

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CYRUS VANCE, WORLD STATESMAN,
CHALLENGES COLLEGE GRADU-
ATES—SERIOUS BUSINESS OF
EDUCATION PARAMOUNT AT SA-
LEM AND FAIRMONT COLLEGES

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 19, 1970

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, while the newspapers give the headlines to campus disorders, a great majority of our 2,500 colleges and universities are proceeding with the serious business of education.

It was my privilege last weekend to return to the campus of my alma mater, Salem College, for the 1970 commencement exercises. I also delivered the commencement address at Fairmont State College, in West Virginia. What I experienced was both rewarding and refreshing. For I found that the real academia depends not on the place, but on the people—and how they interact with rationality and responsibility.

Salem College, in Harrison County, W. Va., was founded in 1888 as an independent liberal arts school with the assistance of the Seventh Day Baptist Church. Its enrollment today is approximately 1,600.

Last Sunday there were 212 graduating seniors and, interestingly enough, 164 of them are from outside the State. They came from as far away as California, but most of the student body is drawn from the surrounding States of the East and Midwest.

There were three distinguished speakers during the 2 days of ceremonies. Each received an honorary doctorate. They are: The Reverend DeWayne Woodring, administrative assistant to the bishop of the United Methodist Church, of Akron, Ohio; John F. Heflin, a native of Doddridge County, a renowned educator and inspired business management authority who addressed the Centurion breakfast; and the commencement speaker, another West Virginia native, Cyrus R. Vance, of Clarksburg and New York City.

On most of the small college campuses, reason has prevailed over riots and the students are unmoved by the turbulence and turmoil. There are still many bases of scholarly serenity and student concern for the necessary but well-reasoned participation of youth.

As I told the audience of 2,500 at Fairmont State College:

It is particularly critical that we, who are older, afford our young people the opportunity to seek answers, to express their views, and to use their influence in the development of our national policies. Young people want to do this—and the large majority of them want to do it in an orderly and effective manner. . . .

This is what impressed me most about my visits to these two colleges. It is heartening to be reminded that, on many campuses, the visitor can expect to hear hymns being sung instead of harangue,

that he will find honest discussion instead of obscene rhetoric, and that he will see gratifying examples of mutual respect between students and faculty. For these examples, I congratulate Presidents K. Duane Hurley, of Salem, and E. K. Feister, of Fairmont, and their devoted staffs.

Mr. President, in this atmosphere, the commencement address by Mr. Vance at Salem College, was received with the careful attention that it deserved. His profound remarks impressed the audience of approximately 2,000 persons, and I feel his speech actually deserves a much broader audience.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Vance's address, together introductory remarks I was privileged to make, be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
INTRODUCTION OF THE HONORABLE CYRUS R.
VANCE, SALEM COLLEGE COMMENCEMENT,
SALEM, W. VA., MAY 17, 1970

There are men who stand above partisan considerations and narrow viewpoints, and they are acclaimed as true leaders.

When such a man is found, he is entrusted with a role that transcends the ordinary and, quite often, his performance of this role dictates the turn of history.

Such a man is Cyrus Roberts Vance, a West Virginian who rose to the highest ranks of government, a distinguished lawyer and international statesman.

Our speaker was born in Clarksburg, the fourth generation of Vance in that city. His great-grandfather was a former mayor of Clarksburg. His grandfather was a member of the first Secession Legislature at Wheeling.

His father, John Carl Vance, was a successful Clarksburg insurance man who moved to New York soon after Cyrus was born to join an international firm. The father headed the War Materials Insurance Board during World War I. When Cy was five years old, his father died of pneumonia. The mother, Amy Vance, brought him and his older brother John back to their Clarksburg home.

Cyrus Vance attended Kent School and Yale University. He was graduated cum laude from Yale Law School in 1942. During World War II, he served as a gunnery officer aboard destroyers for almost two years.

He is married to the former Grace Sloane, a gracious helpmate, and they are the parents of five children.

After Navy service, "Bobs", as he is known to close friends, joined the Mead Corporation as assistant to the president in New York City, and shortly thereafter became associated with the law firm of Simpson, Thatcher and Bartlett, one of Wall Street's leading firms.

In 1952 he became a full partner. His legal performance was so outstanding that, following the launching of Russia's Sputnik in 1957, he was called to Washington to serve as special counsel to the preparedness investigating subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee. Two years later, he was named consulting counsel to the Special Senate Committee on Space and Astronautics where his ability caught the eye of the committee chairman, Senator Lyndon Johnson.

So it was no surprise—except possibly to Cy and his wife—that late in 1960 he was again called to Washington to serve as counsel for the Department of Defense. He was one of the first official appointments of President John Kennedy.

In 1962, Cy Vance was named Secretary of the Army. Two years later, he became Deputy Secretary of Defense and held that post until 1967, when he returned to private law practice. During his Defense Department tenure, he was credited with a major role in reorganizing and improving the combat readiness and efficiency of our vast military establishment.

His "retirement" from public service was short. He was called by President Johnson at different times to serve as the President's special representative in the Cyprus crisis, in Korea, and during the tragic riots in our major cities. Cyrus Vance came to be known as "the nation's number one troubleshooter." And in May of 1968, he again responded to a call from President Johnson. He and Averell Harriman went to Paris to begin negotiations with representatives of Hanoi for an honorable settlement of the Vietnam war. How successful the mission was is yet to be determined. It was, as you recall, difficult, in the beginning, to get the North Vietnamese to even agree to the configuration of the negotiating tables. Today, the two sides are at least communicating.

Cy Vance returned from Paris 15 months ago. I assume that he is keeping a suitcase packed for another mission when he is called. His long service as a negotiator of non-negotiable demands might be in great demand on some of our college campuses today, including Yale.

It is a pleasure to present Cyrus Vance. . . . A native Harrison countian—a West Virginian who has brought honor to our State—a great American—a statesman of the world.

REMARKS OF CYRUS R. VANCE, COMMENCEMENT
EXERCISES, SALEM COLLEGE, W. VA., MAY 17,
1970

Dr. Hurley, Senator Randolph, distinguished guests, members of the Class of 1970, ladies and gentlemen: It is a special privilege for me to be asked to share this Commencement Day with you. I am particularly moved to be back in the state and county where I was born and raised and with old and dear friends. I hope that you will bear with me for a few minutes, while I speak about certain deeply-felt convictions which I believe are both important and relevant today.

Each of you is keenly aware, I'm sure, of what awaits you. There will be greater freedom and greater responsibilities—wider choices and more decisions, and these decisions will be made in stormy and divisive times.

In recent weeks I have often recalled the words of President Lincoln. Perhaps you remember them. He said, "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present . . . As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew . . ."

This charge, this responsibility of each member of each new generation, is especially true for us. We live in a society which, despite its many shortcomings is blessed with more individual freedom than man has ever known. In creating it, our forebears drew upon the long-held dreams of many men in many lands. What they really did, 194 years ago, in declaring our liberty, was to make the individual sovereign rather than subject. And those who are sovereign are also responsible.

Each member of each new generation, then, is responsible for what he, his fellowmen, and his nation become. They build on the past. They live in the present. But they must reach for the future.

Julian Boyd, editor of *The Jefferson Papers*, wrote not long ago about some of Thomas Jefferson's fundamental convictions. They are relevant to us today. Jefferson, he said,

"... expected each generation to confront its own problems and to seek their solution in the light of reason and justice, not of ancient dogma. The essence of his meaning is that in a society dedicated to improvement in the condition of man, change was not only inevitable but necessary, that it was to be sought out and embraced, and that indeed—whatever laws, institutions and customs might be discarded by one generation after another—there was in reality, 'nothing... unchangeable but the inherent and unalienable rights of man.'"

We must seek and embrace change not for its own sake. We must seek it to keep our institutions responsive.

By molding our institutions to fit changing conditions, needs, and aspirations we preserve the best of the past. When structures harden, they easily break.

The important point is that each individual be concerned with the fundamental issues, that he seek responsible, flexible, and compassionate solutions for them, that he take his position upon them.

For concern and responsibility do not exist in a vacuum. They exist in the community. And it is ultimately in the community that they must be exercised.

President Kennedy once observed, "That in a dangerous and trying time in the life of this country, there is no substitute for action. We cannot drift or sleep or lie at anchor." That is clearly still true, and it is likely to be true all your lives. But it is equally true that such action should be non-violent. For the use of violence is corrupting and defeats the cause in the name of which it is used.

This is where you stand, then, confronting the problems of your generation educating yourselves so that you can seek solutions fitted to the need and reason of the time. But this—I believe—is not a rootless process. Rather, it is a new growth on the plants of yesteryear, and an infusion of new energy and imagination in the society which now exists.

As a new generation grows, its roots draw sustenance from knowledge of the past; from things built well, long ago; and from long-tested values and ideals. The new generation can and should question everything, test everything, and reach its own conclusions.

But there is a continuity in the affairs of man. If it is true that many of our problems stem from the errors of the past, it is also likely to be true that some of the learning of the past is applicable today. And it is certainly true that the price for discarding old values is the creation of better alternatives. Failure to do this is to destroy rather than to build, and, through building, to help one's fellowman.

There is a need, I submit, to preserve those old roots from which a revitalized society can draw strength to meet the world which lies ahead. In this endeavor, you will not be alone. The biblical allotment of three-score-and-ten means that several generations will always be living side by side—hopefully in "peaceful coexistence"—facing the challenges and opportunities together. There is an old German proverb which holds that "the old forget and the young don't know." The task of the several generations, I think is to prove this a libel on both counts and to merge what they remember and what they learn for the benefit of all.

The old do remember some things which are worth preserving. Perhaps, above all, they have learned to discount absolute certainty—they know that men can often be wrong. This, for example, is a part of what Benjamin Franklin said in September of 1787, in urging the adoption of what the British statesman Gladstone later called "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

Franklin said: "I confess that there are several parts of this Constitution which I do not at present approve, but I am not sure I shall never approve them. For having lived long, I have experienced many instances of being obliged by better information or fuller consideration, to change opinions even on important subjects, which I once thought right, but found to be otherwise... the older I grow, the more apt I am to doubt my own judgment, and to pay more respect to the judgment of others... I cannot help expressing a wish that every member of the Convention, who may still have objections to it, would wish me... doubt a little of his own infallibility and... put his name to this instrument."

The young bring a questioning, an energy, and an impatience with the status quo—qualities which energize society and broaden the horizons of all, young and old.

A vital ingredient, needed, however, almost above all others, to assure that the new generations make constructive contributions to society, is knowledge. We need criticism, but it must be informed. We need dissent, but it must be informed. We need new ideas, but they must be informed. We need new programs and new initiatives, but they must be informed with the learning of the past and made relevant to the problems of the present.

But even being informed is not enough. It is, in fact, worth little—unless you are prepared to take a stand.

It need not be a public stand, although it can be. It need not be a stand that leads you to participation in an active movement, although it can be. But it must be your own stand. It is all too easy to run with the pack, to take the currently popular positions, merely because your peers are doing so. Your stand must represent your own thinking and your own convictions.

How and where one proceeds from that stand depends upon one's particular talents. And it depends upon one's particular opportunities. The individual with the greatest talent might, in some instances, have the opportunity to influence only his or her neighbor. One person's talent and opportunity might permit him to express his concern and convictions at a moderate level in a small community; another at a high level of government.

As I have previously said, the important point is that you involve yourselves in the fundamental issues, seek solutions for them, and take positions upon them.

I cannot in this troubled world, at this time, let this day pass without briefly touching on two issues which dominate our time. They are the question of our national priorities and the war in Indochina. These are issues on which all of us have a responsibility to take a stand.

Clearly the time has come for us to reorder our priorities. In this you will and should play a major role. It will no longer do for us to continue to starve our budgets—federal, state, and city—for housing, health, education, welfare, and the quality of life. Each of you in West Virginia knows how much work needs to be done to revitalize our towns, our cities, and our rural areas.

In the international area—I believe—we must find a way to bring to an early end the war which has riven our country and polarized its people. The expansion of the war into Cambodia should be reversed, and new initiatives—including the proposal of a standstill cease-fire—pressed in an urgent new effort to find peace.

Looking ahead, you can see, then, how much there is that remains to be done. What you must do is do it—do it all. I urge you to continue to turn your attention to public matters. For the ultimate fulfillment of man

lies in the best use of his talents in the best interests of his fellowmen.

Thank you, and may God bless and keep the Class of 1970 in the years ahead.

SENATE COMMITTEE REPORTS ON NLRB

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to a report on the National Labor Relations Board issued by a Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, the Subcommittee on Separation of Powers, around March 1 of this year.

This subcommittee is headed by Senator ERVIN, of North Carolina, recognized as a constitutional authority and its membership includes, in addition to the North Carolinian, Senator McCLELLAN, of Arkansas, Senator BURDICK, of North Dakota, and Senator HRUSKA, of Nebraska, all regarded as able men. The majority report was signed by Senators ERVIN, McCLELLAN, and HRUSKA, and Senator BURDICK dissented.

Some Members of the House are aware of this report on the NLRB and its significance. But little publicity was given the findings and all Members of this body are busy, day in and day out, with their own affairs. I hope, however, that all Congressmen find time to get this document and study it for, sooner or later, I feel that additional legislation dealing with the National Labor Relations Board is inevitable.

As is well known, I have been critical of the NLRB in the past. My attention was called to actions by this body in my district which I regarded as biased and high handed and with little regard for the law, itself, the National Labor Relations Act. As I went into this matter, I came to the conclusion, which I still firmly hold, that the National Labor Relations Board is simply an adjunct of the major unions and that, in particular, it feels its duty embraces helping the AFL-CIO, the UAW, the Teamsters, and other groups in their never-ceasing campaigns to organize all the workers in this country.

In case after case, the NLRB, in my considered judgment, and that of many others, ignored the law and fair play in its effort to help unionize employees. This partisanship towards unions is reflected in many other cases.

My view is the view taken by the majority of the Senate subcommittee, which goes into a good deal of detail in citing individual cases which support its conclusions. However, the attitude of the majority is pretty well summed up in the following statement from the report:

On the basis of its study, the Subcommittee has found that in choosing between conflicting values—in difficult cases and some that are not so difficult—the National Labor Relations Board has of late unrea-

sonably emphasized the establishment and maintenance of collective bargaining and strong unions to the exclusion of other important statutory purposes which often involve the rights of individual employees. Unions unable to persuade a majority of employees to opt for collective bargaining have been able to get the Board to impose it for them. An the Board has been able to do this by a freewheeling interpretation of the statute's more general provisions, by applying double standards, and by ignoring plain legislative mandates. The Board has also, we find, in matters going beyond recognition and the establishment of bargaining, given interpretations to the statute which reflect an overemphasis on helping unions impose their will on employers and individual employees. The Board clearly believes that it knows what is best for employees and all too frequently subordinates individual rights to the interest of organized labor.

These are harsh words but I think, and so do a lot of other people who have followed the Board's decisions, that they are warranted.

In support of its criticism of the Board, the majority of the subcommittee points out that the agency purports to test the validity of a representation election by determining whether it was held in "laboratory conditions." I am uncertain as to just what is meant by "laboratory conditions" and the report points out "this concept of 'laboratory conditions' has no counterpart in American political practice."

If we examine the Board's rulings in certain key cases, we will find that the determination as to whether a representation election was held under "laboratory conditions" gives the NLRB an excuse to do just about anything it wants to do. The validity of an election is determined also whether either party committed a preelection unfair labor practice which affected the election. If an employer is not guilty of a preelection unfair labor practice, in the opinion of the NLRB, he is always vulnerable under the "laboratory conditions" formula.

In Peoria Plastic Co., 117 NLRB 545, (1957) the NLRB ruled that if an employer called all or a majority of his employees into his office to urge them to reject the union, this action was sufficient to upset election. This verdict also applied to calling them into the office individually, or calling upon them at their homes to urge them to vote against unionization.

But in Plant City Welding and Tank Co., 119 NLRB 131 (1957) the NLRB held that calls by union organizers at the home of employees to urge them to vote for unionization did not destroy "laboratory conditions."

Section 8(c) of the NLRA holds that speech alone cannot be the basis of an unfair labor practice charge unless it coerces or promises some benefit. The definition of coercion is, of course, difficult but it is clear that the Board has moved toward ever-increasing restrictions on employer speech. In this connection, *NLRB v. Golub Corp.*, 388 F. 2d 921, 926 (1967) is referred to, with the comment that the Board "has gone the limit and beyond in finding a coercive impact in isolated and relatively innocuous remarks by employers." In the Golub case, for example, the NLRB found that the

employer's statements that unionization might result in disadvantages to the workers was unfair but, as the subcommittee reports pointed out:

The Union is always free to promise increased benefits as a result of its efforts.

The tendency of the Board to direct an employer to bargain with the union on the basis of authorization cards signed by employees is emphasized in the report. The Taft-Hartley Act gives "election by secret ballot" as the only specified means for resolving questions of representation but more and more, the NLRB relies on cards provided they accord with the wishes of the union involved.

I find some remarks from the subcommittee report about the insistence of the Board upon bypassing secret elections—ordered by the NLRA—in favor of cards both interesting and enlightening. I quote:

The Board's disregard of secret elections as the best means of determining employee choice and its determination to impose unionism whether or not the employees want it is exemplified by its decision in *Conren Inc.*, 156 NLRB 592 (1966). Section 9(c) (3) forbids the holding of valid elections within 12 months of each other. The section clearly is intended to establish industrial stability and peace for 1 year after an election. The Board in *Conren* held the employer violated 8(a)(5) when he refused to recognize a union with authorization cards from 28 of 53 employees 9 months after the union lost a valid election. The Board's holding that the employer did not have a good faith doubt as to majority status seems unbelievable in light of the previous election and the slim majority of authorization cards. Indeed, given the Board's experience, as reflected in Chairman McCulloch's speech, on the unreliability of cards, an employer who recognized a union on the basis of 28 cards with 53 employees might more plausibly be found to have committed the unfair labor practice of recognizing a minority union.

The reference to Chairman McCulloch is to the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, who emphasized the unreliability of authorization cards in a speech in 1962.

The subcommittee report continued:

And yet the Board does not give serious consideration to the efficacy of a rerun secret election. It issues bargaining orders based solely on authorization cards from a bare majority of employees whenever it can in Bernel Foam cases. The Board not only relies on what is conceded by everyone, including Mr. McCulloch, to be a generally unreliable indicator of employee opinion but it also has constructed rules which minimize the impact of evidence indicating that in particular cases that cards were secured by questionable conduct. The Board requires, for instance, that each card be invalidated individually by proof as to how it was secured. It gives no consideration to the totality of the atmosphere. It permits union organizers to indulge in the pretense that the purpose of the cards is merely to bring about an election and will not invalidate them unless it was represented that was the sole purpose. See *NLRB v. Golub Corp.*, 388 F. 2d 921, 923 (1967).

The original Bernel Foam decision was handed down in 1964 and gave rise to a series of so-called Bernel Foam cases. Bernel Foam, a Buffalo, N.Y., based firm, refused the request of the Textile Workers Union of America to bargain on the basis of authorization cards. The matter

then went to an election and the union lost. Nevertheless, the NLRB ordered the company to bargain with the union, claiming that statements by Bernel Foam constituted unfair labor practices. This is a heads the employer loses, tails the union wins kind of decision. If the union loses an election to bargain for the workers, it can always appeal to the NLRB, knowing this agency will lean over backward to help it out.

In many respects, I regard the Board's disregard of the rights of individual employees as shocking and unjustified. The Taft-Hartley Act specifically gives an employee the right to engage in, or to refuse to engage in, concerted union activities. This protection did not extend to internal union rights. Under the plain intent of the law, as I read it, a union might expel a worker from membership but this should not affect his employment or put him in physical danger. The Taft-Hartley Act does permit the collection of union dues from workers where the union is the bargaining agency, but the States do have the right to ban this compulsion. Nineteen have done so and are called right-to-work States.

But the NLRB has trespassed on individual rights to the extent that it permits the union to fine the worker for such things as refusing to cross a picket line, or for exceeding union imposed work limitations.

NLRB and union supporters point out that many of the decisions which management has complained about have been upheld by Federal courts, including the Supreme Court. These decisions are the law, it is true, but I would remind Members of this legislative body that the courts, and the Supreme Court among them, have changed their rulings—the law—many times. There has been a controversy about the Federal Court for years, with many well informed attorneys believing that the courts are legislating and going far beyond the meaning of the statute through interpretations that are strained and unrealistic. As a matter of fact, the decisions of the Supreme Court in both civil and criminal areas have become matters of national concern and controversy. As is well known, the recent rejection by the Senate of two Supreme Court nominations of Federal judges from Southern States revolved around the attitude of the Court. The fundamental question was whether the Highest Tribunal should interpret the Constitution and legislation broadly or whether it should confine, itself, generally speaking to a more strict construction.

To those who defend the NLRB by pointing out that most of the rulings in the labor field of that body have been upheld by the Courts, let me point out a couple of things on my own.

In most instances, the Court refuses to examine the facts involved, relying on the so-called expertise of the NLRB in the labor field. Let me give you an example of what I am talking about.

For several years now, the courts, the Supreme Court among them, have held against J. P. Stevens & Co., one of the largest national textile concerns, in cases arising from the efforts by the Textile Workers Union of America, AFL-

CIO affiliate, to organize Stevens workers. In almost every case which has come before it, the NLRB has ruled that Stevens was guilty of unfair labor practices. Insofar as I recall, in every case which has been decided thus far by the courts, Stevens has lost.

As a result, the word has spread far and wide that Stevens had violated the law and without knowing the background, the average person would draw the conclusion that the textile company has stubbornly and willfully refused to let its employees join the union. But this matter, if one goes into it, is extremely complicated and illustrates the length to which the NLRB will go in helping the unions organize employees.

Examiners for the NLRB questioned witnesses for the company and witnesses for the union at length. Both had the support of formidable lists of reputable persons but, curiously enough, or maybe it is not so curious after all, the examiners said they believed the witnesses for the union but did not believe the witnesses for the company. Or to state it another way, the dice were loaded against the company on the very first throw. I am making a strong statement but I can put no other interpretation on the ruling by the NLRB that all the witnesses for one side lied and all the witnesses for the other told the truth. There were, however, no charges of perjury brought. One examiner for the NLRB did try to explain why one group would falsify en masse. What he came up with was that the witnesses for the company believed so strongly that they were doing the right thing in opposing unionism, or supporting the company, that they were willing to lay aside ordinary moral convictions and lie, just as men are willing to put aside ordinary moral convictions against killing in time of war.

A fantastic explanation. To accept it one must presuppose that opposition to unionism among a majority of the Stevens employees amounts to fanaticism. I do not think either the union, or the NLRB, would like to accept this theory, even though it was put forward by a Board examiner. Certainly, however, there is a strong sentiment against unionism among Stevens employees. Otherwise, with the help of the Board and the tremendous resources available to the union, Stevens would have been organized years ago.

I mentioned the fact that the NLRB had trespassed on the individual rights of the worker. Let me illustrate the extent to which this trespass has gone. The NLRB ruled that it was not an unfair labor practice for a union to fine a member who continued to work during a strike called by the labor organization. The Board did not say that the member had the option of leaving the union rather than to pay the fine. He was given no such alternative and the union was told, in effect, to impose its will.

This case, which went to the Supreme Court in NLRB against Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. et al., is famous in the long line of Court decisions on labor matters. Or perhaps, I should say, infamous. The Supreme Court upheld the Board ruling but the decision was 5 to 4.

Justice Black dissented strongly, saying, in effect, that union rights had been placed ahead of individual rights. Even the Washington Post, regarded as extremely liberal in viewpoint, could not stomach the majority opinion handed down by Justice Brennan. The Post said:

The answer of the dissenters . . . (Justice Black and others) is pointed and severe.

The real reason for the Court's decision is its policy judgment that unions, especially weak ones, need the power to impose fines on strikebreakers and to enforce these fines in Court. The dissenters go on to say that the Court has written this new proviso into the law despite a strong and clear purpose of Congress to leave the workers wholly free to determine in what concerted labor activities they will engage or decline to engage.

The Ervin Subcommittee report goes ahead to comment that, extending the Allis-Chalmers rationalization, the Board since has permitted "a union to discipline a member who invoked the processes of the Board in order to obtain a decertification election."

I will not try to detail other sections of the report which should be examined by everyone interested in labor relations. Some of the interesting discussion concerns unit determination, the duty to bargain, organizational picketing, hot cargo clauses, and judicial review.

The influence of politics on the Board is gone into frankly and suggestions are made as to alternatives to the NLRB as it exists today.

I am not calling attention to the subcommittee report in justification for the stand I have taken that NLRB is dangerously unfair. I simply want to emphasize that I am only one of many who feel that something needs to be done about this problem, a problem which will not go away.

The appointments to the Board which will be made by President Nixon may change the biased prolabor attitude of the NLRB but what we need is a body which deals with the National Labor Relations Act in an impartial spirit. Congress has attempted, through two major legislative revisions, to change the obvious prolabor letter and spirit of the original Wagner Act. Yet, we find that the NLRB and the courts have insisted on revising what Congress has tried to do and the bias remains. This whole area is too important to the Nation's economy to let this situation continue.

POWER TO WHAT PEOPLE?

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 19, 1970

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, Mr. Kenneth Crawford, who writes for Newsweek magazine, has written a very thoughtful, to the point column, "Power To What People?" which appears in this week's issue of that magazine.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the article

was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POWER TO WHAT PEOPLE?

(By Kenneth Crawford)

The 75,000 or so young people who gathered in the Ellipse behind the White House to say that they disapproved of military raids into Cambodia and continued war in Vietnam have gone their way—"Right on," presumably. Serious, efficient and near-heroic marshals among them kept the vandal minority in check. Most of the demonstrators behaved well in their own strange fashion. Having done their thing in Washington, they returned to their campuses, some to resume old strikes or start new ones, others to make serious political plans.

It cannot be said this time that the demonstration was irrelevant or wholly ineffectual. Administration officials and members of Congress listened. The announcement that U.S. troops would be out of Cambodia by the end of next month was a concession of sorts. Speakers at the rally, Jane Fonda through David Dellinger, made no notable impression, but delegations of students bent on "dialogue" rather than "confrontation" did. Some even accommodated themselves to the realization that to be heard isn't necessarily to be immediately heeded. The 75,000 in the Ellipse naturally pretended to speak for all 200 million Americans. They, of course, didn't, but their cause probably enlisted more sympathy than ever before.

BACKLASH

What seems quite clear from various samplings of attitude, and the mail congressmen and senators are getting, is that the antiwar majority, if it is a majority, wants to speak for itself, not to be spoken for by college students, be they obstreperous or restrained. Indeed, many who dislike the war dislike the students even more. An entirely predictable backlash against campus disruption is being felt even on campuses. Serious students, especially needy students trying to prepare themselves for careers, resent the often well-heeled, fake proletarians who are denying them access to classrooms. On some campuses they have forced resumption of normal operations.

Off campus, the worst outbreak of resentment against students was the demonstration of hard-hat construction workers in the Wall Street district of New York. The spectacle of burly working men mauling stringy school boys, disguised in beards, was not edifying. But an angry worker, shaking a thick finger into a television camera, explained himself by charging that these kids, getting the breaks he never got, had the gall to taunt him and his kind, hard-working people whose dignity was not to be affronted. The violent march was applauded from office windows and by noonday crowds on the sidewalks.

The Wall Street incident said something about this year's political alignments. Many students, resolved to make another try at working within the system, as they did disappointingly in the McCarthy campaign two years ago, are cutting their hair preparatory to canvassing for "peace candidates" in the Congressional elections. They are already constituting themselves a lobby to promote resolutions now before Congress to cut off funds first for operations in Cambodia and later for Vietnam itself. How a senator or representative votes on these measures will determine his eligibility for student support.

DILEMMA

Most members of Congress have a position on the war, but not all of them have advertised it. They believe either that the President, as Commander in Chief, should be trusted to withdraw U.S. troops from Indochina as Vietnamization proceeds or that his hand should be forced by drawing in the

purse strings. Cut-off resolutions will force those who have been merely passive to come out from behind the bushes. The resulting political dilemma is obvious. Should a candidate for re-election play up to hard-line, or to student sentiment? Will student doorbell ringers help or hurt? For many, this choice will not be an easy one.

Some have been swept up by the hysteria of the Cambodian moment or intimidated, as so many college faculties have been, by the student stampede. They may be caught in a reaction, already setting in, if and when the success of the sanctuary clean-out is fully recognized. As students simmer down and disperse for summer vacations, high-tension polarization will diminish. Issues other than the war will command attention. May's political atmosphere may not be November's. Elections, as they always do, will restore power to the people. But what people get it and how they use it may disappoint the slogan-seers as much as 1968's outcome did.

MEN, CARS, AND SPEED: TONY HULMAN AND THE "500"

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the tension at the Indianapolis Memorial Speedway on Saturday, May 30, 1970, will mount into an almost unbearable crescendo starting at 6 a.m. when the gates open and the stands and infield begin to swell with hundreds of thousands of spectators from all over the world.

At 10:30, the cars are on the apron, in front of the pits.

At 11, the bands parade in front of the pits and tower, on the mainstraight-away.

At 11:50, hundreds of brightly colored balloons soar upward into the Indiana sky.

At 11:53, Mr. Tony Hulman, president of the Indianapolis Motor Speedway, speaks the world-famous command, most thrilling in all auto racing: "Gentlemen, start your engines!" Starting mechanisms whine; engines cough into life; blue smoke from the exhaust spirals into the air; 33 cars, the apotheosis of motor engineering skill and design thunder their hoarse challenges to each other, the sound reverberating across the track and around the world.

One minute later, at 11:54, they move out in 11 glistening, glittering rows of three each, behind the pace car, for the pace lap at a steady 100 miles an hour. Into the southwest turn, low on the inside and riding high on the banks of the "Brickyard," across the south end of the oval, into the southeast turn and up the backstretch, as the crowd, on its feet and roaring, watches them pass as in a grand review. Across the north end of the track, into the main stretch, the tension climbs; then, past the control tower, the green flag snaps down, and the pace car pulls aside. Released from the restraint of the pace lap, 33 throttles are pushed toward the firewall, and the cars plunge ahead in a snarling, charging pack. As the clock marks 12 noon, the 54th annual Indianapolis 500-mile race is underway.

The late, great, beloved Hoosier journalist, Ernie Pyle, once wrote of the 500:

I've felt the great 500-mile auto race at Indianapolis was the most exciting event—in terms of human suspense—that I've ever known.

Let us see the story behind the event, as told in the words of Speedway officials themselves:

INDIANAPOLIS MOTOR SPEEDWAY: HOME OF THE 500-MILE RACE

The Indianapolis Motor Speedway, incorporating a two and one half mile race course inside a 571-acre site just west of Indianapolis, became a reality in 1909, when four men—Carl G. Fisher, James A. Allison, A. C. Newby and Frank H. Wheeler—pooled their ideas and resources to create what has become the greatest race course in the world.

The track surface, originally crushed stone and tar, was opened for competition on August 19, 1909, for three days of sprint racing and the great Barney Oldfield set a new world's record for a closed circuit course when he drove a Benz at an average 83.2 mph for one mile. After those initial contests, however, the founders realized that a paved surface was necessary for the safety and protection of the drivers. Work was begun immediately and a total of three million, two hundred thousand paving bricks went into the huge project, which was completed in time for a series of sprint races on December 18 of the same year.

FIRST "500" IN 1911

The first 500-mile Classic was held in 1911 and the winner, driving a six-cylinder Marmon Wasp at an average speed of 74.59 mph, was Ray Harroun. Since that time, except for war years, the annual Classic has grown to become the world's greatest sports event. At the same time, the famed race course has fulfilled the ideas of its founders by leading the parade of progress for the entire automotive industry. Through the courage and untiring efforts of the drivers and mechanics of Gasoline Alley, who annually prove new ideas and equipment in the 500-mile race, the automotive industry has benefitted greatly. High compression engines, four wheel brakes, hydraulic shock absorbers, torsion bars, fuels and lubricants, various chassis designs, safer tires, better spark plugs, better piston rings, lighter and more durable metals, fuel injection, magnesium wheels, and many other features adding to the safety and comfort of present day passenger cars, were developed on the Speedway.

From a strictly-racing standpoint, the emphasis since 1961 has been placed on the development of light-weight rear-engine cars; and turbine powered cars were strong contenders for premier honors in 1967 and 1968.

PROGRESS OF THE SPEEDWAY

Over a period of 61-years, many changes and improvements have been made to the Speedway, including two changes in management, with emphasis placed primarily on facilities for the safety and convenience of spectators and participants alike. The actual race track, however, has remained virtually unchanged and it still serves as an accurate measuring stick for automotive progress although most race fans apparently are interested primarily in the performance of outstanding drivers who have earned their particular admiration.

During the early years of the Indianapolis Motor Speedway, the names of DePalma, Dawson, Mulford, Milton, Chevrolet and Resta, through their memorable deeds behind the wheel made an indelible impression in the hearts and minds of the motoring public.

In 1927, when such men as Souders,

DePaolo, Lockhart, Shaw, Meyer, Hartz and Hepburn were continuing to write 500 history, the Speedway was old to Captain E. V. "Eddie" Rickenbacker and his associates. Rickenbacker, noted World War I flying ace, remained in control throughout the depression years, preserving the color and tradition of the 500-million race despite financial and economic problems. His reign over the Speedway continued until the advent of World War II, when racing was suspended for the duration. In 1945, following Japan's surrender, the Speedway was purchased by Anton Hulman, Jr., of Terre Haute, Indiana, under whose control the big plant has flourished throughout the past twenty-four years. Under Hulman's control the Speedway was developed far beyond the wildest dreams of race fans and the racing fraternity. Wilbur Shaw, former three-time winner of the 500-mile race, was named president and general manager under Mr. Hulman, and served until his death in a 1954 plane crash.

One of the first major changes to the track itself was the resurfacing program under the Rickenbacker regime during the 1930's, when all but the main straightaway was paved with asphalt. Under Mr. Hulman many more improvements and changes have taken place, eight of the nine wooden grandstands have been placed with structures of steel and concrete, and new stands have been added, as well as a new museum-office building near the main entrance to the grounds. The main straightaway also was paved with asphalt in the fall of 1961 and the remainder of the track was resurfaced in 1964 and the summer of 1969.

CONTROL TOWER BUILT IN 1957

Major changes made in an expensive improvement program prior to the 1957 event included the removal of the historic Pagoda which had been a Speedway landmark since the early 1920's. It was replaced by a modernistic, steel and concrete Tower Terrace which seats approximately 14,000 people and houses vantage points for official timers, scorers, members of the press and radio, and the safety director. This seating section is designed so as to give spectators the best possible view of activity. Located adjacent to the garage area, it is surrounded by a walkway which affords fans a closer view of the cars and garage activity. Strolling along the walkway, spectators now have an excellent opportunity to meet and talk with many of the drivers and personalities on practice and time trial days.

Also included in the improvement program was the remodeling of the pit area proper. This section was greatly enlarged, giving crews 100 per cent more working room behind the safety of a concrete retaining wall and a 15-foot grass plot which separate the pit area from the actual track. A pit driveway, 35-feet wide, gives drivers a safe route to and from the pit area where their cars are serviced.

A new double-decked steel and concrete Paddock Grandstand at the starting line was completed for the 1961 Golden Anniversary "500" and was enlarged in 1963. New grandstands also have been built outside the No. 1, No. 3 and No. 4 turns.

The track itself varies in width from 50-feet on the straight stretches to 60-feet on the turns. Each of the four turns is banked 9 degrees and 12 minutes, and they measure a quarter-mile in length. The front and back stretches measure $\frac{1}{4}$ of a mile while the short straightaways at the north and south ends are $\frac{1}{2}$ of a mile long. From the air, the course appears as a giant rectangle, measuring two and one-half miles, contained in the 571 acres, which also house a 27-hole golf course. Reserved seats are available for more than 200,000 spectators and an additional 125,000 can be accommodated in the infield where there is also room for 30,000 automobiles.

THE FABULOUS 500-MILE RACE

Since 1911, the 500-Mile Memorial Day Classic has been an annual affair. Only the war years of 1917-18 and the 1942-45 have disturbed the running of this famed international contest. The 1969 race, won by Mario Andretti at a new record speed of 156.867 miles an hour, was the 53rd Classic held at the Speedway and Mario's share of the \$805,000 purse was \$206,727, also a new record.

In the period from 1911 to 1969, excepting the war years, there have been 42 different winners. Four men Louis Meyer, Wilbur Shaw, Mauri Rose and A. J. Foyt have won three times. Roger Ward, Tommy Milton, and Bill Vukovich have won the race twice.

In the early years of Speedway competition, racing teams from Europe and other parts of the world were not uncommon. Foreign competitors, in fact, won the race in 1913, and '14 and again in 1916. But Clark, the World's Grand Prix Champion from Scotland, driving a Lotus-Ford, was the first European driver since 1916 to score a 500-mile victory. Graham Hill of England won in 1966. The last foreign-powered car to do it was an Italian Maserati driven by Wilbur Shaw in 1939 and '40. Alberto Ascari of Italy, Jack Brabham of Australia, Jack Stewart of Scotland, Denis Hulme of New Zealand and Jochen Rindt of Austria also have added international flavor to the "500" in recent years.

Speeds, along with new equipment and safety measures, have progressed steadily at the Speedway. Today's four-lap qualification record of 171.559 mhp, set by Joe Leonard in 1968 and Andretti's 500 Mile record of 156.87 mph in 1969 are in sharp contrast with the 74.59 mph average with which Ray Harroun won the 1911 Classic. Through the years, competing cars have become faster and safer through the efforts and ideas of racing men directly responsible for many of the pleasures we enjoy in our passenger cars today.

TICKET INFORMATION

Although the 500-mile race comes once annually, preparations and pre-race activity are full-time projects for both the participants and Speedway management. Entries are accepted from early January until April 15, and more than 70 usually are received each year. Ticket orders are accepted at the Speedway office by mail, beginning July 1st each year, and thousands of fans make ticket reservations on that date. Over-the-counter sales begin after all mail orders for tickets have been filled. Ticket order blanks, showing seat locations and prices are always available to fans calling in person or writing Indianapolis Motor Speedway, Speedway, Indiana 46224.

The Speedway maintains a permanent year round staff of about one-hundred persons, but this is augmented as demands require until Race Day, when thousands more are involved. For example, the Speedway hires a Safety Patrol of approximately 2,400 men each year during the month of May. There are seven first aid tents and twelve ambulances with a personnel of more than 100 to man them. In the main hospital and in the stands, more than 250 doctors and nurses are on duty.

A large number of other organizations also work with the Speedway staff, such as Bell Telephone Company's 135 men and women, Western Union's 50 operators, and the group of some 350 representatives of the United States Auto Club who conduct the race. Drivers, mechanics and pit crewmen number about 600 while an additional 100 men are occupied with official timing of the race. In addition, there are 350 city, county, state and Speedway City police and Marion County deputy sheriffs, plus 250 firemen. A site of 571 acres is transformed into a city of approximately 300,000 persons on Race Day,

with 30,000 cars parked in the infield alone. Busses and taxicabs also carry many thousands of spectators to and from the track.

The starting field for the International 500-mile race is open to the fastest thirty-three cars, and these are determined by four-lap (ten-mile) qualification runs timed to one-one hundredth of a second by an electric timing device. Four days (two weekends prior to race day) are allotted as qualifying days. Each entrant is allowed three chances to make a time trial, and the lineup for race day is determined through speeds posted by each qualifier. Cars qualifying the first day are awarded starting positions at the front of the field with number one or pole position going to the day's fastest qualifier. Cars posting second and third fastest time on the first day, receive number two and three starting positions. The same procedure is used throughout each day of qualifications, with cars lining up behind those qualified on previous days, until the field is full. Then it is possible for additional qualifiers to bump slower cars from the lineup, regardless of the day on which they qualified, by posting faster speeds.

All track activity throughout practice, qualifications and the race itself, is under the strict supervision of United States Auto Club (USAC) officials. From the time practice begins, on May 1st, cars on the track are under observation at all times from veteran USAC observers stationed at vantage points around the two and one-half mile track. Every practical precautionary measure is taken for the safety of drivers and spectators.

"ROOKIES" GIVEN STIFF TEST

Drivers appearing at the Speedway for the first time must pass a strict driving test under the watchful eyes of USAC officials and veteran drivers. Even though a driver may have years of racing experience elsewhere, he is required to take this test before attempting a qualification run. Officials deem this necessary since speeds and driving techniques at Indianapolis differ greatly from other types of racing in this country. Drivers failing to pass their "rookie" test are usually advised to obtain more experience and try again the following year.

Race day at Indianapolis is the climax to months of preparation and tense excitement. The pre-race activity, the colorful last minute preparations, and the roar of thirty-three powerful automobiles taking the starting flag, provide a thrill unmatched anywhere in the world. A quotation written by Ernie Pyle—"I've always felt the great 500-mile auto race at Indianapolis was the most exciting event—in terms of human suspense—that I've ever known".

During a race, pit crews refuel a car and change all four tires if necessary in the phenomenal time of 24 or 25 seconds.

One of the most treasured points of interest to Speedway visitors is the Museum, located in the east wing of the office building at the main entrance to the grounds. Opened in May 1956, just prior to the race, the Museum contains an array of interesting exhibits including race cars that have contributed to 500-mile race history throughout the past 58 years. To thousands of visitors passing through, these exhibits offer a link with the early history of the internationally famous 500-mile Classic.

THE 11 WINNING CARS ON DISPLAY

Among the prominent cars on display are 11 former winners, including the famous Marmon Wasp with which Ray Harroun won the first 500 in 1911; the National which Joe Dawson drove to a record victory in 1912; and the French Delage with which Rene Thomas won in 1914. In addition, there is the Duesenberg which Jimmy Murphy drove to Victory Lane in 1922—the same car in which he won the French Grand Prix at Le Mans, France to become the first American

race driver ever to win a European Grand Prix event. Other former winning cars include the Italian Maserati which Wilbur Shaw drove to two of his three victories; Louis Meyer's 1928 Miller Special; the famous Lou Moore Blue Crown front drive, chattered to victory in 1947 and '48 by Mauri Rose; Lee Wallard's 1951 winner; the car Bill Vukovich drove to consecutive victories in 1953 and '54; the Belond Special which Sam Hanks and Jimmy Bryan used to win in 1957 and 1958, respectively; and the Sheraton-Thompson Special in which Foyt scored his 1964 triumph. The Shaw car, an eight cylinder creation, was the last foreign-powered automobile to win the 500-mile race, and the first care to win consecutive, "Indy" races (1939-1940). Clark and Hill drove cars powered by Ford V-8 racing engines.

Other famous cars from France, Germany, Italy and England also are included in the Speedway display.

Etchings of each 500-mile race winner make up an impressive display in the center of the Museum, in addition to many pictures which tell an interesting story of the Speedway from its beginning to the present. There also are trophies—some of them dating back to 1909—plus medals; early-vintage programs; pit badges; the famous Krauss Crown of Jewels; a huge plaque honoring all members of Auto Racing's Hall of Fame; and the first crash helmet worn in the U.S.

Since the Museum was opened to the public, it has been expanded constantly. Vigorous research and uncounted hours have continued to turn up new items of interest for display. Before long, it is expected that the Indianapolis Motor Speedway Museum will be one of the most unique and complete establishments of its kind in the world. Already it has become a national showplace, with persons from each of the 50 states as well as visitors from every continent passing through its portals. The Museum is open to the public free of charge, from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. daily.

Admission to the Speedway grounds also is free of charge except during the month of May, when a nominal charge is made during the practice and qualification periods. Visitors are welcome daily, including Saturday and Sunday, from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., and they may go into Grandstand E near the main gate, in order to get a good view of the grounds. From this location it is possible to see most of the track as well as the garages and pit area. When the cars are not running on the track, visitors may ride around it in one of the Speedway's buses for a nominal charge of 25 cents.

