

Jerry Friedheim and asked for specifics of where there had been violations of classification. Upon discussing this material with Mr. Jerry Friedheim of the Defense Department—he said, “Well, we just would have preferred that certain sections not be used in that report.”

Again, we asked for specifications of item by item of where we were violating security. Even though they have found time to have press conferences and engage in press releases and discussions, they have yet, up to this date, to relate to us, even though we have requested it, exactly what material they would like us to delete or what material was classified material.

Mr. THURMOND. In response, I still say that the Department of Defense felt so strongly about this matter that they contacted the distinguished Senator from Oregon, wanting to meet with him to talk these matters over. We would not expect the Defense Department officials to tell him over the phone what was top secret. That would not make sense. They wanted to meet with the Senator from Oregon in person and discuss these matters, to tell him they were classified, and to see if they could not induce him to withdraw them. Why could not that have been done, rather than to go ahead and have a news conference and release the information to the public?

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I have been in my office. I am willing, able, and eager to meet with representatives of the Defense Department at any time. I did not ask them for specifications over the telephone. It would be ridiculous to ask the Defense Department to supply them over the phone. I do not know whether my phone is tapped or not. But, by the same token, I have to say that I have had no indication that the Defense Department was interested in communicating with me, other than through a news conference. I think that is not the way to handle a serious matter. If there had been serious thought about this whole report by the Defense Department, they should have been on the telephone, so to speak, seeking an appointment or seeking to counsel with me, rather than to communicate with me through a news conference.

Mr. THURMOND. I respond by saying that they asked for a conference with the Senator. They did not get a conference. The Senator went ahead and held a press conference, and the Defense Department said the report contained classified information. They wanted to point

that out to him. I am informed now that the Department of Defense has detailed these security violations. If the Senator had had a meeting with them, they could probably have resolved the situation. It is my belief that the Senator might have agreed not to publish this report after the Pentagon had pointed out the classified portions which should not have been published.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, in reviewing the letter again—I suggest that the Senator reread it—there is no request at all for a conference.

Mr. THURMOND. That letter informed the Senator that the report contained classified information, and it also said that the Department hoped the Senator would await instructions before proceeding with the publication and dissemination of this report. But the Senator went ahead and disseminated it in a press conference without conferring with Defense Department officials.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I think we have made our points. I am not going to belabor the issue. I think, again, that basically the problem of the Defense Department is its medieval system of classification, trying to say something is classified when it has already been published in the newspapers or published in a journal. I do not think it is up to Congress to determine whether published materials are classified. If a Member of Congress who is doing research can find something in a publication of this kind, I do not think it is necessary for him to ask permission from the Defense Department to make a report to his Senate colleagues.

This is not the first time this has happened. It has happened a number of times with Senators. I think that after a while the Defense Department might get a little notice that their system is not functioning correctly.

There is no intention, no desire, to violate classification. I think, again, that the Defense Department is acting more in a political manner than with concern for the security of the Nation, because had they been deeply concerned, they would not have waited to exchange letters; they would not have waited to exchange press releases; they would have had an immediate confrontation.

I have had representatives of the military call at my office before. They know they are welcome and can come at any time for a conference or discussion or to ask for an appointment.

I question the real concern of the De-

partment for the security of the country in this case, because I can prove, by chapter and verse, that every word of this report came out of publications available to the general public.

I would urge the Senator from South Carolina, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, to perhaps make it an item on the agenda of that committee to review the classified system of the U.S. Department of Defense. I think it might prove to be a worthwhile undertaking. Then we will not have to get into the question of challenging or repudiating the patriotism of any Senator. I think it would be better if the question were studied by the committee and made a committee project.

I urge the Senator from South Carolina, if he is deeply concerned, to have this question taken up as an item of agenda by the committee.

Mr. THURMOND. I think what is most needed is not a new system but to observe the present system.

ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. MONDAY, JULY 20, 1970

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate adjourn until 11 o'clock, Monday morning next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, July 20, 1970, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate July 17, 1970:

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officer for temporary appointment in the U.S. Air Force under the provisions of chapter 839, title 10 of the United States Code:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Roy M. Terry, xxx-xx-xxxx FR (colonel, Regular Air Force, chaplain) U.S. Air Force.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate July 17, 1970:

BUREAU OF MINES

J. Richard Lucas, of Virginia, to be Director of the Bureau of Mines, which was sent to the Senate on May 6, 1970.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CAPTIVE NATIONS

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1970

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, in a recent letter from Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University and the distinguished chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee, I was particularly struck by his comments:

Ironically enough, as all reports at this stage show, the captive nations in Eastern Europe, the USSR, Asia and Cuba, not to speak of the near-captives in Southeast Asia and elsewhere, have far more faith in the historic role of America than some segments of our populace. Congress can responsibly and assertively rectify this lag by (1) creating a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations, which would unquestionably offset the appalling ignorance of our youth and others regarding the captive nations and (2) moving for reconsideration of the Freedom Academy bill in view of the intensification of Red political warfare on our own terrain.

I could not agree more with Dr. Dobriansky's views. For years I have introduced and reintroduced the resolution to create the Special Committee on the Captive Nations. In this Congress it is House Resolution 77. If we in Congress do not take the initiative or have the moral courage to act on this simple resolution, which has so many cosponsors in the House, how, indeed, can we expect our confused and uninformed youth to understand the true nature of the plight of the captive nations and the depredations

they suffer under Communist imperialism? Except by contrast with the harsh realities of what communism is actually doing to millions of human beings around the globe, how can we teach them that only in a society which respects the rights of each individual can they flourish and grow?

