

When pot was a vessel for cooking things in
And hooked was what grandmother's rug may have been?

When fix was a verb that meant mend or repair.

And Be-In meant merely existing somewhere?

When neat meant well-organized, tidy and clean.

And grass was a ground cover, normally green?

When groovy meant furrowed with channels and hollows

And birds were winged creatures, like robins and swallows?

When fuzz was a substance, real fluffy, like lint.

And bread came from bakeries—and not from the mint?

When roll meant a bun, and rock was a stone.

And hang-up was something you did with the phone?

It's groovy, Man, groovy, but English it's not.

Methinks that our language is going to pot.—
—Author Unknown.

ALL WE ARE SAYING IS, GIVE
NIXON A CHANCE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, certainly anyone recognizing the complications the President inherited and continues to face in Southeast Asia, recognizing the heavy burden that falls upon anyone who serves as our President, would objectively judge Presidential decisions after the results are in rather than with knee-jerking reactions. This is the theme of an editorial in the Sunday, May 10, Harvey, Ill., Tribune, which I believe represents the type of thinking of grassroot Americans which is too seldomly reflected in the Washington or New York press.

The editorial follows:

[From the Harvey (Ill.) Tribune,
May 10, 1970]

ALL WE ARE SAYING IS, GIVE NIXON A CHANCE

President Nixon announced Friday night that all American troops and advisors would be out of Cambodia by the end of June. This announcement should serve as proof that the President is sincere when he says that he is not interested in escalating the Viet Nam war into a Southeast Asian confrontation.

The President has already withdrawn 115,000 troops from Viet Nam and has promised to remove another 150,000 troops this year. In so doing, he will have cut the number of American soldiers in Viet Nam in half in less than a year since assuming office and the responsibilities of the war.

Mr. Nixon has accepted the full responsibility for his Cambodian decision, using his belief that millions of South Vietnamese will be killed unless we can arrive at a suitable peace arrangement there. We wonder if those critics of the President would assume the responsibility for those millions of lives if an immediate troop withdrawal was enacted and the administration's fears were realized.

Almost all Americans want us out of Viet Nam, including President Nixon. The question is how best to accomplish that goal, protect the American soldiers there while doing it and ensure that millions will not be killed after we have left.

Fortunately, none of us has to make the decisions that mean life or death in such circumstances. We agree with the lyrics of the student protest song . . . "All we are saying, is give peace a chance" . . . but, we would also urge that we give our President a chance. And, while no one should judge all students by the one who throws the rock, no one should judge all Presidents by the same criteria.

We are convinced that President Nixon will not escalate the war in Viet Nam and contrary to his critics, we think his Cambodian action proves just that point. We would urge all who protest to look beyond the rhetoric of the peace movement in the streets and analyze the peace movement going on in the White House.

YOUR CONGRESSMAN JOHN MYERS
WANTS YOUR OPINION

HON. JOHN T. MYERS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, in each succeeding Congress it has been my practice to poll the people of the Seventh Congressional District of Indiana on major issues in Congress. I have reported the results of the questionnaire to my colleagues in the Congress and to the President of the United States. My theme is "Your Congressman JOHN MYERS wants your opinion" because that is my sincere request of my constituency. In the next few days I will be mailing the 1970 poll and as soon as the results are in and tabulated, I plan to again inform my colleagues and the President of the results. The special questionnaire reads as follows:

YOUR CONGRESSMAN JOHN MYERS WANTS
YOUR OPINION

QUESTIONNAIRE 1970

DEAR FRIEND: With many important issues now being debated in the 91st Congress, I again turn to you for your opinions.

Please consider carefully your answers to these questions. Knowing your views will be a great benefit in helping me effectively represent you. Results will be tabulated and made known to the Congress and the President.

Whatever your political affiliation, it is my hope you will take a few minutes to answer the questionnaire and return it to me. I am looking forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

JOHN MYERS,
Your Congressman.

1. Do you believe our selective service system should be:

- (a) Retained as is.
- (b) Abolished in favor of an all-volunteer army.
- (c) Based on a lottery system without deferments.

2. Do you favor a government-guaranteed annual wage as a means of eliminating poverty?

- (a) Yes.
- (b) No.
- (c) Undecided.

3. Which do you believe should take preference in efforts to control inflation?

- (a) Raise income taxes.
- (b) Reduce federal spending.
- (c) Wage and price controls.

4. What course do you favor in Vietnam:

- (a) Administration plan for orderly withdrawal of troops.
- (b) Immediate withdrawal of all troops.
- (c) Seek complete military victory.

5. In dealing with the possession and use of marijuana, do you favor:

- (a) Easing and eliminating federal minimum penalties.
- (b) Increasing the penalties.
- (c) No change in present laws.

6. With regard to the question of granting 18-year-olds the vote in national elections, do you favor:

- (a) A change by amendment to the Constitution.
- (b) A change by act of Congress.
- (c) No lowering of voting age.