Let us look, for a moment, at the man behind all of this: Anton "Tony" Hulman:

He is one of Indiana's most prominent leaders in business and industry, and has maintained a constant interest in sports since he first attracted attention as an outstanding athlete at Worcester Academy and Yale. Hunting and deepsea fishing are his favorite forms of recreation today, but he still has all of the enthusiasm and aggressiveness which characterized his performance in more strenuous sports during the athletic "boom" which followed World War I.

At Worcester, in 1919, Tony earned recognition as the best schoolboy pole vaulter in the United States while engaging in other sports with almost equal success. Two years later he represented Yale in an international track meet at Boston, when the combined Yale-Harvard squad met the Oxford-Cambridge forces from England. In 1923 he won the international high hurdles championship in a similar event at Wembley, Eng-

land; and he also starred at end on the Yale football team.

Tony's principal responsibilities now are as president of Hulman & Co. at Terre Haute, Ind., the Indianapolis Motor Speedway, and the Coca Cola Bottling Co. of Indianapolis.

At Hulman & Co. he is carrying on the business founded by his grandfather, but he has devoted almost an equal amount of time to the Indianapolis 500-mile race since he acquired the famous race track in November of 1945. As the world's greatest sports spectacle, the annual event attracts approximately 300,000 spectators; and the participants compete for prize money in excess of \$700,000 each year on May 30.

Tony also serves on the board of directors of many important industrial and public utility firms throughout the Wabash and Ohio River Valleys; he is associated in various capacities with several of Indiana's educational institutions; and is active in numerous civic enterprises.

The following, from the official 1970 speedway souvenir program, tells how this outstanding Hoosier has contributed so much to the great sport of auto racing, and to his State:

TONY HULMAN AND THE "500"

As the world's outstanding cars and drivers await the starting signal for the 25th Indianapolis 500-Mile Race under the dedicated stewardship of Tony Hulman, there is little resemblance between today's magnificent facilities and those which existed when Tony assumed control in November of 1945.

After four years of idleness since the last previous race in 1941 (because of World War II) thickets of tall weeds and young trees blocked every entrance to the grounds. The dilapidated wooden grandstands, almost stripped of paint, appeared ready to collapse on the first windy day. Grass grew in the crevices between the bricks which formed the actual racing strip. But, with the same pioneering spirit which had inspired Carl G. Fisher and his associates to build the Speedway in 1909, Tony experienced a compelling desire to accept those conditions as a personal challenge.

There were several reasons he might have sidestepped the issue. The first contractors he called for consultation, for example, expressed the opinion that it would be impossible to refurbish the big plant and replace two grandstands—regarded as unsafe for occupancy—in time for a 1946 race on May 30. Some of his friends also believed that auto racing never again would attain its pre-war magnetism as a spectator sport; and that no amount of money and effort could re-establish the "500" on a sound economical basis. This was a challenge of even greater magnitude than any others Tony had faced during his career as an outstanding athlete and sportsman and businessman.

Evaluating the importance of the traditional race as a civic responsibility rather than a business opportunity, however, he followed the dictates of his provincial patriotism as a native Hoosier and purchased the Speedway from Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker.

Wilbur Shaw (killed in the crash of a small airplane nine years later) was Tony's choice to head the new "Speedway team" as president and general manager. During subsequent weeks, a solution was found for each of the many problems encountered in an effort to have the track ready for the start of practice on May 1. Members of the racing fraternity, meanwhile, completed their various wartime responsibilities and

began preparation for the first important automobile race in five years. There was too little time to create much in the way of new equipment. The necessary replacement parts for the pre-war cars also were extremely scarce, but a field of 56 entries finally was assembled.

Some of the wooden forms used in the construction of new concrete grandstands still were in place on the morning of the race as the largest crowd in the history of the sport created a gigantic traffic jam while "storming the gates" to be on hand for the long-awaited resumption of big car championship competition. Many ticket holders, caught in the worst of the incredible congestion, didn't reach their reserved seat locations until the race leaders already had passed the 300-mile mark. By that time, most of the highly-regarded "chargers" already were on the sidelines and the contest had developed into an endurance test with George Robson and Jimmy Jackson battling for first place.

Only eight other starters still were running when Robson crossed the finish line in an eight-year-old race car. Jackson, in an entry of similar vintage, trailed by only 34 seconds; but he had a lead of more than seven laps on Ted Horn in third place.

The "500" purse reached six figures for the first time in Speedway history as race participants shared \$115,450 at the victory dinner on the following night. Then, under Tony Hulman's guidance, the Speedway management embarked on a long-range plan of expansion with two principal objectives in mind: (1) everything possible would be done for the safety and convenience of drivers and spectators, alike; and (2) prize money would be increased as rapidly as sound business practices permitted.

New entrances to the grounds and a better system of interior roads solved the traffic problem for 1947. More steel and concrete grandstands, 18 additional garages and special accommodations for accessory companies followed as rapidly as gate receipts permitted. Next in chronological order came the new office-museum building, the control tower, the modern and much safer pit area, Tower Terrace seats, electric scoreboards, the motel and clubhouse, more tunnels and grandstands, a new championship golf course and the resurfacing of the race track.

Tony also increased the prize money steadily—to a new record of \$805,127 for last year's international classic—and members of the racing fraternity responded by building safer and faster cars. On 17 occasions since 1946, the race winner has shattered all previous records; and Mario Andretti surpassed Robson's performance by an average speed of more than 42 miles an hour to set the present mark of 156.867 a year ago.

Civic and business leaders, working together as members of the "500" Festival Committee and the Citizens Speedway Committee of the Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce, also deserve credit for helping establish the race more firmly as the world's greatest sports spectacle. But everything that's been accomplished by the combined efforts of everyone involved can be traced to that November day in 1945 when Tony Hulman accepted a new challenge as an important obligation of his Hoosier Heritage.

A truly American sports classic, the 500 attracts competitors in auto racing from all over the world. In past years, the rivalry was great, as it is in a somewhat similar vein today. The following lines are from a poem which was written around that intercountry rivalry for the 500 checkered flag, but within these lines, I believe, are contained the spirit and the drama and the excitement of this great classic sports event:

FROM: TO AMERICA'S DEFENDERS

(By J. C. Burton)

O! my sons, give heed to the gods of speed
When they call on you today;
There's a race to be run from the starting
gun

Till the bolts and nuts give way;
And the call to flight is a challenge old
From the men who dare to the men who're
bold.

O! my sons, give heed to the gods of speed,
For they call on you again;
If you give your best in this crucial test,
Then our hopes will not be in vain;
And the call to flight is a challenge rare
From the men who're brave to the men who
dare!

A FIGHT TO THE FINISH

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have been especially interested in the editorials carried over WGN television 9 commenting on the problems involved in drug abuse. Its editorial, "A Fight to the Finish," emphasizes the fact that it will continue to spotlight the subject and not drop it for other headline issues. I commend WGN for its determination to stay with this issue and continue to provide figures and information on drug abuse which we must do to combat the problem.

The editorial follows:

A FIGHT TO THE FINISH

A broadcast station perhaps comes closest to its reason for being when those who watch and listen understand that it cares.

The air waves can be impersonal. Broadcasting can be mechanical. But when lives unseen to us here are touched . . . when people are entertained, informed, and educated as a result of our efforts . . . then the broadcasting thing is working.

But it is incumbent upon us—the broadcasters—to care. We do. And that is why the week of April 26 thru Sunday, May 2 became "Anti-Drug Abuse Week" at WGN Television.

And now, through your letters, we are realizing how very personal broadcasting can be.

Teen-agers, using drugs, who—in their minds for this exact moment—have nowhere else to turn, are turning to us for help . . . to the whole vast complex known as WGN . . . in letters addressed to "Anyone."

Anyone.
"I know you will think I am a ridiculous teenager." . . . "I have a drug problem." "You could really help me if you could write me and tell me where . . . I could talk to someone." Or, ". . . really I would like to know of someone who wants to talk to me."

For those of us at WGN Television who read these letters, the anguish of their writers becomes, in a sense, our anguish . . . for how can we help now? We can and will send all the literature available to us to all those who request it.

But these 15 and 16 year olds whose letters we are holding need more than that. They need someone who cares about them personally right now!

These letters we're getting could be coming from your son: "I know that my parents are not the type that would try and understand."

These letters we're getting could be coming from your daughter: "I am looking for guidance with a drug problem. . . I usually have our car and my parents trust me."

Do you care enough to be sure that the teen-ager you love isn't feeling compelled to turn to WGN for help . . . help that you desperately want to give him?

As first planned, Anti-Drug Abuse Week on WGN-TV was to be over on May 2. But our efforts to help aren't over. Our efforts have just begun. Henceforth every week is Anti-Narcotics Week. WGN Continental Broadcasting Company continues to care.

OUT STONE MOUNTAIN WAY

HON. BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, a few miles from the center of Atlanta is Stone Mountain Park. This park presents unique recreational opportunities for all Georgians. In fact, it is considered the foremost tourist attraction in north Georgia.

Because the carving on the face of this mountain depicts three leaders of the Confederacy—Jefferson Davis, Robert E. Lee, and Stonewall Jackson—it has become a monument which is adored by most Georgians.

Recently, Mr. Marvin Mobley wrote a poem which outlines the feelings Georgians have for this region. The poem, as it appeared in the Atlanta Constitution, is as follows:

OUT STONE MOUNTAIN WAY

(By Harold Martin)

Our old friend Marvin Mobley has been courting the Muse again and comes up with a tribute to Georgia, and Georgians, and the country around Stone Mountain that makes us forget for a moment our current concerns with politics, pollution and general poltroonery.

Mr. Mobley is a noted penman, who writes with an antique flourish which makes his verse look like something that might have been inscribed by Percy Bysshe Shelley or John Keats. But maybe if the printer sets it just like Mr. Mobley wrote it the music will come through the cold type just as well. It's called "Out Stone Mountain Way" and it goes:

"This is the song in the Georgian's heart:

'Here I want to stay,
in these hills where bobwhites are
Out Stone Mountain way.'

"Georgians like the camp-fire meal,
the broiling bacon's lure,
Coffee hot, from the oldtime pot,
and ham with the country cure.

"Yes, these things, too, a Georgian likes:
A cabin in the hills,
A boat, a lake and quiet cove
for the fishing pole's fine thrills.

"Give him shotgun and beagle hounds,
—and a log fire burning,
and the corn pone he'll be munching on
while he's returning.

"This is the song in the Georgian's heart:—

Here oh let me stay;
With the cabin, lake and lofty pines,
Out Stone Mountain way!"

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IMAGE OF OUR ARMED FORCES

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, on May 13, Armed Forces Day, the Honorable Robert F. Froehke, Assistant Secretary of Defense, addressed a large gathering of people in San Antonio. The meeting was sponsored by the downtown Rotary Club and the San Antonio Chamber of Commerce. The address was well received by an appreciative audience.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of Mr. Froehke's remarks. They follow:

Armed Forces Day is an appropriate occasion to look at America's attitude toward its Armed Forces. It is particularly appropriate to look at that attitude from this city—the home of so many members of the Armed Services, past and present. I confess that I anticipate a friendlier reception here than many other parts of this country—and that might be indicative of what can be improved throughout this country.

Today I want to discuss the image of our Armed Forces. What is the reputation of our servicemen and the Services they serve?

I am reluctant to use the word "image". It has a Madison Avenue connotation. Nevertheless, any public figure or institution must know how he looks to the public. To ignore this aspect of public life might well result in public and Congressional disapproval and a serious lowering of morale among the employees of the institution in question.

In a democracy the Armed Forces must have the support of the electorate—the people. The public must support our mission and have confidence in the military. We can have temporary image set backs. However, should our Armed Forces lose the confidence of its constituents over a long period of time, the consequences for our country's security are grave.

The military must also have the support of the Congress. That body authorizes and appropriates. Without Congressional support our Armed Forces will wither and become ineffectual. Each Congressman is also a molder of public opinion—another reason why his support is important.

As a manager I know how important a role image plays in morale and organizational efficiency. It is impossible to have a hard-charging efficient operation if the operation itself, or the members of the operation, are constantly the target of derisive comments from their friends, neighbors and the press. All of us want to spend our waking hours working for something worthwhile. What our peers think of us and what we are doing does affect our morale. Thus, image does affect morale.

What is the image of our Armed Forces? My personal evaluation is that the public tends to distrust and depreciates the role of the military. Worse than that, the trend line is unfavorable.

In a very personal way I have felt this distrust. Fifteen short months ago I was one of the good guys. Once I entered the halls of the Pentagon, however, it was as though I wore a constant black hat. Motives are questioned. Snide remarks are made. Eyebrows are lifted. All a part of the formal initiation to our Armed Forces—1970!

What are the causes?

They are far from simple. Yet I think they stem primarily from a misunderstanding of the basic responsibility of the Armed Forces. At the risk of oversimplifying, I would like

to discuss some basics as to the part the military plays in a democracy. I fear a misunderstanding as to basics has led to a tarnished military image.

The military is not responsible for America's worldwide commitments:

Vietnam was a Presidential and Congressional decision.

So was Korea.

So was NATO.

Defense's role is to give military advice and to be prepared to carry out such commitments as the President and the Congress may make. When, or if, the combat forces are not ready we should be criticized. We should not be criticized for the involvement itself.

Even the conduct of the action after the commitment is not entirely in the hands of the military. Without deciding their correctness, it should be obvious that the ground rules of our Vietnam involvement are as much politically as militarily motivated.

The military must be prepared for any eventuality. Or, to put it another way, the military must be prepared in every peaceful minute to wage war within the hour. By any definition this makes combat forces uneconomical in peacetime. It is their role—their responsibility—to have more men, more ammunition, more materiel than needed for a peacetime operation. Using hindsight this is horribly wasteful. Unfortunately military leaders are not born with 20-20 foresight.

Do you recall the affirmative response accorded Secretary Louis Johnson when he pared the Defense budget to the bone in the late 40's? Do you also recall the criticism when we weren't ready for Korea? Query—Did we learn anything by that drill?

We are frequently accused of using "scare events" to get more money out of the Congress. Intelligence is usually the scapegoat for this criticism because it is by intelligence that we learn what is going on in the world. It is true that this information is sobering—and at times downright scary. However, it seems to me any criticism should be leveled at those who cause the facts to occur and not the messenger.

A complicating problem with intelligence is that many people don't understand that we generally are not able to determine the "intentions" of individual leaders and their countries. In those cases we are restricted to determining capability and basing our decisions on the known rather than the unknown—or wished for—intentions. Thus the comment that "no one would ever start a nuclear war" isn't too helpful to those responsible for national security—when our intelligence tells us that a foreign power is building towards a first strike nuclear capability.

We are also accused of being warmongers—of heating up the arms race. There are those who would have us walk into the Salt talks and unilaterally give up Safeguard as a token of good faith. These well-meaning people would have us go into the talks with good intentions and no negotiating strength.

The military very much desires a cessation of the arms race—particularly as applied to strategic weapons. However, we are convinced that the best chance for successful SALT talks is to have the USA go to the table with weapons in being, willing to negotiate. We have seen little indication from the Soviets that unilateral disarmament prior to negotiations is a wise or fruitful step.

Some of our management problems (perhaps I should say some of the management problems we inherited) shake the public's confidence in the Department. The C-5A is an example. There can be no argument—the cost of the airplane rose substantially from the time it was originally conceived. Some of the increase can be blamed on sloppy management and, for that, we should take our licks—and I dare say we are!

It is too easy to attribute the entire cost growth to poor management. Consider these facts:

It takes about 8 years to conceive, design and produce a major weapons system.

In that 8 year period inflation affects cost and, by law, we are not allowed to include inflationary factor in all our cost projections.

The strategy and world situation which dictate the need for a new weapons system can change markedly in that 8 year period. When it does, it frequently requires a major change in the system . . . and changes are expensive.

Technology marches on and when it does the technological improvements during the 8 year period frequently are incorporated in the new weapon. This again causes delay and added expense. But who wants a weapon that is obsolete when it comes off the production line?

We are changing the procurement practices which were used when the C-5A was designed. We anticipate this will make our cost projections more realistic. However, don't expect anybody to bat 1,000%.

Frequently businessmen say "DoD is not run in a businesslike manner."

I wish it could be. When I was in business my Board of Directors agreed on the policy and goals, and let us operate as long as we met our goals under established policy. There was no disagreement among the Board's members as to goals or policy. It checked once a quarter to see that we met our goals within that policy. Those were the good old days!

Defense's Board of Directors meets about a mile away in continuous session. It has 535 members. I have yet to know it to speak with one voice, and many of these voices advise us daily—much of this advice is good, much of it is contradictory.

I have just described the democratic process. I would not change it if I could. But it is the governing process and it is *not* businesslike! Defense cannot be run strictly on a "businesslike" basis in a democracy.

More and more taxpayers are increasingly accusing the DoD of taking too big a bite of the Federal budget. It is true that Defense continues to be the big spender of all the Cabinet Departments. However, these facts should be considered:

In FY 1971 Defense will be less than 35% of the Federal budget. The lowest since 1950.

Defense spending in FY 1971 is approximately 7% of the Gross National Product. The lowest since 1951.

This administration in FY 1970 and 1971 has cut 682,000 military and civilian positions and \$9.8 billion dollars out of the total budget.

We in the DoD agree that there should be a reevaluation of our national priorities. However, in light of the world situation and our commitments, we question whether further budgetary cuts are advisable. Any further cuts would cut muscle and scrape bone—highly undesirable where national security is at stake.

The military will be the object of many protests this year. This, in itself, is not bad.

Protesting, in one form or another, seems to be the thing today. Some of the more active and more vocal protesters believe they have invented it as an art form. This is a singularly uneducated view—in itself an insight into these protesters. For the Nation itself was born as a result of protests against injustices. Protesting in this sense is an institution older than the Nation itself. I believe in protesting.

Of late I have become somewhat of an expert in protests—or at least a target of some of them. The right kind are not only a part of our heritage but also very useful. Much of what is good about America today has come about as the result of courageous people protesting yesterday.

It seems to me, we citizens should neither ignore nor worship at the shrine of protesters. Admittedly, it is simpler to go either extreme route. (Who ever said being a useful citizen was easy?) Let me suggest a test for determining the credibility of the protest.

One, is protesting selling a point of view or is it attempting to stifle another's? If it is the former, I tend to listen. My hearing aid goes off when confronted with the latter.

Secondly, I look at the protesters themselves. What selling techniques do they use? Are they honest or high pressure? For instance, do they oversimplify? Is a situation presented as all good or all bad? I have rarely found life that simple. Most of the situations with which I have been faced recently have been of the neck and neck variety. (Beware of those who say the ABM, Cambodia, the Draft or ROTC are either all good or all bad.)

Perhaps most revealing, have the protesters spent any time working in any civic organization, to improve the local community? In the Jaycees, Chamber of Commerce, their church, local politics, or in community fund raising? Are they full of prescriptions and broad generalizations about the state of the world—but do nothing to improve the street on which they lived? Frankly, I have little time to give the individual who deplores and offers suggestions for the state of the world and doesn't have time to put his arm around his neighbor next door.

Since joining the Defense Department, I have observed and served with officers and men of all branches of the Services. I cannot say they are more brilliant or imaginative than others with whom I have been associated. I can—and unequivocally do—say they are more dedicated and unselfish. They are solid citizens serving what they conceive to be the highest call—supporting their country. Without such people and without such a commitment to the country, the nation cannot long survive.

Though they would not say so themselves, military personnel are patriots. They do not seek undue reward nor special recognition. On their behalf, I ask that this free and open society apply another American standard to them—that of fair play. I hope some of my comments today will help to put the military point of view in better focus.

Because my colleagues in the military have impressed me with their dedication, I am particularly pleased to be in San Antonio, a town that is proud to be a "military town," to celebrate Armed Forces Day. I hope you gathered from my comments that I'm proud of my country, its system of government and the military that insures the longevity of both.

In the Secretary of Defense's hall is a picture and an inscription that typifies to me the attitude of the military man towards his country. It portrays an airman and his family kneeling in a chapel at prayer. The caption under it is from Isaiah, Chapter 6, Verse 8. "I heard the voice of the Lord saying whom shall I send, who will go for us? Then said I—here am I. Send me."

This is the unfailing response of our military men when faced with a call to duty.

Would that we had more Americans today, who, seeing a job that needs to be done, would come front and center and proudly volunteer "Here am I. Send me."

COORDINATED TRANSPORTATION

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, there was an important measure recently cleared

for floor action by the Rules Committee which in my judgment will go far in improving our Nation's transportation system. I refer to H.R. 8298, the so-called mixing rule bill which was favorably reported by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee last year.

This bill will at last unshackle our valuable domestic inland water carriers from an unfortunate Federal ruling which has long impeded the growth and progress of this vital industry. H.R. 8298 will make it possible at long last to have the benefit and full use of the productive and efficient technology which has been developed over the years by this industry. By making proper use of this important know how on the rivers, we will surely lower unit costs on many products. In a time of rising prices and costs and faced with increased demands by consumers such a step seems abundantly wise and proper.

For a complete description of the evolution and history involved in seeking a solution to the problem faced by our domestic water carriers, I commend to all the Members the speech recently made at the University of Alabama Transportation Forum by Mr. Peter Fanchi, Jr., president of the Federal Barge Lines, Inc., St. Louis, Mo.

I include it at this point in the RECORD:

THE PEOPLE PROBLEM

(By Peter Fanchi, Jr.)

In the first half of the first year of the new decade, a number of us have been called to the University of Alabama's justly renowned annual transportation forum to talk about a new decade in transportation. In the past it has been customary for each speaker to stick closely to his own field. I plan to cover very briefly the new developments which may be expected in the inland barge industry.

But for most of this talk I want you to consider with me a universal problem which in transportation takes an extreme form. Perhaps, in this decade, the water carriers, the railroads, the pipelines, the truckers, the airlines and the shippers can, together, reduce this problem to a more manageable form.

I refer to the "people problem," the problem of the resistance of people to new ideas, their refusal to consider new circumstances on their merits, their love of the unthinking knee-jerk reaction to something a little different from the carbon copy of what happened yesterday.

If one considers the real roadblocks to progress in the different modes of transportation, one almost always finds that it stems from a "people" problem.

We can have new and more productive technology, more efficient organization of shipping, and lower unit costs. The roadblock is not the need to invent new technology or to think out better ways of doing things. The roadblock is almost invariably one of human resistance.

As an illustration, let me give you in brief terms the story of what has happened over 15 years in an attempt to achieve and maintain reductions in barge costs. Surely there can be no more praiseworthy project than an improvement in technology which results in lower costs for the shipping public and for the consumer. Who can be against that?

The story begins back in the early 1950's when marine engineers and the river shipyards began talking about building very powerful new towboats with a capacity for handling more than double the number of barges compared to those handled at the time. The change did not come overnight. But as a few of the big boats were tried,

It soon became clear that they could do everything that had been promised and more. By 1960, the big towboat and the 30 to 40-barge tow were commonplace sights on the river. Federal Barge Lines contributed the biggest towboats of all, the MV America and the MV United States with 9,000 horsepower capable of moving over seven acres of freight. And let's give credit where credit is due. The maritime labor unions supported this technological advance. Other unions in other times have resisted technological advances. The maritime unions took the long view that increased efficiency would mean more and better jobs.

From 1960 on, a downward trend began in river freight rates. Larger tows meant lower unit costs, lower unit costs permitted lower rates. In a time of inflation, at a time when labor costs and material costs were rising, the barge line rates were going down.

I stress this because I want everybody to understand that we are talking about an actual proven technological advance with actual proven benefits to shippers; not a pie in the sky promise of reductions to come some day.

There was a small cloud on the horizon. We didn't pay a great deal of attention to it at the time because we really couldn't bring ourselves to believe that anyone would try to cancel out the economic advantages of the big towboats. We couldn't imagine anyone suggesting that we go back to the little boats and discard the new and more efficient method of operating any more than we could imagine anyone suggesting that the airlines abandon the jets and go back to operating DC-3's.

But there definitely was a small cloud over the legality of mixing regulated traffic—paper, steel, packages of one kind or another—and unregulated dry bulk traffic—grain, coal, salt and the like. Technology outdates laws all the time; we had every confidence that the Interstate Commerce Commission would interpret the law so that we could continue to offer low rates to shippers, particularly since the ICC had actually at one time found the practice of mixing was legal. Why do we need to mix regulated and unregulated commodities? The answer is simple: we need both kinds in one tow to accumulate enough barges for a big tow.

The Commission could have agreed with its original finding, but chose not to do so. We were disappointed, but confident that, on appeal, the courts would reverse the Commission and allow us to continue to offer the benefits of the new technology. To be on the safe side, however, in 1961 we supported the introduction of a bill in Congress which would have clearly legalized the mixing of regulated and unregulated traffic. It was a simple bill. There was no attempt to resolve the true anomaly of the exemptions: why in the name of reason barge lines are only permitted to haul three dry-bulk commodities in a tow without losing the exemption. Older members of the Congress said this had something to do with the fact that there are three holds in Great Lakes steamers and the restriction somehow spilled over to river flotillas more or less by accident. For 20 years it meant little, because tows were small and there was seldom any demand for the transportation of more than three commodities. But, by 1960, with the big towboats in service, the restriction was clearly obsolete.

However, in 1961, the barge lines did not aspire to a complete modernization of the exemption provision. That, it was thought, was too ambitious, however, logical it might have been. The over-riding need in the public interest was to continue the mixing of regulated and unregulated commodities.

It was with this simple change that the "people problem" first arose. There was quite violent opposition to the bill from those who didn't take the trouble to understand it. I

say they didn't understand it because today those same people are endorsing the 1961 concept. The bill got nowhere. Meantime the appeal from the ICC decision was wending its way through the courts.

The courts finally passed the buck to the Congress. If enforcement of the Commission's order meant adverse results, to the public interests, i.e., high costs, then the Congress should fix the Act, the courts said.

Let us pause here to remember that all that was at stake was continuation of proven low operating costs for barge lines. At any point in this complex process some universal transportation ombudsman could have stopped all the wheel spinning and said: "mixing is in the public interest; it should be permitted."

But further extended struggles lay ahead. On the one hand the Commission and the Congress didn't want to be tagged, in a period of rising prices, with the responsibility for a totally unnecessary cost increase for a very large part of that essential 10 per cent of the nation's inter-city freight which goes by barge. On the other hand, the solution did not appear to be obvious.

A number of public spirited water carriers and shippers got together to discuss what was the logical, the sensible, the right thing to do—always a highly dangerous occupation. A new bill resulted which, in effect, thoroughly modernized the dry-bulk exemptions. I won't take time to describe this bill, but it did more than fix the mixing problem. It was a good compromise and was widely hailed by shippers, farm groups, labor groups, industrial groups, dozens of nationally known individual companies, State industrial development groups and others too numerous to mention. The questions it raised were very clear. Are you for improved technology? The answer of course was universally, yes. Are you for lower costs for the barge lines? The answer of course was universally, yes.

The Senate Commerce Committee liked the bill and recommended it unanimously. The Justice Department liked it, Agriculture liked it, and the new Department of Transportation liked it. The entire government generally endorsed it.

When the bill was called for hearings in the House of Representatives, it ran into serious trouble. One leading member of the committee explained the problem as follows: There was nothing wrong with the bill. In fact, it obviously had a great deal of merit. Indeed, it was one of the cleanest pieces of legislation he had seen in many years. "Why all this does," he said, "is to provide for low rates." But, he continued, the bill had no chance in its present form.

We had hit the people problem again.

When the exemptions from economic regulation became law in 1940 the water carriers got them and the railroads did not. The theory was that water carrier rates were so low that they did not compete with the railroads so there was no point in regulating them.

Conditions have changed. Railroads have enjoyed technological advances. Dry-bulk traffic on the rivers—corn, salt, wheat, coal, alumina and similar commodities moving by river—are quite competitive with the railroads. The railroads had convinced the House Committee that a great injustice existed. The barge lines were partially regulated and the railroads fully regulated. This represented an unfair competitive advantage to the barge lines, the railroads said. It would not be fair to the railroads to modernize the exemption to permit mixing unless the Committee did something, at the same time, about this greater injustice.

That argument was persuasive to the Committee and it was clear that the bill to permit the continuation of low rates had no chance unless some accommodation were made of the railroad complaint.

Members of the Congress said that they believed the railroads would be reasonable and urged that some sort of compromise be struck. With a compromise bill, there would be no more trouble.

So again, as had taken place in the beginning, shippers, railroads, water carriers and others began to think of what such a compromise might be.

In the meantime, one of the shippers was distressed by the fact that there was no clear cut evidence that mixing regulated and unregulated commodities really did produce savings. Have a study made, it was suggested. Some of those involved found it a little hard to believe that a study was needed to prove that using one boat to do the work of three produced significant savings. However, Stanford University School of Business was engaged to do such a study and the barge lines contributed data on all shipments in the year 1967 to show what precisely would have happened if the law had been applied.

Sure enough, the study concluded that, if the new technology were discarded, costs would go up dramatically and rates would then have to go up. According to one estimate, rate increases between 10 and 15 per cent could be expected. The Congress and the ICC had before them some precise figures on the unnecessary cost increases which would result if no solution were found.

I should explain that the ICC, at the specific request of the Commerce Committees of the House and Senate, has suspended the effective date of an ICC order compelling an unmixing of the tows no less than four times in the expectation of a legislative solution. The current suspension runs out on June 30, 1970.

Many good people earnestly studied a variety of compromises ranging over the whole spectrum of the Interstate Commerce Act.

This discussion often got quite out of focus. To some people mixing was a valuable lollipop the barge lines wanted. Someone else had to have a lollipop of equal value. To others the barge lines had, in mixing, an economic advantage. They should be willing to accept an economic disadvantage to balance out the advantage.

Mixing was and is a technological advance. The benefits have already been passed on to consumers in the form of low barge rates. The Senate Commerce Committee, in its favorable report on the bill stressed that mixing should be considered on its own merits and its benefits not denied the public while solutions to all transportation problems were found.

There was a special shipper committee formed to consider the problem. In all, about a year and a half elapsed in fruitless study.

Finally, the House Transportation and Aeronautics Subcommittee, under the chairmanship of Representative Samuel N. Friedel of Baltimore, took the bull by the horns. It isolated two well-established facts. Mixing the dry-bulk and regulated commodities in the same tow produced lower costs and therefore was in the public interest. The railroads were disadvantaged in competing with water carriers because the water carrier rates were secret. Why not a bill to permit mixing—and denying for the time being a thorough-going modernization of the exemption provision—and equalize the competitive situation between railroads and water carrier by requiring the publication of rates of all dry-bulk commodities shipped by water?

There would be no economic regulation of barge rates; just a requirement for posting the rates.

The barge lines didn't get everything they wanted, but they could not be completely unhappy; the railroads didn't get everything they wanted but they, too, could not be completely unhappy. The public was advantaged because mixing would continue, there would be more intense competition

between railroads and water carriers leading to greater efficiency on both sides, and with rates out in the open the public's right to know freight rates would be satisfied.

Finally, the bill called for a study of the entire problem based on facts that would become available for the first time and a report back to the Congress with policy recommendations for further action. The bill had a termination date so that if it turned out that anyone was seriously hurt, it wouldn't be for long.

The regulated barge lines, which account for one third of the river traffic, endorsed the bill. The railroads endorsed it. Maritime and railroad labor endorsed it.

The bill made a lot of sense to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. The favorable vote was an overwhelming 18 to 6.

That was last October. In November, the bill went before the Rules Committee and was held up there until only three weeks ago, when it was voted out for floor action by a 7 to 6 margin.

The delay was caused by another people problem. Some large shippers like secret rates and are prepared to fight to kill the bill so that no one knows the freight rates by water on dry-bulk commodities. I suspect that the trend is against them. We have truth in lending, truth in packaging and I expect we will soon have truth in barging. The whole trend is toward the public having the right to know essential facts affecting its welfare.

It does not seem logical that a shipper will use railroads for part, usually the greater part, of his shipments of precisely the same commodities at rates which are not only published, but economically regulated, and can then turn around and make a public interest case for keeping the rates on the water-borne shipments secret.

No one is against mixing. No one is against cost reduction. Our people problem on these issues is over. But those who are against the public's right to know a transportation rate are actively trying to break down the compromise the House Committee has reached. I can only say, I hope they do not succeed.

My point in this long recital is this. If transportation is to meet the needs of the economy over a period of very substantial expansion in economy activity, we must find some way to curb the people problem.

Every mode has a people problem. I know nothing about the truckers' problem in winning approval for the use of tandem trailers. But it stands to reason that two trailers with one engine and one driver represent a more economical way to transport freight over the highway. We see these "double bottom" rigs all the time in the west. But apparently there is a great people problem involved in extending the service to the east.

The railroads have people problems. I'm sure the airlines saw 10 years ago that their airports and airways would be now jammed to overflowing. But a people problem got in the way of adequate planning. Now of course in most airports I visit there's a wall-to-wall people problem brought on by a people failure 10 years ago.

We just can't go on this way.

I'm an optimist at heart. Despite our problem with the mixing rule, which, you might assume, would be enough to discourage any thinking about innovation and technological improvement in the barge lines to the end of the century and beyond, I do want to leave you with a brief list of items to look for in the decade of the 1970's.

The boats and the horsepower are likely to get bigger and the tows will carry more tonnage with consequent lower unit costs. I wish I could say that the rates would continue down, but inflation has hit all of us hard and the barge lines are no exception.

We can also look at other ways to improve productivity and achieve cost reductions.

There has been a rush of industry to the river banks since World War II. The production line leads to the barge loading dock in more and more plants. The water freight rate is usually about one third the surface rate. High costs are usually incurred in rehandling by rail or truck to get to water. Many companies are eliminating that rehandling and cutting transport costs dramatically.

A co-product of the on-going flood control, bank stabilization, power, irrigation and other water resource programs continues to be navigation. Already the re-development program of the Ohio has reduced the number of locks and dams from 53 to 28, greatly improving the economy of barging on the Ohio. We'll be down to 23 locks by 1974, another advance in productivity, and 19 when the re-development program is finished.

The lower Mississippi is rapidly developing a 12-foot channel from the bank stabilization program. The Arkansas will shortly be navigable to Tulsa, opening five more states to water transportation. Ground is being broken on the short cut from the Tennessee to the Gulf via the Tombigbee-Warrior Rivers. In a couple of years, slack water navigation will reach to Lewiston, Idaho on the Columbia and the Snake. Other developments are coming.

The ocean-barging program appears to be a success. Ocean-going barges have been sent to Vietnam and regularly serve Alaska. Cross-Gulf operations from Florida to New Orleans are successful in 26,000 ton self-unloading barges.

Huge barge-carrying mother ships are sending lighters up the river as far as Chicago from New Orleans and eliminating rehandling at ports on both sides of the ocean.

Even mini-ships are finding their way up the river to Greenville and beyond to provide new service between the Mississippi heartland and the Caribbean and South America.

The Water Transport Association's program to join the best efficiencies of rail and water seems to be off the ground. Proper coordination of rail and water transportation, according to the industry's studies, can mean savings of from 10 to 30 per cent in transport costs.

Taken together, all these developments should mean great dependence on the part of the economy on water transportation in the coming decade.

But if we could add to more intensive use of low cost water transportation the rewards of eliminating the problem of unreasonable resistance—the people problem—we would really be on our way to greater economy and efficiency in transportation.

INVASION OF CAMBODIA VIOLATES INTERNATIONAL LAW: N.Y.U. LAW STUDENTS BRIEF PROVES

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in a carefully documented, well reasoned paper, a group of students in the Root-Tilden program at New York University School of Law have shown that the U.S. invasion of Cambodia violates international law.

Wide distribution should be given to this excellent statement. I am placing in the RECORD excerpts from this copyrighted paper. It deserves careful review by Congress, the administration, and the American public.

The statement follows:

PART TWO. QUESTIONS UNDER INTERNATIONAL LAW

I. CAMBODIA

A. Collective self-defense under the United Nations Charter

1. Definition of "Armed Attack." Under international law, the legal justification for the incursion of United States forces into Cambodia was presented in a letter of May 5, 1970, from the Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations, Ambassador Charles Yost, to the President of the Security Council. The letter states that the United States action in Cambodia was taken as a measure of "collective self-defense." In essence, this same justification has been employed to explain all United States military actions in Vietnam. It forms the foundation of the March 1966, Department of State Memorandum on the legality of United States participation in the defense of Vietnam.

It is important, then, to consider the meaning of the concept of "collective self-defense" as embodied in Article 51 of the United Nations Charter. Article 51 constitutes an exception to the basic Article 2(4) obligation of members of the United Nations to "refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force." It states in part:

"Nothing in the present Charter shall impair an inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security."

Military action taken in "self-defense" which does not satisfy the Article 51 exception results in a prima facie violation of the obligations assumed under the Charter. The invocation of self-defense as the justification for the use of force depends on the satisfaction of two preconditions. The threshold question is whether an "armed attack" occurred. The following argument demonstrates that no credible claim of actual, physical armed attack on allied forces in Vietnam was asserted; and that, assuming arguendo that the threat of an armed attack would qualify as an "armed attack" under Article 51, the military movements of North Vietnamese troops in Cambodia merely raised the possibility of an attack, a possibility so remote in time and so contingent on fortune as to fall outside the meaning of a "threat of armed attack."

President Nixon described that attack in his televised address to the Nation on April 30, 1970, as follows:

"North Vietnam in the last two weeks has stripped away all pretense of respecting the sovereignty or neutrality of Cambodia. Thousands of their soldiers are invading the country from the sanctuaries. They are encircling the capital of Phnom Penh. Coming from these sanctuaries as you see here, they had moved into Cambodia and are encircling the capital.

"[I]f this enemy effort succeeds, Cambodia would become a vast enemy staging area and a springboard for attacks on South Vietnam along 600 miles of frontier: a refuge where enemy troops could return from combat without fear of retaliation."

Apparently, the attack to which the President referred was the increasingly intensive strife between Cambodian and North Vietnamese forces. The joint United States-South Vietnamese response involved an attempt to prevent a defeat of the Government in Phnom Penh. The President confirmed this view in a latter portion of his speech:

"But the aid we will provide will be limited for the purpose of enabling Cambodia to defend its neutrality and not for the purpose of making it an active belligerent on one side or the other."

Ambassador Yost's letter to the President of the Security Council refers to base areas maintained for five years by the North Vietnamese in Cambodia for purposes of conducting military operations against South Vietnam. The letter identifies the developments which triggered United States action as the expansion by the North Vietnamese of the perimeters of the base areas, the expulsion of any remaining Cambodian presence in those areas, the linking of the base areas into a continuous chain along the South Vietnamese border, and the extension of the bases deeper into Cambodian territory. The letter asserts that North Vietnamese forces were massing in those areas in preparation for attacks against South Vietnam.

When the United Nations Charter was originally drafted an "armed attack" was generally understood as action(s) through which a state sought the initiative by the violent exercise of physical power. Since then, some have argued for an expanded concept to include a military process rather than a single, hostile, offensive event. The Department of State's 1966 Memorandum espoused this broadened concept. Specifically, the Memorandum argues that the concept of an "armed attack" included the processes of externally supported subversion, clandestine provision of arms, infiltration of armed personnel, and introduction of regular units of the North Vietnamese Army into South Vietnam. Assuming *arguendo* that the Memorandum's much criticized position is valid, Ambassador Yost's letter to the Security Council in justification of the Cambodian incursion further broadens the concept of "armed attack."

In effect, the Yost letter defines an "armed attack" in two extremely expansive senses. First, it views the enlargement and extension of military staging areas as falling within the concept of an "armed attack." In light of reports from Southeast Asia and the President's address indicating that the movement of the North Vietnamese forces in Cambodia had the apparent objective of isolating or overthrowing the Government of Phnom Penh, the current American military response appears designed to minimize the threat to the existence of the Cambodian Government. Certainly the use of all of Cambodia as a base of operations against Vietnam would increase the strength and flexibility of North Vietnamese operations. However, it strains both language and credulity to consider the enlargement of a base of operations an "armed attack." More plausibly, North Vietnamese activity in Cambodia constituted an effort to facilitate the threat of an "armed attack." This is the second sense in which the Yost letter expands the concept. For the threat foreseen is sufficiently distant in time as to render meaningless any attempt to equate the "threat of armed attack" with an "armed attack" as defined under Article 51. The following answer by President Nixon to a reporter's question at the President's press conference indicates the time at which the Administration considered the threat would materialize:

"Q. On April 20, you said Vietnamization was going so well that you could pull 150,000 American troops out of Vietnam. Then you turned around only 10 days later and said that Vietnamization was so badly threatened you were sending troops into Cambodia. Would you explain this apparent contradiction to us?"

"A. Well, I explained it in my speech of April 20, as you will recall, because then I said that Vietnamization was going so well that we could bring 150,000 out by the spring of the next year, regardless of the progress in the Paris talks and the other criteria that I had mentioned.

"But I also had warned at that time that increased enemy action in Laos, in Cambodia, as well as in Vietnam was something that we had noted and that if I had indicated and if I found that that increased enemy action

would jeopardize the remaining forces who would be in Vietnam after we had withdrawn 150,000, I would take strong action to deal with it.

"I found that the action that the enemy had taken in Cambodia would leave the 240,000 Americans who would be there a year from now without many combat troops to help defend them would leave them in an untenable position. That's why I had to act."

Apparently, the United States crossed an international boundary and employed armed force in response to a threat which, by its own admission, would not materialize for at least one year. Attempting to justify preemptive actions exclusively in terms of an incipient threat does violence to the clear meaning of Article 51. Furthermore, such an overly broad definition of what constitutes an armed attack eliminates the distinction between the concepts of armed attack and self-defense. A defensive measure taken in anticipation of an attack can be interpreted by the country or force under attack as an armed attack necessitating self-defense measures. To define self-defense in such a way as to legally entitle the aggressor to in turn respond in self-defense is to destroy the legal justification for self-defense embodied in the United Nations Charter.

Quite clearly, the concept of "armed attack" cannot be woodenly or mechanically applied. An armed attack is properly differentiated from other forms of hostile behavior. Safeguards designed to deal with both types of unauthorized intervention have been incorporated in various treaty instruments. For example, the distinction exists in the Charter of the Organization of America States, which, in Article 25, differentiates unequivocally between an armed attack and other forms of aggression. The distinction is also found in Articles 3 and 6 of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance of 1947, in the North-Atlantic Treaty of 1949, in the Warsaw Treaty of 1955 and in the United States-Japanese Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security of 1960. All these treaties refer only to "armed attack" while specifically noting Article 51 of the United Nations Charter. Interestingly, Article 2 of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty (SEATO) also carefully distinguishes between armed attack and subversive activity directed from without; Article 4(1) of the SEATO Treaty covers "aggression by means of armed attack"; while Article 4(2) covers threats "in any way other than by armed attack" or "by any other fact or situation which might endanger the peace of the area." This distinction has been propounded consistently in treaty instruments drafted after the United Nations Charter, to many of which the United States is a party. Consequently, it would appear that Article 51 has always been understood to embody a narrow construction of "armed attack." The position taken by the President, as justified in the Yost letter, conflicts with that construction.

The latent threat of hostile action launched from a neighboring state has not traditionally justified resort to armed force in preemptive self-defense. Two examples sufficiently illustrate the point.

The "Caroline," an American vessel used for supplies and communication in a Canadian insurrection, was boarded in an American port at midnight by an armed group acting under the orders of a British officer. The boarding party set the vessel afire and let it drift over Niagara Falls. The U.S. protest resulted ultimately in an apology by Lord Ashburton, the British Special Commissioner to the United States. In a note of reply of August 6, 1842, Secretary of State Webster stated:

"[R]espect for the inviolable character of the territory of independent states is the most essential foundation of civilization. . . . Undoubtedly it is just, that, while it is admitted that exceptions growing out of

the great law of self-defense do exist, those exceptions should be confined to cases in which the 'necessity of that self-defense is instant, overwhelming, and leaving no choice of means and no moment for deliberation.'"