Toward that end, both for the goal of self-determination of the enslaved captive nations and the enlightenment of a segment of our own young people, let us act now on the resolution to create the Captive Nations Committee.

PSYCHOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF THE FACTORS LEADING TO AND MAINTAINING AMERICAN INTERVENTION IN VIETNAM

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1970

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the long list of studies detailing America's entrance and maintenance of its tragic adventurism in Southeast Asia still grows, and with each new analysis, I perceive an immense and extremely complex jigsaw puzzle beginning to fall into place.

One of the more fascinating studies was first published back in April 1967 in the American Journal of Orthopsychiatry. That study was entitled "Psychological Habituation to War: A Sociopsychological Case Study" and is the work of Dr. Isidore Ziferstein, an associate clinical professor of psychiatry at UCLA.

Despite its rather academic title, Dr. Ziferstein's study avoids overuse of jargon, and I found it quite readable—and extremely informative. I am impressed by this type analysis, and I believe it has great merit.

Briefly, what Dr. Ziferstein says that over a period of years the U.S. Government has employed public relations techniques to sell to the American people a war they never wanted. Heavy reliance has been placed on the technique of psychological habituation—a means of psychologically incremental moves aiming to show that whatever was done was right and within a set logic. The end result is that the individual citizen eventually acquiesces with no feeling that his right to disagree is being suppressed.

Recently, Dr. Ziferstein added an epilogue to his original study, and, as with the first paper, I find his perception and application of theory to be most valuable.

I highly recommend these studies, and I now place them in the RECORD at this point:

PSYCHOLOGICAL HABITATION TO WAR: A SOCIOPSYCHOLOGICAL CASE STUDY

(By Isidore Ziferstein, M.D.)

In a comprehensive essay on adolescence, George E. Gardner lists as a major and most difficult task confronting the child as he enters adolescence, the giving up of the security that is predicated upon the "all-knowingness" and the "all-powerfulness" of his

mother and father. In this connection Gardner emphasizes . . . the extreme vulnerability of all adolescents (or of adults who are still essentially adolescent) to the cry and to the seductive voice of the false leader or the leader with the false ideology or intent. That adolescent (of whatever chronological age) are appealed to—and respond to—such leaders, is accounted for by the fact that that the latter always promise, among other things, a omniscient who can do their thinking and an omnipotent who will be their power.¹⁰

There is a parallelism between these growing pains of adolescence and the growing pains of a developing democratic society. In both instances, there is the danger of regression to an earlier phase of development, where security is sought by relying on an omniscient and omnipotent authority. The success of the democratic process requires citizens who are psychologically ready and willing to think creatively, to make choices, to make decisions as adults, not only in their family and other interpersonal relations but also in matters affecting their community and the nation. The democratic process, to be successful, also requires elected representatives who are able to resist the occupational hazards of their positions of leadership—the temptation to feel and act omniscient and omnipotent.

Too often there is a polarization, a division of labor, a division of society into two castes: the leaders and the led. Too often the ordinary citizen beset by the cares and demands of everyday living, is relieved and content to leave the business of governing to the leaders. And too often the professional "governors" are men who are attracted to this profession by their need to wield power, the need to feel and be omnipotent.

One of the situations that bring this division into sharp relief is the state of war. The men who govern in time of war quite openly arrogate to themselves special powers over the governed. The reason given for this arrogation is the need to "maintain unity on the home front in time of crisis." This phrase means simply that the government feels it can not tolerate, in wartime, expressions or actions that may turn public opinion against the war effort.

In past wars, our government, like other governments, has employed forceful means and appeals to jingoism to achieve the required suppression of dissent. For example, in 1917, during World War I, the Congress enacted a Sedition Act under which more than 1,900 persons were convicted for such crimes as . . . making a movie of the American Revolution showing Britain and America at war; saying that war drove men mad; urging people to vote against Congressmen who had voted for conscription; and writing a pamphlet which said that war is contrary to the teachings of Christ.¹²

In any upsurge of superpatriotism, an interest in anything German was considered unpatriotic. Sauerkraut became liberty cabbage; opera companies stopped performing Wagner; and symphony orchestras eliminated works by German composers from their repertoires.

The current war in Vietnam has to date been relatively free of such phenomena. In fact, high government officials, including the President, Vice President, and Secretary of State, have made a point on several occasions of defending the right of dissenters to protest. They have even pointed with pride to these proofs of freedom of speech in an America at war.

It may be that the government is not employing the gross techniques of suppression of former wars because there has not been a declaration of war by Congress. The government might therefore be on precarious legal ground if it attempted to invoke wartime powers of suppression. A more likely

explanation, however, is that the gross suppressive techniques of previous wars have been replaced by more subtle methods which are effective without being offensive, methods whose effectiveness is enhanced by the refinements of the new "science" of public relations and by the all-pervasiveness of the mass media.

A major element in the new, "Public relations" approach is the very gradual escalation of the war effort. In this process of graduated escalation, each new step toward greater involvement is in itself small and seemingly insignificant. Each step appears to evolve as a logical consequence of a previous small and seemingly insignificant step toward greater involvement. And the new step equally logically prepares the ground for the next small and seemingly insignificant step.

The smallness of each step, and its logical evolution out of previous steps, make it acceptable. The gradualness of the process produces a habituation to the involvement. The end result is that the people find themselves deeply committed to large-scale war, without being able to tell how it came about, when and how it all began.

This point was dramatically illustrated at the hearings on the war in Vietnam of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. On February 17, 1966 the following interchange took place:

Senator HICKENLOOPER. When was the commitment made for us to actively participate in the military operations of the war with American personnel?