7. Should the Federal government promote rural development through programs of economic incentives and aid to private industry to help create jobs in rural areas?

- (a) Yes.
- (b) No.
- (c) Undecided.

8. Do you support Congressman Myers' legislation providing strict controls over pollution of our environment?

- (a) Yes.
- (b) No.
- (c) Undecided.

9. Do you support efforts by the Administration to reach an enforceable arms control agreement with the Soviet Union?

- (a) Yes.
- (b) No.
- (c) Undecided.

10. Do you favor ending federal aid to individual students found guilty of disrupting classes or other normal college operations?

- (a) Yes.
- (b) No.
- (c) Undecided.

11. Concerning the operation of the Post Office Department, should Congress reorganize the Department by

- (a) Changing it to a non-profit public corporation,
- (b) Allowing private industry to take over postal functions, or
- (c) Granting present postal authorities additional control with specific Congressional oversight.

12. How would you rate President Nixon's overall performance since he took office?

- (a) Excellent.
- (b) Good.
- (c) Not so good.

KNOXVILLE SOLDIER IN VIETNAM SENDS POEM TO COUNTER PROTESTS

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish all of the students, and everyone else, who are protesting our involvement in Southeast Asia would read the following letter from a young soldier from Knoxville, Tenn.

Sp. Bobby W. Adkins is in Vietnam helping to fight a war for peace while the enemy he faces is getting help from young people his own age here at home. This young man understands war and he is very realistic in summing up the situation.

KNOXVILLE SOLDIER IN VIETNAM SENDS POEM TO COUNTER PROTESTS

EDITOR, THE NEWS-SENTINEL:

I am presently stationed in Tay Ninh Province with the 1st Air Cavalry Division. My home is in Knoxville, and I used to deliver your newspaper.

I am writing you because of the increased and insistent demonstrations that are occurring in the U.S. concerning this war. I feel that I have come across something—a poem—that may make a few people think before they act. People don't seem to really think about the American lives that have been lost here in Nam, and those that will be lost before this war ends. This poem seems to "tell it like it is" for those people who demonstrate against what we are doing over here.

I didn't enlist in the Army, but I do believe that while we are in this war we should do all we can to end it as soon as possible. This push the Army—mainly the Cavalry—has going now, may help bring an end to this war before more Americans have their lives interrupted and then ended like so many have already.

Please print this poem. Maybe some people will change their minds and back President Nixon in this campaign. I hope it does something for the dissenters and protesters. If they want to protest about this war, let them spend one week with a Grunt unit here in Vietnam. I doubt if many of them would still want to protest how we are fighting this war. They would probably protest the NVA and VC methods instead.

A MAN A SOLDIER

Take a man, make him a soldier.
Put his kind alone 12,000 miles from home.
Empty his heart of all but the blood
Make him live in sweat and mud.
This is the life we soldiers must live
And our souls to the devil we give.
And you peace boys back home don't have a care,

You don't know what it's like over here.
You have a ball without really trying,
While over here men are dying.
You burn your draft cards and march at dawn,

You put your signs on the White House lawn,

You want to ban the deadly bomb,
You say there's no war in Vietnam.
Use your drugs and have your fun,
And refuse to lift a gun,
You say there's nothing in it for you
And we're supposed to die for you.
I'll hate you till the day I die,
When I hear again my buddy's cry.

I see his arm a bloody shred,
And I hear the medic say
"This one's dead."

It's quite a price he had to pay
Not to live another day.
He had the guts to fight and die,
He paid the price but what did he buy?
He bought your life by losing his,
But what do you care what a soldier gives?

Thank you for your time and interest. I hope people will eventually wake up. I don't want to live under Communism.

SP/4 BOBBY W. ADKINS,
HH & Battery, 2nd Battalion (AM), 19th
Artillery
1st Cavalry Division (AM)
APO San Francisco, Calif. 96490

TRIBUTE TO LOREN C. BARTON

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, today at Leuzinger High School in Lawndale, Calif., the citizens of that community will gather to pay tribute to Loren C. Barton. Mr. Barton is retiring this year, after many years of dedicated professional service to his community and to education. He has been associated with education in the Los Angeles area for 35 years.

Mr. Barton began his teaching career in 1935 at Washington Intermediate School in Hawthorne, Calif., where he taught until 1937. From 1937 until 1941, he was an instructor of physical education at Crozier Junior High School, Inglewood, Calif. He was a teacher and supervisor of physical education of the Hawthorne School District, Hawthorne, Calif., for 5 years from 1942 to 1947. In 1947, he began his tenure at Leuzinger High School in Lawndale, Calif., and in 1951, he became assistant principal. He has served in this position for the past 19 years.

Mr. Barton served on the PTA Council of Lawndale and as a member of the Coordinating Council of the Case Conference Committee.

He represented the Centinela Valley Secondary Teachers' Association on the legislative, credentials, and salary committee and also served as treasurer of the Centinela Valley Teachers' Credit Union.