More recently, in the Nürnberg trial of War Criminals, the court dealt with the defense, "that Germany was compelled to attack Norway to forestall an allied invasion, and her action was therefore preventive." The Tribunal said:

"It must be remembered that preventive action in foreign territory is justified only in case of 'an instant and overwhelming necessity for self-defense, leaving no choice of means and no moment of deliberation.' . . . From all this [evidence as to German belief regarding an allied attack on Norway] it is clear that when the plans for an attack on Norway were being made they were not made for the purpose of forestalling an imminent allied landing, but, at the most, that they might prevent an allied occupation at some future date. . . . In the light of all the available evidence it is impossible to accept the contention that the invasions of Denmark and Norway were defensive and in the opinion of the Tribunal they were acts of aggressive war."

Furthermore, the assertion of a claim of collective self-defense is primarily the right of the victim state, and not of the would-be protector. Collective self-defense involves the right of a nation to request assistance in its defense. It differs fundamentally from any contention that third party nations have a discretionary right to intervene by force in conflicts between other countries. Assuming *arguendo* that the North Vietnamese launched some sort of "armed attack," either in the traditional sense or in the loose, expansive sense articulated in the Yost letter, the question of determining the victim of such an attack remains. The North Vietnamese activity which, according to the United States argument, constituted an "armed attack" involved the enlarging of staging and supply areas within Cambodia, troop movement in the direction of Phnom Penh but within Cambodia, and the possibility of an eventual threat by North Vietnamese forces within Cambodia to remaining United States units in South Vietnam. On these facts, it is clear that the asserted depredations of North Vietnamese main force units were directed against Cambodia. If a victim need be found, (and for purposes of properly invoking the justification of self-defense under the United Nations Charter a victim must exist), it is the Cambodian Government of Premier Lon Nol.

On these facts, the only state which could have claimed to be acting in self-defense was Cambodia. There is no indication however, that Cambodia asserted a claim of self-defense. Even if Cambodia has asserted a claim of self-defense, the United States, under the concept of self-defense embodied in the United Nations Charter, could not legally have joined in an action of collective self-defense. For, under the Charter, the right of self-defense does not extend to a state which seeks to associate itself in the defense of a state acting in self-defense. However, the United States did not invoke the doctrine of collective self-defense in conjunction with South Vietnam, which was not in this instance a victim of any "armed attack," the tenuous justifications in the Yost letter notwithstanding.

2. Proportionality. The second precondition necessary for the justification of the use of armed force in self-defense under Article 51 is that the response must be proportionate to the attack. A disproportionate response to a situation which validly requires self-defense will transfer an otherwise justifiable exercise of the right of self-defense into an act of aggression. The application of this standard to the allied thrusts into Cam-

bodia reflects the basic flow in labeling North Vietnamese activities in Cambodia an armed attack on Vietnam or allied forces therein. The only military operations against which the proportionality of the allied incursion can be measured are the expansion of the Cambodia sanctuaries and the concurrent attacks on Cambodian forces by North Vietnamese troops. Such measurements would be difficult to make as they turn on factual determinations not readily available. But the standard of proportionality cannot be applied in this case as the nations using armed force under the right of collective self-defense were not the objects of an armed attack.

Ambassador Yost's letter states that "North Vietnam has stepped up guerrilla actions into South Vietnam and is concentrating its main forces in these base areas in preparation for further massive attacks into South Vietnam." This factual assertion is not reflected in President Nixon's address of April 30 or subsequent press conference of May 9. The President indicated that he was responding to the threat which would exist to United States forces following another withdrawal of 150,000 men should North Vietnamese forces succeed in consolidating their position in Cambodia through the overthrow of the Government of Premier Lon Nol or by a severe limitation of its power. Without dwelling on this rather crucial discrepancy, one cannot seriously say that the incursion into Cambodia of at least 50,000 allied troops on six fronts with accompanying air support, a flotilla of 140 gunboats and a one-hundred mile allied blockade of the Cambodia coastline was a proportionate response of self-defense to "stepped up guerrilla actions," the only alleged new military action emanating from Cambodia against South Vietnam.

B. The neutrality of Cambodia

As President Nixon affirmed in his address of April 30, the United States acknowledged Cambodian neutrality. Respect for that neutrality was assured by a diplomatic note during the Johnson administration and was reiterated on numerous occasions by repeated demands that North Vietnam respect the neutrality and territorial integrity of Cambodia.

Generally, a neutral state must remain impartial while the belligerent state must respect the neutral's impartiality. The belligerent must also respect the territorial integrity of the neutral state. On the other hand, the neutral state is obligated to prevent the use of its territory for the launching of attacks by one belligerent upon another. While a state may disregard violations of its territorial integrity, a neutral state has the duty to protect such violations, because failure to do so would offend its duty to maintain impartiality. However, the breach of neutrality by either a belligerent state or a neutral state does not terminate neutral status. Only a declaration of war or hostilities amounting to acts of war by one of the parties will have that effect.

The Administration argues that North Vietnamese forces have violated the territorial integrity of Cambodia and that they have utilized Cambodia as a base for military operations against South Vietnam. Certainly, these actions constitute a breach by North Vietnam of Cambodia neutrality. But they do not terminate Cambodia's neutral status. Indeed, it has been the announced policy of the Cambodian government, albeit unsuccessful, to keep its territory free of armed Viet Cong troops. Hence under traditional principles of international law, the movement of American forces into Cambodia is itself a violation of that state's neutrality unless some further justification can be shown.

The argument that Cambodia ratified the American action after it had taken place is

not persuasive. In fact, two members of the Cambodian government made an initial protest. Clearly, the joint U.S.-South Vietnamese incursion constituted a fundamental breach of Cambodian neutrality which could not later be rectified by acquiescence, particularly since the Cambodian government had little choice but to acquiesce. Nor does the argument that the areas subjected to invasion were no longer under the effective political control of Cambodia justify the incursion. The political and military realities do not diminish in law the rights of the Government of Cambodia with respect to the maintenance of its territorial integrity and neutrality. Otherwise, one might argue that South Vietnam could claim no rights over Viet Cong-held portions of its own territory. The argument that, under general principles of international law and particularly neutrality, Cambodia's failure to repel the North Vietnamese presence justified the allied incursions into a neutral country must fall in view of the treaty obligation, under Article 33(1) of the United Nations Charter, to first of all seek a solution of disputes, other than armed attack, by peaceful means.

C. Rights and obligations under SEATO

The Administration did not attempt to justify its policy under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty (SEATO). The reluctance to invoke the SEATO commitment is understandable since a colorable case for the Cambodian incursion under the SEATO Treaty cannot be made.

At the outset, the SEATO Treaty obligates the signatories to uphold the United Nations Charter. As demonstrated above, United States actions in Cambodia are violative of that document, and therefore violative of the SEATO Treaty as well. If pursued further, the inquiry discloses other damaging discrepancies. First, the treaty speaks of meeting "the common danger in accordance with its (each country's) constitutional processes." Thus, any action taken in violation of such constitutional processes, as argued in the discussion of the constitutional issues above, is *per se* invalid under the treaty. Secondly, the SEATO Treaty creates certain obligations in the event a party is the victim of an "armed attack." In Articles 4(1) and 4(2), the treaty carefully establishes a distinction between an "armed attack" and "subversive activities directed from outside." As pointed out above, the thesis that an "armed attack," to which the United States could legally respond, occurred, cannot be sustained. The late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles himself cautioned that the treaty language would not support the contention that "any country which feels it is being threatened by subversive activities in another country is free to use armed force against that country." The SEATO Treaty expressly requires, moreover, that the parties consult before taking any action to meet the common danger posed by such outside subversion. The United States made no effort to consult with the SEATO allies prior to taking action in Cambodia. More important, the failure to obtain Cambodian consent or act in response to a Cambodian invitation resulted in a direct, unequivocal violation of Article 4(3), Cambodia having been designated a state within the scope of Article 4 by the September 1954 Protocol to the SEATO Treaty. The Cambodian incursion, demonstrably violative of the SEATO Treaty, could hardly have been justified under it.

D. The position taken by the United States in analogous situations

The action taken by the United States in Cambodia is inconsistent with the position propounded by the United States in the past. When confronted with similar types of action initiated by other states, United States spokesmen in the United Nations have consistently condemned unilateral attacks di-

rected across national borders in pursuit of foreign troops using foreign soil as sanctuaries.

1. Tunisia, 1957. For example, in 1957, French forces operating in Algeria attacked Sakiet-Sidi-Youssef in Tunisia, then being used as a sanctuary and staging area by Algerian revolutionary forces. The United States publicly expressed concern about the incident and the Department of State summoned the French Ambassador to explain the French action. The official French explanation markedly parallels the stated U.S. objective in Cambodia, to destroy enemy sanctuaries, staging and supply bases used by guerrilla forces for raids into Algeria.

2. Yemen, 1964. In 1964 Ambassador Stevenson, speaking in the Security Council, condemned a British bombing attack on Habir in Yemen which was undertaken in response to Yemeni attacks against the British Protectorate of Aden.

3. Middle East. During the course of the ongoing conflict in the Middle East, the United States has repeatedly expressed, in the United Nations and in other forums, negative reactions ranging from concern to condemnation of Israeli attacks upon Arab guerrilla sanctuaries in other Arab countries. The Israeli raids were designed to accomplish the dual objectives of reprisal and destruction of guerrilla sanctuaries and staging bases.

The American incursion into Cambodia hardly lends credence to the aforementioned expressions of dismay, much less to any future United States attempts to limit the use of armed force as an instrument of national policy throughout the world. The Cambodian affair invites cynicism toward subsequent United States efforts to encourage respect for law in the conduct of international affairs.

LESSONS FROM OUR DARKEST HOUR

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1970

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, the recent tragedy at Kent State University is on the minds of many Americans today and will have its impression for years to come.

This past week, the Ohio State Society held a meeting, presided over by our former colleague Walter Moeller, and attended by members of the Ohio congressional delegation, their wives and, of course, present and former Ohio residents now living and serving in some capacity with Federal agencies, congressional staffs and other private and public sector positions of responsibility. I was among the invited guests.

The principal event of the evening was to have been the presentation of an award to the very distinguished president of Kent State University, the Honorable Robert White. However, due to the extenuating circumstances associated with the tragic incident, President White felt that he should remain at the university and sent his vice president for administration, Dr. Ronald W. Roskens, to represent him.

In addition to receiving the award for Dr. White, a message was delivered to those attending by Dr. Roskens, that, in my judgment, was one of the finest, most

timely and constructive speeches I have heard since my arrival here in the Congress nearly 8 years ago.

Everyone in the audience was visibly moved by the devilry but, more importantly, the content of the speech.

It prompted me to seek recognition and respond, briefly, to his remarks. I felt then, as I do now, that this speech could, conceivably, generate the turning point in American history on just what direction our American colleges and universities take in the future as it relates to campus conduct and student, faculty, and administration roles and responsibilities.

Once all the facts are revealed relating to this tragic incident, I believe we can look forward to new policies being established in colleges and universities and new attitudes developed in the minds of students.

Personally, I believe the time has come when all Americans must realize that educational institutions are established for the purpose of providing education, and not for politicization. We cannot continue to permit the so-called "emphasis on social experimentation" in our colleges and universities.

In the current hysteria that is far too prevalent on our campuses today, more and more colleges are becoming committed, as institutions, to partisan positions. This movement was primed by previous antiwar protests, by militant demands for institutional activism and by erosion of the faculty's authority by an overemphasis on student participation in the administration of the institutions. I strongly believe in student input and involvement, but this trend toward mobocracy tends to make one think we are seeing, here in America, a repetition of what happened to the universities in Hitler's Germany, Latin America, Japan, and other countries.

Academic freedom can only be sustained through the retention and assumption of basic academic responsibilities.

I believe Dr. Roskens' very eloquent speech could serve as a guideline for the future, based upon their very sad and tragic circumstances of the immediate past.

Therefore, I submit to my colleagues a partial transcript of his recent remarks:

LESSONS FROM OUR DARKEST HOUR

(Ronald W. Roskens, vice president, Kent State University)

(These remarks were presented to a joint gathering of the Ohio Society and Kent State University alumni in Washington, D.C., Wednesday, May 13, 1970. On this occasion the Ohio Society presented an honorary membership to President Robert White in absentia.)

There is no rational being in the universe who would not gladly exchange the first thirteen days in May at Kent State University for an opportunity to begin the month *de novo*. But the easy route of fantasy is not available to us.

Nor is there anyone in this assemblage who would not prefer to see and hear the distinguished gentleman in whose stead I appear tonight. You understand his inability to be present, and you recognize that I am a mere substitute, but, I should add, one who feels profoundly honored to represent President White on this occasion.

For a brief period of the fourth day of May, nineteen hundred and seventy, the sympathy and sorrow of the world rested on the Kent State University campus. The attention of the global community shifted from the conflicts of Southeast Asia and the Middle East, and focused on the tragedy which had befallen our University.

Lord Byron's story of Don Juan tells us that all tragedies are finished by death. For Kent, the tragic deaths of four young students write not the epitaph but leave instead indelible scars that linger on.

The events of the first four days in May are still not clearly understood. Unfortunately, some reports in the public media added to confusion, rumor and speculation. Indeed, criticisms of reporting inaccuracies have been registered in media reviews, including assertions that the bias shown by certain commentators helped polarize an already inflamed public.

What can we say with reasonable assurance?

We do know that Law Day celebrations were taking place in other parts of the nation on May 1, a group of Kent State students met on the University Commons to bury our Constitution and to protest U.S. involvement in Cambodia. By evening the symbolism of a dead Constitution took a more tangible form when an unruly mob of some 400 persons smashed store fronts and windows through a two block section of the City.

The citizens of Kent were understandably frightened. The City constabulary numbers fewer than twenty men and is an hour or more from immediate neighboring help. As a precaution the Mayor alerted the Governor of the possible need for troops of the Ohio National Guard. Less than twenty-four hours later when the midnight blue sky of Saturday, May 2, gave way to the red fires of arson as the torch was put to the University R.O.T.C. Building, the Mayor requested that aid. Troops of the National Guard subsequently patrolled the Kent community—City and campus.

That "violence begets violence" can be no more dramatically portrayed than during those four tense days in early May. The window smashing melee of Friday night became a building burning sortee by Saturday night and served as prologue for the armed and tragic confrontation of Monday noon. The same bell that heralded the beginning of a peaceful rally on Friday noon, tolled sad and mournful sounds on Monday—a postlude to death.

That a number of Kent students were involved in the disruptions of campus and City is clearly fact. But there is additional evidence which indicates that outside elements helped stoke the forges of violence. We may fully expect the final report to document the importation of some hard core revolutionaries into the Kent community. Consequently, we urge that any disposition to condemn the Kent State student body, *per se*, be reserved until all facts have surfaced.

The wagging fingers of accusation have been busy since death struck that Monday noon but I believe that far too much time has been spent in recriminatory efforts to assess blame. The question of blame is moot and fruitless, but impossible to obliterate. I would simply suggest that small parcels of accountability must be placed on many—if not all—doorsteps.

... While one side cries that Guardsmen should not have fired ... another cries that students should not have gathered to taunt, harass, and throw potentially injurious items ...

... While one group cries that troops should never have been called ... the other side remonstrates that buildings should not have been burned nor property damaged ...

... While one side argues that University officers and faculty should have established more dialogue with dissident students ...

another side points to the obvious abandonment of reason by some of these students ...

... The list can go on and on ... and we must add to any consideration of causal factors the sincere aggravation of a large faction with the increasing involvement of the U.S. in Cambodia and Southeast Asia ... while another vociferous core group cries for total military victory.

I keep visualizing that scene in MacBeth when Lady MacBeth cries out in desperation, unable to remove the blood from her hands. All of us must accept responsibility for this terrible turn of events both at Kent and in a larger, national sense.

Our overriding concern, however, must be for the future; we must try diligently to maintain our equilibrium so that we can view this horrendous event in broader perspective than that of the moment, at the same time not forgetting the personal tragedies, and the kind of suppression which these circumstances temporarily thrust upon us.

We lived for the whole country an experience which revealed something alarming about what we regard to be one of our most precious elements—academic freedom. The eyes and ears of the world experienced, through Kent State University, what it means to find academic freedom meaningless in a democratic society. They witnessed the results of escalating threats, and terror, and violence in a University milieu.

Conceptually, academic freedom accords respect to whatever views individuals may take as a result of intellectual analysis and discourse. It implies independence from all unreasonable and improper pressures, be they from government or industry, patriotic organizations or students. But academic freedom dissipates rapidly whenever intimidating or threatening propositions are intruded. It is eroded completely and becomes pointless whenever violence erupts and the insidious influences of force are present—as we witnessed at Kent State University.

A nationally known scholar and historian Dr. Henry Steele Commager spoke not long ago to the use of force on the campus:

The use of force ... closing buildings, assaulting or intimidating members of the faculty, setting fire to ... (buildings) ... (is) ... the very antithesis of reason and the deepest repudiation of the university.

Force is abhorrent to academic freedom and to the University itself. But if we are repulsed by the force and violence used to close a university or destroy its buildings, we must be equally repulsed when force is employed to keep the university functioning.

The problem facing our University along with several hundred others and perhaps every American educational institution, is not how to keep the universities open, but how to keep them *open and free!*

We must not permit what I am certain is a relatively small, but well organized group of revolutionaries, to close the educational institutions of America. If they prevail they will reduce to shreds the very fabric through which the threads of our matchless freedoms have been so carefully interwoven. The progress of this nation and the world depends on the success of education in general and on the success of higher education in specific.

At a press conference following the May 4 shootings, President White told the nation's newsmen:

I hear lunacy on the one side and frightening repressions on the other and I don't hear from that traditional center position that says: 'Let us discuss fully and without limits and let us come to a decision and a conclusion within orderly processes which are in themselves subject to orderly change.'

At this point we must note the good fortune of Kent State University in having as president a man with the strength and leadership of Dr. Robert White. He represents,

in composite sense, that balanced temperament that is so desperately needed in times of tension and crisis.

Here I should like to pause to insert a paragraph contained in a recent letter addressed to President White from a nationally recognized, highly respected educational leader:

At last, a chance to send you a note to let you know our sorrow for you, your good wife and the university you built. No one else can really feel your sadness but we know it exists, deep and full of personal anguish. No other college or university president, of the hundreds we have known, has as compassionate a spirit as yours. Always you put students first, talking with them all the time and trying to build an open institution in which they could be heard, could be individual persons, and could learn from dedicated teachers in a warm, friendly environment. I remember your quiet optimism on the phone just 6 nights ago, full of hope that reasoned, rational, concerned students would prevail and that forces of un-reason could not develop a mob psychology. It is a tragedy that it could happen in quiet, peaceful Kent, in a place where the president, his staff, and many faculty really put students first. No one in America has done more, out of personal conviction and desire than you have.

It is that deep reservoir of compassion, that determined sense of purpose, that quiet inner strength which have enabled him in recent days to bear the burden of tragedy and grief. And in all of the cruel loneliness of our darkest hour, he never lost his equilibrium.

If the universities are to remain open and free we must hear from that traditional center position. Patience, reason, cooperation, compromise must be touchstones in the relationships between those with differing views. The myth of the generation gap has been divisive, and must be replaced with a partnership between generations based on mutual accord and respect.

The distance between emotional outbursts and physical force is short and quickly traversed, and those who engage in such uncivilized battle destroy the hope of compromise so earnestly sought by the center group. We dare not frustrate the centrists drive for moderation because it is they who must separate from the cacophony of extremes those chords which may blend a peaceful harmony.

Violence imperils the survival of a free university—but recognition of that stark reality is insufficient. Violence has always been anathema to the academic community and we now see clearly the horrible results of the substitution of violence for reason.

We can afford nothing less than complete rededication of all parties to the substantive principles of the university.

In this light we must all—students, faculty, staff and responsible citizens everywhere—renew our memberships in the university community.

Two years ago our University Press published a book in which HEW Secretary Gardner's article reported an imaginary conversation between a leading educator and a visitor from the 21st century. The visitor described the demise of the University structure during the closing years of the 20th century and said:

The difficulties were intensified by a disintegration of the university community. Individual professors and departments might have been persuaded to rise above their vested interests to preserve or advance a beloved community—but in most places the community no longer existed, and where it existed, it was no longer beloved. Each professor believed that he owed his loyalty to his professional or scholarly group and not to the university. All elements related to the university—trustees, faculty, administration, students, alumni—distrusted

one another and engaged in combative interaction that made a sense of community even less attainable.

That conversation is painfully close to the realities of the moment and it behooves us now to insure that the character and copy of John Gardner's story remain fiction. We must not permit the University community further to disintegrate, nor can our free larger society afford the demise of its universities.

Ladies and gentlemen, the situation before us is gravely serious and the challenge immense. The times call not for emotion, but rather for logic and return to reason, poignantly phrased by Pope Leo XIII:

It is the mind, or reason, which is the predominant element in us who are human creatures; it is this which renders a human being human, and distinguishes him essentially and generically from the brute.

I express to you my personal recommitment to the university community and to the principles of true academic freedom. I stand and speak from that traditional center position and I invite you and our fellow citizens throughout the land to join with me: Together we will keep our universities open and free.

POLLUTION: THE PROBLEM FOR US ALL

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, pollution has become a matter of grave concern to many of our citizens. The following are the first six reports of a planned series I am writing on this problem:

POLLUTION REPORT

There can be no denial of the "pollution problem" but at the same time it is becoming obvious that we're skidding dangerously close to a pool of hysteria about how to deal with it. This is the "run-in-circles-and-scream" mentality—the running deals with those trying to cash in on this relatively new awareness, and the screaming refers to those who are trying to make political capital out of it all. We don't need either; what we do need is a calm, reasoned approach to how it came to be, and an equally calm, reasoned approach to finding the solution. Both are at hand; a problem created by Man can be solved by Man. It has always been thus and it always will be—and will—be, or else we will have served notice that we are no better than beasts.

First, the problem, or concern about it, is not new. One of the English Kings, in the Middle Ages, proclaimed an edict against burning coal because it made too much smoke, and there are records of some executions of his subjects who didn't take him seriously. And Charles I, of course, was violently anti-tobacco; whether on grounds of health or air pollution, I am not sure. There is record of his angrily upbraiding the captain of his guard, when he was confined and waiting trial, prior to his execution, because the unthinking captain lit a pipe in his presence.

For the present day, we have the whole topic lumped conveniently under the term "ecology." Ecology as a science is only about 70 years old; coined from a Greek word meaning "house," it is a study of how living organisms and the non-living environment get along together.

The fundamental principle of ecology is this: We can never do just one thing. By way

of further explanation, Charles Darwin gave us an amusing example of an ecologic system in his *Origin of Species*; Darwin's discussion of the consequences of introducing a cat into rural England is a classic:

"The number of humble-bees in any district depends in a great measure upon the number of field-mice which destroy their combs and nests. . . . Now the number of mice is largely dependent, as everyone knows, on the number of cats; . . . Hence it is quite credible that the presence of a feline animal in large numbers in a district might determine, through the intervention first of mice and then of bees, the frequency of certain flowers in that district!"

(Note: "humble-bees" is correct; that was the term at the time)

Further writers had fun with this. They pointed out, on one hand, that old maids keep cats, and, on the other, red clover (which required bees as pollinators) made the hay that nourished the horses of the British cavalry. From this, it followed that the continuance of the British Empire depended on a bountiful supply of old maids!

So, in essence, tinkering with nature never stops with one move and one move only. Today's classic example is the Aswan Dam, of Egypt. We all remember the Aswan Dam, of course, this great water-conserving project that would tame the Nile, and how castigated Secretary of State John Foster Dulles was when he withdrew American support for its construction. So the Russians moved in and helped Nasser build it; a great victory for Egypt, wasn't it?

Indeed not! The Dam controlled irrigation, and deprived the Egyptian flood plains of the annual fertilization the Nile floods had given them for 5,000 years. The fertile silt now piles behind the Dam, which will eventually have to be abandoned. And, artificial fertilizers now have to be imported into the Nile Valley.

Second, there is no longer any periodic flushing of the soil, such as the floods provided. This means the soil is being salinated, bit by bit. Methods for correcting this cost money and they haven't yet been faced by Egypt.

Curious footnote to history, here; I myself have traveled in the great Mesopotamian Valley, in the area around Babylon, the city whose name is synonymous with dead civilizations. The soil is—and has been for years—heavily salinated to the point where it is worthless for anything.

Third, the eastern Mediterranean is deprived of flood-born nutrients; the sardine catch in that area is down from 18,000 tons a year to 500 tons, a staggering 97 per cent loss. No one has reimbursed the fishermen.

Fourth, there has been a great increase in the terribly debilitating disease known as schistosomiasis among the Egyptians. The disease organism depends on snails, which depend on a steady supply of water (the present constant irrigation furnishes this, but flooding did not).

So the first effect of the Aswan Dam has been to mean a larger population for Egypt, of whom a greater proportion than before are chronically ill.

This is, then, what it's all about. We need, now most of all, honest concern; we need panic not at all; and political demagoguery, for sure, will pollute the atmosphere far more than anything else.

REPORT

A citizen of the American Republic, today, quite properly concerned with garbage-strewn fields and highways, gaseous air hardly fit to breathe, and rivers too thin to plow but too thick to swim in, due to pollution, might well ask "How did it get that way?"

When the country was first settled everything looked inexhaustible. Sir Walter Raleigh's representatives wrote back to him that everything on the continent was "even in the midst of summer in incredible

abundance." By 1800 we had four million people; less than one century later, there were 60 million. We moved across our land, and, as Walt Whitman sang:

"We primeval forest felling,
We the rivers stemming, vexing we, and
piercing deep the mines within;
We the surface broad surveying, we the virgin
soil upheaving. Pioneers! O Pioneers!"

In the history of almost every country and culture there has been pride in one's land, and its natural beauties and glories. It is no accident, for example, that the loveliest, most lilted American sea chanteys of them all was the hauntingly beautiful "O Shanadore!" Its strains soared about the royals and top-gallants of Yankee clipper ships in ports all over the world as the American seaman sang nostalgically of the Shenandoah River, which to them was symbolic of the beauty of their homeland.

But then, swiftly, the balance of nature was altered. The prairie dweller literally did not miss the buffalo until they were gone. "Virgin soil" was virgin no longer; it blew away in great whirling clouds of dust. Rain and melting snow poured unchecked floods over land unable to hold water, as the topsoil was no longer there.

Walden Pond, immortalized by Thoreau, was not immune. A biting, satirical account of a modern-day visit to the spot noted that as one approached the pond:

"From beneath the flattened popcorn wrapper . . . peeped the frail violet. The pond lay clear and blue in the morning light. . . . In the shallows a man's water-logged shirt undulated gently."

But even with all of this, we are still fortunate, we Americans, are blessed beyond all other people on earth. We still retain much. Daniel Boone and his party saw the "ample plains, the beautiful tracts below" before them as they stood on a mountain ridge in Kentucky; these are still there. The Ohio River still pulses majestically on in what one early writer called "silent dignity." Skyscrapers line the shores of the Hudson, but in April, May and June, fishermen still net shad as the Indians did off "Manhats" in the 1600's.

But not all of the changes made by Man in the New World were bad. When Lewis and Clark went up the Missouri, there were no trout; it was too muddy. When Coronado gave the Colorado River its name, it had no game fish; it was too full of red silt. The situation was unchanged until development and reclamation projects of the first few decades of the 20th Century.

It has been half a thousand years since the first mail-clad Spanish Don came to Florida, but deep in the mangrove keys life goes on even as it did centuries before the Spaniards. In the words of one naturalist:

"A million years have done little to change the aspect of a hidden pool inside the mangrove. If you don't believe it, crawl with crocodile and terrapin through the slime and watch the lowly gastropod leave his smooth track beside yours. . . . Best of all, stay out there at night. You will listen to the silence of centuries and you will hear, as I have, the noiseless murmur of the Pleistocene."

It is these things that lie within the soul of a nation and its people, and give its life the quality without which no culture nor nation can survive. Nor would it care to survive, I think, if these were gone. It is these things that make us aware of what we had, what we have lost, and of the necessity to regain, and restore, and help a basically benevolent Mother Nature to fight back. If we do not, the results can be truly horrible; worse, if possible, even, than an Earth seared to a cinder after a nuclear war. The next newsletter will go into the really frightful aspect of what could be, unless. . . .

REPORT 3

The "Black Death" of the 14th Century—bubonic or pulmonary plague—was apparently born of the fertility and filth of Asiatic populations, impoverished by war and weakened by famine. It crossed Arabia into Egypt and the Black Sea into Russia and Byzantium. From Mediterranean ports of the Near East, the merchants and ships of Venice, Syracuse, Pisa, Genoa and Marseille (with the help of fleas and rats on these ships) brought it to Italy and France.

It found fertile ground. There had been a succession of famine years in Europe already, and the plague swept all over Europe from 1348 onwards. From a third to one-half of Europe's population died—generally horribly, in shrieking agony; as a chronicler in Sienna, Italy wrote in 1354: ". . . And people said and believed, 'This is the end of the world.' . . ." The total deaths were estimated at 25 million in Europe, and Chinese chronicles say 13 million died in that land. It came closer to wiping out mankind than any other evil, before or since.

There are certain distinctive parallels between the reaction of the people of that age to the Black Death, and the reaction in some quarters—some, by no means all—to the "pollution problem" today. The nameless, unspeakable fear of the Black Death caused one of the oldest examples of mass psychosis known to history, what is called by some historians the "Dance Madness." Great masses of people, fleeing from they knew not really what, except that it would kill, and fleeing to they knew not where, except feeling that anyplace would be better than where they were, literally danced their way across the roads of Europe. Totally, completely, senseless—chanting and shrieking oaths or prayers, as the mood moved them—great wriggling snakes of crowds of humanity—goaded by terror to near-madness—until they, too, were struck down.

The Black Death was a stark reality, a horror unmatched, and no one knew how to cope with it. There are quite a few very serious aspects of pollution that also hold within them the potential for horror unmatched. "Earth Day" brought about, on a national scale, attention to many things that have bothered a lot of people for some time. And it also brought about a great deal of demagoguery, senseless name-calling, distorting of facts, over-simplification of the issue, fright tactics, and a general collection of idiosyncrasies in some quarters that skate perilously close to resembling the witless dancing of the Dark Ages when the plague struck.

Burying new cars; collecting trash—then dumping it on the steps of a city hall; these smack more of some long-dead pagan ritual, planned to appease heathen gods. They are not only witless and thoughtless but also detract from the real good others tried to do.

On the other hand, there was what the Indianapolis Star, on April 24, 1970, called ". . . down-to-earth things. There were young people picking up litter. There was the schoolmaster telling his boys that the problem is a serious and complicated one which will go on day after day, and which must be understood and met and conquered. . . ."

Exactly! Right now there seems to be precious little inclination to do any understanding of something that existed, for example, in Rome centuries before the birth of Christ. So far back the date of its construction is unknown, Roman or Etruscan engineers built the Cloaca Maxima, the Great Sewer, with massive stone arches so wide a wagon loaded with hay could pass under them. The city's refuse and rain water passed through openings in the streets into the Cloaca Maxima and drains—which all emptied into the Tiber, and, to quote one authority, "whole pollution was a lasting problem to Roman life."

For that matter, let's go back even farther.

so far back the example exists only in mythology. Do we realize, for instance, that the first recorded example of a truly serious pollution problem was solved by what we might call private industry, of sorts, after the governing authorities despaired of a solution? It was the Sixth Labor of Hercules when, by diverting the flow of the River Alpheus, the hero cleansed in one day the incredibly filthy stables belonging to Augeas, King of Elis.

REPORT

Take the delicately-balanced Scales of Nature, in which are weighed the elements of the Earth upon which our very existence depend. Put in one scale the Earth's load of ice, six million cubic miles, covering 10 per cent of the surface of the globe. Put in the other scale the Earth's atmosphere, 5.1×10^{18} tons of dry air, composed of nitrogen, oxygen, argon and carbon dioxide, plus water vapor and non-gaseous matter such as domestic and industrial smoke, natural dust picked up from the earth by the wind, salt spray from the Seven Seas, and, within recent years, fission products of atomic tests and nuclear reactors.

I said "delicately-balanced Scales of Nature." Yes, far beyond the point where an imbalance would require, as one person has suggested, gas masks on carburetors of automobiles, over the air intakes. Nature isn't always too helpful, here, and has some tricks of her own with the atmosphere. "Inversion layer" is probably the most common, and has, for the longest period of time, been the most troublesome.

Before the white men came to Southern California, the Indians of the region noted smoke from their campfires hung in the air and did not disperse. Los Angeles, on a coastal plain and bordered on three sides by mountains, is in a box, where sea breezes, westerly winds and the mountains (forming an inversion layer) trap smoke and everything else that rises from the ground. Los Angeles' smog problem is a subject for bad jokes and also great concern. In early December, 1930, in the Meuse Valley, in Belgium, smoke from the industrial city of Liege concentrated so heavily (inversion layers again) that hundreds had acute respiratory attacks and 63 died. Twenty died and hundreds were sickened by the same thing at Donora, Pa., in October 1948; Donora is in the deep and narrow Monongahela River Valley, near Pittsburgh.

What does this have to do with the polar ice caps? Quite a lot; truly catastrophic and geologically revolutionary changes can come from an imbalance between these two elements and the scope is much wider than regional "inversion layers." Now, to repeat, I am not in the "fright merchant" business stench created when your neighbor burns rubber tires has implications far beyond the smell that drifts into your yard. The atmosphere is a giant insulator: by day, from the heat and lethal rays of the sun; by night, preventing Earth's heat from escaping into outer space. Meddle with the qualities of an insulator and its insulating properties change drastically.

This has happened in the past. Geologists know there have been catastrophes on truly immense and grand scales. And the probable cause was changes of sea level, relative to the surface of the continents. This, in turn, is directly attributable to a change in the temperature of the earth; a drop in the annual average temperature of only $3\frac{1}{2}^\circ$ Centigrade (about 38° Fahrenheit) would bring on a new Ice Age. And a rise of the same amount would melt Antarctica and Greenland down to bare rock in a time period estimated to be a few centuries, by some, and a few decades, by others.

The end of the major geologic periods—Cambrian, Ordovician, Devonian, Permian, Triassic and Cretaceous, in particular—saw

these mammoth changes on earth. The Cambrian seas, for instance, swarmed with trilobites, primitive creatures related to the shrimp, lobster and crab. There were about sixty families of trilobites, but at the end of the Cambrian, two-thirds of them disappeared. The greatest mass extinction of all came at the end of the Permian, when nearly half of all the known animal families in the world were wiped out. The end of the Cretaceous saw dinosaurs, marine reptiles, flying reptiles and many forms of land and sea life go without leaving a trace. Why? Probably change in temperature due to, yes, air pollution.

True, there were no factory chimneys nor autos; not much for smoke except volcanoes and forest fires. Volcanoes? Few things discharge so much carbon dioxide into the air. A young earth, heaving, buckling, trembling—volcanic activity almost constant—carbon dioxide content of the air increases. It doesn't take much. Present content is 0.03 per cent of the air; doubling this to 0.06 would raise the temperature the required amount to melt the ice caps, as escape of heat from the earth at night is blocked. Again, if carbon dioxide content dropped to half of what it is today, glaciers would level the towers of Manhattan.

So what does this have to do with burning rubber tires? Simply to point out that while Nature holds the scales, Nature also sometimes tips the balance. The extinction of prehistoric life, mentioned above, quite probably came about from this imbalance of Nature herself. Even here there is still a balance to be struck. The same thundering volcanoes pouring carbon dioxide into the air exposed new, unweathered rock, which absorbs the same gas. So, gradually, the balance was restored and the temperature fell again as this prehistoric "pollution" was taken from the skies.

The Washington STAR for April 28, 1970, noted the Smithsonian Institution on that day reported a 16 percent reduction in direct sunlight from that measured no more than two generations ago. Where was it measured? Right on the Mall, within one mile of the U.S. Capitol. Why? Air pollution, 20 Century style. What will it add up to? The next newsletter will look at three possible situations.

REPORT 5

The preceding newsletter in this series on pollution went rather extensively into geology to show two things: first, the truly precarious balance in Nature that allows life to exist in various forms, and, second, how Nature herself can upset this balance. Drop or increase of a few degrees in temperature, brought about by drop or increase of a few hundredths of a percent of carbon dioxide content in the atmosphere, and there can be trouble.

What these changes did to prehistoric life itself, i.e., exterminating dinosaurs and other forms of life, wouldn't necessarily occur in such scope today. Animal and vegetable life might not be quite as susceptible to these relatively small fluctuations in the thermometer. So we go back to the other factor in the Scales of Nature: the ice caps, and the "greenhouse effect" as heavier concentrations of carbon dioxide hold heat and modify the temperature.

During the first half of the 20th Century average temperature for the earth has risen about .55 degrees Centigrade. It's been calculated, as I pointed out in the last newsletter, that an increase of $3\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$ Centigrade would melt the Antarctic and the Greenland ice cap down to bare rock. The International Geophysical Year (July 1, 1957 to December 31, 1958) did show among other things that glaciers are receding. One of these in the Himalayas had receded 700 feet between 1935 and 1959; others as much as 1,000 or 2,000 feet. Fish adapted to cold waters were migrating northwards; warm-climate trees

were found sprouting farther north than ever before. In Scandinavia, arrowheads over 1,000 years old have been found where for centuries the land was under snow and ice—for the snow and ice are melting. The North Polar ice cap is thinning and shrinking.

Some estimate the critical increase in temperature ($3\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$ Centigrade) will come about in forty years, as six billion tons a year of carbon dioxide enter the atmosphere. Already, violent storms at high tide don't miss by much flooding the New York subway system. Total melting of the ice caps would mean a rise in sea level of between 200 and 400 feet—more than enough to drown most of the world's major cities, which after all are located on sea coasts.

Another flood? Not necessarily; there is another thesis that this increased carbon dioxide content in the air will reduce the amount of sunlight reaching the earth. Then, of course, we head back down the scale—that drop of $3\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$ Centigrade that means return of the glaciers.

There is yet another intriguing idea. Intriguing, yes, even though if it happened it would be probably more catastrophic than a nuclear war, and intriguing as anything about the earth around us is intriguing. It is this: the warming trend, melting the polar ice caps, will deprive Earth of these two mammoth counterweights that keep it in its present position. Enough ice melted from the Antarctic, for example, and the loss of weight at that end of the globe would cause it to tilt.

Now, the North Pole has not always been in its present position; this is easily enough determined by noting alignment of bits of magnetized iron in ancient rocks. These are natural compass needles and show the magnetic pole was in different places, at different times. Within the last few months it has been established beyond question that the South Pole was once in the middle of what is now the Central Sahara. Some think this was merely due to continental drift, the proven theory that continents have drifted apart. Others speculate it may have been a mammoth, major upheaval when the entire globe out of balance, spun crazily, until it stabilized where it is today.

Flood? Another Ice Age? During the last Ice Age, there were glaciers over most of northern and western Europe and south of the Great Lakes on the North American continent. Or a truly frightful upheaval, as the earth spins off its present axis; this would be in terms of sheer disaster probably even beyond the apocalyptic, last-ditch, insane nuclear slugging match between nations that some feel will incinerate our globe.

These things are there, on the spectrum of "possibles," when Man's existence on this planet is concerned. They are, admittedly, far extremes of "possibles" and how far they are usually depends on who is advancing what theory.

I cite these things as part of this series on the environment as examples of how very small changes can produce thunderingly major upheavals in the pattern of existence. And, for another reason, too: in the process of cleaning up and preserving our planet, it doesn't hurt any of us, one bit, to look a little deeper into its natural history. The more you know about something, the more you take care of it, and cherish it.

REPORT NO. 6

So where do we go, all of us, caught up one way or another in this sudden, highly-intensified concern with the problem of pollution that has plagued us in one way or another for centuries? In what direction do we look to preserve our environment? In the right direction—and with that in mind it is time to knock down some of the phony signposts so noisily and wrongheadedly erected lately.

False premise No. 1: Pollution is a by-

product of an advanced industrial society, where the market is glutted with senseless consumer products, and their residue is scattered all over the landscape. Anyone who swallows this one would know he was wrong the minute he stepped off the plane in, let's say, Calcutta, India. In a country where it is an article of faith to let sacred cows roam the streets (unmolested) and sacred monkeys swarm over the rooftops (unmolested), the pollution threat from beer cans and stacks of yesterday's newspaper pale into insignificance.

False premise No. 2: Pollution of the environment is solely a by-product of the capitalistic system. Two recent newspaper stories answer this one: the New York Times for April 27, 1970, reported the concern of a Moscow conservationist over careless use of pesticides, that killed animals and birds. "It happens everywhere. This question is worrying us more and more every year." Then on April 28, 1970, the same newspaper announced the Soviet Union had opened a "comprehensive legislative program . . . to conserve water and curb increasing pollution. . . ."

False premise No. 3: Modern industrial society has measurably and significantly made the problem worse. Well, this same modern industrial society may have more chimneys, but it also has more techniques to cut down the smoke output of these same chimneys. And were the "Good Old Days" better? Theodore Roosevelt once wrote of an extremely hot summer in New York City, where the heat killed horses where they stood. As Roosevelt told it, the city simply did not have adequate facilities to remove the dead horses. Well, I hate seeing abandoned junked cars on the streets as much as anyone, but if the choice is a defunct sedan to a dead horse with five days of July heat having worked on it, I will take the car any time.

False premise No. 4: We are going to soon be submerged in trash because there isn't anyplace to put it. Not quite; all the household trash for the entire United States for one year could be buried in a pit one mile square and five hundred feet deep. A large pit, to be sure, but no great problem with today's modern technology, and especially with the giant pits already gouged out of the earth by strip-mining, that are just waiting to be filled.

False premise #5: The Federal Government should get involved, instantly, on a large scale. Totally misleading; to begin with, the Federal Government is in it—up to the eyebrows. Thirteen Congressional Committees (some of which are quarreling with others and hauling and tugging over who should do what); 90 separate federal governmental programs; 26 quasi-governmental bodies; 14 inter-agency committees. The first 15 months of President Nixon's Administration saw submission of 23 major legislative proposals to Capitol Hill, and, by executive order, 14 new measures dealing with the environment. Of course, this isn't enough for the doom-shouters; the President's proposed \$3 billion was denounced as "hilarious" and a demand made for \$100 billion. This gets us into the "anything-you-can-spend-I-can-spend-more" game. So let's stay out of it.

False premise #6: The most vocal of the environmental activists today are idealistic, concerned, dedicated people with no ulterior motives. Now, some are—very much so—a recent flood of well-written letters to me from students in several 6th Indiana Congressional District high schools made this perfectly plain.

But hanging around the fringes and, in some instances, I believe, right smack in the center, the whole environmental movement is threatened by a tinge of radicals who would not, from what I read of them and what they say, necessarily shrink from tossing a bomb at a power plant to get rid of its smoking chimneys. You think not? A recent magazine much beloved by the radical

fringe, young and old, led off with a sour editorial whose tenor can be determined from its comment on the students burying a new car as a symbol. The magazine said it was "... an indication of dangerous political naivete that must be overcome. To buy the car in the first place was to pay the criminal and strengthen him. . . ."

And for a clincher, the last paragraph referred to the recent burning of a branch of the Bank of America, in Santa Barbara, California, by a youthful mob.

"Burning a bank is not the same as putting the banks and their system out of business. To do that, millions of people in this country will first have to wake up to the real source of their misery. The action in Santa Barbara, a community which has seen its environment destroyed by corporate greed, might spark that awakening. If it does, the students who burned the bank of America in Santa Barbara will have done more to save the environment than all the Survival Fairs and 'Earth day Teach-Ins' put together."