General MAXWELL TAYLOR. Insofar as the use of our combat ground forces are concerned, that took place, of course, only in the spring of 1965. In the air, we had been participating more actively over two or three years.¹³

The fact that General Taylor, who was personal military representative of President Kennedy in 1961-62, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in 1962-64, Ambassador to South Vietnam in 1964-65, and now Special Consultant to the President, could only say vaguely, "in the air we had been participating more actively over two or three years" is characteristic of the confusion and uncertainty produced by this kind of gradual escalation.

At this juncture, with the nation already deeply involved in actual fighting, other seemingly cogent arguments take over; e.g.: The nation is in danger. Our boys are fighting and dying. Now is not the time for doubting, questioning, hesitating, debating. We must give full support to our boys at the front. Those who refuse full support, or who hesitate, give comfort to the enemy and are directly responsible for unnecessary deaths at the front. All we can do now is to rally 'round the flag, support our Commander-in-Chief. Etc.

Under these conditions, there is no longer any need for direct suppressive measures to guarantee a pro-war consensus. Instead one can employ appeals to "maturity," to concern for one's country, to concern for our boys fighting and dying at the front.

A classic example of this technique appears in a *New York Times* report of a speech delivered by President Johnson on May 17, 1966:

President Johnson, in his most outspoken attacks on the opponents of his Vietnam policy so far, called on all Americans to unite behind him.

Mr. Johnson, gibing at "nervous Nellies," seemed almost to call for an end to criticism of the Administration's actions in Vietnam and to question his critics' patriotism.

Mr. Johnson said, "I ask you and I ask every American to put our country first if we want to keep it first. . . . Put away all the childish divisive things if you want the maturity and the unity that is the mortar of a nation's greatness. I do not think that those men who are out there fighting for

Footnotes at end of article.

us tonight think we should enjoy the luxury of fighting each other back home."¹⁸

Here the President skillfully appeals to the regressive wish of his audience to be good little children and surrender their critical faculties, but couches it as an appeal to maturity. He is lecturing his audience as a benevolently despotic father might lecture a naughty child. In the process, the democratic responsibility of the mature citizen to question, to examine, to criticize, is stood on its head and gibed at as the "childish divisive things" indulged in by "nervous Nellyes."

These latter-day techniques are far more difficult to counteract psychologically than are techniques of direct suppression. The individual no longer experiences the suppression as coming from outside himself. The suppression seems rather to come from within, as a logical response to the situation that the country is in. The individual citizen himself, in response to the President's appeals for unity and maturity, suppresses any wish he may have to think critically, to evaluate objectively, to dissent. The suppressing forces are no longer regarded as ego-alien.

This tendency to self-censorship is reinforced by another factor. Since he does not understand how the country got so deeply involved in the war, and feels quite confused about it, the average citizen concludes that the problems of war and peace in general, and of the Vietnam war in particular, are much too complicated for his average mind to encompass. This self-depreciation facilitates a regressive process, where the confused and helpless infant-citizen finds comfort in leaving all decisions to the father-figures, the all-powerful President and his all-knowing expert advisers.

Once the citizen has accepted the policy of war, psychological processes come into play which induce him to distort reality by ignoring or minimizing those facts which contradict the policy, while giving undue weight to facts which tend to validate the policy. Charles E. Osgood has described these processes under his "congruity hypothesis" as the strain toward consistency.²⁰ Leon Festinger has described them as "the reduction of cognitive dissonance."²¹ These theories submit the proposition that when people know things that are not psychologically consistent with one another, they will try to make them consistent by various means. Osgood points out that the individual is mostly likely to change that element in the incongruity to which he has the least intense attachment and will maintain that element about which he has the most intense conviction.

To illustrate: When Stephen Decatur made his famous toast "My country right or wrong," he was in fact saying that he was capable of tolerating the cognitive dissonance between the strong positive valence of "my country," and the negative valence of "wrong." The average citizen cannot tolerate the dissonance and must change the positive valence of one of the elements to a negative one, or vice versa. He will find it extremely difficult to go through the emotionally painful reevaluation of values and the enormous intellectual efforts that would be involved in admitting to consciousness the idea that his country is engaged in policies and actions that are basically wrong. He will find it easier to eliminate the dissonance by justifying, for example, the bombing and napalming of enemy civilians on such grounds as: the enemy, even civilians, are cruel, ruthless, cunning, fanatical, and none of them can be trusted.

Having achieved this regressive reduction or elimination of dissonance, the citizen experiences a sense of relief from anxiety and from the pressure of having to think about these complex questions. Henceforth, even if

it may seem to him at times that his government's policies are palpably wrong, he can fall back on the comforting thought that there must be some top-secret information to which he has no access, and to which he is not entitled to have access, which can explain everything and make everything all right; and that the father-figures surely know what they are doing.

It seems clear to the behavioral scientist that this situation of habituation, confusion, self-devaluation, and regression to an infantile state of helplessness is unhealthy and should be corrected. Some behavioral scientists also feel that their life-long training and professional skills should enable them to make a contribution toward ameliorating or "curing" this state of sociopathological ill health. Unfortunately, the situation becomes much less clear when the specific questions are asked: What can behavioral scientists do? What contribution can they make?