The retiring assistant principal has been paid the high tribute of an honorary life membership in the California Congress of Parents and Teachers. Students have recognized his devotion by dedicating a school annual to him. In further recognition of his concern for the young, he has been awarded the Order of Merit from the Boy Scouts of America.

Mr. Barton is well qualified as a teacher and has worked hard to acquire the necessary credentials. He received his AA and junior certificate from Compton Junior College in 1933 and his degree in education from UCLA in 1935. Between the years 1938 to 1953 he studied to acquire his M.S. in education at USC.

He has been active in many organizations associated with education. He is a life member of the UCLA Alumni Association, and a member of the USC General

Alumni Association. He belongs to the California Teachers' Association and the California Association of Secondary School Administrators. He is also a member of the National Association of Secondary School Principals and the Centinela Valley Secondary Teachers' Association.

In addition, Mr. Barton is active in other community activities. He is a past president of the Hawthorne Optimist Club. He is a member of the Parent Teacher Association, the YMCA, the Boy Scouts of America, and the Girl Scouts of America.

His hobbies include ham radio operation as well as being a journeyman machinist and journeyman plumber. He is vice president of the Malibu Bowl Land Investment Corp. and a member of the National Association of Watch and Clock Collectors.

Loren C. Barton is an active and dedicated citizen. His contributions to his community and to youth are many. I invite my colleagues to join me in congratulating Loren C. Barton, my friend

and a great citizen, for his outstanding service to his fellow man.

WALTER REUTHER

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, Walter Reuther will be deeply missed by everyone involved in the labor movement. That he was a tough bargainer, a predictable innovator, and a constant guardian of his constituents is unchallenged. But the tragic loss of Walter Reuther will be felt on a much wider scale. He will be missed by all Americans for these were, in a larger sense, his constituents also.

To merely say that he was a progressive is to detract from a man who committed his life to a movement through which the welfare of the worker could be improved and the decency of all men

maintained. This required the ability to move beyond special interests; to seek out the best in people and encourage them to act together for higher social purposes.

Walter Reuther understood the needs of the Nation and the unattended peoples because he had lived and worked with them. Forty cents an hour, 13-hour days, and 7-day workweeks were understood by him because he had experienced them.

But the elimination of these oppressive conditions did not blunt his desire to improve the quality of life for the working man. Pension benefits, profit sharing, and a guaranteed income plan were just some of the milestone accomplishments negotiated by Mr. Reuther for the UAW.

And there were others, too. For no direct benefit to his union, he led the way in civil rights, the war against hunger, and efforts to provide adequate health care for the Nation. His service was marked by distinction and dedication to the best interests of the people of this Nation. I extend my deepest sympathy to his family.

SENATE—Friday, May 15, 1970

The Senate met at 11:30 o'clock a.m. and was called to order by Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama.

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

Eternal God, who has been the hope and help of many generations, and who in all ages hast given men the power to seek Thee and in seeking Thee to find Thee, grant to us here a vivid sense that Thou art with us. Give us a clearer vision of Thy truth, a greater faith in Thy power, and a more confident assurance of Thy love.

We beseech Thee, O Lord, by Thy grace to mend our broken Nation, and to bring reconciliation of man with man and of government with people.

When the way seems dark, give us grace to walk in the light we have; when much is obscured, make us faithful to the little we can clearly see; when the distant scene is clouded, give us courage to take the next step; when insight falters and faith is weak, help us to repay Thee in love and loyalty, in tenderness and compassion, for our souls' sake and the welfare of the people.

Hear us, O God, in whom we trust now and forever. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., May 15, 1970.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Sena-

tor from the State of Alabama, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
President pro tempore.

Mr. ALLEN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 14685. An act to amend the International Travel Act of 1961, as amended, in order to improve the balance of payments by further promoting travel to the United States, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 17575. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 520. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of an additional 1,000 copies of House Report 91-610, 91st Congress, first session, entitled "Report of Special Study Mission to Southern Africa for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs" of the House of Representatives;

H. Con. Res. 537. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing as a House document the tributes of the Members of Congress to the service of Chief Justice Earl Warren;

H. Con. Res. 578. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of a "Compilation of Works of Art and Other Objects in the U.S. Capitol," as a House document, and for other purposes;

H. Con. Res. 580. Concurrent resolution authorizing certain printing for the Select Committee on Crime;

H. Con. Res. 584. Concurrent resolution relative to printing as a House document a

history of the Committee on Agriculture; and

H. Con. Res. 585. Concurrent resolution authorizing certain printing for the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. ALLEN):

H.R. 14465. An act to provide for the expansion and improvement of the Nation's airport and airway system, for the imposition of airport and airway user charges, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 1232. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1970, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H.R. 14685. An act to amend the International Travel Act of 1961, as amended, in order to improve the balance of payments by further promoting travel to the United States, and for other purposes; ordered to be placed on the calendar; and

H.R. 17575. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following concurrent resolutions were severally referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

H. Con. Res. 520. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of an additional 1,000