This was condensed to appear on the front of the magazine as this chiller:

"The students who burned the Bank of America in Santa Barbara may have done more towards saving the environment than all the Teach-Ins put together."

A lot of what is being said and printed about the environment is foolish nonsense, and I tried to cite the prime fallacies in the first 5 false premises. But this last is more than foolish; it is dangerous, incendiary and volatile. And it is far more threatening to us all than a littered landscape, filthy rivers, or dirty air.

DR. JOHN J. MENG, PRESIDENT OF MARYMOUNT COLLEGE DISCUSSES RELEVANCE OF THE CATHOLIC WOMEN'S COLLEGE TO TODAY'S WORLD

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, at a time when private liberal arts colleges are finding it increasingly difficult to continue in their commitment to the educative process, it is encouraging to read the views of Dr. John J. Meng, president of Marymount College, Tarrytown, N.Y., concerning the relevancy of such institutions to today's world.

The spring issue of Marymount contains an article by Dr. Meng entitled, "Relevance and the Catholic Women's College," based upon his remarks last November at the inauguration of Sister Marie Barry, SND, as president of Emmanuel College in Boston.

Alluding to the axiom that each institution should do that for which it is best fitted, Dr. Meng concludes that "our society requires the preservation and development of instruction which liberal arts colleges in general, and Catholic women's colleges in particular, are best fitted to provide."

So that our other colleagues may have the benefit of Dr. Meng's views on this important subject, I include the full text of his remarks at this point in the RECORD:

RELEVANCE AND THE CATHOLIC WOMEN'S COLLEGE

(By John J. Meng)

"Relevance" is a word now used in connection with almost every educational topic—

sometimes sensibly, more often nonsensically. The dictionary tells us something is "relevant" if it "fits or suits given requirements." What this means to me is that anything "relevant," including a Catholic women's college must be "relevant to something." I would conclude that if these colleges are effectively accomplishing an appropriate purpose, they are relevant. If their purpose is not appropriate to today's world, they are not relevant.

Until shortly before the beginning of the twentieth century, American higher education was exclusively education in the liberal arts. This educative process was designed to enshrine in the minds of students the principles of private and civic morality, of self-reliance, of self-control, and of self-government. It was designed to transmit to posterity knowledge of the great achievements of man. It was honestly directed toward character building; toward a deep-seated understanding of the world and of its peoples rather than toward a knowledge of superficial techniques and methods. It was intended to train young adults in the art of original thinking. It was designed, in short, to keep the heart of civilized culture beating strongly.

The liberal arts college for women roughly paralleled in its development the gradual entrance of American women into the business and civic life of the nation. Today, with the rights of women more nearly equal to those of men than ever before in our history, the need for the continuance of colleges for women exclusively is being seriously questioned.

Practically all American liberal arts colleges, with the exception of those created by government, were established by one of the religious denominations. Church-related colleges are still numerous, although many that were originally so are today in practice completely non-sectarian. Facilities for various forms of denominational worship are supplied with increasing frequency in both public and private higher educational institutions. The utility and economic feasibility of maintaining separate Catholic colleges are subjects for debate.

The sum of these questions is whether there is a need in today's American society for the liberal arts college which is dedicated to the education of women and to the value system of Roman Catholic Christianity. If the answer to this question is affirmative, it must be based upon the existence of real needs rather than sentimental attachments. If it is affirmative, we must justify it in terms of today's facts and tomorrow's reasonable probabilities rather than in terms of wishful thinking and hopeful guesswork. Many American colleges and universities are today as open to women as they are to men; large Catholic colleges and universities are coeducational, and public and nonsectarian institutions generally provide facilities and opportunities to Catholic students for Catholic religious worship. I am forced to the conclusion that, if the availability of a good secular education and opportunities for religious worship were the sole criteria justifying the Catholic women's college, the answer to the question "is there a need?" would be a clear and evident "No." But these are not the only criteria.

The utility of the liberal arts curriculum as a pattern for baccalaureate education is under heavy fire. Many believe that the liberal arts have lost all pertinence to today's world. American higher education is confronted with major dilemmas. New knowledge makes obsolete much that was taught as axiomatic in earlier days. Colleges are large. Their students, their faculties, and their administrators seek to adapt educational programs to the apparent needs of the times.

There is general agreement that we cannot divorce ourselves from involvement with the society of which we are intimately a part. Yet that involvement must be intelligent,

rational, effective, and properly balanced. Are we to abandon the ideals of a liberal arts education and become operating social agencies of one type or another? None of us can ignore the realities of life about us. Must today's college deemphasize the past and concentrate on the present? Must it exchange philosophy for technology, and social theory for social commitment? Must it concentrate on "know how" and abandon "know why"? There is nothing wrong with the idea of participation in the life of the world outside the college doors, but other purposes, too, should be served inside those doors. Study and reflection are the truly important ingredients of the liberal arts college experience.

Education is a mosaic of many factors. It is the sum of patterned studies and environmental circumstances surrounding an individual during the formative years of life, plus the experiences and lessons of daily living throughout life. Education does not and should not stop at the door of the college classroom. Formal schooling is designed to provide a base for learning rather than learning itself. Organized patterns of instruction save each generation of the human race from learning over again by experience the hard lessons their ancestors learned over the centuries. That portion of a person's education which is expected to take place in a college is education different from the education one acquires in the world of work. Some things are best learned by "doing"—other things are best learned by study and reflection.

"Learning by doing" teaches man to know the society in which he lives, and the tools and techniques best suited at any given moment to achieve whatever his purpose may be at that moment. Such knowledge is a valuable asset, but it never remains fixed. Constant social change requires a constant adaptation of tools and techniques. No educational institution—not even professional schools whose stock in trade it is—can hope to keep abreast of this type of knowledge. Witness the wide variety of "retooling" seminars now provided in increasing numbers for even the most prestigious of our professions. No college can supply this type of knowledge to its students in any comprehensive fashion, nor can its students acquire such knowledge as effectively in college as they can outside college.

Learning by study and reflection is designed essentially to train the intellect and the will, to develop principles of conduct and action, and to discipline the mind in order that it may grasp concepts and ideas more readily. These aims remain valid and valuable, whatever changes may occur in the surrounding civilization. With the ability to think and plan, with a system of values against which to weigh the ideas and proposals of others, an individual may hope to contribute something to society and to keep abreast of the "knowledge explosion" in the world around him. These are abilities not easily learned in the work-a-day world.

All the above is designed to emphasize the significant difference between the legitimate role of the liberal arts college and the current demand for active social commitments as a college function. I do not mean to imply that the liberal arts college should be wedded to the past, or that it should ignore the present. Far-reaching changes in the traditional liberal arts curriculum are essential. The instruction which these colleges impart must take into account new ideas, new learning, and new social experiences. If our teaching has been confined within national or regional bounds, it should be broadened and expanded to include other areas and other systems of thought. It must encompass systematic treatment of current social problems so that these things can be done effectively. We must be prepared constantly to change the content of our teaching. We must make our colleges adaptable and sufficiently pliable so that they may

continue to pursue their high purposes under whatever set of changed circumstances the future may bring. This implies the creation of an adventurous spirit in education. It implies a willingness to consider drastic alterations in content and methods of instruction. The time has certainly come for Catholic institutions to throw off some of the intellectual shackles which have bound them to the past, to cease to be primarily "apologetic" establishments existing principally for the purpose of protecting the faith of young Americans. There is a much broader and more significant role for our colleges in today's world than any which they have played before.

American institutions of higher education come in all sizes and shapes. Their purposes are varied. They range from great universities, generally coeducational with a major interest in research, through the large urban colleges with a nonresident student body, to the relatively small liberal arts colleges for men or for women. Academic standards in some may be high, in others moderately low, and perhaps in still others very low indeed. An axiom I think we all would recognize is that each institution should do that for which it is best fitted.

Universities and large coeducational colleges are mostly career-oriented. Their undergraduate curricula are appropriately designed as underpinnings for advanced studies leading to graduate or professional degrees. Considerable diversity of undergraduate curricular choices results from the variety of specialized competencies found among university faculties and from the large numbers of students enrolled. For the career-oriented student, such an institution may be the wise choice. Large size, however, places a premium on individualized instruction and seriously limits institutional freedom to engage in educational experimentation. Direct contact between senior faculty members and undergraduate students tends to lessen as the size of the college or university increases.

Just as the large diversified institution may possess certain advantages for students with specific career aspirations, so can the relatively small liberal arts college offer a type of education well adapted to the needs of other students.

And what is it that the very excellent Catholic liberal arts college for women can do best? In effect, what makes it "relevant"? What can it do which makes it "fit or suit given requirements"?

By keeping its academic standards high it can attract from the great mass of college-directed students young women of sound intellectual capacity, with the greatest potential for future personal development. For many young women of this caliber the large coeducational college, the large urban university, the large research institution with only a tangential interest in undergraduates can provide a stultifying experience. The excellent liberal arts college, whether it be for men or for women, with economic stability and a lively and dynamic faculty provides a milieu in which the academically oriented student of great potential can develop to the utmost her intellectual capacity and her understanding of the practicalities of life.

Our current intense desire to establish social and economic equality for all citizens causes us to forget or ignore the sociological implications of the biological fact that men and women are different. The facts of biological and psychological distinctions between the sexes create sociological conditions which legislation cannot change. In our society, the woman is the head of the home, and in that capacity she not only brings children into the world, but she is the most important element in their upbringing and in the formation of their minds at the most malleable stage of life. The woman's particular role in the partnership of marriage is

unique and highly significant. This is not the place to define the specific elements that should be included in the education of young women for the significant roles of mother, wife, and mentor of the very young. Of one thing I am quite sure, however. Sources of vast wisdom in this area are available, and the need for instruction is great.

Of another fact I am also quite certain. The development of future generations, of their characters, of their attitudes, and of their sensibilities will continue to depend in very large part upon the maternal direction of their young minds. One of America's greatest social needs is for upright, intellectually alert women who understand and appreciate the tremendous social significance of woman's place in our society. We need women who are prepared to create the sound home life and uplifting atmosphere for their children which will provide us with citizens of whom the future may be proud. Here, as I see it, is the true justification for a women's college. None of this is intended to disparage or deny the aspirations of young women for careers in business, in politics, or in the professions. In all of these activities women should have opportunities equal to those of men. I wish simply to point out that our society will crumble if many women do not recognize the social essentiality of the career of motherhood and if American higher education ignores the particular needs of those who recognize its significance.

Whatever may have been the motivations for the establishment of Catholic women's colleges, they have an additional important reason for continuation. Roman Catholicism considered from the point of view of the temporal order alone is a force for stability in a world torn by conflicts. In different times and different eras, this has always been true. It is no less true today. The principles which Catholicism teaches are principles which lie at the foundations of social order. Even violent opponents of the Church hesitate to deny this fact. They may attack persons, or church institutions, or methods of implementing church teaching, but the inherent integrity of the Church's social principles is practically unassailable. The membership, the organization, and the geographical diffusion of this universal Church confer upon it a potential power for good in our disordered civilization which it would be folly to abandon. Now, as in few other periods in history, it would be wise to expand and develop this power for social good to its utmost. Developing Catholic dialogue with men of good will of all nationalities and of all philosophies provides encouraging evidence of this trend.

If these things are true, the role of the Catholic college in America today should become greater than it has before. Our young people need to know and understand their faith fully—not in an apologetic sense, but in a more dynamic way. They need to learn something not only of the ideas, ideals, and principles of their Catholic forebears, but they need also to learn of other great philosophies and other great teachers of moral and ethical ideas. With knowledge of these ideas they also need to learn respect for them. This way, too, our world is moving—toward an intellectual social synthesis which may incorporate in it not only the aspirations and the hopes but also the experiences and the ideals of great moral leaders everywhere.

I am not suggesting that Catholics should abandon their theological concepts. One of the most important life forces is religion. If civilization is to be preserved, religion can be one of its saviors. The material well-being of this world is at stake, and religions have much to contribute to its preservation. At this point in time Roman Catholics have an obligation to move out into the world to contribute their share along with others of good will toward the maintenance and re-

creation of a better social order. Our society requires the preservation and development of instruction which liberal arts colleges in general, and Catholic women's colleges in particular, are best fitted to provide. If these things are true, then our colleges are "relevant," for they "fit or suit given requirements."

"MOONFLAG"

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, recently I was the recipient of a very outstanding and somewhat unique presentation during the annual banquet of the Rio Dell Chamber of Commerce.

The presentation was made by a very lovely, talented, and patriotic young lady, Ruth Senteney.

To say that it was a pleasant surprise would be an understatement of my true feelings. She has sent "Moonflag" to, and received acknowledgments from, President Nixon and Governor Reagan.

I feel singularly honored to have been the recipient of this beautiful "Moonflag," but also to have the privilege of representing the "Creator of Moonflag."

Recently, during the "Rhododendron Festival" parade in Eureka, Calif., Ruth Senteney displayed "Moonflag" as a float entry in the parade. It was particularly appropriate, inasmuch as I had Dr. William Lenoir, a scientist-astronaut, as my special guest during the parade and festival.

I take the liberty of bringing to the attention of the Congress, the creative work of Ruth Senteney, by inserting her own description of how she became personally motivated to design "Moonflag." In my judgment, it is truly inspirational.

THE CREATING OF "MOONFLAG"

We, Earth people, all have a flag for our own nations. It was while watching the First Step on the Moon, that I decided the moon, in all its loneliness, needed a flag too. One that was as beautiful as our "Old Glory" and for all nations to enjoy. So, on July 27, 1969, on a Sunday afternoon, I made a drawing of the moon as it was the night the astronauts first landed there.

In observing the moon and the many beautiful stars around her, what would be more fitting than a burst of moonbeams and stars to come dancing from the moon.

There will be more people going to the moon, so I decided Neil Armstrong and Edwin Aldrin should represent all others who will land on the moon. While they will always need one to help guide them as Michael Collins did, so he as a mother ship should be hovering near to watch out for her children.

Now put them all together, a white crescent moon, 13 white moonbeams and 50 red stars on a sky blue background, plus two pale blue stars for Armstrong and Aldrin and one navy blue star for Collins and that's how "Moonflag" was created.

Long may "Moonflag" live in the hearts of all Earth people as she the moon has no people to enjoy her.

Now that the moon has a flag for her, maybe she'll shine a little brighter and not mind these Earth people that go up there to see her.

"MODERATION" A LA CHICAGO 3

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, recently at the University of New Hampshire after considerable debate relative to policy concerning the invitation, the Chicago 3—Hoffman, Rubin, and Dellinger—appeared and spoke. Much of Rubin's and Hoffman's remarks were unprintable even in this RECORD, but it has been contended by some that Dellinger was "moderate" in what he said.

David Dellinger's background is significant, for there is no question concerning his intentions, which are to disrupt America by encouraging recourse to anarchy through violence. In this connection the following editorial from today's Manchester, N.H. Union-Leader is of interest:

DELLINGER'S "MODERATION"

We're getting a little tired of hearing references to the "moderate" speech given by David Dellinger at UNH on the evening of May 5th. The speech was moderate only in its paucity of obscenities—and, perhaps, in comparison to the wild ranting of Rubin and Hoffman, it seemed moderate to some.

But when we hear someone describe the speech as reflecting a moderate point of view, we immediately begin to doubt the ability or willingness of that listener to discriminate between truth and malicious falsehood.

It is not moderate to accuse the Illinois commander of the National Guard of being personally responsible for the deaths of the 4 students at Kent State.

It is not moderate to accuse the Chicago police of murdering Black Panther Fred Hampton "in cold blood"—or in any other manner.

It is not moderate to define truth as constituting whatever Ho Chi Minh or the North Vietnamese delegates to the Paris peace talks allegedly told Dellinger "in personal conversation."

It is not moderate to say that the U.S. Air Force deliberately slaughters water buffalo because, Dellinger suggested, a small child is tied to the end of a rope attached to each animal.

It is not moderate to praise the Black Panthers' record of hate and mayhem.

It is not moderate to call for "a second American revolution," and then apparently try to skirt the Chicago court's warning to him not to make seditious speeches by drawing a phoney distinction between violence against property and violence against people.

It is not moderate to state that UNH radicals have "opened up the university as liberated territory from which people can paralyze the war machine."

And it is not moderate for anyone to try to palm off Dellinger as being simply an idealistic pacifist.

Dellinger's Communist leanings are no secret to anyone who has even begun to research his background. Instances of his reported association with Communist front organizations and Communist publications are legion.

Dellinger sent greetings which were read at the annual banquet of The Worker, official organ of the Communist Party, in New York City on October 17th, 1965.

He was a sponsor of the 1968 and 1969 Du-Bois Centennial Year celebration of Freedomways, a Red publication cited by the House Committee on Un-American activities.

He belonged to or sponsored programs of the following Communist fronts:

The Medical Aid to Cuba Committee (in 1962 and 1963), cited in 1965 by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The Socialist Workers Party (from 1963 to 1968), cited as long ago as 1947 and 1948 by the U.S. Attorney General and HCUA, respectively.

The National Guardian (from 1964 to 1966), cited by HCUA in 1956.

The Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, now known as the National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee (from 1965 to 1968), cited by HCUA in 1959 and by the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee in 1956.

Youth Against War and Fascism (in 1966), cited by HCUA in 1967.

The Spring Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam (in 1966 and 1967), cited by HCUA in 1967.

The W.E.B. DuBois Clubs of America (in 1966 and 1968), cited by HCUA in 1967.

The Committee to Secure Justice for Morton Sobell, also known as the Committee to Free Morton Sobell (from 1966 through 1968), cited in 1967 by HCUA.

The Student Mobilization Committee (in 1967 and 1968), cited in 1967 by HCUA.

National Mobilization Committee, formerly the Spring Mobilization Committee (from 1967 through 1969), cited in 1967 by HCUA.

The National Committee to Abolish the Un-American Activities Committee (in 1969), cited as a Red front by HCUA in 1961.

In addition, in May 1965, Dellinger spoke at the Vietnam protest teach-in, sponsored by the Vietnam Day Committee, at the University of California at Berkeley. In May of the following year, he spoke at VDC's first anniversary teach-in at Berkeley. VDC, according to the House Committee on Un-American Activities, was "organized at the University of California . . . in May of 1965, and controlled by members of various participating Communist and Marxist-oriented organizations. (It has) lent support to the campaign for the collection of money and medical aid for North Vietnam and the Viet Cong."

Dellinger has spoken at rallies sponsored by the Students for a Democratic Society (from 1965 through 1967). The SDS has been characterized by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover as "one of the most militant organizations now engaged in activities protesting U.S. foreign policy . . . Communists are actively promoting and participating in the activities of this organization, which is self-described as a group of liberals and radicals." A more complete background of SDS appears in a Union Leader editorial of May 2, 1970, entitled "SDS Is 'In' at UNH." (SDS has an office on campus, but Young Democrats, Young Republicans and Young Americans For Freedom have none).

In 1965 and 1968, Dellinger spoke at rallies sponsored by the so-called Chicago Peace Council. According to HCUA, the Council "follows a 'united front' course, cooperating and participating in projects with Communist, pacifist and front organizations," and is run by a mixed group of Communists (both of Moscow and Trotskyite variety), pacifists, and individuals from the so-called New Left."

From 1965 through 1969, Dellinger spoke often at anti-war rallies of the Fifth Avenue (Vietnam) Peace Parade Committee, described by HCUA as "a New York City anti-war in Vietnam organization, which . . . has a mixed group of identified Communists, notorious fellow travelers, and pacifists in its leadership."

Dellinger's role in the Chicago riots of 1968—he was later convicted—is outlined extensively in Parts 1, 2, and 3 of the HCUA report (1968), "Subversive Involvement in Disruption of 1968 Democratic Party National Convention."

Of course, we are NOT contending that

Dellinger, who calls himself a "non-Soviet Communist," would deny any of his Communist affiliations. (He certainly made no secret during his May 5th address at UNH of his current love affair with the Viet Cong.)

But we ARE contending that it is dishonest or naive to try to pass him off as a kindly, nonideologized "pacifist" who wants no more than to see peace in Vietnam.

ADDRESS BY HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1970

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means has today delivered a very important address to the Council of the U.S. Investment Community. Under leave to insert it in the RECORD, I am happy to include it with my remarks for the edification of Members:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE WILBUR D. MILLS BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE U.S. INVESTMENT COMMUNITY, OLD SUPREME COURT CHAMBER, U.S. CAPITOL, MAY 19, 1970

It is a real pleasure for me to be here this morning and to share in the program of the United States Investment Community. When my friend, Joe Fowler, called me, I was quite interested, since it is not often that this type of gathering takes place. This group of 100 overseas investment managers plus other portfolio managers and distinguished financial leaders is unusual, representing as you do management of funds and financial institutions that are so important to the economic strength of our own country and many countries around the world. I hope that the visitors from abroad will find their visit to this country both edifying and enjoyable.

It is the responsibility of the Committee on Ways and Means, of which I am Chairman, to pass on legislation of considerable interest to your own activities in the money markets. As a Committee whose primary responsibility is the initiation of tax legislation in the Congress, we must be constantly aware of the effects of tax policy on the capital market in this country and those abroad. This has become increasingly necessary in the last 20 years as the deficits in the United States balance of payments have continued.

Our payments deficits and the economic problems of other countries have constantly challenged the international monetary mechanism of the post-World War II period. Fortunately, it has been through international cooperation that the problems and challenges to international monetary and financial stability have been met. Problems remain, but the willingness of the major countries to act in a spirit of cooperation and of burden-sharing is a hopeful sign amidst other economic, political and social problems which confront us.

In recent years, it has indeed been fortunate that with the decline in our trade surplus the international flow of funds has developed into such a favorable factor in the United States balance of payments.

Not only has the United States' returns on foreign investment become the most positive sector in our balance of payments but your own activities in the investment of common stocks has aided significantly in this regard.

Net foreign purchases of common stock increased from \$760 million in 1967 to \$2.3 billion in 1968. This was a substantial contributing factor to the surplus in the United

States' balance of payments in 1968—the first such favorable balance of payments both in terms of liquidity and official settlements that we had achieved since 1957. Although there was a slight decline in the surplus to \$1.7 billion in 1969, it is hoped that a sizable surplus in foreign portfolio investments can remain a key factor in the longer term efforts to achieve balance in our international accounts.

As I have indicated, the Committee on Ways and Means has legislative responsibility for a number of areas which involve financial stability and growth potential. An example is the statutory limitation on our public debt.

I anticipate next week that the Committee on Ways and Means will consider an administration proposal to increase the public debt limit as budgetary pressures make it necessary that the Treasury borrow additional funds. While there are differing views on the need for a statutory limitation on the amount of public debt, Congressional consideration of the public debt limitation does provide the Committee with the occasion to examine the expenditure policy of the Federal Government in relation to the revenue system for which the Committee on Ways and Means does have responsibility.

The need to take up legislation to increase the public debt limitation comes at a time when the Committee is holding an extremely important set of hearings on foreign trade and tariffs. These hearings represent the beginnings of a Congressional review of our foreign trade and tariff policies which has not been held in the Congress since 1962. Those deliberations in 1962 resulted in the Trade Expansion Act which set the stage for the Kennedy Round of trade negotiations. As significant as those negotiations were in reducing barriers to trade, it has become obvious to us that the conditions for liberal trade anticipated with the enactment of the Trade Expansion Act and the beginning of the Kennedy Round have not developed.

We can all take a great deal of satisfaction in the tremendous growth in world trade that has developed since World War II. To a large degree this growth has been made possible by international economic cooperation. In the trade field this has involved the dismantling of trade barriers which grew up in the early '30's as a result of the depression and the wartime controls imposed by all countries.

We can also recognize the benefit of economic recovery and growth abroad, in particular that which has occurred in the developed countries of the free world. The growth and spread of productive capacities and market abilities in the developed countries and developing countries alike have brought a dynamic aspect to world markets. It is a dynamic aspect, however, that we have not yet been able to assimilate in terms of trade policy.

The leadership that the United States has provided in liberalizing the barriers to international trade as authorized by the Congress and administered by the President is very much questioned in the United States today. It is also being challenged by the policies being pursued by other countries. For in order to lead, others must join with you in seeking the goal that all agree is desirable.

The testimony being presented and that which will be presented in the hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means indicates that many Americans feel that there is a lack of reciprocity in our trading relationships with many countries. Others have said, and I have said, that the United States is the most open market in the world. I believe this to be true. There is a question, however, of how open it can remain in the absence of greater access which other countries offer to their own markets.

As to the openness of our market, consider the fact that during the years 1962 through 1969, United States exports increased from \$21.4 billion to \$37.3 billion, or 74 percent. Normally this increase of a little over 10 percent a year could be considered an acceptable performance, although smaller than the rate of increase in exports enjoyed by many developed countries.

However, for the same period, United States imports increased from \$16.4 billion to \$36.1 billion, or a 120-percent increase. The rate of increase in imports as compared with exports has resulted in a virtual elimination of our export surplus although apparently there will be some improvement in the export surplus in 1970.

A fundamental change has been the increase in the ratio of imports to the gross national product, an increase of from 2.9 to 3.9 percent during the period 1962-1969. This relationship between imports and GNP when compared with generally higher ratios of imports to GNP in other countries does not seem too striking. However, the commodity trends behind the increased participation of imports in the domestic economy indicate a somewhat different picture.

I would like to share with you just a few of these trade trends in terms of some product lines in order to emphasize what lies behind the concern that is shared by many in the United States.

Imports of machinery during the period 1962-69 increased from \$954 million to \$4,571,000,000, or a 379-percent increase. This is an average annual increase of 54 percent. At the same time, exports of machinery increased from \$5.4 billion to \$10.1 billion—an increase of 87 percent, or an average annual increase of 12 percent.

Imports of transport equipment increased from \$720 million in 1962 to \$5.2 billion in 1969—a 622-percent increase, or an average annual increase of 89 percent. Exports of transport equipment grew from \$2.3 billion in 1962 to \$6.2 billion in 1969—an increase of 166 percent, or an average annual increase of 24 percent.

Thus, while exports of transport equipment were increasing by \$3.9 billion, imports of transport equipment were increasing by \$4.5 billion. The average rate of increase for imports was almost four times the average rate of increase for exports of transport equipment.

I have chosen to cite trade statistics for machinery and transport equipment because both cover industries which are among the strongest in the United States. There have been similar rates of increases in imports for other product lines. I cite these figures, however, not to indicate that imports are undesirable in themselves. It is the rate of increase in imports which often makes necessary economic adjustments in our own economy that are unacceptable in the time span involved. Moreover, they are unacceptable if our own producers are artificially restrained from participating in growth in markets of other countries who are at the same time exporting in ever increasing quantities to the United States.

These are some of the concerns which confront the Committee on Ways and Means as it considers the President's proposals to provide additional trade agreement authority, for the approval of the elimination of American Selling Price valuation, the proposed changes in our domestic law to provide tariff adjustment and other adjustment assistance to industries, firms, and workers being injured by import competition and the request for additional authority to deal with problems of foreign barriers to United States exports.

In addition, there are many bills before the Committee which represent a very grave concern felt by domestic industries that existing United States law and the administration of those laws place them at a

disadvantage in competing not only in foreign markets but in the domestic market. In effect, these bills represent a conclusion on the part of some domestic producers that quantitative restrictions on imports are the only means by which the domestic industry may maintain a fair share of the United States market.

Specifically in terms of the textile and apparel industry, I have attempted to indicate that I felt that the solution to these problems could best come by international cooperation and agreements that would provide fair access to the United States market and which would preserve the health of our own domestic industry. My own voice and the voices of others calling for international cooperation in this problem thus far have gone unheeded.

But the problem, as I have indicated, is larger than textiles. In a sense, it is a problem that calls for the same degree of international cooperation that has been achieved in the international monetary sphere. In the field of international financial and monetary policy, the United States holds a unique position. In the area of world trade our responsibilities are also great. We have, however, reached a time, just as we did in international monetary policy, when other countries have developed not only the economic strength but also the economic responsibility to cooperate and to share common burdens in finding solutions to the common problems that all of us face.

ROLL THE DICE, ER, TAXPAYERS

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1970

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, the bureaucrats are normally a rather industrious and I might add creative bunch; but this time they really outdid themselves. For now the taxpayers are paying through the nose to rehabilitate so-called disadvantaged persons to be blackjack players, dice throwers, keno table operators, and professional gamblers to work in the casinos of Las Vegas.

This one goes to the credit of the Labor Department and those good folks in the concentrated employment program, without whose sense of humor this could not be possible. For to date \$49,977.40 of the taxpayers' inexhaustible money supply has been invested to rehabilitate 56 enrollees—at the bargain basement price of \$890.66 per head for a 2-month course. And given the generosity of the Congress to renew appropriations beyond 1970, we are assured by the Labor Department that this program will continue turning out polished graduates to fulfill the continued demand for dealers in Las Vegas.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is necessary to emphasize two points concerning this whole affair.

First and foremost, I find it incredible and utterly shocking to think that Federal tax moneys are being used to subsidize an operation that is illegal in 49 out of 50 States. Surely the Labor Department or others who may be charged with helping the so-called disadvantaged could find more worthwhile occupations for which to train these persons—after all, should that individual

decide to move to a different area, of what use would his profession then be? In a way such a program can only serve to heighten the disadvantage of those it had intended to help since they are now assigned to an inflexible role behind a card table.

Furthermore, it is inconceivable that the taxpayers under any conditions should be made to subsidize trainees for Las Vegas gambling casinos, among the most lucrative business in operation today. For if these multimillion-dollar enterprises are to be accepted as legitimate business corporations, then they should also be prepared to accept the responsibilities shouldered by other companies, including the training and employment of so-called disadvantaged persons.

But then, as long as Uncle Santa is around, it looks like they can have their cake and eat it too.

YAF SUPPORTS VOLUNTEER MILITARY

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, over the past several years we have witnessed a groundswell of support for an all-volunteer army. I and many of other Members of this body have introduced bills to establish such a military system.

One of the groups which has spoken out forcefully for an all-volunteer army is the Young Americans for Freedom. As YAF notes prominent conservatives and liberals have come out in favor of eliminating the military draft. They realize that an army based on volunteers will be more efficient and cheaper and more in tune with American principles.

The following is the most recent statement by the Young Americans for Freedom in favor of an all-volunteer army:

STATEMENT BY YOUNG AMERICANS FOR FREEDOM

If Barry Goldwater and Ronald Reagan and Wm. F. Buckley, Jr., and Richard Nixon want to end the Draft; and if Eugene McCarthy and John Kenneth Galbraith and George McGovern want to end the Draft, why hasn't the Draft been ended? You can start your answer by saying it's hard to end any Government program that's been going on for thirty years. On top of that, student radicals have made ending the Draft harder because they confuse being against the Draft with being against America. Most important of all, the American people aren't convinced we ought to end the Draft.

We can't do much about thirty years history, and we probably can't do anything about student radicals who hate America. But we can do something about persuading the American people that the Draft ought to be ended. We think it is the job of all young Americans who love freedom (1) to show why a volunteer army can serve freedom more efficiently and at lower cost than a conscript (drafted) army, (2) to show why a peacetime Draft is against American principles, (3) to show how a volunteer army will promote social justice in America. Let's take them in order.

1. A VOLUNTEER ARMY WILL BE MORE EFFICIENT AND CHEAPER

No one argues that a conscript army is more efficient than a volunteer army. It takes the better part of two years to train a man for technological warfare: it isn't very efficient to do that when the man is only going to be in the army for two years. A couple of centuries ago, any kid who could shoulder a squirrel-gun could be a soldier. No more. To be a part of our modern technological army requires training, and we waste more than two billion dollars a year training men who quit when their two years are up. They quit because they didn't want to serve in the first place—they were drafted. And we draft men for desk jobs civilians could do better—that costs us \$50 million a year. Add in the cost of running 4000 Draft Boards, and you come up with an extra cost of two and one-half billion dollars a year for the Draft.

Those who want to keep the Draft will say that the extra payroll costs of a volunteer army of three million men would be almost eight billion dollars a year, the difference between what draftees are paid and what volunteers would have to be paid. Trouble is, the eight-billion dollar cost is there now. It comes out of the draftees' pockets, the difference between what they could be earning and what they are earning. It's called an "implicit tax," and instead of being shared by all the people, it's shared only by those in the army—by the men on hardship duty as well as by those in safety stateside. So put it down that the Government loses \$2.5 billion a year on the Draft, and the draftees themselves bear an \$8.0 billion a year cost that would be paid out of general taxes if we had a volunteer army.

2. A PEACETIME DRAFT IS AGAINST AMERICAN PRINCIPLES

Thirty years ago, the peacetime Draft was extended by a one-vote margin in the House of Representatives. Only because they thought the very existence of the United States and Western Civilization was in clear and present danger, this slim majority voted against individual liberty and for the peacetime Draft. Senator Robert Taft called the move "totalitarian." And even those who voted for it said it was only temporary. That was thirty years ago.

The Civil War was fought to free the slaves. The War of 1812 was fought because the British seized our ships to draft men into their Navy. The War of the Revolution was fought in part because Americans were required to support any army in time of peace. The last war declared by Congress ended a quarter-century ago: but our Government is still drafting men in time of peace. The Constitution forbids involuntary servitude except for crimes committed: is it a crime to be between the ages of 19 and 26? Or has our Government decided that individual freedom doesn't matter any more?

When our country needs our services, we ought to volunteer. In time of national emergency, a Draft will be permissible. But we should not have the Draft now.

3. A VOLUNTEER ARMY WILL PROMOTE SOCIAL JUSTICE

The "implicit tax" is paid by those who would otherwise be marrying, starting families, buying homes, cars, appliances—in short by the young working middle class. It is paid by Black people, because at current pay levels the army is relatively more attractive to Blacks than to Whites. You'll hear that a volunteer army will be a Black army. But that isn't true. Raise the pay levels and the army will attract both Black and White to volunteer. Another thing—the Lottery system takes a little uncertainty out of the Draft, maybe, but Draft-age American men still can't plan much for the future. No system that doubly penalizes those

who will be the backbone of America—by sending them to fight and by taxing them extra—is fair, nor is it good for the United States.

If you agree with us, join with Young Americans for Freedom to fight effectively for a Volunteer Military. And when you send in the membership blank, send letters to your Senators and Congressmen as well: tell them to vote for the all-volunteer armed force.

DELANO FREEDOM BELL CEREMONY

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1970

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on May 4 a ceremony was held in the AFL-CIO headquarters lobby here in Washington at which time the "Delano Freedom Bell" was presented by Cesar Chavez, director of the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee to AFL-CIO President George Meany.

Our distinguished colleague from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA) was present at the ceremony to represent the many Members of Congress who have fought for equal rights for the American farmworker. His remarks and the complete transcript of the ceremony follow:

AFL-CIO Organizing Director WILLIAM KIRCHER. I thank all of you for coming. This will be rather short. I'd like to first introduce to you Cesar Chavez, who is the director of the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee, who has been here for the past couple of days. As you know, we had a very interesting march and a real old time trade union rally on the Mall in front of the Agricultural Building yesterday. Following Brother Chavez's statement, President George Meany will respond. Let me introduce at this time Brother Cesar Chavez.

CHAVEZ. Thank you very much, Bill. President Meany: ever since the union received this bell from England, we have planned that the bell should come to the House of Labor and rest here for at least a day. So that in its history it will have visited this building—will have been in the presence of President Meany, and more importantly it will be a part of labor history that this bell will make as it travels across the land.

We were, of course, happy and anxious that this bell be here, because it symbolizes to us the support that the AFL-CIO and President Meany have given us and the encouragement that, God knows, we need so much in order to stay with the struggle and to continue making progress.

After serious consideration we decided that symbolically it would be a good thing to have the bell chained, to keep it silent, only momentarily, until farm workers are able to get their freedom. Some people across the seas, who gave us the bell do not fully understand the significance of the meaning of the silencing of the bell. We want to tell them and everyone else that the chain only symbolizes what we consider to be the silence of the farm workers for not being able to have their freedom as workers and their union. At the point when the farm workers are able to make their first big breakthrough and establish a union in the grape fields—at that point we're going to take the chain off—we're going to ring the bell loud enough so that President Meany can hear it in this building—and so that all men of good will hear it all over the world signifying the end of the oppression of the farm worker.

So it's indeed a great pleasure for me to

be here and to have the bell here where it should be—in the House of Labor. Thank you.

KIRCHER. Thank you. Let me now introduce President George Meany.

MEANY. First I'd like to express our appreciation to Cesar Chavez and the farm workers for bringing the bell here even for a short time. This bell was cast in the same foundry where the Liberty Bell, which rests in Philadelphia, was cast almost 200 years ago. So we think it has great significance.

The fact that it is chained into silence awaiting the liberation of the American farm worker, I think will be understood very clearly by all of the American people.

This fight for justice for farm workers has been going on for a long time and I don't know how much longer it is going to go on. But, as far as the AFL-CIO is concerned, it's going to go on until this bell can proclaim liberty throughout the land for all of the people of the land especially the farm workers of the country.

So I'd like to again pledge to Cesar Chavez and his co-workers the full support of the AFL-CIO, until we can really say that the farm workers are not second-class citizens—that they're covered by the labor laws of the land, the same as all other workers.

I think that is the first requisite to bringing about freedom for farm workers—putting them under the same labor law—giving them the same right to organization, the same right to recognition as the workers in any other part of the land.

So I'm delighted that you brought the bell here and I look forward to the day when it will ring and ring in a meaningful way.

Thank you.

KIRCHER. We have one additional presentation Brother Chavez would like to make.

CHAVEZ. We're, of course, very pleased to present this piece of shoo. It's the first union label box that was printed after the first grape contract. It's the beginning, we hope, of a very familiar sign for all of you—not only in grapes—but in years to come in all of the things that are produced in this country—that are produced with union labor. And I'd like to present this to President Meany as the first piece of shoo with the union label printed on it. I am very happy to present it to you and to give you this memento.

MEANY. I am delighted and I hope that we see a whole lot more of it. Very good.

KIRCHER. To those uninitiated—a shoo is what you commonly call a box or sometimes a lug. So from now on, when you go into a market, if you want to identify yourself as one of the real knowledgeable friends of the farm workers, you can refer to the lug or the box as a shoo. I'd like now for you to hear from a real great farm worker friend, who has walked a lot of shoe leather off. This fellow came out to the very hot Coachella Valley a year ago. I remember I walked with him. He has just a little less hair on top than I have and he had an awful sun-burned top. He came out and marched about seven miles the last day of the Coachella March last year and it was 107 that day. When you march out in the sun at 107 degrees to the Mexican border you have to really be dedicated to your friends. He was out and again marched at the beginning of the pilgrimage from Baltimore to Washington that took place this past weekend. What is even more important than his marching with the farm workers is the fact that each day he is locked arm and arm with our cause in his work in the legislative efforts. He is one of the leading voices on behalf of the farm workers in the Congress of the United States. He has sponsored and is fighting for legislation there and he is a true friend of the labor movement and a most particularly dear and dedicated friend of the farm workers. I'd like to introduce for just a couple of words, Congressman Jim O'Hara of Michigan.

O'HARA. Thank you, Bill, and I'll consider

my appearance here this morning as being on behalf of the dozens of members of Congress who have engaged in this legislative struggle to help guarantee the equal rights of the American farm worker. I think it is very appropriate that it should be a Freedom Bell from the foundry that cast the Liberty Bell, that we have here today, because the struggle we're talking about is more than a struggle for decent wages, even more than a struggle for decent working conditions—although heaven knows that both are seriously lacking in the agricultural industry. It's a struggle really for freedom and equality, for first-class citizenship for the farm worker.

You know all these years the farm worker has been offered the second best and he's being offered the second best again by his friends—the American Farm Bureau Federation. Under the terms of the Murphy Bill, if you will pardon the expression, he's being offered the chance to organize and bargain, but only on a second-class basis, without the same rights as other American workers. And that it seems to me is the one principle that we must insist on. This is the one thing that makes this fight a much bigger fight than simply that of the farm worker, because it makes it a fight for first-class citizenship for a depressed group. We must insist that they have every right that any other American enjoys and that has to be our goal. When we reach it, it will be because of the dedicated leadership of Cesar Chavez and because of the strong and unstinting support he's received from George Meany and the American labor movement as a whole. And we're going to reach that day, and soon. Thank you.

KIRCHER. Thank you very much, Congressman O'Hara. In closing let me show you the label that you are going to be seeing a great deal of. I've got a favorite union label story—a true story that I think you'd enjoy hearing. My good friend here—Cesar—they talk about him being charismatic and one thing or another. He's also pretty tough. And he gets pretty nasty with the management at the negotiating table every now and then. It was in the breakthrough a few weeks ago—it was 4 o'clock in the morning and many of you know how you go on in those last marathon sessions—and by this time it had become clear that the management was going to sign a contract. But if management was going to sign a contract, it was very interested in what it could get out of the contract. All of a sudden we found ourselves talking, not about contractual clauses, but about how we could help them sell their grapes at a higher price and they were asking us what we could do to promote it through the label. And about this time Chavez says: "look, you know for the last thirty years you guys have been using the state of California's money up at the University of California, at Davis, to do all of your scientific and laboratory and experimental work. You've made yourselves wealthy by the kind of processes that were developed there for you from public funds. Now I've got a good project for you. Why don't you go up to Davis and see if they can't grow a grape that, just as it ripens, a little thunderbird can fly up out of the staff of the grape and then we won't have any trouble."

Let me thank all of you for coming. Thank you very much.

TRIBUTE TO HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this means of joining with

Members of the Kansas delegation and others in paying a brief but sincere tribute to the memory of Clifford R. Hope, who served with distinction in the House of Representatives for 30 years.

Cliff Hope was a dedicated American. He had a national outlook.

And as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture he carried out his legislative responsibilities with the national interest as his guiding influence and philosophy.

Cliff Hope believed deeply in America and he fully understood and appreciated the importance of farming and agriculture to the Nation.

It has been said that he was perhaps one of the truly nonpartisan Members of the House.

He was able, genial, warm, and friendly. We who served with him loved him and respected him.

Cliff Hope served his district, State, and Nation well and his achievements and accomplishments are a monument to his ability and dedication.

I want also to take this means of extending to his family this expression of my deepest and most sincere sympathy in their loss and bereavement.

NATIONAL HOUSING STARTS GAIN IN RURAL PROGRAM

HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1970

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, at a time when housing starts on a national basis are far below where we would like to see them, we find one aspect of the picture which is encouraging. The Farmers Home Administration of the Department of Agriculture recently reported that its home insurance program is making it possible for rural Americans to move into new or improved homes at a 17.4-percent faster rate than a year ago, despite the national slowdown in housing starts.

In a progress report, FHA Administrator James V. Smith, our very able former colleague, said:

For the first nine months of fiscal 1970, the agency approved almost 44,000 home ownership loans totaling \$465.4 million, as compared to 37,000 loans totaling \$360.7 million in the corresponding period of fiscal 1969.

He continued:

New home starts will run approximately twice as high this year as in any previous year. Loans for new one-family homes under the rural program exceeded 25,000 through March equalling the number approved for the entire fiscal year 1969. By contrast, new home starts in the nation as a whole declined by an estimated 15.3 percent during the 9-month period ending in March.

The Spring seasonal upsurge of building is expected to result in the Farmers Home Administration surpassing \$800 million in insured housing loans for the year ending June 30. This will account for about 80,000 new and improved homes for rural Americans of low and moderate income. Last year, the agency's previous record year, Farmers Home insured \$500 million worth of loans on 50,000 homes. Next year the target is 156,000 insured home-buyer loans.