Jules Masserman concludes an essay on "Psychological Medicine and World Affairs" (in which he writes prophetically as early as 1948 about "the dread prodromata of war") with the question: "What, then, can we as scientists, physicians and men of good will do?" After apologizing for the fact that "as is usual in medical treatises, the section on therapy must be regrettably brief," Masserman answers his own question:

First, let us raise our voices to cry havoc and, since our puny professional and academic "securities" would in any case become meaningless should catastrophe break, dare to use every means of communication at our command to rouse the world to its danger. [And second,] let us leave our crumbling ivory towers and use every podium and influence we have to secure a voice on policy-making and governing bodies.¹⁹

The writer agrees with Masserman's two proposals. He would suggest, in addition, a third way that a contribution could be made by behavioral scientists. In the case described in this paper of the public habituation to war, an effort could be made to counteract it by confronting the public with the existence of habituation and helping the average citizen gain insight into its genesis. The gaining of intellectual and emotional insight is an important tool in dynamic psychotherapy. It should be tried in sociotherapy. Perhaps the average citizen can be helped to feel less bewildered, less helpless, if he is helped to understand, step by step, how the present confused situation came about. Perhaps he can gain confidence in his own ability to think and to understand if he can be helped to perceive the subtle techniques by which his ability to think has been undermined. Perhaps, as in individual psychotherapy, a gaining of insight into the processes, external and intrapsychic, which led to the citizen's regression, may be the first step toward developing greater maturity and self-confidence.

What follows is offered as a sample of an attempt at such elucidation—an effort at counteracting the habituation to war by retracing some of the early steps in the gradual escalation by which the habituation was established.

HABITUATION BY GRADUAL INVOLVEMENT— A CASE STUDY

It is not easy to determine just when, how, and why the United States became committed to intervene in Vietnam. The involvement began quite indirectly, and seemingly without premeditation or intent. It began as an indirect consequence of the efforts of the United States government, under the Marshall Plan, to help the countries of Europe recover from the devastation of World War II.

The French became recipients of Marshall Plan aid soon after World War II ended. When, in 1946, the French began their war against the Viet Minh in an effort to reestab-

lish their colonial rule in Indochina, Marshall Plan dollars enabled the French government to release francs for expenditures in that war.²² This first indirect involvement, and the sympathy of American government officials for the role of the French as "the defenders of the cause of human freedom" in Southeast Asia,²³ led inexorably (although in steps barely visible to the unaided human eye) to the present full-scale involvement with over 400,000 American ground troops and all the latest paraphernalia of war.

The indirect involvement continued from 1946 until 1950. Then it became direct. This next step was taken in May 1950, with the announcement that the U.S. would give direct economic aid and military equipment to the French in Vietnam and to the emperor Bao Dai, who had been appointed by the French to rule Vietnam under their tutelage.²⁴ This step seemed insignificant at the time (merely a shift from indirect aid to direct aid), and logical (since the French were our NATO allies).

The sending of American military equipment to Indochina led logically to another step—the sending of American experts to teach the French how to use the equipment. This was another fateful step—the first commitment of American manpower. President Eisenhower wrote in his memoirs:

It is true that certain legislators have expressed uneasiness concerning any use of American maintenance personnel in Indochina. They fear that this may be opening the door to increased and unwise introduction of American troops into that area. [As indeed it proved to be. I.Z.] The Administration has given assurances to guard against such developments.²⁵

By May 1954, when the French suffered their conclusive defeat at Dienbienphu, there were 684 such American experts, maintenance personnel, and advisers. The French left (in April 1956) but the Americans stayed on, to build up the army of Bao Dai, later of Diem, and still later of the succession of military juntas that followed the overthrow and assassination of Diem.

These American advisers not only stayed on but multiplied, although very slowly at first. At the end of the Eisenhower Administration in 1960, there were about 750 American military personnel in South Vietnam.²⁶ Although they were military men, they wore civilian clothes, because the Geneva Accords of 1954 forbade "the introduction into Vietnam of any troop reinforcements and additional military personnel."²⁷

The next step was also a seemingly unimportant one, but it was perhaps crucial. The American advisers began to appear on the streets of Saigon in American military uniforms. This "surfacing" of the American military in Vietnam was also very gradual. Here, for the first time, was established a palpable, visible American military presence in South Vietnam. Once this was established, all that followed seemed logical and inevitable.

The increase in American troop involvement was considerably accelerated during the Kennedy Administration. By the end of 1961, the newly elected President had more than quadrupled the number of troops to over 3,000. This number tripled in 1962; and by October 1963 there were about 17,000 American "advisers" in South Vietnam. Many of them accompanied their South Vietnamese "advisees" on combat missions, and they were authorized "to fire when fired upon."

In retrospect it is clear that at this stage of the involvement, Americans were engaging in combat—killing and being killed. But this was glossed over by public assurances that there had been "no change in the quality of our support, but only an increase in the quantity of it," and that American military personnel were serving, and would con-

Footnotes at end of article.

tinue to serve, in South Vietnam in a purely advisory and training capacity.²⁵

Furthermore, on October 2, 1963 Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara and General Maxwell Taylor made the reassuring announcement that "the major part of the U.S. military task can be completed by the end of 1965, although there may be a continuing requirement for a limited number of training personnel." This was backed up by a statement that 300 American troops would leave Vietnam by December 3, while another 1,000 would depart before the end of the year.²⁶

Despite these assurances, American involvement continued to increase, in numbers, in intensity, and in overtess. But by this time, the habituation had taken hold. As late as November 1964, with more than 20,000 American ground troops in South Vietnam and with total American casualties close to 2,000, the American people still believed they were voting for a President who had kept us out of war.

A story in the *Los Angeles Times* in April 1965 described the satisfaction of American airmen that "the wraps have at long last been taken off the Air Force." Previously, every American helicopter pilot had to be accompanied by a South Vietnamese "even if the South Vietnamese was a mail clerk," so that in case the helicopter crashed or was shot down, it could be claimed that the Vietnamese mail clerk was the pilot and the American pilot was only an adviser. All this pretense could now finally be discarded, the report in the *Los Angeles Times* continued with obvious satisfaction.

It took 19 years of very gradual escalation for our involvement to reach the point where "the fight is now predominantly an American war," as Walter Lippmann points out. But it should be noted that in the past two years, since "the wraps have been off" and all pretense finally discarded, the escalation has been accelerated precipitously. By November 1965 there were more than 150,000 American soldiers in South Vietnam. In November 1966 there were 360,000 American fighting men on Vietnamese soil.

One might ask whether the gradual escalation was deliberately planned by government leaders as a subtle and effective public relations technique, or was the haphazard result of historical factors outside the control of our government. Since both history and human motivation are never a matter of black-or-white, the question can be posed more meaningfully as follows: to what extent was the gradual habituation deliberately planned and predetermined, and to what extent did it just happen?

It is doubtful that anyone, including the leaders themselves, could answer these questions categorically. However, the weight of the historical evidence goes to show that the government of the United States was determined, from the very beginning, to do everything it could to keep Ho Chi Minh and the Viet Minh from coming to power in Vietnam. For example, Chalmers W. Roberts, Chief of the National News Bureau of the Washington Post, and Times-Herald, reported that on March 25, 1954 the National Security Council took a firm position that the United States could not afford the loss of Indochina to the Communists, and that if it were necessary to prevent the loss, the United States would intervene in the war. This decision was approved by President Eisenhower.²⁷ On April 16, 1954 Vice President Nixon sent up a public trial-balloon in a speech before the American Society of Newspaper Editors, in which he said:

If to avoid further Communist expansion in Asia and Indochina, we must take the risk now by putting our boys in, I think the Executive has to take the politically unpopular decision and do it.²⁸

A few days previously, on April 3, 1954, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and Admiral Arthur W. Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, had urged upon a secret meeting of eight leaders of the Senate and the House the necessity of a joint resolution by Congress to permit President Eisenhower to use air and naval power in Indochina. Admiral Radford's plan was to relieve the French at Dienbienphu by striking at the Vietminh forces with hundreds of American planes from Navy carriers and from the Philippines. Roberts writes:

Some of those at the meeting came away with the feeling that if they had agreed that Saturday to the resolution, *planes would have been winging toward Dienbienphu without waiting for a vote of Congress—or without a word in advance to the American people.* [Emphasis mine I.Z.]

Secretary Dulles tried to interest some of America's allies in his plans. "In these talks Dulles ran into one rock of opposition—Britain."²⁹ The reaction of another ally is described by Roscoe Drummond and Gaston Coblenz in their book about Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, *Duel at the Brink*. They write:

The main figure with whom he [John Foster Dulles] negotiated in Paris, shortly before the [Geneva] conference and during its early weeks, was [French] Foreign Minister Georges Bidault.

As the collapse of Dienbienphu approached, Dulles told Bidault that a battle lost was not a war lost. The discouraged Bidault replied that General de Gaulle had said the same thing in 1940, but that it was something one says in the first year of a war, not in the eighth, as in Indochina.

Bidault's recollection of the talks, as recounted to these reporters, introduces into the Dulles record a new element which, at present, reposes solely on the French statesman's testimony. *Bidault understood Dulles, on two separate occasions, to have offered him the use of American atomic bombs by French forces in the Indochina war.*

By Bidault's account both offers were made before the fall of Dienbienphu; prior, that is, to the Geneva Conference. According to Bidault, both offers were made to him personally by Dulles in Paris.

The first is recalled by Bidault as an offer of one or more atomic bombs to be dropped on Communist Chinese territory near the Indochina border in a countermove against the Chinese supply lines to the Vietminh Communists.

The second is recalled as an offer of two atomic bombs against the Vietminh forces at Dienbienphu.

Bidault, by his account, declined both offers. He told Dulles that it would be impossible to predict where the use of nuclear weapons against Red China would end, that it could lead to Russian intervention and a world-wide holocaust. In the case of the second offer, he considered the French and Vietminh forces to be by then too closely engaged at Dienbienphu to permit the use of atomic weapons.

There is no doubt in Bidault's mind that these offers were made to him by Dulles.³⁰ [Emphasis mine. I.Z.]

These facts point to the conclusion that the Administration would have plunged the United States into the Indochina war much more precipitously if it could have. But it encountered two obstacles: Our Allies, especially Britain and France refused to go along. And Nixon's trial-balloon brought forth an avalanche of negative letters and telegrams to the President, and a great deal of negative reaction in the press. The time was not ripe for total intervention. The American people would have to undergo a prolonged process of habituation before they would be ready for total intervention.

It is, of course, quite likely that, having

embarked on a course of gradual escalation, the leaders themselves became conditioned and habituated—they became the victims of their own techniques. The strain toward consistency and elimination of cognitive dissonance described by Osgood, Festinger, and others applies not only to ordinary citizens but also to leaders. The leaders are constrained to find rationalizations which will justify their decisions to themselves, as well as to their followers. Former President Eisenhower recently exemplified one such technique in high places, a technique to justify the killing of civilians in underdeveloped nations. In a televised speech on September 18, 1966, he argued against "the fear of using a weapon [nuclear] that the free world might need in some outlying place where people or life seems to be cheap, and they want to have their way."³¹

It is also probable that the original planners of our Southeast Asia strategy did not anticipate in 1950-54 either the duration or the extent of the ultimate involvement. They grossly underestimated the determination, stamina, and dedication of the guerrillas. The performance of the Viet Minh against the French should have alerted our decision-makers, but here another factor entered, which is operative to this day. The American leaders felt vastly superior both to the French and to their rag-tag guerrilla opponents. The leaders were the victims of the parochial tendency to feel that "one American is as good as any 10 foreigners," (especially if the foreigners are non-white).