U.S. WAR FOES WARNED OF
"DISASTER"

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1970

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following story by Kingsbury Smith, European director and chief foreign writer for the Hearst newspapers, appeared in the Baltimore News American of Friday, May 15. I hope that those of my colleagues who have not seen it will read it:

BRITON SUPPORTS NIXON'S CAMBODIA MOVE—
U.S. WAR FOES WARNED OF "DISASTER"

(By Kingsbury Smith)

ROME, May 15.—Those who are trying to sabotage President Nixon's effort to save Cambodia from Communist conquest and safeguard his Vietnam troop withdrawal policy should beware lest they precipitate a disaster.

This is the warning of Sir Robert Thompson, former head of the British Advisory Mission in Vietnam, chief architect of the British victory over the Malayan Communist guerrillas in the late 1950's, and a special adviser to the President on Southeast Asia.

In a letter written to me from his home in Winsford, Somerset, England, Sir Robert said:

"I do hope that those who are protesting against the war and the President's present actions realize that they could be inviting a disaster."

The British expert on Asia was responding to questions I submitted to him in connection with the President's decision to send American troops along with South Vietnamese forces into Cambodia.

While he did not say so specifically, Sir Robert seems to share the view I have heard expressed elsewhere in recent days that the anti-Nixon movement in the United States might encourage Red China to intervene in Indochina or tempt North Vietnam to launch a major offensive in the hope that large-scale fighting, coupled with heavy American casualties, would cause very grave domestic difficulties for the President.

Those who know President Nixon well do not believe he would prove a weakling in face of such a challenge. They consider it much more likely that he would do as he warned he would do, and as he has done in Cambodia, if the Communists jeopardized the security of the remaining American forces in Vietnam by increased military action in Indochina—
"Take strong and effective measures to deal with the situation."

The danger that the Communists might be encouraged to miscalculate the impact on the President of the antiwar movement and might consequently be tempted to resort to a reckless move is what Sir Robert means by warning that the anti-Nixon protesters in the United States could be inviting a disaster.

The British expert, who reported to President Nixon late last year that a "winning position in the sense of obtaining a just peace" had been achieved in South Vietnam, believes that the destruction of Communist supplies in the Cambodian sanctuary should make it almost impossible for North Vietnam to mount an offensive operation into the southern portion of South Vietnam for more than 12 months.

"This will," he said, "enable the Americans and South Vietnamese to consolidate their pacification and Vietnamization programs."

"By reducing the threat on the Cambodian flank and enabling these programs to continue, President Nixon may in turn be able to proceed with his planned withdrawal policy."

Sir Robert believes that if President Nixon had allowed North Vietnam to gain control over the whole of Cambodia with a secure supply port at Sihanoukville for unlimited Russian and Chinese supplies, the whole withdrawal policy would have been in jeopardy.

He further believes that the move into Cambodia will have a strong and beneficial psychological effect.

"Quite apart from making it clear that the Cambodian bases are no longer sanctuaries, the President will have shown that neither diversions in Laos nor attacks on Cambodia can throw him off his set course to achieve a just peace in this tragic area."

This confidence that President Nixon will prove no weakling is also reflected in an article in the conservative London Daily Telegraph, one of the few newspapers in Europe which supports American foreign policy generally. Written by Peregrine Worsthorne, the article said:

"The first and perhaps the most important point to notice about the American crisis over Cambodia is that the man in charge, President Nixon, is not what most of the American and British press say he is—a weakling posing as a warrior, a panicky opportunist trying to prove himself an heroic statesman, a chronic trickster reverting to form.

"Mr. Nixon is a man who does not easily give way, whose political reputation was originally made by refusing to give way, moreover, to precisely those forces of political liberalism, ideological dissent and youthful idealism which are today once again ranging themselves against him in furious condemnation."

Describing the President as "determined to the point of obstinacy, single-minded and, once convinced of the rightness of his cause, relentless and ruthless in his pursuit," the Daily Telegraph article added:

"The danger is that the North Vietnamese may have dangerously miscalculated, encouraged to believe they were dealing with a caricature rather than the reality."

Stating that the highest price for this misunderstanding may well be paid by America herself, the article blames the liberal American press for painting a "grossly misleading" picture of the President.

"One reads the New York Times, for example, with dreadful fascination, as it trots out all the arguments most certain to inflame student opinion against the Cambodian operation, practically encouraging them to take to the streets and campuses in violent opposition. Does this organ of the liberal establishment not realize what manner of President they are inciting the students to confront.

"The New York Post, another such organ, sought to suggest . . . that Mr. Nixon's Cambodian foray was the action of an important man seeking to demonstrate his virility, the implication being that he could easily be frightened off by a show of real strength. This is playing with fire with a vengeance.

"Can the Anglo-American liberal establishment not realize that the man now in the White House is a formidable figure?"

"Mr. Nixon is not Lyndon B. Johnson. He will not abdicate. Nor can he. It is madness to suppose that the forces of protest can humiliate two Presidents in swift succession, without calling into question the very basis of constitutional government.

"'Tricky Dicky' would certainly not be the man to stand up to the challenge. That is why it is so important that everybody should realize—and the sooner the better—that the man in the White House is not 'Tricky Dicky,' but somebody whose true measure his enemies both at home and abroad have always failed to take, as they may, with luck, be about to discover."

GEN. WLADYSLAW ANDERS,
1893-1970

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1970

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, the free world was saddened when the news came over the wires that Gen. Wladyslaw Anders, who commanded Polish troops who fought with the Allies in World War II was dead. He died at the age of 77 in a London hospital on May 12 of a heart attack.

General Anders was born of Polish parents in Lithuania, then a Russian province. He studied mechanical engineering at Riga and began his military career in the army of the czar. He was wounded five times while leading a cavalry squadron during World War I.

Following Polish independence after the war, General Anders led a Polish cavalry brigade. When Germany invaded his country in 1939, General Anders was wounded in fighting his way out. When Russian troops entered eastern Poland, he was again wounded and then captured before he could carry out his plan to escape to Hungary.

Captured, he spent 20 months in solitary confinement in Moscow. In 1941, after the German invasion of Russia, he was freed and appointed commander of the Polish forces in Russia. He organized Polish prisoners of war freed from Soviet camps into units making up more than five divisions, then went to the Middle East with them. The Polish II Corps, as the army was called, fought alongside the Allies in Africa and Italy.

His name will always be linked with the bitter struggle for Monte Cassino during the 1944 Allied offensive in Italy when crack German units entrenched on the mountain and in the monastery crowning it were barring the way to Rome.

His Polish II Corps was given the task of capturing the stronghold. After days of bombardment and bombing that attack was launched on May 11, 1944. A week later General Anders and his men stormed the last battle to hoist the British and Polish flags side by side on the summit.

General Anders was honored by the American, English, and French Governments for his service. From the United States he received the Legion of Merit, from the French Government he received the Legion of Honor and Croix de Guerre with Palms, and King George VI made him a companion of the Order of the Bath.

After the war General Anders settled in London and held the title of inspector general of the Polish expatriate army since the war. He was a militant opponent of Soviet Russia and the Polish Communist Government. When he died he was living on a British military pension of less than \$48 a week.

The Polish Communist Government stripped General Anders of his nationality in 1946, accusing him of "activities detrimental to the state."

Mr. Speaker, General Anders devoted his life to the cause of Poland in her pursuit for freedom and independence. His was a patriotic devotion for a free Poland and the necessity of continuing the fight for freedom.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks on General Anders, I would like to include an article which appeared in the Polish-American, a newspaper published in Chicago, Ill., and widely circulated among this Nation's Polish communities.

The article, which appeared on May 9, 1970, follows:

GENERAL ANDERS: IN MEMORIAM

This past Tuesday General Anders of World War Two fame died. His family remains in Britain, where they settled with the General after World War Two.

In these times, when the military is feared and even hated in various countries of the world, and sometimes with good reason, we should recall this great Polish General, and do honor to his memory.

General Anders gained world-wide fame as the founder and leader of the Polish Army in the East. During the War years, Anders went into Russia (at that time an ally) and rescued over forty thousand Poles from the camps of Siberia, where Russia held them captives. He led them to Iraq, where he formed an army out of them which was to be used against the German and Russian foe in the World War. By common consensus it was the sharpest, the best force of Polish soldiers then in existence.

It was General Anders, who, on May 11, 1944, launched the Polish II Corps (the famous *Drugi Korpus*) against the impenetrable Monte Cassino. It was the Second Corps which planted Polish and British flags atop that monastery.

But after the war was over, and his homeland had not regained her independence, Anders continued fighting for it, doing what he could as a civilian.

General Anders belongs to that invaluable and minutely small group of men in this world who fought for their country with greatest honor not only when hope was at its highest, but also when there was no hope. He belongs to the ranks of Polish Generals-statesmen—scholars who understood the golden mean between the need for war and the need for peace. Undoubtedly Polish history and the history of the free world will put him on an equal footing with such great Polish leaders as General Marian Kukiel, General Kazimierz Pulaski, General Thaddeus Kosciuszko, Marshal Pilsudski, and General Kazimierz Sosnkowski.

With the passing of General Anders this past week and the passing of General Sosnkowski not too long ago, as well as with the recent and not-so-recent deaths of many of the valiant leaders who fought for the freedom of Europe and the world, the tangible substance of that era of great international conflict is passing. Our whole attention must now shift from that era of war to our times. We can not but wonder, as we look around us, what did the prodigious effort of those millions of men in World War Two change for the better. More countries are enslaved now than had been before the War. More little wars are raging now than had been going on before the War. More people are hungry now than had been before the war. The danger of the annihilation of mankind is greater now than when Hitler began his invasion of Poland on September 1, 1939.

It is at times such as our own, that we can look back with fond memory on the deeds of such as General Anders, whose efforts produced results, concrete results. Many of those he rescued from the internal, cold hell of Siberia are alive today, living in the West. The freedom he gave them they continue to

cherish and hold. Monte Cassino today is still free, after General Anders captured it for the Allies when all the other Allied troops: British, French, American and others, could not budge it. General Anders was a man who intuitively knew how to bring back freedom, and retain it where he brought it back. That there would be more men of his genial intuition in this world today.

A FINAL TRIBUTE TO WALTER P. REUTHER

HON. LOYD MEEDS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1970

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, last week many Americans young and old from every section of the country, paid their final tribute to a man who will long be remembered in the journals of our history, both as a labor negotiator and social reformer. The tragic death of Walter P. Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers Union and a man of action, principle and passion, was indeed a great loss to this Nation especially in light of these troubled times.

Many of labor's gains in the past two decades can be directly attributed to the work and efforts of this one man. Because of his negotiating ability tens of thousands of auto workers now benefit from company profit-sharing plans, increased retirement pensions, extended and improved medical coverage, as well as guaranteed annual incomes. Also stressing the desire for organized labor to play an expanded role in industrial planning, Walter P. Reuther held a deep concern toward the effects of automation upon his workers and other results stemming from the scientific age now besetting us.

While always striving for their economic betterment, as a union leader Walter Reuther tried to encompass his followers in social and political action as well. In doing so he, himself, set an example hard to match. An advocate of equal rights for all regardless of race, color or creed, Walter P. Reuther was one of those leading the civil rights march into Washington in 1963. Depressed by the critical housing shortage, he worked closely with industrialists in seeking to apply space technology to the mass production of housing. Moved by the efforts of many working to save man and his environment from pollution, Walter P. Reuther had planned to make new demands on auto manufacturers during this summer's contract negotiations for supplying strong new safeguards against occupational health and safety standards.

Yes, Walter P. Reuther was a great American. His dedication to the welfare of the members of his union, his broad vision of an ever greater America, and his leadership to achieve social and economic justice for all people whatever background, will inspire us all throughout our lifetimes.

WALTER P. REUTHER—1907-70

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1970

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, the United Auto Workers and the entire labor movement lost a giant among the labor circles when Walter P. Reuther, the auto workers' leader of 24 years was killed in an airplane crash.

The Nation will miss Walter Reuther since, as president of the Nation's largest industrial union, he filled a leadership role that far outreached his union's bread-and-butter concerns.

As a union leader, Walter Reuther did not shrink from the use of economic pressure against him. He relied more than most on economics, research, and his extensive knowledge in seeking the ends he sought for his union constituents. Moreover, he was not simply a union advocate; he was a vocal and constant proponent of social justice, as he saw it.

Reuther's death leaves a void in the labor movement which will not be easy to fill. But of great immediate concern is the void he will leave at the bargaining table when the UAW opens critical negotiations in mid-July with the big three auto manufacturers. In past negotiations Walter Reuther filled that seat with imagination, daring, and success—pioneering concepts in the field of labor relations and increasing the pay envelopes of his members and assuring their security when their productive years are over.

In the labor movement, there is sadness at Walter Reuther's death. He was respected as a brilliant and able leader of the UAW, even by those who did not agree with him and did not agree with his approach to correcting social injustices.

As a labor leader, Walter Reuther's first priority was securing wages and benefits for the rank and file. His vision led to several breakthroughs such as a guaranteed annual wage for the assembly line worker and company-paid pensions for those who were "too old to work and too young to die," a slogan he coined in the 1950 battle for retirement pay.

The concept of the guaranteed annual wage, first envisioned by Walter Reuther, was the forerunner of President Nixon's welfare reform plan which now calls for a guaranteed annual wage, not for automobile workers alone, but for everyone.

In the 1955 bargaining talks, he won a system of "supplemental unemployment benefits," from the Ford Motor Co. to increase the out-of-work payments to regular Ford employees who were laid off from time to time.

His leadership within the labor movement routed Communist elements from his own union and later helped expel Red-led unions from the CIO.

Reuther, in his strong espousal of his views, made some enemies, inside and outside the labor movement. His liberal ideas were not always universally accepted. But his shoes will be hard to fill.

Whatever else may be said, Walter Reuther's death has taken from the labor movement, and from the political scene, one of the most aggressive, visionary, and effective men of our time . . . a true leader in the cause of labor and social justice.

SOUTH CAROLINA TRICENTENNIAL

HON. JOHN G. TOWER

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 19, 1970

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the State of South Carolina is observing this year its Tricentennial and has constructed outstanding visitor exhibit centers in its three major cities, Columbia, Greenville, and Charleston.

As one of the original 13 Colonies, the history of South Carolina is rich in the history of Colonial America.

A brief outline of some of this history and other items of interest on the Tricentennial were noted April 30, 1970, by the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND).

Because the Tricentennial observance in South Carolina will continue for the remainder of this year and many citizens across the Nation will visit the State this summer, the Tricentennial newsletter by Senator THURMOND should be of wide interest.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the newsletter entitled "The Tricentennial," published in the North Augusta Star of April 30, 1970, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

THE TRICENTENNIAL

(By Senator Strom Thurmond)

This is the year of the Tricentennial of the first permanent settlement in South Carolina. We are happy to share our heritage with the whole United States. South Carolina has been at the pivot of history again and again in the development of our Nation. From our tradition have come the men who made critical decisions at moments of turmoil, men who have affected the destiny of the whole country. We have had men of initiative whose ideas opened new dimensions of culture and development.

S.C. FIRSTS

Let us look at some of our historical "firsts."

The first Charter or Constitution for South Carolina was drafted by the great philosopher, John Locke.

In 1685, South Carolina was the first province in the New World to plant rice for sale, thus opening up a basis for the agricultural economy of the South.

In 1698, the first free library in America was started by the provisional General Assembly.

In 1712 the first state health officer in America was Gilbert Guttery of South Carolina.

In 1735, the first opera advertised by title on American soil was given in Charles Town.

In 1736, the first building in America devoted wholly to drama was built in South Carolina.

In 1740, the first free school for Negroes in America was founded in South Carolina.

In 1762, the first musical society in America, the St. Cecilia Society was organized in Charles Town.

In 1773 the first public museum and city Chamber of Commerce were founded in Charles Town.

In 1776, South Carolina was the only State whose signers of the Declaration of Independence were all natives of the State, and all college men. They were: Edward Rutledge, Thomas Heyward, Jr., Thomas Lynch, Jr., and Arthur Middleton.

South Carolina was the eighth State to ratify the U.S. Constitution, leaving only one more State to ratify to trigger the Constitution into effect.

South Carolina was also the first State to secede from the Union, on December 20, 1860.

SHARING OUR TRADITION

It is appropriate that we share this tradition of courage and vision with today's America. For too long the South has been excluded from a position of equality in the halls and councils of our Nation's leaders. Many younger regions have not had the opportunity to understand the depth of our traditions. Our social structure has been viewed from the bias of narrow mercantile and liberal prejudices and judged by a poverty imposed upon a conquered region.

Today this unhappy situation has changed. We are making progress in raising the standard of living for all of our people. We have brought in new industries to give jobs to those who want to work. We are consciously developing the best strains of our culture, as the Tricentennial celebration demonstrates.

THE VICE PRESIDENT

Best of all, we are being understood in other regions of the country. Today people are listening, and their ears are attuned with sympathy and justice.

In the midst of this celebration, we were pleased to welcome the Vice President of the United States, the Honorable Spiro Agnew, to participate in this noteworthy event. It is highly appropriate that the Vice President, a former governor of his State of Maryland, was able to speak at the ceremonies in Edgefield County, birthplace of ten governors of our State. Mr. Agnew exemplifies the new interest which the Nation as a whole is taking in the South.

This year's Tricentennial, therefore, represents the turning of the full circle. South Carolina once more plays its proper role in the affairs of the Nation. The rich traditions of our past equip us in a significant way to contribute to the future development of America. The Tricentennial is not a turning toward the past, but a turning toward the future.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 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?

BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM R. BOND, FIRST GENERAL OFFICER TO BE KILLED IN VIETNAM GROUND COMBAT ACTION

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 19, 1970

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks a statement by me with respect to Brig. Gen. William R. Bond, the first general officer to be killed in ground combat action in Vietnam.

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

A TRIBUTE TO BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM R. BOND

Brigadier General William R. Bond was killed in action 70 miles northeast of Saigon on 1 April 1970 while in command of the U.S. Army's 199th Light Infantry Brigade. The fifth general officer to die in action during the Vietnamese War, he was the first to be killed in combat on the ground. Receiving word that the brigade's armored cavalry troop was involved in a sharp action with two North Vietnamese companies, General Bond had flown to the scene to determine the situation at first hand. At the time he was felled by hostile arms fire General Bond was assisting in consolidation and resupply of the unit and in directing search of the surrounding areas for enemy remnants. For his inspirational leadership and heroism on that occasion, he was awarded his second Silver Star medal.

A veteran of nearly 29 years service, General Bond was universally regarded as one of the Army's finest; in the estimate of many he was the "complete professional." Certainly, his range of assignments and his superb performance in each are mute evidence of his extraordinary versatility, intellectual depth and capacity for command.

General Bond graduated from the University of Maryland in 1940, majoring in Political Science and History. A three year letterman, he starred on the Maryland lacrosse teams of that era.

After a year at the University of Maryland Law School, he enlisted in the Army and within months was a staff sergeant. He took officer training at Fort Knox, Kentucky, and was commissioned a second lieutenant of Infantry in September 1942. Lieutenant Bond was immediately assigned to the Armored Reconnaissance Troop of the 82d Airborne Division. He moved with that unit to North Africa and participated in the invasion of Sicily. While in Sicily he volunteered for duty with the famed "Darby's Rangers" and joined the First Ranger Battalion in time to lead a company onto the beach at Maiori, just west of Salerno, in early September 1943. Once the Fifth Army advance to Naples was well underway, the Rangers were withdrawn to prepare for a tough special mission. This turned out to be, for Bond's battalion, a fierce two week battle for control of the rocky heights above Venafro deep in the Italian Apennines. When the Rangers at last dislodged the Germans, employing tactics reminiscent of Wolfe's Army at Quebec, the way was clear for the advance of the Fifth Army's right flank.

In late January 1944, Captain Bond and his unit landed with the assault waves at Anzio, where the Rangers occupied a critical sector of the Allied perimeter which linked the 3d U.S. and 1st British Divisions. On 29-30 January, Darby's Rangers made their gallant but ill-fated night attack to cut the Apian Way at Cisterna di Littoria as part

of the larger design to break out from the ridge end. Infiltrating the German lines by stealth, the 1st and 3d Ranger Battalions were on the edge of their objective by dawn, only to find themselves in the midst of German strength, completely cut off from the remainder of the attacking forces. Surrounded by vastly superior strength and subjected to relentless pounding by tanks and artillery, the Rangers fought on for over 5 hours until all ammunition was exhausted. At the time of surrender, casualties had reduced the force to less than half of its original 900 man strength. For his magnificent exploits on that day Captain Bond was awarded the Silver Star.

For the next 11 months, Bond was confined at an officer prisoner of war camp at Szubin, Poland. When the Russians breached the line of the Vistula in early January 1945, the Allied officers were evacuated westward. On the second night of the move, Bond, his Battalion Commander (Jack Dobson, now Brigadier General, USA-Retired) and several others made their escape to find the Russian lines. Six days later, they encountered a Russian armored column and, after some difficulty, established their identity as American officers. For the next week Bond's group had the unique distinction of being integrated into the Red Army, as a special reconnaissance detachment, in the drive west. Thereafter the group was interned in the former Polish War College at Rembertow until the completion of the Yalta Conference. Bond was ultimately moved by rail to Odessa, by British ship to Port Said and by air to the United States headquarters at Caserta.

Upon his return to the United States, Bond immediately volunteered for Pacific duty and was undergoing refresher training at Fort Benning when the Japanese surrendered. He nonetheless continued on to the Far East where he joined the 7th Division on occupation duty in Korea. Major Bond divided the ensuing two years between battalion command and the post of Division G-3 (Operations). It was during this period that he developed an interest in Asian social and cultural patterns which was to be a continuing avocation throughout his life.

His next two assignments evidenced his growing reputation. At the outset of 1948, he was selected as one of the principals for conduct of the Universal Military Training Experiment at Fort Knox. Subsequently, in mid-1949, he was detailed to the U.S. Delegation to the United Nations as a member of the initial Truce Supervision Team in Palestine. In the explosive, and emotion-charged disputed areas of Jewish and Arab confrontation, Bond proved himself a shrewd military observer and perceptive political reporter, earning friendships on both sides and high plaudits from both his U.N. superiors and regional State Department authorities. He was cited for gallantry when he intervened to prevent a serious clash north of the city of Jerusalem.

Bond's assignments over the next nine years were reasonably typical of the mid-career pattern of an outstanding officer being groomed for high responsibility. In succession, he was an instructor at the Ranger Training Command at Fort Benning (finding scope to also win a master parachutist rating). As a lieutenant colonel he commanded an infantry battalion in the 8th U.S. Division in Germany; served as an operations staff officer in the senior, junior U.S. headquarters in Europe under General Gruenther; attended a year long course at the Command and General Staff College; and had his first taste of duty at the national level. In this last capacity, he was a member of the White House staff and represented the Army on the interdepartmental board charged with coordination of politico-military actions world-wide. In 1956, he began a tour with the re-activated 101st Airborne Division

at Fort Campbell, to include a year each as the Division plans and operations officers and as Commander of the 501st Airborne Battle Group. The significance of these assignments is highlighted by the fact that the 101st was then the Army's elite organization. Logically, Lieutenant Colonel Bond was selected to attend the War College at Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania, and graduated therefrom in June 1959.

The ensuing year was a specially momentous one. He was assigned to the Military Assistance Advisory Group in Vietnam coincident with the first serious moves of the Viet Cong to challenge the established South Vietnamese government of then President Ngo Dinh Diem. Although a middle ranking staff officer, Bond's work was of such caliber and his reports of combat actions so precise and penetrating that the Commanding General promptly elevated him to the post of Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations. Of equal import was his short leave to the United States to wed the former Miss Theodora Sedgwick, daughter of Ellery Sedgwick, dynamic and notable Editor of Atlantic Monthly, and great-great-great-granddaughter of Judge Theodore Sedgwick, fifth Speaker of the House of Representatives.

In November 1960, then Colonel Bond was assigned to the Office of the Chief of Staff, U.S. Army. In this capacity he was responsible for some of the Army's most important programs. Notable among these was the development of an Army capability for counterinsurgency. Bolstered by his Vietnam experience, Colonel Bond was an early and articulate advocate of the importance of gearing for a form of warfare which was then generally misunderstood and underestimated. His subsequent duty as Chief of Plans and Policy, and Deputy Director of Special Warfare from June 1962 until the summer of 1964 provided him the opportunity for staff leadership in this field; and he deserves a major share of the credit for the rapid and effective progress the Army made in restructuring its organization and capabilities to meet this new threat. His efforts earned him a Legion of Merit.

Colonel Bond left the Pentagon in the summer of 1964 with the exuberance characteristic of any true soldier, for he had been selected to command the 2d Brigade, 101st Airborne Division. Over the next 6 months, with the enthusiasm and drive that were his hallmarks, he brought his brigade to new levels of esprit and readiness. In January 1965, in the course of a field exercise, he suffered a slight heart tremor and was rushed to Walter Reed Army Medical Center for observation and treatment. Weeks later, a Medical Board found Colonel Bond permanently unfit for retention on active duty. For the ordinary officer, this would have been the end of career and aspirations. But Bond was cast in a special mold.

By a complex series of persuasive appeals and waivers he secured medical assent to a probationary assignment, this time in Thailand where he had been urgently requested to fill the post of J-3 in the newly activated Military Assistance Command—an upgrading of the joint MAAG in anticipation of the American buildup in that pivotal country.

A year later (1966) he was elevated to the post of Chief of Staff. In both capacities, Bond was enormously productive. He was, in fact, the guiding genius of the Command in coping with the burgeoning military requirements of the third largest U.S. military population in Asia, in coordinating the politically sensitive and multiple interfaces with the Thai government and in influencing the Thai Armed Forces approach to the first sizeable insurgency in that country's long history. To paraphrase his immediate superior (who recommended Bond for the Distinguished Service Medal): "This team is unanimous that Colonel Bond, the finest Chief of

Staff I have ever known, deserves the predominant credit for our accomplishments. Under continuous heavy pressure for two solid years, he has never faltered, never once failed the Command. He has been my data bank, innovator, principal negotiator, sensitized antenna and, above all, indispensable counsellor. His universally acknowledged professionalism, consummate ability to assess and handle people and situations, catholicity of knowledge of interests, skill in synthesis, buoyancy and wit and genuine compassion combine to place him high in that miniscule group destined to lead the United States Army."

Bond left Thailand in late 1967 with the affection and admiration of Thai officialdom and with the total respect of the American community. His incomparable performance earned him his second Legion of Merit. Fittingly, he returned to Bangkok one month before his death to receive, from the hands of the Prime Minister, the Order of the Crown of Thailand, Knight Commander grade.

Back on the Department of Army Staff as of September 1967, he was appropriately assigned as Deputy Director (and sometimes Acting Director) for International and Civil Affairs in the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Military Operations. Superbly equipped for this duty, Bond was singularly effective in improving the substance and authority of the Army's view in national security policy matters, in politico-military affairs, in foreign assistance plans and programs and in international military organizations. He was a highly competent and respected representative in inter-Service and inter-departmental conferences and was extensively consulted on counter-insurgency and unconventional warfare matters. Specially selected by the Army Chief of Staff to organize and conduct the IX Conference of American Armies in 1969, he won the resounding praise of all participating Latin American Army Chiefs of Staff for the success of that major event and for his brilliant performance as the Secretary General. His great contributions during his last two years in Washington were recognized by award of the Distinguished Service Medal. A year earlier, this military prototype who had once faced medical retirement, was nominated for promotion to brigadier general.

The IX Conference concluded, General Bond was released for the combat command he had long sought. He departed for Vietnam in November 1969 to take the helm of the 199th Light Infantry Brigade. A full fledged member of the Profession of Arms, he had attained his most cherished military goal. During his tenure, he was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross and the Air Medal with 8 Oak Leaf Clusters. His posthumous awards include, in addition to the Silver Star, the Purple Heart, the Vietnamese National Order and the Vietnamese Cross of Gallantry with Palm.

GROUNDBREAKING CEREMONIES,
MCCLUSKY CANAL, GARRISON DIVERSION
IRRIGATION UNIT, MCCLUSKY,
N. DAK.

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 19, 1970

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, on Saturday, May 16, groundbreaking ceremonies were held for the McClusky Canal of the Garrison Diversion Irrigation Unit at McClusky, N. Dak. This is a project North Dakota has been

endeavoring to obtain for nearly half a century. The groundbreaking ceremonies mark a great milestone in our efforts to bring water to eastern North Dakota for various purposes—principally for irrigation, but also for water supplies for our major cities, as well as for recreation and fish and wildlife development.

Mr. President, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation Ellis L. Armstrong, speaking at the groundbreaking ceremonies, made what I believe to be a great speech, not only for this project, but also pointing out the benefits which have accrued to the country from all reclamation projects. The speech, I believe, is of nationwide significance and importance. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

NORTH DAKOTA AND THE WORTH OF IRRIGATION
(By Ellis L. Armstrong)

Just a few miles from where we are today, and at just about the same time 17 years ago—1953—President Dwight D. Eisenhower presided at ceremonies marking the closure of Garrison Dam. With those ceremonies, one of the greatest manmade, fresh-water reservoirs in this Nation began to form. With this storing of water, North Dakota was provided the key to open a whole new era of opportunity for its people.

Today, new and positive steps are being taken which will be of direct benefit to your State in using the waters of the Missouri River.

I am pleased and deeply honored to join you in breaking ground on the start of the Garrison Diversion Unit's lifeline waterway—the McClusky Canal—the 73-mile connecting link between Garrison and Lonetree Reservoirs. This is the lifeline in a chain of water delivery that will bring new wealth and new life.

As we, at long last, begin this exciting new chapter, turn with me nearly a century back into the pages of history. In 1889 Major John Wesley Powell, Director of the U.S. Geological Survey, addressed the North Dakota Constitutional Convention. Speaking in somber tones, he warned that "years will come of abundance and years will come of disaster, and between the two, people will become prosperous and unprosperous."

But Powell foresaw, for all the West, the importance of utilizing the available water from rivers and streams, small and large alike. One of the greatest of those rivers crosses through North Dakota and now you are finally turning it to your own purposes, in your own area.

The "boom and bust" economy Powell predicted for North Dakota has been as erratic as its annual precipitation. As a farm State with limited industry, your economy historically has been tied to the success or failure of agricultural production. From force of circumstances, you have not been able to maintain a level of growth which now can be achieved by utilization of your now existing stored water.

For example, the population of North Dakota decreased by 4 percent between 1940 and today. Meanwhile, the population of the north central region increased by 20 percent and that of the United States as a whole increased by 50 percent.

During the decade between 1950 and 1960, the total net out-migration from the State is estimated at 105,000 people, half of whom were in the productive age bracket of 20 to 39. Similarly, the migration from the farm to the city has continued unabated with the rural farm population declining from 327,000

in 1940 to 204,000 in 1960, a decrease of nearly 50 percent. I expect the 1970 census will show an even further out-migration from the rural areas to the cities and to other States.

Cash receipts from farming since 1950 have increased only 50 percent in North Dakota compared with about 80 percent for the west north central region and 70 percent for the Nation as a whole.

The importance of a water supply is demonstrated by the variability of farm income from year to year when dependent on the weather. For example, in 1961, a severe drought year, the total net farm income in North Dakota amounted to about \$70 million. The next year, 1962, timely and adequate rainfall resulted in a total net farm income of nearly \$400 million, nearly six times greater. In 1963, net farm income was about \$260 million. It is impossible to build sound, stable communities with these variations.

Retail sales in North Dakota increased only 40 percent during the period 1948-1963 compared to a 60 percent increase for the west north central region and a 90 percent increase nationally.

But now these rather discouraging statistics are going to change. With the groundbreaking today, a new era of growth and opportunity begins.

To see what happens with irrigation, we can look at the Columbia Basin Project in Washington State, an area somewhat similar in characteristics to your area. With the coming of irrigation, tremendous growth in the project area has occurred. In contrast, an adjacent dry farm wheat production comparison area, similar to the project area before irrigation, showed only small growth or actual decline.

The economy of the Columbia Basin Project irrigation area, which is still far from a mature development, exceeded the comparison dryland area by a ratio of: 20 to 1 in employment and wages; 19 to 1 in business and occupation taxes; and 17 to 1 in population, business establishments, postal receipts, retail sales, taxes, and Federal income taxes.

Battelle Memorial Institute, the well-known research foundation, completed a study just last month of the prospective economic impact of irrigating an additional 460,000 acres in the East High area of the Columbia Basin Project.

This land is presently in a dryland wheat-fallow cropping system with an average yield of 33 bushels per acre. The annual gross value of agricultural production from this dryland area is \$9 million, which in turn has a direct and indirect impact on income to the State economy of \$17 million.

Under irrigation, the value of agricultural production is predicted to be \$200 million, which will generate total income in the State economy of \$358 million, a twenty-one fold increase. Furthermore, the population density in the Project area is expected to increase twelve-fold, and 28,000 new jobs will be created within the State.

We also can look at experience in Nebraska where a study by the University of Nebraska showed that \$5.70 in increased business volume resulted from each dollar of increased farm income credited to irrigated crop production. This included about \$1.30 of increased volume for businesses and services supplying items necessary in producing the irrigated crops and about \$4.40 in increased volume among businesses involved in processing and selling that part of the increased crop production which was processed and sold within the State.

The total increased business activity due to irrigation in Nebraska was over \$812 million per year, which was over \$300 per acre of irrigated land. About \$153 million of this was increased personal income to households within the State. The total increased business

volume in Nebraska due to irrigation during the 25-year post World War II period is estimated at about \$13 billion.

With experiences such as the Columbia Basin Project and irrigation in Nebraska, it is not difficult to predict the economic growth and stabilizing effects the Garrison Diversion Unit will have on the economic future of North Dakota. Availability of irrigation water to the 250,000 acres in the initial phase of the project will free those acres from an uncertain "one crop" boom-and-bust economy and permit a choice or diversification of cropping plans never before available to those lands. It will provide sound, solid, stable communities, with economic opportunity for growth in a quality environment. Further, you can get away from the "surplus" crop problem and grow crops and livestock that will contribute to a high quality diet for the Nation.

Farm operators will have the opportunity to increase their net income by intensification and employing a varied crop pattern rather than by expansion in terms of additional acres. This, in turn, will tend to decelerate the trend toward larger farm size. It will slow down the migration from the farms and small towns to the metropolitan centers, and will provide additional opportunities for farm labor, thereby providing new employment in the area. Additional employment opportunities and economic growth possibilities will be attracted to this stable base.

Surely in this day when we are seeking a solution to the overcrowding of our great cities, such a program is of value far beyond a dollar yardstick. But even so, the dollar yardstick is impressive. We can with fair certainty estimate the dollar value of new agribusiness which will be generated by the demand for additional machinery, fertilizers, chemicals, processing and marketing plants and services.

This increased business volume generated by the Garrison Diversion Unit is expected to increase from about \$1.4 million in the first year of irrigation to about \$62 million in the 10th year. Ultimately an annual rate of \$90 million in present-day dollars is anticipated.

It is estimated that 50 years after the first year of irrigation the increased business volume will have accumulated to more than \$3.7 billion. This is over ten times the total cost of the \$300 million project and over 15 times the total irrigation allocation of about \$240 million.

Of the \$90 million ultimate annual increased business volume, about \$31 million will result in increased personal income to households of the State. Other significant increases include \$9 million with the construction industry, \$8 million in automobile and machinery sales and services, \$4.5 million with legal and financial institutions, \$3.5 million with lumber and hardware businesses and \$2.6 million with food and kindred products.

You should remember too, that an irrigation development of this magnitude will have widespread effects upon the social, economic, and political structure of individual communities. As opportunity for a better life increases, as a stable economic base is established, a new spirit of enthusiasm, with optimistic activity will occur. Public and private investment will be required to satisfy the increased volume of business. It all adds up to the wonderful story of American ingenuity and progress of which we are so proud.

The construction of the Missouri River mainstream multipurpose reservoirs has taken many acres of your most productive bottom lands to achieve benefits from river regulation, flood control, and navigation which are being felt all down the river valley to New Orleans. Now, by this great irrigation project, your turn has finally come. You

are getting into position to realize direct and specific benefits of your own.

You see, water is not just a commodity. Rather it is the heart of a circulating system of environmental and economic progress. The proper development and utilization of water means quality as well as quantity, stability as well as growth, protection as well as production, distribution as well as size, human well-being as well as economic growth. It becomes the very core, the essential catalyst, of the good life in a quality environment, which is our goal.

This needs to be better understood and appreciated. You have a unique opportunity now to see this actually unfold in your lives.

Complex water resource development projects, such as the Garrison Diversion Unit, require large investments of Federal funds. These investment costs are allocated to the various project functions served for purposes of economic analysis and repayment. Such allocations are made through a standard procedure based upon the separable costs of a particular project function and the remaining benefits above such costs.

In the case of irrigation, total irrigation benefits are used in the allocation process. This includes those benefits attributable directly to the water users and those attributable to the indirect beneficiaries as well. Direct irrigation repayment, on the other hand, is based largely upon charges to the water users in accordance with their ability to pay.

This sometimes results in a large imbalance between the total allocated Federal irrigation cost per acre of land served and the repayment responsibility per acre of the water users. Irrigation costs often are above the water users ability to pay and financial assistance from surplus revenues from the power produced at project dams and other miscellaneous project revenues are used to pay these additional costs.

Considering the total benefits realized as I have outlined, such assistance is fully justified. Certainly, it is a proud boast that Reclamation returns 90 percent of its investment to the Federal Treasury, cash on the barrelhead. No other resource program can show such a record.

These investments are clearly justified regardless of how the costs are allocated. As has been shown by the Columbia Basin study, the Nebraska study, and as estimated for the Garrison Diversion Unit, the increased business volume and returns to indirect beneficiaries complements that of the irrigation water user. The total increase in net returns to all beneficiaries well justifies the required capital investment.

Nevertheless, as it now stands, the apparent imbalance is there and it makes it look as though the water users are either ducking their repayment responsibilities or the project was poorly conceived in the first place.

Our cost allocation and repayment policies need modification so that an equitable portion of the so-called irrigation investment can be allocated to indirect beneficiaries. There is need for a greater amount of repayment to be obtained from the indirect beneficiaries through ad valorem taxes or other public revenues in order to spread the burden of repayment more equitably.

This problem is under intense study by the Water Resources Council, and others, as well as those of us in the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation. We must improve the identification and measurement of total project benefits. This reevaluation has been long overdue. We are taking a whole new look at our procedures for allocating costs. An equitable portion of the Federal irrigation investment should be allocated to the indirect beneficiaries in proportion to the indirect benefits they receive. Costs allocated to the water users should include only those supportable

by their direct benefits rather than the total benefits from irrigation.

Right now irrigation is in somewhat the position of the groom at a wedding. As the ceremony progressed, the minister asked the congregation:

"If there is anyone here who knows why these two should not be joined in wedlock, let him speak now or forever hold his peace."

"I want to say something," came a quavering voice.

"You keep out of this," snapped the minister, "You are only the groom."

Well the irrigation allocation is something like that. It is charged in a rather lopsided and inequitable fashion compared to other benefits, but without irrigation users having much to say about it. It seems a matter of tradition starting from the early days of Reclamation, to associate all agricultural and related benefits with the land to be served.

However, progress is being made. In recent years there has been greater recognition of other benefits in allocation of costs. In fact the main support for irrigation projects often comes from the business interests. Certainly here in North Dakota there are overwhelming benefits for recreation and fish and wildlife purposes with the restoration of potholes and dried up lakes which are contemplated. These benefits and others must be fully represented in the allocation of costs. With our new look underway, I am hopeful that we can get a much more realistic and essential understanding of the great importance of water-resources development.

I am as interested as you are in your State achieving maximum benefits from the Missouri River Basin Project and particularly the use of the waters of the Big Muddy. We are working with you in a number of areas to insure that this comes about.

For instance we are studying the possibilities of adapting the latest sprinkler irrigation technology to the project area. The best means of water conveyance to the farm units is the subject of intensified consideration. A number of materials for underground conveyance, including fiberglass materials, are under study.

We are proud to be cooperating with other State and Federal agencies in regards to crop-variety trials, water-use studies, water applications, and other aspects of irrigation farm management. We are especially proud to be working with your State Water Resources Research Council. These studies can be especially beneficial to irrigation farm production and management to insure maximum returns from the utilization of your water and land resources.

We are working closely with your North Dakota Water Commission and the city of Minot to develop an interim water supply. The city's present supply is limited and must be shared with a major defense installation—the Minot Air Force Base. A pipeline connecting an underground aquifer and the city's treatment plant represents the first stage for an improved supply for the city. Later when Missouri River water is available from the nearby Velva Canal, the city's increased demands can be accommodated from the Garrison Diversion Unit.

Even though we are now launched on the construction of this great project, there is a long road ahead. As we break ground today, we look forward to further progress in the chain of events that will lead toward the completion of this huge waterway. Next Tuesday, bids will be opened in Fargo for the next 2 1/4 miles of this McClusky Canal. That will be the second of seven reaches of the canal to enter the construction stage. It is located a short 4 miles north of where we are today, and will require the excavation of about 7 million cubic yards of earth material, or about half the quantity involved in this reach on which we are breaking ground.

To accomplish our goal of completing the principal supply works by the mid-70's, we will be making a number of additional major contract awards, including the five remaining reaches of the McClusky Canal, the Lonetree and Wintering Dams, the James River Dike, and several smaller dikes that will be required to confine the waters of Lonetree Reservoir—the principal storage facility for the entire unit.

To keep these construction works moving along will take continuing work and support by all of you. Competition for available Federal funds is tough and we need all the help you can give us to keep the show on the road.

Let me say to you who have advanced the Garrison Diversion Unit up through its formulation and authorization to the point of construction, I salute you and commend you for a job well done. You are great pioneers. And as the sons of the pioneers take the helm in the days ahead to keep the project moving, the promise is still good. I am sure that you will get the job done.

You, and the folks in the other States of the Missouri River Basin, are due for an upturn in your economic situation. Certainly this is wonderful country, and an integral and important part of America the Beautiful, the miracle of America, that we all love so much.

Your State will contribute greatly to our national well being, to our national goals, by providing these new economic opportunities, new wealth productivity, new jobs, new communities, and the enlargement and stabilizing of those you now have. Projects like this, which require people cooperatively working together for the common good, bring out the best that is in man. And we occasionally get a fleeting glimpse of the great potential of man, and of what this old world can be, and will be, when we pool our efforts to produce the good life in a quality environment. The Garrison Diversion Project will help all of us to progress toward those goals. There are great days ahead.

NIXON WAS RIGHT ON "NO TIME OUT"

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1970

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, thousands of Americans are voicing their support of the American military actions in Cambodia as directed by our President. One such voice is the Irving Independent of Irving, Tex. I insert the newspaper's editorial of May 10, 1970:

NIXON WAS RIGHT ON "NO TIME OUT"

President Richard M. Nixon was right when he decided it was time to stop calling time outs in the Vietnam War to permit the Communist forces to regroup and replenish their supplies.

It is the firm conviction of The Irving Independent that the President exhibited a "Texas tub" full of political nerve when he made the decision to move our forces into Cambodia and begin an elimination process of the enemy's hideouts which the Cong and other North Vietnam troops have been swarming back to for years when they were knocked around during combat.

And, although this may not be in line with the thinking of some people in Irving, we believe the President's only fault was he didn't do it sooner.

Lyndon Johnson and John F. Kennedy could have taken the same position Nixon did but the record shows they refused to act, either because of decisions their high echelon

advisers made or because they were worried about their political and public opinion standings.

Regardless of the way Johnson and Kennedy acted it was their decision to make and not that of the people as a whole, since they were the commanders-in-chief and the burden was upon their shoulders. However, members of our military forces continued to die as the enemy struck time after time, inflicting casualties, destroying supplies and creating consternation among the troops because the commanders would call an "all stop" when our people were about to step across a line that would put them out of bounds, according to the thinking in Washington.

Mr. Nixon, according to the thinking of this newspaper, had no other choice. It is inconceivable for anyone to believe we could bring all our forces out of Vietnam at one time for they would be slaughtered on the beaches, any military man will support that.