Since then, much habituation has taken place. In June 1954 a Gallup Poll showed that 72% of the American people opposed sending American troops to Indochina. By 1966, 60-70% were going along with Administration policy. The process of habituation has been eminently successful. It has achieved a 180 degree shift in American public opinion in the space of 12 years.

The habituation has been reinforced by techniques of news management and manipulation of public opinion. The President's televised press conference of July 28, 1965 is a classic example. It furnishes an instructive case study of the psychological preparation and manipulation of the American public:

Several weeks before the press conference took place, Secretary of Defense McNamara made a highly dramatized and thoroughly publicized "fact-finding" tour of South Vietnam. Newspaper dispatches stressed the dangerous nature of this mission. The Viet Cong, it was reported, spared no efforts to "get" McNamara. On one occasion, a mine was discovered in the nick of time under a bridge that McNamara was to cross. (No one asked why such a dangerous mission was given so much advance publicity. Would it not have been safer for Mr. McNamara to slip into Vietnam incognito and with no fanfare?)

Upon his return from Vietnam to Washington, Secretary McNamara and his fact-finding mission continued to capture the headlines. For several days, these front page stories in the news media reported that the President was closeted with Mr. McNamara and several top-level advisers in day-long, continuous top-secret consultations. The purpose of these conferences was to determine, on the basis of Mr. McNamara's findings, the future course of the war. Strangely enough, at the end of each day's "secret" session information was "leaked" to the news media which indicated that there would be a very rapid increase in U.S. combat forces in Vietnam, a marked rise in draft quotas, mobilization of the reserves, and a request that the Congress make a supplemental war appropriation of 12 billion dollars. With each day, as preparations were reported for a Presidential press conference, tension rose and public apprehension mounted that the country would be placed on a total war footing.

Footnotes at end of article.

So well was the public prepared by the press "leaks" to expect the worst, that there was a general expression of relief when, on July 28, the President asked for "only" 1.7 billion dollars, a draft quota of "only" 35,000 by November, an increase in troop strength to "only" 125,000, and greatest concession of all, did not call out the reserves. However, the *Wall Street Journal* of August 4, 1965, reported that . . . the President had announced one plan for public consumption, but was pushing, behind the scenes, for a much larger involvement in the war.

In connection with this concealed program, the *Wall Street Journal* continued, Secretary of Defense McNamara appeared before a closed session of the Senate Armed Services Committee to project a far heavier commitment of manpower and funds.

By January 20, 1966, the *Los Angeles Times* was reporting that the President "appeals to Congress to provide \$12 billion more to support expanded Vietnam action." (The precise figure mentioned in the press leaks of July 1965.) By February 12, 1966, the President was stating that the time may come when he will have to summon the reserves. Several months after that, a bill was passed giving the President authority to do so. And, of course, the number of combat troops rapidly rose above 125,000 figure projected in the July 28 press conference.

It is clear, in retrospect, that the skillfully stage-managed, televised press conference of July 28, 1965 marked a new phase of open, headlong escalation of the war—now that the "wraps were off." But an adverse public reaction to this new development was averted by skillful manipulation of information. The formula is simple, but effective: First step: highly alarming rumors about escalation are "leaked." Second step: the President officially and dramatically sets the anxieties to rest by announcing a much more moderate rate of escalation, and accompanies this announcement with assurances of the government's peaceful intentions. Third step: after the general sigh of relief, the originally rumored escalation is gradually put into effect, after all.

This technique of psychological backing and filling has two effects: (1) By the time the originally leaked figure of, say, \$12 billion, is officially presented by the President in January 1966, the citizen has the comfortable feeling of familiarity with it, of being knowledgeable about it. Somewhere, sometime he has seen and heard this figure before, as indeed he had—in July 1965. It has been robbed of its shock effect. The citizen has become habituated to it. (2) The succession of "leaks," denials of leaks, and denials of denials, thoroughly confuses the individual. He is left bewildered, helpless, apathetic.

The habituation is further reinforced by what is politely called "news management," but what some newsmen have referred to more frankly as the withholding of information or the giving out of misinformation by the government. In February 1965, U.N. Secretary General U Thant bluntly stated that the American people were not getting the true facts about the war in Vietnam, particularly about peace feelers from Hanoi.¹⁸ Australian correspondents in Vietnam have charged American military public relations men with misrepresenting casualty figures in order to make them less stark for the American public.¹⁹ American newsmen have similarly complained about misleading news and misinformation. In a front page news article headed "U.S. Command Less Than Candid in Reporting Vietnam Battle Action," Jack Foisie, Bureau Chief in Saigon for the *Washington Post* and the *Los Angeles Times*, writes:

Even in a minor defeat, or a minor error in contrast to the bigness of the war, spokesmen try to minimize the setback, distort the fact. They do their best to sweep the dirt under the tent.¹⁴

Professor Thomas A. Bailey writes in the *New York Times* about President Johnson's "warping, sugar-coating or falsification of the news."²

News management is not a new phenomenon. It is probably as old as politics itself. In the United States, as Professor Bailey puts it, "news management dates back to George Washington's Administration."³ What is new, in our democracy, is the quantity, the degree of news management. What is new is the fact that high government officials openly admit it, and that the large majority of the American people have accepted it as one of the facts of life. William Touhy, the *Los Angeles Times* correspondent in Saigon, writes:

Sylvester [Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs Arthur Sylvester] has said he favors government news management, including lying to the press in times of crisis. On a trip to Vietnam, he declared the press ought to be the handmaiden of the government, as far as reporting the war went.¹⁵

And *Newsweek* quoted the official spokesman for the United States mission in Saigon as stating: "My directive says that our policy is one of minimum candor."¹⁷

The open advocacy by governmental leaders of policies of "minimum candor" and lying to the people undermines "the right to know." The restrictions on his right to know the truth mesh neatly with the citizen's regressive wish to remain unknowing, and further facilitate his regression to the pre-adolescent phase of seeking security in the omniscience and omnipotence of the authority figures.