It is inconceivable to believe that the President would continue to permit the enemy to run roughshod over our people. It is also unbelievable that the scum of the nation be allowed to stage out-and-out rebellion and not be brought to justice for their actions simply because some people in Washington say "they have the right under the Constitution to voice their approval."

One of the agitators who deserves his just desserts is the avowed Communist Jerry Rubin. He should be in the penitentiary instead of roaming across the nation instigating trouble on campuses and at other locations, but an appeals court held back the sentence he received in the widely publicized trial at Chicago so the tramp is still on the loose.

It's people like McGovern, Rubin, Rap Brown, among others, who are causing the troubles we face. They defy the President and in so doing they defy the policies established under the Constitution. They are playing a game established by the Communists to undermine this country, and The Irving Independent strongly believes it's time to call a halt to their movements.

We have been blunt in this. We intended to be. It's time for the news media and others, not to stand idly by while the United States of America falls into ruin, just as did the Roman Empire.

We do not condone any war. We do not condone killing. And although some of our people are dying in Cambodia—and we deeply regret it—Mr. Nixon had to make a decision. He did and we think he acted correctly because, looking at it in the cold light of fact, he had to make his move.

That took guts—intestinal fortitude, if you please—and we greatly admire him for it.

YOUNG REPUBLICANS SUPPORT THE PRESIDENT

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1970

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, during this season of controversy over our policies in Southeast Asia, we should be careful lest we mislead the enemy in Hanoi into believing that our internal fabric is torn and that we are not unified as a nation.

History is replete with instances where countries engaged in conflict with another country have refused to sit down to the bargaining table with that country because there was evidence it was suffering trouble within.

All of us have a right to dissent, but we should do it in a way that is peaceful and constructive, thereby laying the groundwork for intelligent resolve of any problem concerned. If we will proceed in this manner during the current controversy on Southeast Asia policy, then the leadership in Hanoi will not be led to believe that we are a country disunited. The enemy will not be inclined to believe that we are divided and, therefore, he can conquer, and he will more likely become disposed to come to the conference table for the purpose of negotiation.

Just recently young Republican organizations throughout the land have gone on record as being solidly behind President Nixon with respect to his policies in Southeast Asia. On May 2, 1970, for instance, the Kansas Young Republican Federation forwarded President Nixon a wire, advising him as follows:

You have our full confidence and support concerning Southeast Asian decisions and policies.

Just recently, too, the Young Republicans of York County in my congressional district sent me a letter advising me that they had unanimously resolved "to fully support President Nixon on the action he has taken in Cambodia." Because both this resolution and the previously mentioned wire properly should be considered in the current controversy on Southeast Asian policy, I insert them into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and suggest an analysis of their content by those interested in obtaining a balanced view with respect to this vital foreign policy matter that confronts us today.

YOUNG REPUBLICANS OF YORK COUNTY,
York, Penna., May 9, 1970.

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GEORGE: On May 5th the Executive Board of the Young Republicans of York County unanimously and enthusiastically resolved to fully support President Nixon on the action he has taken in Cambodia. In doing so, we are urging members of both the United States Senate and House of Representatives to also lend their support to the President and stand firmly behind him on this important issue.

The purpose of our resolution extends much further than partisan politics. We feel that since the President is privy to all the information regarding the Vietnam conflict, which is not available to Congress, nor to students on college campuses, he is the most credible source of truth.

In a time when there is a higher percentage of young people fortunate enough to be attending colleges than ever before in our history, a minority of radical militants lead groups of naive students into acts of violence and destruction that have sometimes ended in death. Students commit unlawful and outrageous acts in the name of PEACE, but are themselves warlike and when they provoke gunfire by government troops, who would not be on the campus if there was a semblance of peace there, they seem stunned and their views on violence become one-sided. This outlook is condoned and encouraged by certain members of college faculties, who will often participate in meetings and demonstrations that stir up the emotions of the young, instead of setting a good example of social and personal responsibility for their students. College administrators are failing to fulfill their obligations to those who truly desire an education; the quiet students

who attend classes, study and do not burn buildings, but whose tuition may well be raised to recover money for damages done by others, and who are barred from classes because administrators are not maintaining order on their campuses. When officials of schools bow to coercion by youthful agitators, the quality of education is reduced.

The question of the United States involvement in Southeast Asia has become clouded by time, technicalities and commitments of the past, but one thing is clear: President Nixon did not start the Vietnam conflict, but he is the first President to initiate and carry out steps towards getting this conflict resolved, and our troops withdrawn from Vietnam. And, if to do this, he must send troops into Cambodia to protect American fighting men in Southeast Asia and enable the continuance of our withdrawal from Vietnam, he deserves the support of his countrymen, Congress and Party.

Therefore, we ask for your full support on this important issue.

Yours very truly,
DONALD F. MENGES,
Chairman.

END THE WAR

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1970

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the past few days, I have received various letters and telegrams expressing the concern of some citizens over the proposed political amendment to end the war. My reply is as follows:

DEAR FRIEND: Thank you for your thoughtful note urging me to "vote for the amendment to end the war." How very much I do wish the solution were that simple. If that was really all that it took, you can be sure we'd end the war tomorrow . . . we'd also pass amendments to stop crime, end hunger and poverty, eliminate pollution, and establish a friendly world of international brotherhood, of love, of happiness . . . a world free of hate, greed, disease, pain and discomfort.

No one wants the war ended more than I do, or more than President Nixon does . . . but it can not be ended by the passing of an amendment any more than it can be ended by demonstrations and protests.

Protest is a cinch. It is easy to be *against* those things that are bad . . . and for those things that are good. What is not a cinch is to find practical and workable solutions for a world that is beleaguered with conflicts, starvation and the by-products of an exploding technology. That takes devotion and study and a painstaking consideration of more or less unpalatable alternatives.

If you observed an irrational arsonist working his way up your street, one house at a time, pouring gasoline on each house, setting it on fire and burning it to the ground . . . would you (1) call your next door neighbors to warn them of the impending danger, (2) notify the police and fire departments of the events and urge their appropriate response, (3) remain calm and "uninvolved" with an "at least it's not my house" peaceful attitude, or (4) urge your Representative to "vote for an amendment to end fires"?

Now, admittedly that's an unreal, but simple analogy that most people can comprehend. But let's review a more complicated situation. Suppose you were a citizen of a strong, free country that had recently elected a President, who when he assumed the responsibility of the leadership of his country,

found his immediate two (2) predecessors had involved your country in a war in a far-off land . . . an indecisive, vacillating war that had committed 550,000 of your fellow countrymen to fight a holding action for the right of self-determination of a small nation of people against outside aggressors who were trying to forcibly impose their will upon the small nation.

Your new President reviews the circumstances he has inherited, by reason of his election to office, and determines that this war in a far-off land should not be the responsibility of his countrymen. He declares, "We will materially assist the small nation to strengthen itself to become able to defend its own people against the aggressors . . . but we will not assume the responsibility of doing that job for them with our countrymen."

The new President initiates his announced plan. The small nation's military strength and capabilities grow and they begin to assume an ever-increasing role of defending themselves. Your nation begins to withdraw your fellow countrymen from the war . . . 125,000 are withdrawn the first year. The plan continues, and your President announces the continued withdrawal of another 150,000 of your countrymen . . . advising the world, all along, that he will proceed in an orderly, systematic withdrawal program as rapidly as the small nation can assume the role of its own defense . . . and, yet, announcing that at all times he'll protect his Army's flanks against increased enemy action that might endanger the lives of your fellow countrymen. The withdrawal proceeds regularly, orderly and carefully.

As you observed these accomplishments, would you then, (1) advise your President to throw knowledgeable advice and military caution to the wind, and demand that he unilaterally try to withdraw all the troops immediately, (2) write your Representative and urge him to forsake the elected President's succeeding plan of withdrawal, "vote for the amendment to end the war", and cut off materials and supplies to your remaining countrymen in the far-off land, or (3) would you lend your support and encouragement to your President and help him and your fellow countrymen to honorably extricate themselves from an indecisive, costly, killing eight-(8)-year war?

Some people are confused because they don't understand. Some don't understand because they don't want to understand. Some can not hear the facts because they are protesting too loudly.

Sincerely,

ED FOREMAN.

HEW LAWYERS WHO WITHHELD THEIR LABOR SHOULD NOT BE PAID

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1970

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the lawyers at HEW went out on a strike against the war yesterday. Their "Exodus for Peace" brochure that was handed to everyone as they went to work. It said in part:

Some of us feel that only by withholding our labor * * * can the war machine be halted.

I am including the statement for the RECORD but I hope that HEW will make sure none of the lawyers listed below will get 1 cent pay for yesterday at least. I hope they do not try to use this as a day

for sick leave or some other "time off" excuse. If they want to withhold their labor, that is one thing, but the Department must also withhold their pay for that day as well.

It should be pointed out that I was told by one of them that they did not have the answer for getting the troops out of Vietnam but they were supporting Senator GEORGE McGOVERN. It might be, Mr. Speaker, that all this legal talent might just read over the "Hatch Act." Their great support of a candidate for the President might just be covered by the act.

Their brochure is as follows:

EXODUS FOR PEACE

We, the undersigned members of the Office of General Counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, can be silent no longer about the War in Vietnam, the War in Cambodia, and the domestic strife that is tearing our country apart.

We are speaking out for many and varied reasons. Some of us believe that the United States never had an interest to protect nor a right to be involved in Vietnam. Some of us supported the War once, but now believe it essential to bring all American troops home at once. Some of us see Vietnam as a mistake; some see it as an inevitable consequence of a foreign policy based on the use of military might to frustrate any form of social change. Some of us see all War as unjustified; some think War is sometime permissible, but oppose the senseless killing in Vietnam and Cambodia.

Some of us believe the War is illegal; some believe it is immoral; some believe it is not in the best interest of our country; some find it altogether incomprehensible.

Some of us feel that only by withholding our labor (and by encouraging others to do likewise) can the War Machine be halted; some want only to bear personal witness to our absolute opposition to the expansion and continuation of the War. Some of us feel that the greatest obstacle to achieving Peace is the "BUSINESS AS USUAL" complacency which must be shattered; some want to take one day to spend our energies for Peace.

But all of us agree that:

1. We can no longer be silent. Nor is it enough to talk Peace without doing something to stop War.

2. We can no longer let fear guide our conduct. If it takes risk, action, and sacrifice to end this war now, then risk, act, and sacrifice we will.

3. We can no longer speak with separate voices. United we can and will end the War.

4. We can no longer wait for two months, or two years, or two decades to see if a policy of escalation works. American troops—all of them—must be withheld at once.

5. We can no longer allow guns to be our country's dominant response to the world's real social and economic problems. We can no longer allow guns to be our country's dominant response to its own real social and economic problems.

6. We must not stop striving to end the war until the war is ended.

Robert Anderson, Wesley W. Collins, Margaret M. Conway, Elizabeth Croog, Darrell Grinstead, Ronald B. Gutmann, Christopher Hagen, Marcia Harrison, Robert Jacoby, Michael James, Alan Jones, William A. Kaplin, Stephen M. Kraut, Daniel J. McAuliffe, John D. McCabe, C. Brian McDonald.

Marlaine K. McMillan, William Metzger, Bruce K. Miller, Virginia R. Mitz, Eugene Pfeifer, Michael Romain, Jeffrey H. Schwartz, Jeffrey M. Shaman, Arthur Shapiro, Sarah Hertz Spector, S. N. Spiller, Borge Varmer, Howard Walderman, David D. White, Frances White, John L. Wodatch.

THE LADY WHO LOST TO JUSTICE AND A THIEF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1970

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to insert into the RECORD an article by Judd Arnett, of the Detroit Free Press. Mr. Arnett is one of America's most perceptive columnists, whose sharp wit portrays the sometimes humorous but frustrating consequences we all have experienced in meeting the problems of today's world. The article follows:

THE LADY WHO LOST TO JUSTICE AND A THIEF—A CITIZEN'S COMPLAINT

(By Judd Arnett)

A good part of what follows will be excerpted from a letter which arrived at this desk a few days ago. The author is Mrs. Madge G. Becker of Detroit, who approves of the use of her name.

In fact, when I telephoned and offered to withhold her name she replied: "Why not use it? I am not afraid of a little more trouble." No member of the silent majority, she. So away we go . . .

"On April 14, at about 7:30 on that brilliant Tuesday morning," Mrs. Becker tells us, "my purse was snatched as I walked on Park Avenue toward a bus stop. By sheer luck two squad cars were within two minutes of me, and the culprit was apprehended within minutes. My purse and contents were found, also immediately, in an abandoned garage from which the man was emerging when he was arrested.

"On the prisoner's person," she continues, "was found the exact amount of money I had in my purse, and two unopened packages of Virginia Slim cigarettes I had purchased just before the incident. (I had checked the cash in my purse just before leaving my hotel at \$5.22 and had spent \$1.04 at the time I bought the cigarettes).

"The arresting officers were Patrolmen Jack Masters, Paul Getzen, Charles Holman and Lawrence Szykowski. They did an excellent job.

"Then the case was turned over to Detective Sergeant G—and his partner, Detective L—." Mrs. Becker tells us. "Later that morning I identified the purse snatcher in the lineup (a positive identification) and signed a complaint. Altogether I spent about four hours at the police station that day, just waiting.

"All of a sudden, nothing began to happen. I was asked to appear at the preliminary examination on Monday, April 20. I was in the court room promptly at nine, and at 10:30 the defendant had not shown. It was then that I learned that Judge James N. McNally, before whom the prisoner had been arraigned, had let the man go on a personal bond.

"In effect, that judge had said to the defendant, 'Go and sin no more,' or, to put it more bluntly, 'Get out of town before it's too late, chum.'

"My purse and money and sundry other personal items are being held at the police station," Mrs. Becker reports, "and to Detectives G- and L- I have suddenly become a damned nuisance. L- told me eight days after the scheduled examination that a fugitive warrant had not been issued. He hinted not too subtly that he had more important things to do than answer my questions (I had called him once) and he would appreciate it if I would get lost.

"G- told me frankly when I talked with him that the defendant deserved to be let out on a personal bond because he had no record." (Note: The names of the detectives have been withheld because I have been unable to reach them for comment.)

"I suspect," Mrs. Becker concludes, "That both detectives feel that I was remiss in walking down Park Avenue in broad daylight carrying a purse, because the poor man was tempted beyond bearing. Should I be the one to don sack cloth and pour ashes over my head?"

Now at first glance this seems a trivial matter, doesn't it? After all, only a small amount of money and two packs of cigars were involved.

But there is more to it than this, especially in view of frequent police (and court) protestations to the effect that all too often the victims of crime will not stand hitched when it comes down to push and shove. But here we have a lady who was willing to sign a complaint, appear at a police lineup and show up in court at the appointed time. The fact that the culprit, as she calls him, did not appear may indicate there was some weakness in the court's decision to give him personal bond. And one wonders about the delay in issuing a fugitive warrant.

We keep hearing from apologists that if there was just enough money to flood the streets with police, crime would be brought under control. But if one accepts the testimony of Mrs. Becker (and she is not alone in such reports), patently there is more to it than that. In this instance, the police on the street did their jobs, adequately. And then "All of a sudden nothing began to happen. . . ."

Incidentally, she did not want the man imprisoned. But she did think it a good idea to have him on the record, just in case he might go purse-snatching, or worse, again.

KENT TRAGEDY

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1970

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the recent columns of two widely known columnists shed some light on the Kent tragedy which should not be overlooked.

The first is the column of David Lawrence, the other the column of Victor Riesel. Both columnists point out that SDS had been building up the student body at Kent for just such a situation as took place. The point that neither of them made however is the fact that National Guardsmen are just plain businessmen called to duty and are not accustomed to having long-haired kids hit them with bricks and rocks—yes—and possibly even a shot or two.

The two columns follow:

KENT TRAGEDY 2 YEARS IN BREWING (By David Lawrence)

All of a sudden a sensational piece of news saddens millions who read it on the front pages of newspapers or hear it on radio or television broadcasts. Immediately, people in politics make accusations, and everybody in authority—the governor of the state, the National Guard or even the President—is blamed. But the vast majority of citizens do not get the background of what has happened.

The Kent State University episode, in which four students were killed, is an interesting example. A summary of Associated

Press and United Press International dispatches with particular reference to campus disturbances in the last two years at Kent College is significant.

The United Press International, in November, 1968, reported that about 250 members of the Students for a Democratic Society and the Black United students demonstrated against police recruitment on the campus.

The Associated Press reported a demonstration on April 8, 1969, led by the Students for a Democratic Society, which brought clashes with university police. The SDS was then banned from the Kent campus, 37 students were suspended and five were charged with assault and battery. The demonstrators had demanded that the university abolish the Reserve Officers Training Corps, a crime laboratory and a law-enforcement-training school. On Oct. 7, a campus survey showed that 81 percent of the Kent students approved the calling in of the state police to put down the April disruption.

On May 1, 1970, according to the Associated Press, hundreds of students broke windows, set fires and damaged cars in a march from downtown Kent to the 19,000-student campus in a protest against the American military move into Cambodia.

On May 2, the Associated Press said National Guards were sent to the Kent campus, and demonstrators burned down the Reserve Officers Training Corps building. Students took away firemen's hoses and turned them on the fire fighters.

On May 4, the Associated Press reported that four students were shot to death and 12 other persons were wounded or injured when National Guardsmen opened fire on demonstrators at Kent State University. The Guardsmen had been targets of bricks and rocks before they opened fire.

Many millions of readers see news accounts of student raids on ROTC buildings, and don't know what the initials means. They don't realize that these are branches of the Reserve Officer Training Corps and are operated by the Armed Forces of the United States. Attacks on such structures are a grave offense, especially during a war.

Senator Mike Mansfield, leader of the Democratic party in the U.S. Senate, said on Friday, according to the United Press International, that the program of the Reserve Officers Training Corps on campuses has become a convenient but somewhat mistaken target for student frustration and occasional violence. He declared that the ROTC law was changed years ago to make the project one of "local option" with each campus and largely elective with the students. He added:

"The right of students to participate in ROTC should be honored and respected."

The army needs men with college training in certain fields. It surely is not in the public interest for any group to block the efforts of the military to obtain volunteers who can be enlisted for officer training. Surprisingly, the campus demonstrations against the ROTC have been continued notwithstanding the fact that the training programs are primarily voluntary.

Members of Congress are by no means in agreement as to what caused the shootings at Kent University, but the opinion of many is that in a disturbance involving many hundreds of students, sniping by outsiders is likely as a provocation.

Representative Roger H. Zion, R-Ind., mentions that he has gotten a copy of an instruction sheet given demonstrators at Lafayette, Ind., which he says included information on how to use molotov cocktails, how to disrupt communications and how to wreck trains. He adds:

"The dangerous subversives who are organizing these activities travel from campus to campus."

A better-informed student body in every college will help to defeat the troublemakers.

SDS LONG TARGETED OHIO UNIVERSITY FOR "BURNING TO THE GROUND"

(By VICTOR RIESEL)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—It is the fashion of revolutionists to cry for blood. And cry they did at Kent State U. which many an observer would have you believe is a party-raid enclave, where strollers down the tree-lined campus worship their wrestling team. And when the blood came, it came to children of working people who sought uncstly education (\$642 a year) for their youngsters.

But Kent State U. is no movie set for an old Jack Oakie film. There are those of us who would hop off at Akron, drive the 10 miles and observe the SDS Weatherman faction—Mark Rudd, Bernardine Dobrn and comrades—scream, literally, for blood, for murder, for revolt, for the leveling of its buildings to wind-blown ashes, and for armed rebellion. For some time now Kent State U. has been the target for the SDS Ohio region and the Akron communes.

It's all in the record. There is the SDS pamphlet, written in the ancient argot of old Czarist era terrorists which shouts: "The war is on at Kent State." It was written by two SDS regional staff people. It was distributed from a table set before the auditorium on April 28, 1969. It lay among publications of the Peking Chinese, the early rifetoting Progressive Labor Party, and other "splinters." This pamphlet begins with today's nihilist father image, as did the old Russian literature. The paragraph under "the war is on" is a quotation from Mao. "Then follows a report of weeks of intense struggle" on the college grounds—especially to "raise the political consciousness of thousands on the campus, while the pig-thug Administration has responded with swift and heavy repression."

Intelligence sources have been reporting Kent State U. as the target for years. And why?

No one has bothered to look at the SDS "demands" at Kent. There are four points—indeed significant. And this quadripartite program should be the pivotal point of any objective probe—preferably by a Congressional select committee whose report should be unimpeachable to the reasonable.

Note what the SDS shouted for on this bucolic campus. (1) The elimination of the ROTC. This demand is standard neo-anarchist operating procedure. (2) "End Project Themis Grant to the Liquid Crystals Institute."

Do note that there are but two such institutes in our land. One is on Kent State campus. Its objective is to develop "liquid crystal detectors." These crystals are extremely sensitive to heat. They are used in mechanisms to detect campfires in jungle areas and in some instances to detect body heat at long range. This is of vital strategic use by our troops in Southeast Asia seeking hidden Viet Cong and North Vietnamese forces either encamped or set to spring an ambush. In recent years, Project Themis has funded some two-score anti-insurgency scientific projects for the Department of Defense.

Third point in the SDS tactical schedule is a demand for the abolishment of the Law Enforcement School. This trains students for police careers. And fourth, Abolish the Northeast Ohio Crime Laboratory used for swift identification of rioters as well as criminals.

Obviously the SDS is out after more than the radicalization of a quiet campus where in the spring young man's fancies turned to panty raids.

Let's pass over for a moment the looting, the burning, the attacks on banks, the assault on firefighters and the destruction of inventories of small businessmen which hit Kent U. last week. Let's go back some years when the SDS's national self-appointed fe-

male revolutionist, Bernardine Dohrn, created herself in the image of a young Russian woman who almost 100 years ago became the sole survivor of a band of bomb-making terrorists who even then worked with electrical gadgets.

"Bernardine," who sees herself as a latter-day "Lapassionaria," is one of several National SDS leaders. It is she who targeted Kent State U. for quite a while. Then on April 28, 1969, she spoke to a student crowd in Williams Hall. At one point during the discussion which followed her speech she became agitated, lost her cool, rushed to the rostrum, grabbed the microphone and shouted that she could murder for self-defense, an eye and ear witness has reported under sworn testimony, and could murder for revenge. She stopped. And she added "in a sense." Well, what sense?

A week later, on May 6, almost exactly a year before the awesomely tragic shooting of four students, the SDS helped whip up a rally. Joyce Cecora, reportedly an important SDS speaker, bluntly called for the use of arms to end "the repressive action of the administration."

"They used guns at Cornell and they got what they wanted," said this young woman now typical of the new fraternity of violence. "It will come to that here!"

On Feb. 27, 1969, this same Joyce Cecora had said that, unless the administration gave way, the SDS would burn and level the campus (according to sworn testimony in federal reports).

Blood, now rotting the earth of Kent's lovely campus, did not spill accidentally. That soil was tilled—furrowed by the clanging iron words of the toughest band of nihilists this land has known. Virtually all of them are outsiders. Virtually all of them chose Kent State because it is what it is, a source of strength for American forces, a source of learning for the children of working people, a spot in middle America.

The SDS has been crying for blood. It knows, for its leaders are deeply read, what can happen when any military in any land shoot down children of America's middle class. It identifies. It cries out. It can shake governments.

In the "right on" argot, let's cool it. Men of stature must go to the scene and search the record.

I have criss-crossed this land a hundred times. I know America will listen to an appeal to reason. It is time there be more reason or there will be more blood.

And it is time for the young men and women to appeal for that reason. The SDS is not their world—or it would be fighting for true peace and not be the explosive advocate of a provincial Mao Tse-tung.

ACTION BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF NEW YORK ON BEHALF OF LAW STUDENTS

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1970

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I have just received an answer from the able and distinguished Attorney General Louis J. Lefkowitz in response to my May 15 telegram to him, a copy of which I inserted into the RECORD, Monday May 18.

I am informed that the attorney general wrote to the court of appeals on behalf of the students and in support of the petition for a rehearing.

I would like to call my colleagues' at-

tention to the action of the attorney general whereby supporting the plight of those graduating law students who are faced with both final test prerequisite to the bar examination, and a greater commitment to constructively take part in our country's great dissent against the latest administration moves in Southeast Asia, particularly Cambodia.

VIOLENT PROTEST: A DEBASED LANGUAGE

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1970

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Time magazine in its current issue has an excellent essay on the futility of violence as a means of protest—"a confession of ultimate inarticulateness."

Because of the interest of the American people and my colleagues in this most important subject, I place the article in the RECORD herewith:

VIOLENT PROTEST: A DEBASED LANGUAGE

Words, like trees, bend with the prevailing winds. In the climate of opinion of the past few years, the word dissent has undergone a decided transformation. For most of U.S. history, it clearly meant speech—the unorthodox opinion, the challenging idea. Then, during the 1960s, civil rights protesters took to the streets to fight segregation, and the word became associated with demonstrations as much as with speech. As protests have continued to broaden and increase, dissent has come to be used to describe and defend a wide variety of physical acts, including violence toward property and even toward people.

The explanation many protesters offer for their switch from verbal to physical dissent is that no one pays attention to words alone any longer. However eloquent it has been, however imaginative its uses, language has not succeeded in eliminating racial discrimination or ending the war in Indochina. So the protesters have resorted to what Social Psychologist Franklyn Halman of Northwestern University calls "body rhetoric"—sit-ins, lie-ins, marches—and more and more bodies have started colliding. Such public confrontations are an expression of gathering frustration over a society that no longer seems to respond to more traditional forms of dissent.

COMMUNICATION OF FEELING

This argument contains a measure of truth. It is also true that in many cases the massed forces of dissent—as at most of last week's rallies mourning the Kent State four—have demonstrated a commendable restraint in not letting verbal protest build into violence. The fact remains, however, that all too often these days dissent is a matter of arson and rock throwing. The reason may be that protesters have despaired of the efficacy of words before they have really mastered them. It is significant that this generation of dissenters has failed to produce a literature, or even a polemic that is likely to endure. On the contrary, it has been persistently, even proudly, nonverbal. It has emphasized a communication of feeling rather than of words. The vocabulary of protest, often weighted down with an outmoded Marxism, is relentlessly conventional and conformist. The same phrases—"up against the wall," "get the pigs," "tell it like it is"—are endlessly re-

peated, less for their intrinsic eloquence than for their emotive and symbolic value. And that sort of thing gets tiresome; to borrow from the jargon, it "turns people off." Even the most outrageous obscenities lose their impact when they are used ad nauseam.

There is often a disconcerting inexactness about today's rhetoric of dissent. To denounce the Establishment in blanket terms makes little sense in a society composed of several establishments, each with its own ideology and set of mores—many of them surprisingly competitive. "Power to the people" is an admirable democratic slogan—except that, as used presently, what it really seems to mean is power to the leftist radicals who seek to control any revolution in America. It is verbal overkill to describe every mild demurrer as "whites against the most bluntly radical of black-militant demands as nothing but 'racism.'" And the case for political dissent is weakened when almost any attempts, however peaceful, by college authorities to restore law and order on campus are automatically condemned by militant radicals as proof that the U.S. is a "fascist America." Taken at face value, many protest slogans suggest that the dissenters have seriously misestimated U.S. society and its possibility for evolutionary change.

The ultimate debasement of language, of course, is violence. Except for protesters who simply want to destroy—and there are more than a few—most dissenters turn to violence in a desperate effort to communicate their profound feelings of grievance. Yet surely this is too crude a way to get their message across. A bomb, for example, lacks specificity; its meaning is as scattered as its debris. Some people may interpret such an act as a signal to pay more attention to the protester and his cause; many more are likely to read into it a need to make life a lot tougher for the protester. Violence is, essentially, a confession of ultimate inarticulateness.

Throughout history, dissent has been more effectively expressed by the word than by the weapon. The French Revolution was betrayed by the ruthless masters of the Terror who silenced all opposition with the guillotine. The enduring importance of the revolution lies, rather, in the principles enunciated on its behalf by the philosophers of the Enlightenment, who bequeathed the notion of human equality to the modern world. During its bleakest hours, the American Revolution was resuscitated not so much by brilliant military strategy as by brilliant words—those of Tom Paine in the "times that try men's souls." Even less persuasive and more recalcitrant words can have an impact that dramatic acts do not. Wrote Lord Keynes: "Madmen in authority, who hear voices in the air, are distilling their frenzy from some academic scribbler of a few years back. I am sure that the power of vested interests is vastly exaggerated compared with the gradual encroachment of ideas."

Debasement of the language cannot be blamed on protestors alone. The news media, the advertising agencies, the Government—even President Nixon himself—have all helped flatten and attenuate the English tongue. When radicals misuse language, they are only applying the lesson they have been so well taught by their society. That lesson has been reinforced by philosophers now in fashion—Marshall McLuhan, for instance, who says that pictures are more important than words and contemplates a society of inarticulate tribal emotions based on instant sight and sound. Or Herbert Marcuse, who teaches that protesting words are as empty as air in a technological society where power is concentrated in a few hands. Such a contempt for language makes people impatient with the orderly processes of thought. No sooner is something glimpsed or considered than it is demanded. Not only is dialogue destroyed, but so is rationality, when protesters insist upon immediate capit-

ulation to their "nonnegotiable demands." This is what infants demand—and totalitarians.

EXAMPLE OF AGNEW

Reactionary as the thought may seem, words are still as powerful a force as ever, when they are cogently used. It was, after all, language alone that catapulted Spiro Agnew from a political nonentity to a national figure with an enthusiastic personal following. Agnew, to be sure, can be accused of appealing to the raw emotions of the body politic in his now-famous attacks on "effete snobs" and "tomentose exhibitionists." On the other hand, a protester would have a hard time telling the Vice President that mere speech is not capable of stirring people. Unwittingly, he has shown his antagonists on the left that it can still be done.

During a period of national turmoil and self-doubt, it is all the more imperative for protesters to put down their rocks and find their voices again. As a commentary on the Kent State tragedy, President Nixon's remark that "when dissent turns to violence it invites tragedy" is callously inadequate. His warning, however, carries the weight of history; in a general unleashing of violence, dissent is the first casualty. Today the nation is in considerable need of healing, as well as elevating, language; often in the past that need has been filled by protectors whose perspective on society matched their passionate commitment to its improvement. Now is the time for dissenters to assert their own dignity and maintain their tradition by upholding the ultimate value of the word.

IS SCHOOL OUT OR IN?

HON. WALTER FLOWERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1970

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to offer for inclusion in the RECORD, in order to share with my colleagues and others, an editorial appearing in the May 14 issue of the Birmingham Post Herald entitled "Is School Out or In?", which eloquently expresses some of my personal feelings about the current student problems:

IS SCHOOL OUT OR IN?

With thousands of college students wandering over the countryside like Quantrill's Raiders, the question arises as to whether anyone is back on the campus studying for exams.

We are told, of course, that the arena of public affairs is a better teacher than some gloomy professor lecturing from 20-year-old notes.

And, indeed, there may be merit in spending a few days in Washington, as the entire faculty and student body of Haverford College did last week, to talk to congressmen about the war in Indochina, or any other public issue.

Nor is there any special objection to giving students time off next fall, as Duke, Princeton and other schools have done, to campaign for candidates in the congressional elections.

This is where dissent should be channeled—into the political process.

But there is not much educational value in blocking highways, tossing rocks at police, burning down Old Main (as they did at Colorado State) and refusing to go to class until U.S. troops are brought home from Asia.

From the student squattertown at the University of Denver to the "Effete Snob Corps

Marching Band" at UCLA, there is a great deal of nonsense passing for war protest these days.

This is the time of year when "birds do sing, hey ding a ding, ding." And the voice of the cuckoo is heard distinctly through the land.

At last count, more than 150 colleges and universities either were closed indefinitely or their students were out on strike. How these schools will be able to offer academic credit this semester is a mystery; but that's only half the rub.

What about the students—in most cases the majority—who might prefer to go to class instead of attending peace rallies?

Eight students at Wayne State in Detroit finally were forced to get an injunction giving professors the right to teach even if the university was closed down.

Similar suits have been filed in New York, Georgia and Florida by students who paid their tuition and would like to get a little schooling in return.

Any student whose "conscience" compels him to stay out of class as a protest against American foreign policy has a right to do so, of course.

But other students have rights, too. Or have we forgotten?

THE GOLDEN EAGLE PROGRAM

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1970

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment regarding the continuation of the golden eagle passport program under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act.

This program has provided a passport to recreational enjoyment for millions of Americans, while at the same time easing the administrative burdens of the U.S. Park Service and the U.S. Forest Service.

The benefits for individuals and families are enormous. The passport is universally applicable, so that a family touring the scenic attractions of our country is assured of entry to our parks and forests no matter to what State they may travel. In California, which contains some of the most popular parks in the country, golden eagle passport sales accounted for approximately one-quarter of the total sales in the country.

At a time when the President and the Congress are encouraging travel within the United States, in order to aid the balance of payments, it seems very strange to me that the House committee should have delayed so long in taking action on the measure. The Senate passed the bill in September of last year, and yet the bill sat in the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee past the point where the program officially expired—March 31, 1970. This is inexcusable, both in terms of bureaucratic efficiency and in creating confusion among passport users as to the future of the program.

What were the reasons for this delay? The program has provided vast recreational benefits by encouraging more widespread use of our national parks and forests through a simplified entry procedure. Total sales of golden eagle passports were 1,953,517 in fiscal 1969.

Total visitor-days in the same year were 157,356,500.

The staggering increase in the number of people visiting our parks, camping, hiking, and generally enjoying America has placed a great strain on the resources of the U.S. Forest Service and the National Park Service. Yet the golden eagle passport allowed for a simplified fee collection procedure which saved many man-hours of time. Indeed, it enabled collection of fees from those users of remote national forest areas who might not otherwise have paid.

It is especially interesting to note that the estimated costs of administering this program run at 10 to 15 percent of the revenues—some \$14 to \$21 million annually. This leaves an overall revenue increment from the passport program of over \$120 million. Yet just last week Congress passed a bill to promote travel within the United States funded at \$15 million—with no guarantee of such a high financial return on the dollar investment.

I therefore recommend speedy passage of this measure by the House, and a more expeditious consideration of the needs and wishes of the American people in the future.

ADDRESS BY HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD AT GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1970

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, on May 10 of this year, our distinguished colleague from my neighboring congressional district in Pennsylvania was awarded the degree of Doctor of Science honoris causa at the commencement exercises of the school of medicine, here at Georgetown University.

There, before a learned body of men who had completed their studies in the field of medicine, our colleague spoke to them, not principally about the healing of the bodies of men and women and children, but of caring for the soul and the mind of mankind.

The words he spoke on that occasion were memorable, as so often his words on the floor of the House are memorable. With your permission, therefore, I should like to append here the commencement address he delivered on that occasion. It is a text that all of us might study with profit:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN DANIEL J. FLOOD

It is a privilege and pleasure alike for me to be here today and to be invited to speak to you who are gathered together for this Commencement of the Georgetown University Medical School. I am deeply appreciative of the honor bestowed upon me in your granting of the degree Doctor of Science honoris causa, an honor which I am proud to accept. I am glad to extend to those of you who have completed or are completing your medical studies at this school, to its able faculty and administration, and to all, families and friends, who share in the joy of this occasion sincere congratulations and every good wish for the future years.

We hear much these days of priorities and their reordering, nationally and in our local

communities. Living, as we do, in a troubled time when the fabric of society itself seems frayed and strained by tensions and disruptions of every kind, this concern with priorities becomes increasingly urgent and evident. In my remarks today I want for a moment to direct your attention to the ultimate, basic priorities of our lives in contemporary America.

For practical purposes, you know, we can say that we live—all of us—in three different worlds. Every human being, like a juggler, so to speak, keeps three balls in the air at the same time: think briefly of those three worlds and what they are like.

The first is the relatively small world of a man's private life—the world he is born into, grows up in, is educated in; the world in which he develops habits, some good, some bad; makes a living, falls in love, perhaps; raises a family or lives alone without a family; meets handicaps, makes decisions. In other words, it is the relatively small world of his daily routine—the neighborhood in which he lives, works, and plays.

The second is the much larger world of public events in which he lives, but may not take an active part in, either because he can't or doesn't care to. It's the world in which there are economic depressions and inflation; the world in which wars are fought, and peace bought and paid for at a price. It is the world in which men go to the moon, cities go downhill, institutions rise and fall, empires come and go. It is the world in which men in high office make momentous decisions which affect us all. It's the world in which taxes are levied, laws are made, and men are drafted into military service.

There is another world, a third one and harder to describe. It's the world, not as it is, but as it is meant to be, ought to be; the world in which a man's conscience feels the pull of a magnetic pole—an irresistible moral force which he ignores at his own peril. This is a world of vision and vitality—in a sense invisible, yet often more real than the other two, and sometimes visible in a flash of beauty or a deed of truth and goodness manifest in human life.

These are the three worlds through which a man goes—not as one might go through successive grades in a school, but meshed with each other; we live in all three at once, so to speak, and different people handle these worlds in very different ways. Our concern today is how best to manage this juggling act, if you will, of living in three worlds at once.

First is the question of your scale of priorities. For most of us, the first world is the most immediate and pressing. The second is perhaps the most urgent and in a way the most relevant because we are directly affected by everything that happens in it; there is no selectivity or personal choice in depression or inflation, war or peace.

The third is the most ultimate, not necessarily the most immediate or intimate or relevant—at least from a superficial point of view, but the most ultimate. That being so, our ultimate priorities lead us to questions of relationship—how do we relate life in this third world, the world of ideals and values, of faith and spirit, to life in the other two. The answer is to be found in the long, sometimes tragic, sometimes glorious story of man's spiritual journey and of his awareness of the meaning of God in human life and experience.

In truth, the relationship between these three worlds should and could be quite different: it could be that life in that third ultimate world can liberate us from bondage to the first, that is, your little private world, and enable us to be usefully active in the second. No man, no body of men, can do anything significant in the larger world until he can get out of himself. Except a grain of wheat fall on fertile soil, it cannot nourish life. Once a man gets out of himself, he is free, free to do his part in this confusing, troubled world—to set the crooked right, to

upset what may need upsetting to set right and reconcile; to bring us to the sorrows and tragedies of the world of his joy, his hope, and his loving kindness; to draw together those who have been torn asunder.

It seems to be that this applies to every individual and community, but with this special pertinence here today to you who are entering into or are already a part of the medical profession. The virtues of professional knowledge and experience can easily blind us to the dangers of mere professionalism in a society and world in which the need for medical care at every level is greater than ever. The opportunities for service to human suffering demand a generation of doctors who are able to relate to their fellowman beyond the limited sphere of personal or collective self-interest.

This is the great challenge which confronts you who are gathered here today, just as—in different but not dissimilar ways—it confronts those of us in other areas of human life—whether in politics or in religion, in business or in the arts and sciences. If we are to live creatively as free and responsible men and women in the three worlds I have described, we must reorder our priorities and their relationships.

I have spoken of these worlds today because I believe it must be a vital ingredient in the practice of medicine—is in every area of life. The tradition which speaks of medicine as "the art of healing" and which associates medicine with religion is essentially sound, even in this technological and scientific age, sound in its perception that medicine, in its ministry to the whole man, touches the heart of life—the issues of life and death, the mystery, the tragedy, and the glory of man.

In his recent study of modern German history, Hajo Holborn speaks of the decline of education in pre-Nazi Germany; the failure of German education in the professions, he writes, was a failure to deal with the whole man in his necessary relationship to his society. The result (he continues) was the production of "men proficient in special or special knowledge but lacking not only in the most primitive preparation for civic responsibility but also in a canon of absolute ethical commitments." You who are gathered here know well the growing number of difficult, specific techniques which must be mastered in modern medicine and the pressures which make for acute specialization. We can and must seek to recover for our day the humanizing, liberating values of social and community concern. The challenge rests upon you who are about to enter the high calling of the medical profession as doctors, as citizens, and as human beings alert, open, and responsive to the needs and aspirations of your fellowmen.

So may it be said of you, in the ancient words of the author of Ecclesiasticus in the Hebrew Bible:

"Honor the physician with the honor due him according to your need of him, for the Lord created him. For healing comes from the Most High . . .

His work will never be finished; and from him health is upon the face of the earth."

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1970

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, it has been 92 years since the Congress of Berlin confirmed Rumania's independence. We recall this arrival of the Rumanian State into the community of nations as we pause to commemorate the May 10

anniversary of the two events which made the recognition of this nation possible.

On May 10, 1866, the first prince of Rumania was selected and on May 10, 1877, the Rumanian Principality proclaimed its independence. The date of May 10 was again singled out in the history of Rumania when in 1881, the Rumanian people decided to raise their nation to the rank of kingdom.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed unfortunate that the celebration of these events is done primarily by those who no longer reside in their homeland. By recalling these historic dates here in the House, it is my hope that our words will serve to remind our Rumanian friends of the commitment we share to free and independent nations.

RESPONSIBLE APPROACH TO THE PROBLEMS CONFRONTING US TODAY

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1970

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the May 18, 1970, edition of the Washington Post is a full page statement paid for by the Youth Committee for Peace With Freedom. I do not know the sponsors of this open letter to the U.S. Senate, but I am in agreement with the responsible approach they take to the problem confronting us today.

I was particularly impressed with their statement that some 2,000 of the Nation's 2,400 colleges have not taken part in violent protest. In my home State of New Mexico, our schools, colleges, and universities are carrying on education as usual.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD and consideration by my colleagues the statement of the Youth Committee for Peace With Freedom:

[From the Washington Post, May 18, 1970]

AN OPEN LETTER TO 100 SENATORS

Gentlemen: Over the coming days the Senate of the United States will be passing on two legislative amendments which may be fateful for the future of our country, for the wider cause of freedom, and for the peace of the world.

We take the liberty of addressing this letter to you because as students and young citizens, we are profoundly concerned over the crisis through which our country is passing. It is a crisis which has an internal component and an external component, and the two are clearly interrelated.

Like the students who have come to visit your offices, by the hundreds and by the thousands, over the past two weeks, we fear that we may lose our country if we fail to pay adequate attention to certain pressing national priorities. But we do not share their well-intentioned isolationism, their apparent belief that they can build a beautiful America even if the rest of the world crumbles around them.

Unlike them, we fear that we can also lose our country—and lose the peace of the world in the process—if we fail in our obligations as the free world's greatest power. Indeed, so strained and delicate is the balance in the field of world affairs that single blunder by our country may be enough to open the way to catastrophe.

We believe that the Senate's passage of the Church-Cooper Amendment and/or the McGovern-Hatfield Amendment would constitute precisely such a blunder.

The protesters who have come to Washington have argued that the Senate *must* pass the Church-Cooper Amendment and the Hatfield Amendment because the great majority of our students and the Majority of the American people support them. We think that the premise on which this contention is based is false.

A Gallup Poll taken immediately after the President's speech, showed that two-thirds of those who took a stand supported the President's action in Cambodia. That the President's action is not without important support is also evidenced from the fact that AFL-CIO President George Meany and other leading trade-unionists have also supported the President.

As for the many campus demonstrations and the large number of students who have come to Washington, we note (1) that some 2000 out of 2400 colleges have not taken part in the current protest movement, (2) that strike votes were defeated in a number of colleges and carried only by slender majorities in other colleges, and (3) that substantially more than half of our young people do not go to college and have not been affected by the campus ferment. But even if the protesters were ten times as numerous and ten times as passionate in the advocacy of their cause, this by itself would not constitute a guarantee that they were right. Public opinion can be wrong. Indeed, there have been many occasions in the history of our country and in the history of other countries when courageous leaders have had to stand up against what appeared to be an overwhelming tide of public opinion.