CONCLUSIONS

The techniques employed by government to reduce opposition to the war in Vietnam rely heavily on psychological habituation by gradual involvement. Each small new step in the escalation is presented as a logical, unavoidable result of a commitment made by a previous small step. The result is acquiescence by the individual, with no feeling that his right to disagree is being suppressed.

The acquiescence resulting from psychological habituation to the war could prepare the ground for eventual acceptance of the use of nuclear weapons, if such use developed as a "logical" next step. Senator Richard B. Russell, Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, has advocated using small nuclear weapons in Vietnam, increasing the size of the nuclear bombs when necessary. This foreshadows a kind of nuclear escalation similar to the gradual escalation described above.

The gradual habituation, the "management" of news and information, and the manipulation of public opinion produce in the American people a sense of confusion. They undermine the average American's confidence in his own ability to think clearly and cope with important issues. They foster in the average American a feeling of helplessness and passivity. All this bodes ill for the democratic process: an ill-informed and misinformed people may be unable to participate intelligently in decision-making. It bodes ill for the prospects of human survival: a habituated people may be unable to stop the drift toward a third, thermonuclear, world war. It bodes ill for the emotional health of the American people.

And all this is a matter of serious concern to behavioral scientists, as citizens and as specialists.

FOOTNOTES

¹ ACHESON, D. 1950. Statement at Ministerial Level Meeting in Paris. Department of State Bulletin. May 22: 821.

² BAILEY, T. A. 1966. Johnson and Kennedy—the two thousand days. *New York Times Magazine*. November 6, 1966: 139.

³ DRUMMOND, R. and G. COBLENTZ. 1960. *Duel at the Brink—John Foster Dulles' Command of American Power*. Doubleday and Co., Garden City, New York: 121-122.

⁴ EISENHOWER, D. D. 1965. *Mandate for Change*. Signet Books, New York: 430.

⁵ EISENHOWER, D. D. 1965. Op. cit.: 416.

⁶ EISENHOWER, D. D. 1965. Op. cit.: 427.

⁷ FESTINGER, L. 1957. *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*. Row, Peterson, New York.

⁸ FESTINGER, L. AND D. BRAMEL. 1962. Cognitive dissonance. In *Experimental Foundations of Clinical Psychology*, A. J. Bachrach (Ed.), Basic Books, New York.

⁹ FESTINGER, L. 1964. *Conflict, Decision and Dissonance*. Stanford University Press, Stanford, California.

¹⁰ GARDNER, G. E. 1959. Psychiatric Problems of Adolescence. In *Handbook of Psychiatry*, Silvano Arletti (Ed.). Basic Books, New York: 1: 870-871.

¹¹ GETTLEMAN, M. E. (Ed.). 1965. *Viet Nam—History, Documents, and Opinions on a Major World Crisis*. Fawcett Publications, New York: 78.

¹² KASTENMEIER, R. W. 1963. Speech on floor of House of Representatives. *New York Times*. July 17, 1963.

¹³ *Los Angeles Times*. Nov. 16, 1965.

¹⁴ *Los Angeles Times*. Oct. 3, 1965.

¹⁵ *Los Angeles Times*. Aug. 11, 1966.

¹⁶ MASSERMAN, J. H. 1948. Psychological medicine and world affairs. In *Modern Trends in Psychological Medicine*. Butterworth and Company, London.

¹⁷ *Newsweek*. Aug. 2, 1965.

¹⁸ *New York Times*. May 18, 1966.

¹⁹ *New York Times*. Dec. 8 and 15, 1965.

²⁰ OSGOOD, C. E., G. J. SUCI, AND P. H. TANNENBAUM. 1957. *The Measurement of Meaning*. University of Illinois Press, Urbana, Illinois.

²¹ OSGOOD, C. E. 1960. Cognitive dynamics in the conduct of human affairs. *Public Opinion Quarterly*. 24(2): 341-365.

²² ROBERTS, C. M. 1954. The day we didn't go to war. *The Reporter*. Sept. 14, 1954.

²³ ROBINSON, F. M., AND E. KEMP (Eds.). 1966. *Report on the U.S. Senate Hearings—The Truth About Vietnam*. Greenleaf Classics, San Diego, California: 268.

²⁴ ROBINSON, F. M., AND E. KEMP. 1966. Op. cit.: 268.

²⁵ ROBINSON, F. M., AND E. KEMP. 1966. Op. cit. 265-266.

²⁶ STONE, I. F. 1966. Ike would use A-bombs. *I. F. Stone's Weekly*. Sept. 2, 1966: 4.

²⁷ *The Geneva Agreements* (complete text). 1965. *Viet Report*. Aug.-Sept. 1965: 18.

²⁸ *U.S. News and World Report*. July 25, 1966: 36.

EPILOGUE—JULY, 1970

(By Isidore Ziferstein, M.D.)

The techniques of psychological habituation to the acceptance of war are being continued by the Nixon administration, as may be seen in the escalation of American involvement in Laos and the extension of the war into Cambodia.

Let us analyze briefly the anatomy of the public-relations techniques employed in putting across the Cambodian venture. Here, too, as in the case of our original involvement in the Vietnam war, the involvement was at first seemingly indirect. Late in April, it became known that our South Vietnamese "allies" were invading the sanctuaries of the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese just inside Cambodia. It was announced that no American combat troops were involved. The next step occurred on April 30, with the announcement by President Nixon of a massive invasion of the sanctuaries by American troops. It was stressed that the purpose of the incursion was solely to destroy the sanctuaries, and that American troops would not venture deeper into Cambodia, nor would they fight to defend or support the Lon Nol government.