The supreme example of such courage in the history of our own country was provided by President Abraham Lincoln in the latter part of the Civil War. By the middle of 1863 there was growing agitation against the war . . . The people were weary and tired of the inconclusive bloodshed . . . There were violent anti-draft riots in New York, in which scores were shot down . . . Increasingly vicious attacks on the President began to appear in the press . . . Salmon P. Chase resigned from the Lincoln cabinet and struck up an anti-Lincoln alliance which included congressmen, businessmen, officers and the distinguished editor of the New York Tribune, Horace Greeley . . . In August 1864, the Democratic National Convention adopted a resolution which read: "After four years of failure to restore the Union by the experiment of war . . . justice, humanity, liberty and the public welfare demand that immediate efforts be made for a cessation of hostilities. . . . Lincoln himself was convinced that his administration would not be re-elected. But he persevered in his course because he was convinced of its correctness.

In modern times Winston Churchill provided us with a sublime example of the kind of courage that is willing to swim full against the tide of public opinion. Despite the rise of Hitler, public opinion in Great Britain was predominantly pacifist and, at a later stage pro-appeasement. The spirit of the British campus was reflected in the so-called peace pledge, under which the members of the Oxford Union, by an overwhelming majority, voted to "never again bear arms for King and County." As Churchill commented: ". . . In Germany, in Russia, in Italy and Japan, the idea of a decadent Britain took deep root and swayed many calculations. Little did the foolish boys who passed the resolution dream that they were destined quite soon to conquer or fall gloriously in the ensuing war, and prove themselves the finest generation ever bred in Britain. Less excuse can be found for their elders, who had no chance of self-repudiation in action."

When Chamberlain returned from Munich with the shameful agreement he had signed with Hitler, there was no question that he had the support of the overwhelming majority of the British people—perhaps more than 90 percent of the people. The verdict of history is now in on the conflict between the Churchillian handful and the tide of British public opinion in the period preceding World War II.

In *Profiles in Courage*, our martyred President, John F. Kennedy, told stories of a number of American Senators and American Presidents who displayed exemplary fortitude in standing up against misled majorities in Congress or against a misled public opinion. John F. Kennedy had this kind of courage himself, and he had it in abundance.

About the situation and the commitment which the Senate will be discussing over the coming days, President Kennedy had this to say in July of 1963: ". . . To withdraw from that effort (the defense of South Vietnam) would mean a collapse not only in South Vietnam, but Southeast Asia, so we are going to stay there."

This was not an isolated statement, but one in a series of many similar statements, remarkable for their consistency and continuity, going back to 1956.

If President Kennedy were alive today, there can be little question about where he would stand on the Church-Cooper Resolution, or on the McGovern-Hatfield Resolution.

Gentlemen of the Senate! We are young people, but we know enough about the history of appeasement and about the Nature of Nazi and Communist totalitarianism, to be convinced that these two amendments, if they were ever approved by the United States Congress, would spell disaster both at home and abroad—not in decades to come, but in the next few years—perhaps in the immediate future.

For these two amendments are not a formula for peace; they are—we will mince no words about it—a formula for betrayal and capitulation, and for a neo-isolationism so rigid and so blind that it makes the "Fortress America" isolationism of the thirties look like the most radical internationalism in comparison.

The Church-Cooper Amendment not only demands that we get out of Cambodia by July 1; if rigidly interpreted, it would prevent the Administration from giving a single M16 rifle, or even a captured AK47 rifle, to the Cambodian government with which to defend itself against the North Vietnamese Communist aggression. In the eyes of the world it will be interpreted as saying that, so far as the United States Senate is concerned, the Communists can take over wherever they wish in Asia, and we will not lift a finger to assist their victims.

The McGovern-Hatfield Amendment would compound the mischief done by the Cooper-Church Amendment. By calling for the termination of all military activity in Vietnam by the end of 1970 and the withdrawal of all American forces by the end of June 30, 1971, it sets up a timetable whose excessive tempo and absolute rigidity constitute a virtual guarantee of a Communist takeover—not merely in Vietnam but throughout Southeast Asia.

In less than a year's time, the President has withdrawn 115,000 combat forces; and he has pledged the withdrawal of another 150,000 American soldiers over the next 12-month period. While ambitious, the President's timetable gives the South Vietnamese government the time it needs to take over the burden of defense in an organized manner; and it gives Southeast Asia a precious breathing space in which to organize its defenses against the further encroachment of Communist imperialism. *It is a timetable which, if Congress does not undercut it, can bring peace with freedom for Southeast Asia and peace with honor for the United States.*

The debate to date in the Senate has distressed us and made us apprehensive. We know that Senators are weary of the war, as the American people are, and that they would like to see it terminated as soon as possible. But we cannot help wondering whether those Senators who support these two amendments but of a sincere desire for peace realize that *the manner in which we withdraw from Vietnam is all-important*—that, if we withdraw with honor, we withdraw with credibility, whereas if we withdraw in humiliation and defeat there will be nothing left of our credibility.

More than one authority has made the point that it is American credibility that preserves the peace of the world. For if a time ever arrives when our allies and friends feel that they no longer trust us, and when our enemies have come to regard us as a paralyzed giant or a paper tiger, World War III would become a serious possibility. Perhaps the first point of testing would be the Middle East, where the Soviets might react to an American defeat in Southeast Asia by intervening openly to crush Israel and impose its empire throughout the Arab lands, all the way from the Indian Ocean to Gibraltar.

We also wonder, whether the Senators who support the amendments truly believe that a withdrawal in defeat from Vietnam would usher in a new era of domestic tranquility? We wonder whether they are not, at least, worried that the President might be right when he warned that such a humiliation, would produce a far more dangerous polarization in our society than the one we confront today.

Perhaps it would be better if the President had acted in greater consultation with Congress. Perhaps it would be better if there were a clearer delineation of the powers of the President and the role of Congress in the field of foreign affairs. But are the Senators who sponsor the pending amendments not at least concerned that their proposal seriously undercuts the President's authority as Commander-in-Chief at a critical juncture; that it creates a spectacle of division that can only delight and embolden our enemies; that if they push their contest with the President to its logical conclusion, they will stand responsible before history for the shattering defeat which is bound to result, and for all the tragic consequences that will flow from it?

We appeal to those Senators who have supported the President's program for withdrawal with honor from Vietnam to stand fast against the pressures—yes, and outright intimidation—that will be brought to bear on them.

We appeal to those Senators who have supported the pending amendments to reassess the relative risks of the President's course as against the course of surrender and humiliation.

We cannot at this point begin to match the massive and lavishly financed lobby which has been visiting Senate offices on a non-stop basis. The groups of the undersigned, and of other concerned young people from all parts of the country will be visiting your offices over the coming days. We hope that they will get the same respectful treatment that you have accorded to those who came before us.

URGENT NEED FOR NATIONAL ACTION

HON. J. WILLIAM STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1970

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, over 2 weeks have passed since the tragic deaths

of four students on the campus of Kent State University. Last Friday, two more students died on the campus of Jackson State.

The urgent need for national action has never been more evident. That this terrible thing can happen again is shocking and abhorrent to every thinking American.

Mr. Speaker, before the events at Jackson State, 71 of my fellow colleagues requested to join with me in expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should establish a commission to examine the recent events on our college campuses.

As the original sponsor of this resolution, I know that my colleagues join me in hoping that a Presidential Commission's examination of events at Kent State, Jackson State, and other college campuses will result in specific recommendations to guide us as individuals and as a nation in meeting our responsibilities.

EDWARD VASON JONES: THE NATION'S BEST RESTORATION ARCHITECT

HON. MASTON O'NEAL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1970

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it pleases me greatly to know that my close, personal friend of many years, Edward Vason Jones, of Albany, Ga., has attained the recognition he so richly deserves in the field of restoration architecture.

He has been chosen by Mrs. Richard M. Nixon to design major changes in the Blue Room of the White House.

The First Lady selected Jones after she went to New York and personally viewed the marvelous work he accomplished in creating six rooms of Early Americana for the Metropolitan Museum of Art.

Berry B. Tracy, curator of the American Wing of the Metropolitan, and Clem Conger, curator of the White House, were high in their praise of Jones. He also gained national attention for his great work in the State Department's eighth floor diplomatic reception rooms.

Mr. Speaker, in early April of this year Maxine Cheshire of the Washington Post discussed the proposed White House changes in considerable detail. I am happy to offer this for the RECORD in the interest of history:

RESTORATION

(By Maxine Cheshire)

Mrs. Richard Nixon is bringing the nation's foremost 19th-century restoration architect to the White House for a refurbishing that will include a major overhaul in the Blue Room and a new look in the Red Room.

The expert is Edward Vason Jones of Albany, Ga., recognized as the most authoritative voice on circa-1800 interiors in the United States.

It was Jones who created six flawless rooms for the 19th-Century Americana Exhibit, which Mrs. Nixon is scheduled to open at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York on Sunday night.

He is "so good," one Metropolitan spokesman said yesterday, that Berry B. Tracy, the curator of the American Wing, "would accept no one else to work on the settings."

Jones, because he has been tied up so many months on the Met project, has had only one conference with Mrs. Nixon at the White House.

He was introduced to her by her new curator, Clem Conger. Jones worked with Conger to create the magnificent woodwork which President and Mrs. Nixon admire so greatly in the State Department's Diplomatic Reception Rooms.

Jones had craftsmen and millworkers in Georgia reproduce woodwork from a distinguished Philadelphia house in the period of 1775-1800.

Jones' ideas for 1600 Pennsylvania Ave. haven't got to the planning stage yet. But one source said last night that the first priority will be given to the state rooms.

These were the major interiors where the former Mrs. John F. Kennedy began a restoration project that she hoped other First Ladies would keep alive.

Mrs. Nixon is known to have been "boning up" on the 19th century and has some very definite ideas about the way she wants things to look.

Mrs. Kennedy's decorating was done by a Frenchman, Stephan Boudin of Paris—a fact she tried unsuccessfully to keep secret from American decorators and American taxpayers.

Not everyone approved Boudin's ideas when they were completed, including the Winterthur Museum's Henry F. duPont, who headed the restoration committee.

DuPont so intensely disliked the Blue Room that he grumpily referred to it, upon completion, as "Boudin's Boudoir."

"The Blue Room is going to be the Blue Room again," said someone who knows. "The architect, Hoban, who designed the White House, intended that to be the most beautiful room in the building, and it simply is not."

The source added:

"I know that research is being done to try to find out what Hoban had in mind. I know it couldn't have been that silk fringe hanging around the ceiling. I think wooden cornices will probably be the first thing added, with new BLUE silk on the walls and windows, instead of white."

All the state room fabrics are going to be replaced, but the Red Room is scheduled for the most drastic changes.

The cerise color scheme is going to be replaced with something that is a truer red.

Mrs. Nixon, who is keenly sensitive to colors, is known to like the pale shade of almost-chartreuse *moire* that is now on the walls of the Green Room.

That color will "probably" be used again, but the silk may not be the same very expensive water-marked type which was specially woven for the room during the restoration of Mrs. Kennedy.

"Mrs. Nixon loved what Mrs. Kennedy had done," another source said last night. "But that doesn't mean it cannot change and get better and better. The Nixons want the very best, and it is very exciting that they put so much emphasis on improving it."

"This is a field Mrs. Nixon was interested in before she became First Lady," the source said. "She used to spend her afternoons browsing through the great antiques galleries in New York, and this is her very favorite period."

Everyone knowledgeable about the White House has been aware since the Nixons arrived that the state rooms have grown shabby from the hard wear and tear of some 9 million tourists who have filed through in recent years and put their hands on the walls and upholstery and snipped tassels off the fringes.

In addition to the redecorating, which is long overdue, the Nixons are known to want to upgrade the furniture in various rooms and get museum-caliber replacements which might not have been available to Mrs. Kennedy when she was foraging.

The Oval Drawing Room upstairs in the private quarters, where the President and First Lady traditionally entertain heads of state privately before state dinners, has some very valuable 18th-century French salon furniture. But it also has some reproductions, and those are slated for replacement as soon as possible.

SOME MEN ARE PROUD TO EXPRESS THEIR LOVE FOR THEIR COUNTRY

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1970

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I received yesterday a letter from Sgt. Kenneth Lee who lives in Jersey City, which I am most proud to represent.

Sergeant Lee was drafted into the Army in 1968 and, after serving his full tour of duty, will be released this coming August.

In this time of discontent when school buildings are burned, public institutions bombed, and the flag desecrated, while students are shot and tempers rage over our national military policy, I am able to report to my colleagues in the House that we still have among us patriotic young men such as Sergeant Lee who, as he says in his letter, "love our flag because it stands, today as it did before, for the finest country on earth."

Sergeant Lee and others like him, who are not too proud to express their love for their country as Sergeant Lee has done through word and deed, are the bulwark of our great Nation.

There are hundreds of thousands of young people such as Sergeant Lee, who serve in the Armed Forces and who work within and have faith in our constitutional government.

My faith in our young people remains unshaken. I am grateful to Sergeant Lee for his letter because it strengthens that faith.

Sergeant Kenneth Lee's letter follows:

COMPANY C, 440TH SIGNAL BATTALION,
APO New York, May 11, 1970.

DEAR SIR: This letter is about the day I was drafted into the Army, and I felt I had to put it on paper to let others know how I felt about our flag and country.

The first day in the Army, September 5, 1968 was a rough day. As I swore my allegiance before an officer in Newark's Federal Building, I felt a chill running down my side. Then I looked up at our National Colors. I realized that I was a part of the Flag, and it was a moment I will remember all my life.

It brought to my mind men who went into teaching, marriage and parenthood to get out of the draft, the burning of draft cards, the fleeing to Canada, and the hippies who think America is too old fashioned and mistaken.

If I were to tell you why I love and respect our Flag, it would take a book, because it would be a long and brave story

of America and the gallant men who gave their lives so that we could live in freedom. I love our Flag because it stands, today as it did before, for the finest country on earth.

There is a need today for a new commitment to the basic principles that make our Flag so great. I would hope that everybody would find some way to display this beautiful banner, not just on patriotic days, but on every day throughout the year.

Such respect for the Flag and country would do a lot to bring about a renewed pride and faith in America. Especially for the young men fighting in Vietnam.

Thank you,

KENNETH LEE,
Sergeant, USA.

DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS DIS-
AVOW STUDENT STRIKE AT UNI-
VERSITY OF OREGON

HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1970

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, disadvantaged and minority students have sometimes been unjustly accused of alining themselves with the most militant campus protests. Personally I am convinced that many of these students are, in fact, among the most dedicated and hardest working in colleges and universities today.

The five student directors of disadvantaged programs at the University of Oregon in my State and district have just sent me a statement which reinforces my conviction that these students hold higher education in high regard. Besides disavowing support of or involvement in the strike, which some students were striving to organize on the University of Oregon campus, these students emphasize their desire to use legitimate means to negotiate with the university administration and to take full advantage of the educational opportunities now open to them.

Because the students' statement is well worth our close attention, I insert it at this point along with two related editorials from the Eugene Register-Guard and the Portland Oregonian:

MINORITY STUDENTS

Five student directors of disadvantaged programs at the University of Oregon have issued a statement disavowing any support of, or official involvement in the recent student strike at the UO.

Felipe Canedo, director of the Mexican-American program and one of the signers of the statement said the minority leaders especially objected to the strikers' demand for open admissions for minority and poor white students.

"We already had been negotiating for open enrollment through legitimate means," Canedo said, "and the issuance of this demand was made without consulting us."

He said the strikers "have caused more problems for us . . . they have hurt us in our recruitment and given the public fuel for prejudicial fires."

Program directors who signed the statement in addition to Canedo were Jose de la Isla, director of the High School Equivalency Program; Richard Wilson, director, Native-American Program; Lucious Hicks, co-director

of Project 75; and James Hill, co-director of Upward Bound.

A STATEMENT FROM THE PROGRAMS FOR THE DISADVANTAGED PERTAINING TO RECENT STUDENT DEMONSTRATIONS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

The programs for the disadvantaged (Upward Bound, High School Equivalency Program, Project 75, Native American Educational Program and Mexican-American Educational Program) concur that the student strike does not relate directly to the goals of these programs. Several major points should be taken into consideration:

1. The various "demands" relating to minority and disadvantaged students were advocated not at the first calling but in the second.

2. Program students cannot afford classroom boycott since the ambition of the programs is to take full advantage of all course offerings at this University.

3. All program students receive financial aids. That financial aid is subject to being withdrawn if program students participate in "disruptive activity."

4. The consequence of participation in some aspects of the strike requires the willingness to be arrested and to pay bail. To our knowledge no program student can afford the police record and the bail money.

5. It should be remembered that the political climate in the state and nation is one where the first victims of retribution are the programs creating educational opportunities.

6. The assumption cannot be made that the striking students and the programs are in the same negotiating situation. After the strike almost all of the striking students have a secure niche in the University. This is not true of the program students. Negotiations with the University relate to the day in and day out continuation of the programs and academic success of program students.

Program students (if any) who participate, do so entirely on an individual basis. The program directors have instructed program students on these points and concurrence has been obtained. Because the University has not held itself accountable to the complete success of program students, program students cannot be held accountable for the unresolved problems in the University.

We do not fear nor avoid confrontations on relevant issues, and the public at large should take careful note that we do not prefer injustice to disorder. The fact is that this "strike" is not relevant to our needs or desires, and we wish to make clear to each of our communities that we do not support it.

Signed by: Jose de la Isla, Director, High School Equivalent Program; Felipe Canedo, Director, Mexican-American Program; Richard Wilson, Director, Native-American Program; Lucious Hicks, Co-Director, Project 75; James Hill, Co-Director, Upward Bound.

[From the Eugene Register-Guard, May 3, 1970]

THE REAL SPOKESMEN

Elsewhere on this page is a short, important statement. It is from the student leaders of five programs for minority and disadvantaged groups at the University of Oregon. They seek to disassociate themselves and their groups from the "strike" that some radical students tried to organize a week ago.

Unlike some other students, these people understand that going to college is a privilege, a privilege that many of their friends have been denied. They know the larger community is watching, hoping they do well. It is a matter of understandable pride for them to do well.

The radicals who tried to make it appear that they spoke for these groups did them a

grave disservice. The Register-Guard is happy to print the statement on this page.

[From the Portland Oregonian, May 2, 1970]

SUBSIDIZED RIOTERS

There is a common assumption that students of minority races are generally allied with the militant protesters on college and university campuses. That this is not at all the truth of the matter was demonstrated this week at the University of Oregon when student leaders of five programs designed to encourage enrollment of such students emphatically disavowed involvement in agitation for a student strike there.

One of the demands of the "strike" leaders was that university admission standards be dropped for applicants of all minority races and poor whites. A statement signed by Felipe Canedo, Mexican-American program director, speaking for his and other programs involving Mexican-Americans, blacks, and so-called "disadvantaged" young men and women, specifically rejected that demand. It said the "strike" promoters "have caused more problems for us . . . They have hurt us in our recruitment and given the public fuel for prejudicial fires."

This tallies with the experience on many other campuses. Except in those instances in which race is a particular issue in a protest, blacks and other minority races are seldom involved in any significant degree. College and university administrators who have dealt first-hand with campus unrest and violence generally agree that the complaints of minority-race students differ markedly from those of the typical campus activist. The former want an education and appreciate its value despite the obstacle of their backgrounds, whereas the middle and upper class radicals who constitute the core of rebellion among students want to tear the system down. This is no help to poor students anxious to taste the benefits of education.

The poor are, of course, subsidized in many instances, by the government or the institution. So, too, are the more well-to-do students who have the time to devote to sit-ins, strikes, rock-throwing and bank-burning; they are subsidized by parents or others who pay their way. Some rioters, incidentally, are subsidized by the public; they are the faculty members who are sometimes among the chief strategists of violence on the campus. Such self-destructive subsidies make little sense.

BREWSTER GI WROTE THE DAY BEFORE HE DIED—"WITH SUPPORT, THIS WAR WILL END SOON"

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1970

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the RECORD, as part of the debate on Cambodia, a letter from a young helicopter pilot, Thomas M. McDonald, who wrote a significant letter about the operation on the day before he lost his life.

He wrote:

"The move that President Nixon has taken . . . is the most significant and outstanding move anyone has taken . . ."

He then went on to describe the reason for and the results of the first few days of the mission.

I submit herewith the Massillon Evening Independent stories which give,

first, the text of the letter and second, the story of this fine, young man:

BREWSTER GI WROTE THE DAY BEFORE HE DIED—"WITH SUPPORT, THIS WAR WILL END SOON"

(NOTE.—Army Warrant Officer Thomas M. McDonald, 21, of Brewster, died in combat Tuesday in Cambodia. The day before his death he wrote to his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas M. McDonald, and his sister Cindy expressing his views on the war and the Cambodian involvement. The letter is printed in its entirety.)

"Hi folks and Sis,

"Well, I'm back for the day and tonight. I've been involved in the Cambodia operation. I'd like to tell you some about it and some of my feelings on the issue. I don't know what type of feelings any of you have or what political views you take on the U.S. intervention in Vietnam, but here is how I feel.

"The move that President Nixon has taken and is standing pat on is the significant and outstanding move anyone has taken since this war has begun.

"We have been hurt time and time again by the installations the NVA have in Cambodia. Their operation is not a small one, but major enemy installations. For six years the NVA have been coming across the border, killing and destroying U.S. and Vietnamese people, homes, etc., then returning to safety back across the border.

"Now they can't. We've hit them and very hard.

"Even in these short few days you can tell the difference. Hundreds of the enemy are surrendering, we are not being hit near as much, and we are destroying their strongholds and sanctuaries.

"If we can only gain and hold the support of our own people, this war will end soon. Every day all of us read about all of protesting, bombings and opposition toward the war and the decision of our president toward Cambodia.

"To be frank, I'm very ashamed of the actions of my own people in the United States. I don't even want to return to all of that. We are here for a purpose and we are accomplishing our goal.

"I've become quite involved with what we are doing here. I don't know how to explain it exactly; maybe it's even corny to say I believe in a free democratic society, a free world, and the United States of America and everything it stands for.

"President Nixon is our man. We that are here believe in him, pledge him our votes and support. I truly loathe the man or woman who denounces him and hate to hell every protester that lives.

"I know that what I have just said is a bit strong, but I firmly believe this and I hope you share my ideas, because I'm here and I see what's happening every day. The people in the states don't.

"As for my personal well being, I'm healthy, suntanned and safe. My only problem is that I am homesick and miss and love all of you. We are quite busy with this operation and I don't have much time to write letters, so please bear with me.

"I'll be going to Australia the first of June for R and R and believe me I'm ready.

"So I'll close for now. My mail has not caught up with me yet. I hope it does soon. Tell everyone 'hi' for me and take care."

Love,

MICK.

"HE DIDN'T DIE IN VAIN"—FAMILY

(By Mary Wallace)

Tragedy entered the Thomas M. McDonald residence at 434 Tuscarawas st, Brewster, Friday night when they learned their only son—Thomas M. (Mickey) McDonald—died in combat Tuesday in Cambodia.

Mickey's parents and his teen-age sister Cindy still grieve today and they will in the future, but the blow has been softened for them.

Saturday's mail brought a letter written by their son the day before he died while serving as a helicopter pilot.

News of American reaction to the Cambodian operation had reached the troops and apparently prompted Mickey to share his convictions with his family.

The McDonalds respect his opinions and are proud of him and his devotion to America. They do not feel he has died in vain.

For these reasons, they are sharing his letter, knowing well that not all Americans agree and that they may be criticized.

Mickey was interviewed last spring by a wire service reporter concerning his views on "Moratorium Day." He later received a letter of protest from a woman who wanted to persuade him that he was wrong.

McDonald read it in Vietnam. The letter and nine months of combat which followed the awarding of his Army wings last July did not change his mind.

During those months, he decided to return to college (he had completed 1½ years) when his enlistment was up. He already had received his acceptance papers from Ohio State university for the March 1971 quarter.

Plans of the Fairless high school graduate were figured precisely. Although his enlistment was not up, he had already "signed on" for an extra six months' duty in Asia. This would have taken him up to time for the spring 1971 quarter.

The usual signs of mourning were present Sunday at the McDonald residence where friends, neighbors and relatives called to express their sympathy.

But a quiet dignity prevailed. There was even a Mother's Day gift from Mickey—a vase of lilacs centered the dining room table.

Mickey had given the lilac bush to his mother on Mother's Day when he was so small.

WHY ARE WE IN VIETNAM?

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1970

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, in the May 9 edition of the New York Times there appeared an article by Anthony Lewis discussing this Nation's continued presence in Vietnam. In the interests of open discussion, I place Mr. Lewis' article in the RECORD. The article follows:

WHY ARE WE IN VIETNAM?

(By Anthony Lewis)

LONDON.—President Nixon's action in Cambodia has had at least one constructive effect: it has dramatized the flawed character, not to say illogic, of his declared plan to get the United States out of Vietnam.

As outlined in his address to the nation last Nov. 2, the plan had two objectives. One was gradually to withdraw American troops, the other was to achieve the political goal that the troops were there to secure—maintenance of the Thieu-Ky regime or some other non-Communist government in South Vietnam.

In short, the President seemed to have it in mind to pull American troops out and still "win." That was the significance of his repeated warnings against "defeat" and "humiliation."

INCONSISTENT GOALS

On the face of it, the two objectives were inconsistent. If we could not make the writ of the Thieu-Ky Government run with 500,-

000 American soldiers, how could we expect to secure that aim as we withdrew?

The Administration's answer, the key to the plan, was "Vietnamization": we would strengthen the forces of South Vietnam quickly enough to permit a reasonably prompt American withdrawal.

Possibly out of wishful thinking, most Americans assumed that Mr. Nixon was committed to the withdrawal part of the formula. If South Vietnam did not prove politically or militarily capable of taking up the withdrawing Americans' burden, she would have to compromise with the other side; in any case, we would go.

POLITICAL PRIORITY

But now, in the Cambodian affair, we see that the President still rates the securing of his political aims in South Vietnam over the objective of withdrawal. He had to send troops into Cambodia, it is explained, to clear out the threat from there and make possible continuing withdrawals. In other words, we have to assure the Thieu-Ky Government's security before we withdraw. We, not the South Vietnamese themselves.

If American military action, in Cambodia or elsewhere, could fully guarantee a happy political future for South Vietnam, how simple life would be. But we know from five years of death and destruction that it is not like that. And so the Cambodian action brings us back to the old questions: Can American arms win a political victory? And at what cost?

A British politician has just addressed himself to those questions in a speech that President Nixon and other American conservatives ought to read. The speaker was Enoch Powell, a right-wing figure in the Conservative party, an unsentimental man, a man utterly opposed to Communism.

"American military power," Mr. Powell said, "cannot secure any specific political result in Southeast Asia. This is a war in which the United States can win, if it wishes, every battle; but it is a war which the United States is bound to lose.

"I have no doubt that the United States forces can eliminate the Vietcong base which has so long flourished—of course it has—in Cambodia. But when the operation is over, the underlying facts of the situation reassert themselves like the tide washing out footmarks in the sand.

"The ultimate fact reasserts itself: the Americans do not live there; everyone knows that their presence is destined to be temporary; everyone knows the realities which will prevail over them."

Of course victory of a kind is available to the United States. The other day American forces went into a little Cambodian town called Snoul. They bombed it and burned it and then looted the few pathetic belongings left. A colonel said, "We had no choice." A soldier, looking at the body of a child killed by napalm, said, "I've seen worse, but I hate to see the kids get it."

WE MUST LEAVE SOMETIME

And that sort of victory, even if we are ready to pay the moral price for it, will still not secure Mr. Nixon's political objective. Some day, as Mr. Powell said, we shall have to go, and then the Vietnamese and the Cambodians will settle their own future. The North Vietnamese like to say that they have fought off foreign invaders for a thousand years, and they will be there long after the Americans are gone.

The longer we stay in Vietnam, the more painful and humiliating will be our eventual exit. "It is the futility of American policy," Enoch Powell said, "which constitutes its culpability." We can still bargain. But when the American Government at last strips away its illusions, it will adopt a policy with a single objective overriding all others: to get out of Vietnam.

AN ACTION PROGRAM TO END THE WAR IN INDOCHINA

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1970

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the New York Law Journal, May 14, 1970]

AN ACTION PROGRAM TO END THE WAR IN INDOCHINA

As members of the legal profession we are alarmed by the action of the President in extending the war into Cambodia. We are deeply concerned that the divisions caused by this war endanger our fundamental institutions.

On May 20, 1970, we will cease, to the extent consistent with our professional responsibilities, our usual business and devote our efforts exclusively toward ending the war in Indochina. We call upon all lawyers to join us. We seek to fulfill our responsibilities as lawyers, and candidates for admission to the Bar, by speaking directly with our elected representatives and administration officials to advocate immediate withdrawal from Cambodia, the earliest possible termination of our involvement in Indochina and a return to the rule of law at home and abroad.

TUESDAY, MAY 19, 4:30 P.M.

Convocation at the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, 42 West 44th Street.

Speakers: Francis Plimpton; John V. Lindsay; Eleanor Holmes Norton; Bernard Botwin.

Details of Washington program and press conference; reports on continuing programs for effective action to end the war.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 20

Lobbying trip to Washington—Final Briefing and Team Assignments En Route.

Departure: 6:30 a.m., Penn Station, Train No. 131.

Return: 7:30 p.m., Union Station, Washington.

If you are joining us in Washington, meet us at the Quality Motel, 415 New Jersey Ave., N.W. at 10 A.M.

Sponsors: Morris B. Abram, Fritz Alexander, Bernard Botwin, Robert Carter, Ramsey Clark, Louis Craco, Stanley Danzig, Adrian W. DeWind, Simeon Golar, Arthur Goldberg.

John V. Lindsay, Robert McKay, Eleanor Holmes Norton, Paul O'Dwyer, Manfred Ohrenstein, Francis Plimpton, Simon H. Rifkin, Orville H. Schell, Theodore Sorensen, Michael Sovern.

Joseph Trachtman, Lyman Tondel, Cyrus Vance, William vanden Heuvel, William Warren.

Floyd Abrams, Joseph J. Ackell, Barry A. Adelman, Garrett J. Albert, Neale M. Albert, Mark H. Alcott, John S. Allee, Burton Z. Alter, Robert S. Anderson, Roger Andrus, Albert M. Appel, Guy P. Archer, Carl R. Aron, Paul H. Asofsky, Steven T. Atkins, Jack C. Auspitz, Edwin H. Baker, Joel C. Balsam, Haywood F. Bands, Frederick Baum, Joel I. Beeler, Edwin H. Bennett, Donald L. Bergmann, Peter A. A. Berle, Arthur S. Berner, Lawrence D. Bernfeld, Stanley B. Bernstein, William Bernstein, Richard A. Bertocci, Joel P. Bielowitz, Nathaniel J. Bickford, Diane W. Bishop, Charles O. Blaisdell III, Charles M. Blieberg, Regina Bligh, Neil J. Bloomfield, Allen Blumstein, Judith Boles, Glen E. Books, Frederick B. Boyden, Edward Bradley, David N. Brainin, Harry Brecher, Stephen M. Brett, Allen H. Brill.

Joseph L. Broadwin, Bruce Bromley, Patricia A. Brooks, Walston S. Brown, Lawrence C. Browne, Thomas L. Ryan, Fenton J. Burke,

William L. Burke, Howard C. Buschman III, Albert K. Butzel, Daniel L. Callihan, Doris Carroll, Seymour A. Casper, Franklin Ciaccio, John H. Clark, Jerome L. Cohen, Julius Cohen, Martin A. Coleman, Warren H. Colodner, Irving Constant, Allan F. Conwill, O. Wayne Coon, Steven D. Cooper, John M. Corn, John F. Corrigan, Arlene Cramer, James L. Crane, Thomas F. Curnin, William M. Curtis, John S. D'Alimonte, Joan C. Daly, Sidney Danielson, Richard H. Darsky, Jack David, George A. Davidson, Richard R. Davidson, Monty Davis.

Arthur A. Dawbusch II, John H. de Boisblanc, Charles R. Dickey, Leonard F. DiNapoli Jr., Steven P. Dolberg, David Dolgenos, Barbara L. Dolgin, John A. Donovan, Jerome Doyle, Robert J. Dryfoos, Robert F. Dunbar, Allen B. Eaker, Lawrence D. Eisenberg, David N. Ellenhorn, Dwight W. Ellis III, George M. Elvin, Howard S. Ende, Walter A. Engdahl, John W. Fager, Larry B. Faigin, Robert H. Falk, Walter V. Farber, Peter L. Feicher.

Richard T. Abrams, David Abramson, Elliott M. Abramson, Stephanie W. Abramson, George B. Adams Jr., Michael B. Adams, John R. Adler, John F. Afton, Fritz W. Alexander II, Richard Allan, David R. Almond, Irving J. Alter, Ethan D. Alvey, Martin B. Amdur, John K. Anderson, Ashley R. Andrews, Woodbury H. Andrews, Patricia N. Andron, Hans H. Angermueller, Christopher C. Angell, Nicholas B. Angell, John P. Arning, Selma Arnold, Richard C. Art, Robert Arum, Robert W. Ashton, Harrison H. Augur, Philip J. Bahr, John C. Baity, Robert H. Baker, G. B. Balamut, Charles Ballou.

Eugene F. Bannigan, Paul E. Barke, Franklin Bass, Frank C. Batherman, Jeffrey H. Becker, William J. Beerworth, Carol Bellamy, Michael S. Belohlavek, Terence H. Benbow, Stephen Benjamin, James W. B. Benkart, Philip P. Berelson, Marshall C. Berger, Paul B. Bergman, Daniel G. Bergstein, George Berlstein, Richard Bernard, William Bertin, Richard E. Best, John W. Biasucci, Peter R. Bierstedt, Charles A. Bilch, Elliott L. Bischoff, Richard C. Blake, Robert S. Blanc, Herbert H. Blau, Margaret J. Bletner, Melvin Block, Mock N. Bloom, Martin J. Bluestein, Herbert M. Blum, Alan G. Blumberg, Barton P. Blumberg, Edward E. Blythe, Bruce Bodner, Robert Boehm, Laurence W. Boes, Robert C. Boffa, E. Carrington Boggan, Alfred J. Bohlinger, William S. Boles, George Bolsten, Lawrence P. J. Bonaguidi.

R. Andrew Boose, Charles W. Borgsdorf, William P. Bowden Jr., Roger Boyle, Henry A. Brachtl, Susan P. Brachtl, Michael E. Bradley, James J. Brady Jr., Charles Bramham, Sidney R. Bresnick, John M. Brickman, Clarke W. Brinckerhoff, Samuel Brodsky, Colin S. Brooks, J. Harold Brooks, Joseph E. Browdy, Neal A. Brown, Lee Carl Bromberg, Barry R. Bryan, James Earl Brumm, John C. Bullitt, Richard B. Burt, Samuel C. Butler, Abe Bunks, George R. Bunn Jr., James B. Burke, Gilman S. Burke, Michael A. Butterworth, Edward O. Byrne, Raymond S. Calamaro, Peter J. Calderon, Paulette M. Caldwell, J. Michael Callan, Harold I. Cammer, Rutherford B. Campbell Jr., Peter C. Canellos, Gerald I. Carp, John P. Carroll Jr., J. Speed Carroll.

David B. Chapnick, Michael A. Chapnick, Joseph Chase, Julius S. Chase, Leonard Chazen, Marc P. Cherno, Richard Cherry, Robert Chira, Donald C. Christ, Brian Christaldi, Joseph Chubb, Judith A. Cion, David W. Cohen, Joel J. Cohen, George M. Cohen, Julius Cohen, Myron Cohen, Stephen H. Cohen, Stephen L. Cohen, Seymour L. Collin, J. Peter Coll Jr., Adrian A. Colley, Thomas F. Collins, John J. Connor, Michael A. Cooper, Coster Constantine, Richard M. Contino, John R. Cornell, Philip D. Corsi, Edward N. Costikyan, Ruffen H. Cotton Jr., Glenn E. Coven Jr., Lewis R. Cowan, Randal R. Craft Jr., Thomas C. Crane, Kathleen O. Cress,

Dennis C. Cronin, Robert D. Croog, W. Dennis Cross, Paul A. Crofty, Christopher Crowley, Hugh Cunniffe, Ronald F. Daltz, Donald J. Dakin, Peter A. Dakin, Robert Roy Dann, Ethel Danzig, Robert F. Darling, David Darlow, Peter H. Darrow.

Jack David, Robert Davies, Donald R. Davis, M. Davis, Pamela Davis, William S. Davis, Daniel A. Dean Jr., John B. Deans, Jacques L. Debrot, Quentin J. DeFazio, Robert E. Denham, Paul R. Derensis, George Desipio, Stephen H. Deutsch, Edward B. Dickson, John Dickey, Risa Dickstein, Jeffrey L. Dissin, M. David Distler, Lawrence Dittleman, Hugh M. Doagan, Paul G. Dadyk, Jonathan L. Dolgen, Ambrose Doskow, Hugh M. Dougan, Robert H. V. Douglass, John De P. Douw, Donald F. Driver, Jonathan D. DuBois, Barry H. Dubner, Gerrard A. Duevois, Wolcott B. Dunham Jr.

John W. Durkee, Robert J. Eckert, Gilbert S. Edelson, Richard J. Egger Jr., Herbert A. Einhorn, Everett A. Eisenberg, David J. Ellis, Lawrence R. Eno, Gerald A. Eppinger, Joseph Erdman, Peter C. Ernster, Ellen G. Estes, Stephen E. Estroff, Wm. M. Everts Jr., John Miles Evans, Douglas C. Fairhurst, Haliburton Fales 2d., Donald W. Farley, Robert D. Farley.

Dennis B. Farrar, Stanley F. Farrar, Brenda Feigen Fasteau, Gerald A. Feffer, Ronnie Fein, Justin N. Feldman, Paul K. Feldman, John Ferrell, Joel J. Finer, Joseph V. Fiocca, Bernard Fischman, Peter R. Fisher, Robert I. Fisher, Bruce D. Fitzgerald, William E. Flowers.

William P. Ford, Alexander D. Forger, Michael V. Forrestal, Samuel B. Fortenbaugh III, David L. Fox, Jeffrey Frackman, Stephen Fraidin, Hans J. Frank, Spencer W. Frank Jr., Arthur H. Fredston, Burton M. Freeman, Morton Frellicher, Robert W. Freeman, Jack G. Friedman, Milton H. Friedman, Roth W. Friedman.

Victor J. Friedman, Louis B. Frost, Abraham Fuchsberg, Jacob D. Fuchsberg, Richard D. Gaines, Roy Gainsburg, Herbert Galant, Jeffrey A. Galant, Douglas M. Galin, Mary Jean Gallagher, Alan J. Gardner, Lloyd K. Garrison, Murray Gartner, Robert J. Geniesse, Joel I. Genzer, Jay E. Gerber, Herman B. Gerlinger, David Gerson, George P. Giard, Frederick D. H. Gilbert, Peter R. Gilbert, Eugene J. Gillespie Jr., Robert J. Gillispie, Robert M. Ginsberg, Sheila Ginsberg, R. Ginsburg, Charles S. Gittleman, Edmund G. Glass, Michael K. Glenn, Matthew Gluck.

George P. Felleman, Stephen R. Field, Roger S. Fine, Bernard Finkelstein, Charlotte Moses Fischman, Vincent R. Fitzpatrick, Leonard N. Flamm, Richard Fleischmann, John C. Fleming Jr., Donald Flexner, Stephen B. Flood, Terry L. Flora, Patricia A. Flynn, James A. M. Foley, John C. Fontaine, Gary L. Ford, Philip R. Forlenza, Charles D. Forman, David P. Frank, Stephen Freeman, Theodore H. Friedman, Jacob D. Fuchsberg, Robert M. Fuster.

Robert F. X. Fusaro, Ciro A. Gamboni, Stephen D. Gardner, Fred N. Gerard, Herman Gerringer, James W. Giddens, Stephen Gillers, N. T. Gilroy Jr., Arthur J. Ginsberg, Michael I. Ginsberg, A. Robert Giordano, Max Gitter, John A. Golden, C. Martin Goldenberg, Marvin S. Goldklang, Gerald Goldsholle, David Z. Gordon, Mark D. Gordon, Richard M. Gottlieb.

Raymond P. Green, Ronald Greenberg, Philip Greenblatt, Bernard H. Greene, Edward F. Greene, Jerome L. Greene, Thomas A. Greene, Jay Greenfield, Bernard L. Greer Jr., L. Robert Griffin, Robert S. Grimes, Lawrence M. Grosberg, Peter A. Gross, Susan Grossi, Raymond S. Hack, Peter K. Haje, Everett J. Haller, David Halper, Gail Sanger Halperin, Eric Harris, Gerald Harris, Jonathan M. Harris, Raymond S. Harris, John L. Hawkins.

Walter F. X. Healy, Marc Hecht, William E. Hegarty, Andrew H. Heine, Robert M. Heller, Joseph S. Helman, David I. Helman, David A.

Helms, Arthur A. Herman, Philip J. Heyman, David F. Hixson, Stephen Patrick Hoban, Robert B. Hodes, Harold Hoffman, Richard M. Hoffman, Elizabeth Holtzman, Robert Horowitz, Louis L. Hoynes Jr., Allen S. Hubbard Jr.

David N. Hurwitz, Lawrence C. Hutchings, William T. Hutton, David R. Hyde, Kathy Imholz, Joseph S. Iseman, Arnold S. Jacobs, Joseph W. Jacobs, Leon I. Jacobson, Nathaniel H. James, Herbert G. Johnson, Neal Johnston, Francis R. Jones, Arthur Kalish, Steven C. Kany, Mark N. Kaplan, Morris J. Kaplan, Joel J. Karp, Ed Kaufmann, Ein Kaufman, James R. Keegan.

Thomas V. Glynn, Steven Godeberg, Michael H. Goff, Steven S. Goldberg, Michael M. Goldman, Marvin G. Goldan, Richard J. Goldman, Sherwin M. Goldman, Bernard H. Goldstein, Alan E. Golomb, Marilyn Golomb, E. Robert Goodkind, Ezra N. Goodman, Paul E. Goodspeed, Eugene W. Goodwillie Jr., Richard Goodyear, Burton K. Gordon.

Samuel Gordon, Robert I. Gosse, Wallace Gossett, Robert W. Gottlieb, Lawrence G. Greau, Andrew Graham, Paul R. Grand, Carroll Grant, Richard N. Gray, Robert S. Greenbaum, Michael H. Greenberg, David G. Griff, John W. Griffith Jr., Peter Gruenberger, George J. Grumach Jr., Michael Gruson, R. Guglielmino, Arthur Gussaruff, Ronald E. Guttman, Thomas H. Hagroort.

Phillip M. Hahn, Bruce D. Haims, John H. Hall, Robert Halper, Alexander R. Hamilton, Robert W. Hamilton, William G. Hancock, H. B. Hander, Covington Hardee, Adiri S. Hardin Jr., Colin E. Harley, George Harris, John V. Hayes, Kay Ellen Hayes, Mary Hays, Arthur J. Heath, Stuart Hecker, Barbara A. Heckman, Isaac Heimbinder, Patrick Heininger.

Michael Heitner, Kenneth Held, Edward O. Henneman, Robert G. Heyman, Richard F. Hiegel, Frederick W. Hilles Jr., Chester J. Hinshaw, Arnold Hoffman, Claire Hogenauer, Donald L. Holley, William J. Honan III, Wade S. Hooker Jr., Robert Horan, Richard A. Horgan, John J. A. Hossenlopp, Richard R. Howe, Sidney P. Howell, Charles E. Hoyt, Jeffrey P. Hughes, A. Thomas Hunt, Spencer C. Hunt, Roger B. Hunting, Peter D. Hutcheon, Phillip G. Huyck, Jerome E. Hyman, Edward J. Hzidin.

John E. Impert, Jeffrey Ingber, William J. Ivey, Randolph Jackson, Bernard E. Jacob, Jane B. Jacobs, Stephen M. Jacoby, Harris S. Jaffe, Robert D. Joffe, Kenneth W. Johnson, John F. Johnston 2nd, William A. Joseph, Robert E. Juiceam, Frederick C. Kaels, Anthony C. Kahn, Herbert Kahn, Louis Kahn, Richard D. Kahn, Bruce S. Kaplan, Morris J. Kaplan, Carl E. Kaplan, Peter P. Karasz, Martin Karper, John Katz.

Jerome B. Kauff, P. Ben Kaufman, Richard L. May, Robert Kay, Sutton Keany, James Edwin Kee, Victor F. Keen, Joel D. Kellman, Jon E. Kent, Milan C. Kerno, Steven P. Kestenbaum, Stephen Khaete, Kenneth M. Kirschner, Marc S. Kirschner, Wesley W. Kirtley, Harold Klapper, Donald M. Kleban, William Klein II, Martin Kleinbard, Neil C. Kleinhandler, Sol Klerman, Victor A. Kovner, Richard K. Knelpper.

Wirth H. Koenig, Bruce R. Kohler, Stanley E. Kooper, Daniel F. Kolb, Myron Kone, Harold Korn, William P. Kosmas, Myron Kove, Philip Kovitz, Lillian E. Kraemer, John N. Kramer Jr., William J. Kramer.

Emil A. Kvatovil, Jr., Mark J. Krouman, Sheldon F. Kurtz, Theodore A. Kurz, William C. P. Kurz, Samuel H. Latman, Marie M. Lambert, James W. Lambert, Howard M. Landa, Donald Larkin, Bennett H. Last, Allan Latman, Richard B. Leather, Marvin Lechtman, Lawrence Lederman, Barbara A. Lee, Jonathan E. Lehman, Edward H. Lehner, Franz S. Leichter.

Henry O. Leichter, R. Mark Leidigh, John J. Leighton, Ira Leitel, Leonard Lerner, Pierre N. Leval, Gerold K. Levien, Jane Roe Levine, Laurie W. Lewis, Seymour D. Lewis, David H.

Lieberman, Sidney I. Liebowitz, Michael W. Lillie, Albert F. Lilley, Barry Lippman, Allen S. Lipson, James S. Little, Gerald H. Litwin, Louis Livingston, Carl D. Lobell, Bernard Lonvin, Bevis Longstreth, John A. Lowe, Alvin D. Lurie, Luke D. Lynch.

Terence J. Lynch, Thomas H. Lynch, William J. Lynch, William L. Lynch, Michael G. Macdonald, Edgar H. MacKinlay, David Sterling, Maltin, Edward R. Mandell, Howard L. Mann, Ecton R. Manning, Jr., Nathan M. Markowitz, Harriet B. Marple, Anthony F. Marra, Jr., Edward Martin, Paul Martinson, Arnold S. Mazur, Thomas J. McCusker, Robert J. McDonald, Michael A. McElroy, Patrick W. McGinley, Edward J. McGuire, Jr., George C. McKinnis, Gerald McLaughlin, Joseph T. McLaughlin.

David L. McLean, Edward A. Medman, Seth Melhalo, David A. Melman, Jay H. Meltzer, Edward C. Mengel, Jr., Harold Messing, Martin Michaelson, Richard M. Michaelson, Alan B. Miller, Alfred Miller, David G. Miller, G. Nicholas Miller, Harvey R. Miller, Joel M. Miller, Karen Mills, Taylor O. Miller, Howard U. Mindus, Richard T. Miner, Stephen M. Minikes.

Handsel B. Minyard, Edwin B. Mishkin, Robert G. Mitchell, Jr., Alan J. Mogliner, James F. Monahan, Malcolm Monroe, F. H. Moore, Jr., Richard H. Moore, Eloise L. Morgan, James J. Morrissey, Jr., William D. Morrison, Thomas F. Munno, James F. Munsell, Daniel R. Murdock, Daniel T. Murphy, T. Jefferson Murphy, Daniel T. Murray, John S. Murray, John V. Murray, Charles M. Nathan, Arthur L. Nathanson, Peter S. Ness.

Francis J. Nestor, Thomas C. Newkirk, David B. Newnon, Ralph King Nicherson, Peter P. Nitze, William A. Nitze, Richard Nulantly, Jack H. Nusbaum, Jeremy Nussbaum, Walter W. Oberreit, Michael J. O'Connor, Paul D. O'Connor, Paul O'Dwyer, Charles Oejvoda, George Oeshensky, William J. O'Hearn, Jr., Jerold Oshinsky, Clarence W. Olmstead, Jr.

Howard I. Keisman, Robert J. Kheel, Richard D. Kimball, Jr., Arthur L. Kimmelfield, Charles I. Kingson, Sumner S. Kittelle, Edward Klimmerman, Michael J. Klosk, Douglas S. Knox, Joseph Korff, Edward R. Korman, Barbara S. Kozloff, Morris J. Kramer, Anthony B. Kulkan, Harvey Kurzwil, Irwin L. Kwatek, Francis E. Lake, Jr., Marie Lambert, Deborah Lancaster, Richard E. Landau, Alan A. Lascher, Robert L. Laufer, Bennett S. Lazare.

Henry O. Leichter, Walter F. Leinhardt, Abraham G. Levin, Ezra Levin, William A. Levine, Robert A. Levitas, David Levy, Harold Levy, Lester Levy, Michael A. Levy, Charles E. Lewis, James B. Lewis, William T. Lifand, Arthur L. Liman, George N. Lindsay, Charles R. Linton, Peter Linzer, Jack B. Lipkins, Bancroft Littlefield, Jr., Bernard Londin, Louis Lowenstein, Martin E. Lowy, Michael L. Luey, Marc Luxemburg, John M. Mackey.

Matthew J. Mallow, Edward F. Malone, Jeffrey Mann, Peter J. Mansbach, Jay B. Marcus, Jay L. Margulies, Richard Marlin, Stephen A. Marshall, Marilyn E. Meadors, Richard W. Meirowitz, Robert A. Meister, Ralph C. Menarace, Jr., Alexander Mencher, Neal Merkel, Arthur Mermin, Eric B. Meyers, Charles Miller, Eric V. Mock, Elihu H. Modlin, Donald F. Moore, Sanford W. Morhouse, Deborah M. Murphy.

Edward A. McCoy, Paul McGrath, Francis X. McNellis, Michael J. Nassau, Benjamin F. Needell, James Neeley, Stuart B. Newman, David Nochimson, David M. O'Brien, William J. O'Brien, III, John T. Oitzinger, Kenneth Orce, A. P. Ordover, Samuel F. Ottensofer, Irwin M. Panthey, Samuel Panzer, James F. Parver, Richard H. Paul, Powell Pierpoint, Henry Pildner, Jr.

Benet Polhoff, Jr., I. Miles Pollack, Lawrence S. Pratt, Eve M. Prelinger, John L. Primmer, Wallace Prince, Leonard V. Quigley, Kevin A. Quinn, Stephen R. Rand, David B.

Rea, Thomas A. Reed, Naomi L. Reice, Hoch Reid, Catherine A. Rein, Barry D. Rein, Jan Ellen Rein, Alan B. Reis.

Robert B. Oresman, John S. Osborne Jr., Gilbert R. Ott Jr., James F. Ouchterloney, D. Robert Owen, David C. Oxman, Stephen W. Palley, Samuel Panzer, James M. Pape, Franklin E. Parker, Kenneth A. Parker, Elliot Paskoff, Day L. Patterson, William C. Peister, Edward A. Perell, Edmundo Perez, Albert S. Pergam, John H. Perkins Jr., Mahlon F. Perkins Jr., Julia Perles, Marshall Perlin, Aubrey Lee Pettit Jr., Seymour M. Peyser, Joseph M. Phillips, Harriet F. Pipel, Robert Pitofsky, Louis I. Pleeter.

Francis T. P. Plimpton, Martin Popper, Robert H. Preiskel, Griffith B. Price Jr., Stephen L. Priest, John F. Pichard, Richard C. Pugh, Andrew C. Quale Jr., Peter E. Quint, Stuart Rabinowitz, Herbert M. Rafner, Paul A. Randour, Donald D. Rankin, Paul Rapoport, Michael B. Rauch, John W. Reddy, Edward S. Reid, Hoch Reid, Richard E. Rieder, William I. Riegelman, David Riehn.

Richard Rifkin, Anthony R. Riolo, Richard L. Robbins, Timothy D. Roble, John J. Roche, Edmund P. Rogers III, John E. Rogers, Stephen B. Rohrbaugh, Frank Romano, Simon Rose, Ira B. Rose, Thomas O. Rose, Harvey Rosen, Stuart Morton Rosen, Steven Rosenfeld, Robert Rosenman, Eleanor Rosenthal, Gertrude S. Rosenthal, Alfred J. Ross, Michael A. Ross, Henry Huntington Rossbacher, Eric R. Roper, Arnold I. Roth, Allan C. Rothfield.

Walter S. Rothschild, Bernard Rothman, Hugh Rowland Jr., Victor Royall, Sidney E. Rubenstein, John M. Rudell, Charlotte P. Rudnor, Oscar M. Ruebhausen, James A. Ruf Jr., Alan J. Russo, Peter Ryan, Reade H. Ryan Jr., Allan Salovin, John S. Samuels 3d, Douglas Scarff, Thomas Scarlett, Neal Schachtel, Steven A. Schatten, Arthur Schechter, Daniel P. Schechter, John T. Schmidt, Leo L. Schmolka, Flora Schnall, Milton S. Schnur, W. J. Schrenk Jr., Robert Schur, Alan U. Schwartz, Andre A. Schwartz, Stephen F. Schwartz, Harvey Schweiger, Kate E. Scooler.

Noah Scooler, Harry S. Scott, Richard L. Seidenwurm, Laurence V. Senn Jr., Allin C. Seward III, Robert S. Shahn, Richard E. Shundell, Philip T. Shannon, James M. Shaughnessy, L. Edward Shaw Jr., Gerald MacDonald Shea, John J. B. Shea, J. Stephen Sheppard, L. Kevin Sheridan.

Zachary Shimer, Anthony D. Schlesinger, Lawrence J. Siegel, David C. Siegfried, Peter C. Siegfried, Robert H. Silk, Bernard F. Silver, Daniel B. Silver, Harvey S. Simmons, Norman B. Skydell, Jeffrey Small, Jonathan A. Small, David S. Smalley, Michael G. Smith, Robert J. Smolenski, Peter B. Sobol, Asa D. Sokolow, Elaine Solari, Elliott J. Solomon, Charles Richter, Jerry L. Robinson, Modedal Rochlin, Barry Rona, Sidney S. Rosditcher, Jeffery A. Rosen, Herbert Rosenberg, Jerome J. Rosenberg.

Allen M. Rosenbloom, Gerald E. Ross, Pteer J. Rothenberg, Ira Roxland, Ernest Rubenstein, Joseph B. Russell, Stephen S. Saltz, John M. Samuels, Gilbert Sandler, Merton Sarnoff, Maureen Scannell, Roger A. Schechter, Eugene Scheiman, Thomas Scheuer, Stuart Schlesinger, Irwin Schneiderman, Leonard Schneidman, Gary A. Schonwald, Paul Schreiber, Thomas G. Schueller, H. Richard Schumacher, Burton Seiman, Stephen R. Senie.

Charles A. Severs III, Samuel P. Shaw Jr., Richard Scheinberg, Milton Sherman, Paul T. Shultz III, Robert H. Silk, Joan Nina Simon, Robert J. Sisk, James B. Sitrick, Eric Slvin, Patricia Skigen, Stanley L. Sklar, Sol V. Slotnik, Michael J. Smith, Robert S. Smith, Robert Thornton Smith, Laurence T. Sorkin, Harvey M. Spear, Harvey L. Sperry, Leonard A. Spivak, Susan Spivak, Leon G. R. Spolian-sky, Nancy Stagg, Rowland Stebbins Jr.

Bernard Stebel, Duncan J. Stewart, Jeffrey B. Stone, Chester J. Straub, Theodore W. Striggles, Kenneth J. Stuart, Gerald E. Swimmer, Richard R. Szygula, Ronald Taft, Joel S. Taylor, John C. Taylor III, Mary W. Taylor, Judith R. Thayer, Allen L. Thomas, David R. Tillinghast, David Toomey, Jay H. Topkis, Joseph Trachtman, Robert L. Tracey, Carol Trencher, Carl T. Tursi, Henry K. Uman, Gerald E. Uram, Jacob Usadi, Robert Usadi, Michael A. Varet, Paul R. Verkvil, Richard L. Veron, Robert D. Wachs, Harry H. Wachtel, Leonard H. Wacker, Suzanne M. Warshavsky, David T. Washburn.

Michael J. Weinberger, Murray Weiner, Mark M. Weinstein, Loren S. Weisenfeld, George M. Weiss, Richard I. Wile, Charles E. Williams III, Henry Winestine, Bruce J. Winick, Robert S. Wolf, Michael G. Wolfsod, Edward Wooster, John B. Young, Howard G. Youngstein, Eugene H. Zagat Jr., R. Anthony Zeiger, Terry Sue Zisowitz.

Theodore E. Somerville, Monroe R. Sonenborn, Theodore C. Sorensen, John F. Southworth, David E. Spencer, Allan G. Sperlink, Blakeney Stafford, Stanley Thompson Stairs, William L. Standard, Stephen F. Stander, Peter D. Standish, John Starr, Robert Y. Stebbings, Ernest Steefel, Stephen R. Steinberg, Gerald D. Stern, Lewis A. Stern, Mark G. Stern, Anders R. Serner, Mark Sternfield, Irving B. Stewart, Maurice B. Stiefel.

Thomas E. Stiles, Ned B. Stiles, William I. Stoddard, John C. Stotsenburg, R. Alan Stotsenburg, Laurence N. Strenger, Irwin J. Sugarman, Robert G. Sugarman, William T. Sullivan, A. Welles Sumner, Gerald T. Sun, Howard S. Sussman, David J. Sweet, H. Patrick Swiggert, David A. Swope, L. Gerald Tarantin, Yale D. Tauber, Margarot Taylor, Margo Taylor, Willard B. Taylor, Don H. Teague, Berj A. Terzian, Steven Thaler, Roger W. Thomas, Michael Thoyer, Robert B. Tierney, Edw. I. Tishelman, Christopher Toews, Lyman M. Tondel Jr., Paul L. Trachtenberg, Janet Tracy.

Thomas R. Trowbridge, Frederick J. Truslow, Jeffrey S. Tullman, William J. Turnier, Charles S. Tusa, John D. Tuttle, Eric C. P. Van Ginkel, Diane G. Van Wyck, Benjamin M. Vandergrift, William Vanden Heuvel, Franklin B. Velle, Dennis P. Venuti, A. Paul Victor, Benjamin Vinar, Eugene L. Vogel, Stephen R. Volk, George Vradsenburg III, Leonard H. Walker, George J. Wade, Roger L. Waldman, Gary C. Walker, Mark A. Walker.

Duane D. Wall, Edward C. Wallace, Richard E. Wallach, David S. Walters, Anthony W. Wang, David S. Ward, John F. Ward, Peter M. Ward, Robert J. Ward, Harold L. Warner Jr., Ronald Warner, Irene Warshauer, Henry P. Wasserstein, Alfred H. Wasserstrom, Reed Wasson, Alfred L. Webre, Nancy F. Wechsler, Stuart D. Wechsler, Stephen Shields, Weddle, Henry Weller, Alex E. Weinberg, Stephen A. Weiner, Stephen A. Weinstein.

Peter Weiss, Jonathan M. Weld, Edwin S. Wesely, Barry G. West, Howard Westrich, Gerald M. Wetzler, Arthur M. Wharton, Geoffrey P. Wharton, F. Robert Wheeler Jr., Eunice E. Whitney, Nancy Wichman, John A. Wiener, David A. Wier, James D. Wiese, A. Ronald Wilkoe, Robert G. Willner, Paul H. Wilson Jr., Robert D. Wilson, Robert Wingfray, Frederick F. Winkler, Francis Dana Winslow Jr., Philip S. Winterer, Norman Wise.

Herbert A. Wolff Jr., Norris D. Wolff, Michael G. Wolfson, Cecil Wray Jr., Richard C. Yarmuth, Harvey J. Yaverbaum, Harry M. Yohalem, Nathaniel H. Yohalem, John E. Young, Nina Zagat, Leonard C. Zamore, Steve Zapp, Stephen Zeche, George Zeitlin, Andrew E. Zelman, Roger L. Zissu, Victor Zonana, Ruth J. Zuckerman, Mary Zulack.

A joint project of The Lawyers Committee for Effective Action to End the War and The Lawyers Convocation on Vietnam.

EDITORIALS BY JOHN ROCHE

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1970

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the two columns by John Roche which follow I read in the Saturday, May 16, Baltimore News American and in the Sunday, May 17, Washington Post. Both are thought provoking.

The articles follow:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) News American, May 16, 1970]

OUR "REPRESSIVE" SOCIETY

(By John P. Roche)

At the risk of sounding like a slightly cracked drum, there is one further aspect of the current campus follies that I think requires discussion.

Although the Federal Constitution—Article VIII of the Bill of Rights—flatly prohibits "cruel and unusual punishment," I spent the equivalent of a normal working day in a faculty meeting last week.

For over eight hours (divided into two segments), various of my colleagues rose to denounce Cambodia, the Panther trial, Kent State, and miscellaneous topics that struck them as cogent.

The dominant theme was that the United States was the most "repressive society" in the world, a reactionary, historical monstrosity.

After a while one got numbed by the chant—it reminded me of a jukebox jammed on one record. The evidence? Well, Cambodia, Bobby Seale, the Kent State four, Vice President Agnew's "fascist" speeches, etc., etc.

Those of us who rose in opposition were put in a neat (and nasty) rhetorical corner. After all, anyone who would try to deny that we are savagely oppressive must "justify" the deaths in Kent, Ohio, the expansion of the war, the killing of various Panthers, and every act of every policeman in the country. This is both impossible and preposterous, but it served to intimidate a number of individuals who, if accosted privately, would eschew such witless anti-Americanism.

Now, I "justify" nothing. I support the war. I am interested in whether a jury in a fair trial finds Seale guilty of murder conspiracy. I know a lot of cops, know they hate violence (after all, they are in the front lines), but recognize there are always a few hard cases.

Events at Kent were appalling, but I did not "pull the trigger" and I refuse to accept for one moment the proposition that this random act of frightened brutality was part of a national conspiracy against "dissent."

Indeed, a strong case can be made for the opposite premise: that the student upheaval and the success with which the militants have closed down school after school indicates an amazingly unoppressive political environment.

This heretical sentiment brought a gasp of stunned disbelief when I presented it to a faculty meeting, but I will stand on it: By any historical indices, the United States is one of the least repressive, least indecent societies in the world.

Of course there are injustices and acts of brutality—we have over 200 million people to account for—but the crucial consideration is not that these injustices occur. It is that the protesters—many claiming to be overt "revolutionaries"—are free to advocate

just about anything (including the killing of policemen) without even being prosecuted, let alone "repressed."

I listened for several hours to a live broadcast from New Haven on May 2 and I frankly cannot imagine any other nation in the world that would have permitted this vision of apocalyptic violence to go out over the air. Or to take place. Even the stolid British would have broken that one up, and the French "companies of republican security" would simply have mopped up the green.

In short what is needed is some perspective. Without suggesting for one minute that we should stop campaigning against the real injustices in America, we should also appreciate that the protests could only occur in a climate of freedom unmatched in the world.

In this connection let me recommend to the thoughtful Leopold Tyrmand's "Notebooks Of A Dilettante (MacMillan). Tyrmand is a refugee from both Nazi and Communist oppression. As an alumnus of totalitarian prisons, he looks with shrewd skepticism on oppression in America.

As one of my faculty colleagues, who survived a Nazi death camp, noted sardonically to his unimpressed peers, "You Americans can not conceive of real oppression."

[From the Washington Post, May 17, 1970]

RELEVANCE MUST MEAN COPS—AMERICAN STUDENTS LACK EXPERIENCE TO UNDERSTAND THE TRUE IMPACT OF VIOLENCE ON SOCIETY

(By John P. Roche)

A few weeks back, when the problems of the State University of New York at Buffalo first hit the headlines, I had a discussion with a number of students about the alternatives that a school has when threatened with violence. There are three options to capitulation: close the school, call the police, or form student vigilantes.

My students kept circling around: They belong to the vast "silent majority" on the nation's campuses who want to get an education, and bitterly resent disruptions, but they refuse to accept any of the alternatives.

One can understand why they don't want the university closed down. By definition, a university must be open—and nothing would cheer the extremists more than shutting the place up. Their goal in life is precisely this—to paralyze the system. But if we keep it open, how can we maintain the peace?

Now here there are two answers and two answers only. One must rely on either public or private force—on the police, or on a student militia, a home guard. The latter is in the great American tradition of direct democracy; it is the technique with which a frontier society policed itself.

It could be argued that since the extremists are always talking about participatory democracy, this would be the ideal way to deal with them. After all, a lynching is usually an overwhelming demonstration of majority rule: there is only one dissenter.

However, before anyone bubbles with enthusiasm for vigilantes on the campus, he should read "The Ox-Bow Incident" and maybe a little Faulkner. We spent two centuries in this country trying to bottle up the vigilante spirit, trying to substitute reliance on the public force for private retribution.

Indeed, one of the most appalling aspects of the glorification of violence by Weathermen, Panthers, and assorted sects is its tendency to energize every violent nut in the country.

Fortunately in one sense, unfortunately in another, the great bulk of college students—particularly at private colleges and universities—has been sheltered from violence. In talking to my students, for example, it suddenly occurred to me that they had been insulated from fear. I asked, "How many in this

room"—there were perhaps 160 present—"have ever really feared for their lives?" Not a hand went up. This, I reflected, is the "generation gap."

Because of this insulation, this innocence, they have no sense of the extent to which violence threatens the very fabric of community. Violence is, in fact, the most malignant infectious disease known to man, and the only hope for a decent society is to maintain force as a public monopoly to be exercised only under rigorous standards. Yet, when I suggested that the only sensible course a university can follow, when it is subjected to ideological gangsterism, is to call the police, my students winced and wiggled.

Ironically this notion of the university as a "sanctuary," off-limits to the police power, has the practical result of turning it into the softest target in town for extremists. But when the students thus reject the principle of authority in favor of a new medievalism, they create a vacuum that society must fill. Since in another mood they demand a "relevant education," the point must be made; in any society confronted by nihilists, relevance is cops.

PEACEFUL DISSENT

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1970

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, although the general public probably is a bit more familiar with the few turbulent instances of protest that have arisen over President Nixon's invasion of Cambodia, I have been extremely impressed with the overall-peaceful and organized manner of dissent of the past 3 weeks.

For each confrontation, I see 50 to 100 examples of orderly and constructive efforts aiming at positive redirection of many of our misguided national policies.

For each rock thrown, a thousand names on petitions.

For each epithet, 10 to 20 silent manifestations of prayers for peace.

For each new nihilist, a hundred new converts to working to reform within the existing system.

Today, I would like to place in the RECORD, a series of statements, articles, and documents presenting the peaceful nature of our current dissent.

I am proud of the young Americans whose activities are outlined here. I am very proud to be associated with them, and I heartily endorse and support the programs and policies for peace that they have established at this crucial point in our Nation's history.

Specifically, I want to congratulate the students, faculty, and administration of the University of California at Riverside—in whose behalf yesterday I introduced a petition on the Speaker's table signed by about 35 percent of the Riverside campus community, a petition calling for immediate withdrawal of all American military and paramilitary forces from Southeast Asia, for congressional actions to halt war funding, and for a congressional censure of President Nixon's Cambodia policies—Cypress College, and the College of San Mateo.

The material follows:

SEVEN DAYS IN MAY—AT UC RIVERSIDE:

During the period between Monday, May 4 and Sunday, May 10 a series of unique incidents occurred involving students and faculty at UCR as well as the general community of Riverside. You may find them of interest.

First day: Monday, May 4:

Several hundred UCR students marched two miles from campus to the Riverside City Hall. The march occurred at the rush hour for traffic (5 p.m.). Patrol cars of the Riverside Police Department, and members of the Riverside Police Department on motorcycles, convoyed the group.

Result: The march was peaceful. In a gesture unique in these times, the students cheered the police for their help (the police conveniently neglected to insist on a parade permit for the spontaneous demonstration). There was no violence.

Second day: Tuesday, May 5:

Several hundred UCR students left a campus rally, entered the administration building, and marched to the office of Chancellor Ivan Hinderaker. Their object: to protest U.S. policies in Indochina.

Result: The march was peaceful. After talking with University officials—the Chancellor was in Berkeley—the students left. There was no violence.

Second day: Tuesday, May 5, afternoon:

Several hundred UCR students then marched down to the Council Chambers where the Riverside City Council was in session. They asked for and received permission to enter the Council. City business was set aside and the members of the City Council talked with the students for more than two hours on the war and related issues.

Result: The City Council agreed to the request of the students for a city-wide rally set for Saturday noon, May 9, in the downtown mall of the city and also a one-and-a-half-mile march to Fairmont Park for an afternoon discussing the issues. Following their meeting with the City Councilmen—a session that had occasional stormy moments of rhetoric—students once again cheered police for their courtesy. There was no violence.

Third day: Wednesday, May 6:

Members of the Radical Student Union and others who stood at the entrances to the USR campus and gave each motorist entering two sheets of paper, one of them a message to students from Chancellor Hinderaker, the other instructions for peaceful protests. The message from the Chancellor was reproduced by the students at their own expense for mass distribution.

Result: There was no violence.

Third day: Wednesday, May 6, noon:

UCR shut down at noon at the request of UC President Charles Hitch and Governor Ronald Reagan. Student rallies continued all afternoon.

Fourth day: Thursday, May 7:

Chancellor Hinderaker stood for five hours outside the locked administration building to talk with students. Some 1500 students and many faculty joined in a massive community effort to inform Riverside about the issues as they saw them.

Result: Student and faculty teams began house-to-house canvass of the city of Riverside. Teams were instructed in ways of informing without undue irritation. There was no violence.

Fifth day: Friday, May 8:

Today followed much the same pattern with the Chancellor available to students (he also held informal discussions with students in his home on Wednesday and Thursday evenings between 8 p.m. and midnight), and the faculty-student canvass moving into high gear. Students and administrators met with city police to plan Saturday's rally and march. The students asked for and received permission to control all aspects of the event. Police remained in the

background as students organized a monitor corps for the task of maintaining order.

Result: There was no violence.

Sixth day: Saturday, May 9:

The rally in the Riverside mall attracted some 3000. It was held adjacent to the main office of the Bank of America in Riverside. Not a dime's worth of damage occurred. Students policed the area, picking up every scrap of paper on the mall at the conclusion of the rally. The march to the park was uneventful. Student monitors with walkie-talkies functioned perfectly. Police were required only at intersections for traffic control. At the park Chancellor Hinderaker was among the speakers who praised students for their commitment to non-violence. The rally was chaired by Councilman Sam Digall.

Result: There was no violence.

Seventh day: Sunday, May 10:

The student-faculty canvass committee maintained its information and education program. The campus was quiet. The crisis—for the moment—appeared over.

COMMENT

In many ways, UC Riverside—its students, faculty, administration and adjacent community—was unique in the nation: united in their commitment to non-violence, they achieved an expression of dissent without resort to destruction.

In a time of trouble, the example of university students in Riverside seemed to offer a hopeful development. UCR and its students were not then and are not now seeking congratulations. The times are too uncertain for that. A dozen moments during the period of May 4-10 situation flirted with disaster. But the UCR experience proved that not all university campuses are battlefields, not all communities hostile, and not all police are unfriendly. However, the future of the UCR experiment is, perhaps, uncertain at best and subject always to the special pressures of this angry age.

UCR's 5500 students and 450 faculty have—so far—a unique thing going for them. With continued commitment—and a little bit of luck—they may yet make it. But it is not, and won't be, easy.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, RIVERSIDE,
Riverside, Calif., May 6, 1970.

To Members of the UCR community.

Last fall in my annual "State of the Campus" address, I stated my personal feeling that the war in Vietnam is "disastrous." Now that this war has officially spread to Cambodia, as an individual, I see the disaster as having been compounded.

I am deeply concerned. I know that many of you—students, faculty and staff—are also deeply concerned. The question we all ask ourselves is: What can we do? Realistically, the answer is: Not as much as we might like.

One thing we can do is become better informed about the issues. Another thing we can do is to discuss these issues—and the implications they have for our freedom as a people—with our friends, not only on campus but in the community as well. As individuals we may be able to exert a more direct influence on the direction of our foreign policy.

As a start, I am suggesting to members of the faculty that they set aside Thursday and Friday, May 7 and 8, for special discussions on the Cambodian crisis in their classes, in campus meetings and in other suitable ways.

During this period of crisis and concern, I urge members of the faculty to give special priority to such discussions, and to delay examinations and other regular instructional requirements that may be scheduled for these days.

As I have stated on many occasions in the past, I will give every protection to students who wish to protest or demonstrate their dissent so long as they remain within the ample limits of campus rules affecting such

behavior. I will also give every protection to those students who wish to refrain from open demonstration.

I understand the special frustrations affecting students today. I feel frustrations too. Despite our frustrations, we have a responsibility to maintain the freedom and integrity of our campus. We must always remember that the integrity of the University is what gives us our strength. To close the University, even as a symbolic act, would squander that strength. Let us seek to solve civic problems with tools available to us as citizens.

IVAN HINDERAKER,
Chancellor.

TEXT OF A STATEMENT GIVEN TO MEMBERS OF THE UCR COMMUNITY BY CHANCELLOR IVAN HINDERAKER ON SATURDAY, MAY 9, 1970

We experienced this week an event unprecedented in California higher education: the shutdown of this campus and the University. I did not like to close UCR. You did not like it either.

I have always strongly supported the right of students to dissent lawfully. But I am opposed to any decision—regardless of the provocation—that prevents other students who wish to attend class from doing so. Once the right of students to attend class and the right of teachers to teach is tampered with, the campus moves into uncharted territory with unknown consequences to its future freedom and independence. It is my earnest hope that this decision to close the University will soon be seen as incompatible with those very values which we as a campus, and as a society, are pledged to preserve.

During this difficult period, however, when it would be so easy to succumb to despair, I have found reason for hope. I have found reason for hope—and, yes, pride, too—in the constructive fashion in which concerned UCR students and faculty have conducted their activities this week. In what I wish could be a model for the nation's college and university campuses, UCR students and faculty have gone to the community, with pamphlets and persuasion, peacefully carried their suggestions for change from door-to-door.

I have found reason for hope in the generous spirit of the members of the Riverside community who have listened and, in most cases, responded in gracious fashion. I would not expect everyone to agree with the point of view expressed by their campus visitors, but I am heartened by the courteous reception they gave to them.

I have found reason for hope in the attitude of helpfulness—and patience—exhibited by members of the Riverside City Police during this period of crisis. Surely the city of Riverside must be the only spot in the nation this week where students, on two occasions, gave cheers to the police of this city.

I have found reason for hope in the willingness of the Riverside City Council to set aside "business as usual" this week and spend considerable time listening to the concerns of students.

The *Press-Enterprise* carried an editorial on Thursday titled "Good Sense Prevails in Riverside." It said, in part: "If everyone continues to do as many things right as they have done so far this week . . . Riverside can be enriched in the understanding of a burning public issue while still protected on its civic peace." I couldn't agree more with the expression of this idea.

This is not the time to become complacent. There remains too many uncertainties for that. But what has occurred at UCR and in Riverside this week gives me renewed confidence in the ability of campus and community to survive this period of crisis more united than ever in a joint commitment to the nonviolent solution for our mutual problems and concerns.

CYPRESS COLLEGE,
Cypress, Calif., May 7, 1970.

Congressman GEORGE BROWN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We, as students of Cypress College, represent the youth of a sizeable portion of Orange County. On the assumption of this responsibility we feel that we must convey to you the concern of our fellow students relating to contemporary issues.

We view with alarm the rising number of violent demonstrations on our nation's campuses, and with greater alarm the reactive attitudes reflected by our government and the populace of this country.

As rational individuals we are expressing our opinion without violence in the hope that your response will prove that there really is an obligation to the people on the part of our elected officials. We are concerned with the ability of our Chief Executive to once again involve us in a military action on foreign soil without even attempting to fulfill his constitutional obligations to Congress.

We are also concerned with the attitude engendered in the American public which has enabled them to accept, without significant protest, the killing of several unarmed students on a college campus. We feel that this attitude is due in part to the derogatory statements concerning the academic community which have been expressed by the present administration.

We are enclosing a copy of a resolution which has been passed by our Student Body Cabinet. This resolution formally states what has been conveyed in this letter.

Thank you for your consideration and expected response.

Respectfully,

DAVID H. FLORES,
President, Associated Student Body.

COLLEGE OF SAN MATEO,
San Mateo, Calif., May 7, 1970.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The President's decision to enter Cambodia without consulting his Congress and the people is dictatorship—and he is accusing those who protest of anarchy.

The youth of this country cannot be expected to respect their country and its constitution if the highest office in the Nation shows none.

We must get out of Southeast Asia. It is a needless waste of our natural and human resources. As our representatives, you must act to implement this withdrawal. Peace there will bring Peace at home.

Most sincerely,

Michael Chirs, Martha P. Eddy, J. W. Wilson, T. B. Curre, G. C. Diavel, Alice E. Shoir, Joyce Carlson, S. Roslaniche, Maxine J. Danjoir, D. H. Krieh. Brooks Lambert, Laura J. McGrady, Valerie Manuel, Evelyn Long, Barbara Hart, H. C. Monroe, J. E. Innis, Benjamin D. Pretztl, Stuart Williamson, M. C. Bucher, Karl A. Grassenbacker, Shirley Mainwaring, Norman F. Brestner, D. R. Le Galliar, Lea V. Kelly.

[From the New York Times, May 18, 1970]
STUDENTS TURN TO POLITICS IN EFFORT TO CHANGE SYSTEM

(By Steven V. Roberts)

LOS ANGELES, May 17—Two years ago, when the nation's college students propelled the Presidential campaign of Senator Eugene J. McCarthy, Jeannie Kemper could not have cared less. "I was a home economics major," she recalled the other day. "All I worried about were recipes and parties."

But last week Jeannie Kemper, a junior at Long Beach State College was sitting at a long table in the headquarters of Representative George E. Brown Jr., addressing

envelopes. Miss Kemper, a deeply tanned girl with streaked blonde hair, explained why she was there:

"We're all faced with a decision in this country, whether to break off from the Establishment completely or to try to change it. I just think the system is too strong to go outside it, but we can change it by electing the right people. The people on the far left accomplish nothing except to polarize the country."

Miss Kemper is typical of the thousands of young people who are turning to politics—within the system—in the aftermath of Cambodia and Kent State. Interviews here and by New York Times correspondents across the United States show that the new student activists tend to be new to the game, frustrated by the pace of peaceful change, yet opposed to violence.

And many of them do not come from the liberal, well educated homes that had traditionally produced student activists. Like Jeannie Kemper, a sizable number are children of the silent majority.

"My father is a military man and I just can't talk to him any more," said Miss Kemper. "He's ready to kick me out of the house. He still believes it's all a Communist conspiracy."

There are still plenty of students who would rather canvass a beach than a precinct, and many radicals feel electoral politics is a fraud. But for those who occupy the middle ground between apathy and anarchy, politics provides a chance to overcome their sense of helplessness and hopelessness.

"Students who were never involved before now suddenly feel they've got to do something," said Hal Mickelson, a student leader at Stanford. "This Cambodian thing is insane to them."

CONGRESSIONAL RACES

Probably the most ambitious political development has been the Movement for a New Congress, whose basic aim is to mobilize students to work for peace candidates. Since the organization was started at Princeton two weeks ago, chapters have been formed at more than 100 campuses.

Princeton has already agreed to allow students to take time off next fall to work in the election, and students are pressuring other schools to follow suit. But in some areas, young people have already plunged into critical primary campaigns.

Here in California, students are turning out for Representative Brown, who is competing for the Democratic senatorial nomination. For instance, several departments at the University of Southern California have each taken an assembly district to canvass for the candidate, one of the first Congressmen to vote against funds for the Vietnam war.

Other candidates receiving youthful support include Norval Reece, Senator McCarthy's campaign manager in Pennsylvania, who is running for the Senate in that state; the Rev. Andrew Young, an aide to the late Rev. Martin Luther King Jr., a House candidate in Atlanta; and Gary Hart, who worked in Representative Allard K. Lowenstein's campaign on Long Island in 1968 and is now running for the House in Santa Barbara, Calif.

COORDINATION SOUGHT

Student interest has been running so high that some people are already trying to coordinate what threatens to become chaos. Mark Talisman, an assistant to Representative Charles A. Vanik, Democrat of Ohio, is organizing a telephone clearing house to give prospective workers information about candidates in their own areas. The Democratic National Committee has announced a similar operation.

While the new political concern has pro-

duced a massive lobbying effort in Washington against war spending, students are also invading state capitols from Madison to Sacramento, urging passage of bills that would prohibit local residents from fighting in undeclared wars.

The young people engaged in these efforts are united by more than a desire to "do something." Many of them oppose violence and resent the popular image of the students as rock-throwing radicals.

"Violence might get rid of frustration, and it is understandable, but it only brings on more repression," said a U.C.L.A. student handing out literature for Representative Brown.

Moreover, many of them do not want merely to vent their feelings. A key word in their vocabulary is "effective."

"It is about time," said Mary McCormack, a senior at the University of Illinois, "that something was done for effective political action rather than just standing around at a rally."

A LINGERING FAITH

Perhaps most important, the students who choose politics maintain a lingering faith in the system, or at least an appreciation of its influence. Susan Salisbury, a law student at Southern California, said:

"In 1966, a lot of people said it would not make any difference whether Pat Brown or Ronald Reagan got elected. But I was working for the Welfare Department, and I saw a lot happen. After Reagan won, there was tremendous pressure to cut people off welfare and cut back on other benefits. Elections do make a difference."

Most of the new activists have never been involved in politics before. "These are the fence-sitters, not the long-haired crazies," said Susan King, a staff member for the Committee for an Effective Congress in Washington. "A lot of them don't even know who their Congressman is, but all of a sudden they're radicalized."

OTHERS OPPOSE POSITION

Other veterans of the political wars have given up. The Daily Cardinal at the University of Wisconsin reacted to the Princeton plan this way:

"No, the political position of Princeton students can perhaps be most kindly described as oblivion. In the face of crisis at home, a murderous war abroad, and rioting in the streets they are talking about 'doves' and 'hawks' and Congress. We have been there and back. We will not retrace our steps again but right now we'll move in the only way we know how—by bringing our anger to the streets."

The new activists also have their doubts. "I don't know if the political system can work," said Andy Schwartz, a law student at U.S.C. "I'd like to give it a last try, but none of us are sure."

[From the Los Angeles Times, May 15, 1970]

PEACE ACTIVITIES ON CAMPUS FEATURE

BUBBLE GUM, PAINT

(By Paul Houston)

At UCLA Thursday, a group called Headquarters of World Happiness began passing out the first of 106,000 pieces of bubble gum they plan to distribute on the university's nine campuses to promote peace and happiness.

In Oakland, a group of Mills College girls in leotards and flowing robes invited boys bound for the Induction Center to refuse to join the armed forces and go to the Mills campus for some tea and talk.

At UC Santa Barbara, 13 students smeared their clothes with red paint to protest the bloodshed in Southeast Asia and lay down in front of the administration building. Campus police had to drag them away.

While these scenes demonstrate the variety of activity on the state's campuses Thursday, a fourth scene actually predominated: students going to class.

DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Class attendance was reported high around the state, but many classrooms were filled more with the talk of war and other pressing concerns than with normal instruction.

Many students were already taking advantage of relaxed grading procedures and curriculum requirements by devoting the bulk of their time to working against the war in Southeast Asia.

A committee of the UCSE Academic Senate approved a plan under which students may devote nearly their entire schedule to an experimental extension course already in existence, "The National Crisis: The Problem and its Solutions." The course will meet from May 18 to June 16.

STUDENTS HAVE ALTERNATIVES

As an alternative, students also may suspend their normal class work and take an incomplete rather than a failing grade, or they may have a faculty member allow other requirements to be substituted for the final exam.

Cal State L.A. President John A. Greenlee issued a statement permitting students who do not want to continue formal classroom work to pursue other activities without penalty. They may take incompletes, extend final deadlines one week or take grades they would have been given May 13.

Meanwhile, UC Irvine Chancellor Daniel G. Aldrich issued a clarification of the faculty's action last Sunday night, allowing students to receive credit for taking part in antiwar activities.

Aldrich explained that students can use an existing "individual studies" provision and work out coursework in Education 199 or 299 of their own choosing, with the approval of a professor.

The chancellor said it was important to note that the Irvine faculty "has not in any way suggested that academic work on this campus should cease during the remainder of the spring quarter . . . (The faculty) has assured that all regular courses will continue, that students who wish to add studies of immediate interest will be able to do so . . ."

At UCSB and UC Davis, the Academic Senate has approved a resolution calling for a two-week recess to give students time to participate in the November election campaigns. A faculty spokesman said the measure must be approved by the statewide administration.

At UC San Diego, the Academic Senate rejected by a vote of 119-57 a proposal to request dropping of charges against all students involved in sit-ins, substituting a recommendation that the courts consider the "deep moral motivation and restraint shown" by the students.

TRIBUTE TO MISS U.S.A., VIRGINIA'S DEBBIE SHELTON

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1970

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, I take pride in calling the attention of my colleagues to the winner of the Miss USA Pageant, Miss Debbie Shelton. She received the title over 50 contestants at Miami Beach, Fla., Saturday, May 16.

Miss Shelton is a resident of Norfolk,

Va., and is one of my constituents in the Second District. She is the daughter of Dr. and Mrs. John P. Shelton, and is a junior at Old Dominion University, in Norfolk, majoring in art. She has been a cheerleader for the Norfolk Neptunes professional football team, and is a professional model.

As Miss Virginia she was a swimsuit finalist in the Miss USA Pageant and was named as the most photogenic contestant. Miss Shelton will represent the United States in the Miss Universe Pageant this July. Four of the previous Miss USA's have gone on to become Miss Universe, and I have great confidence in this year's Miss USA.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express the pride of the people of the Second District, and indeed of Virginia, in the selection of Miss Shelton as Miss USA. Her gracious manner and pleasing personality reflect the hospitality of Norfolk and the Commonwealth of Virginia. She will be an outstanding representative of this Nation, and we will be among her most enthusiastic supporters in the Miss Universe Contest.

Winning the title of Miss USA is surely one of the high points of a young woman's life. I extend my congratulations and best wishes to Miss Debbie Shelton.

TOO MUCH FREEDOM NO FREEDOM AT ALL

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1970

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the McLaughlin, S. Dak., Messenger, which I feel should be widely read. The editorial follows:

TOO MUCH FREEDOM NO FREEDOM AT ALL

It may be that the students who are rioting and causing unrest suffer from an overdose of freedom. In a free society there must be laws, rules and regulations or there is no freedom. There has to be a society of law in order to have freedom or one group of people will infringe upon the freedom of others.

Perhaps we have too much freedom—freedom to see any kind of films we wish, freedom to take LSD and marijuana, freedom to burn public property, freedom to grow long hair and wear filthy clothes, freedom for boys and girls to live together in college dorms, freedom for a supreme court justice to advocate revolution, freedom for people to go around the country shouting "burn, baby, burn."

We may be suffering from a backlog of failure to say "no" in our schools, homes and churches.

We cannot become a nation governed by riots and protests or we will soon be no nation at all but a country of mobs, bands and tribes.

There must of course be the right to dissent. People must have the right to speak out when they think the government is wrong. When decisions are made through legitimate processes by people elected to make those decisions we must abide by their actions.

We went through one civil war to preserve this point. Let us hope we do not have to go through another.