A few days later, this was modified to state that American forces would not penetrate Cambodia beyond a line 21.7 miles from the border. This was taken to apply not only to ground forces, but also to air and naval

forces. The President also pledged to pull all U.S. troops and advisers out of Cambodia by June 30.

At his May 8 news conference President Nixon was asked whether the South Vietnamese subscribe to the American pullout deadline, and he answered: "No, they do not. I would expect that the South Vietnamese would come out at approximately the same time that we do, because, when we come out, our logistical support and air support will also come out." However, by May 24, Secretary of State Rogers was indicating to newsmen that South Vietnamese operations in Cambodia will have U.S. support, including air support, after American troops pulled out. (Los Angeles Times, May 25, 1970.)

And by June 24, it was announced that U.S. war-planes struck deep into Cambodian territory to help the Lon Nol government troops break the month-long siege of Kampong Thom. This air-strike was 140 miles inside Cambodia, about 120 miles past the 21.7 mile limit set by President Nixon. At the same time, a Defense Department spokesman maintained that President Nixon and Secretary of Defense Laird had ruled out United States combat air support for South Vietnamese forces operating more than 21.7 miles inside Cambodia. (Los Angeles Times, June 24, 1970.)

Similar double-talk (or psychological backing and filling) was demonstrated when Herbert Klein, the President's communications director, said that U.S. troops would be pulled out of Cambodia by June 30, but that they would return to Cambodia if necessary. A correspondent asked: "When might they return? Could they return July 1?" Mr. Klein replied, "Could be!"

In his July 1 "conversation" with three TV commentators, President Nixon stated unequivocally: "All Americans are out [of Cambodia]" and "We have no plans to send any advisers into Cambodia." However, on July 1, a dispatch by Jack Foisie in the Los Angeles Times reported:

"But there is evidence that some American military men continue to participate in the Cambodian war. Some are in civilian clothes and most of them commute daily from Vietnam bases and return before dark. They thus may technically fulfill the White House declaration that no American combatants other than aircraft crews remain involved in the Cambodian struggle."

And Foisie reports further:

"Although Pentagon spokesmen have denied that U.S. ground crews are present to service these air craft [at the Phnom Penh airport,] there is evidence to the contrary reported by correspondents on the scene."

A later report in Life (July 10, 1970) dated Phnom Penh, states: "The seed of U.S. involvement has taken and is burgeoning with all the apparatus of military, political and economic aid . . . [At the Phnom Penh airport] six Westerners are loading an olive-green truck with a large olive-green container. They wear civilian clothes, but U.S. combat boots show beneath their trousers. Short haircuts and the nice moves of the man trying to hide his walkie-talkie indicate the imminent surfacing of more American presence in Cambodia. Fresh-sprayed paint shrouds every official marking but one on the truck door. It reads, 'For Official Use Only.' Embarrassed and close-mouthed, two of the party concede they are U.S. airmen, in Phnom Penh—way beyond the 21.7-mile limit—to install 'navigational equipment'. . . . The war is settling in for a long stay."

As one reads these reports, he gets a feeling of déjà-vu. The same news-management, the same manipulation and confusion of public opinion by double-talk and psychological backing and filling, that took place over the years in the Vietnam adventure, is now being repeated in Cambodia. And there is grave danger that at some point Mr. Nixon and his military advisers will decide that American

public opinion is sufficiently confused, divided, polarized, and therefore helpless, to warrant an all-out massive effort to achieve a military victory.

All these techniques and all these events continue to take their toll of the emotional health of the American people. It was this fact that moved the American Psychoanalytic Association, which had always carefully refrained from taking any political position, to state:

"At a time when this country's leadership has stated a commitment to disengagement from Viet Nam, we are suddenly and without warning confronted with an extension of military involvement. This has resulted in a dramatic increase in anxiety, turbulence and conflict, involving crucial segments of our population" and to protest the extension of the war into Cambodia.

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

Isidore Ziferstein, M.D., has been engaged in the practice of psychiatry and psychoanalysis, and in research and teaching, for more than thirty years. He is a member of the faculty of the Southern California Psychoanalytic Institute, and a Research Consultant at the Postgraduate Center for Mental Health, New York; Associate Clinical Professor of Psychiatry at the University of California at Los Angeles.

His major research interests are: group psychotherapy, group dynamics, and transcultural psychiatry. He has published extensively on these areas of research.

From 1955 until 1965, he was engaged in a research project, "A Study of the Psychotherapeutic Process" at the Psychiatric and Psychosomatic Research Institute, Mt. Sinai Hospital, Los Angeles (Franz Alexander, Director). Then, for a period of fifteen months in 1963 and 1964, he made comparative direct observations of psychotherapy in the Soviet Union, as a Research Fellow of the Foundations' Fund for Research in Psychiatry, New Haven.

The National Institute of Mental Health has awarded him a grant, to enable him to continue his studies of Soviet psychotherapy, and to write a monograph on the subject.

CURRICULUM VITAE: ISIDORE ZIFERSTEIN, M.D.—
PSYCHIATRIST, PSYCHOANALYST

A.B.—1931—Columbia College, New York City.

M.D.—1935—College of Physicians & Surgeons, Columbia University, New York.

1935—1937: Rotating Internship—Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn, New York.

1937—1941—Staff Psychiatrist—Mt. Pleasant State Hospital, Iowa. Psychiatric Consultant—Iowa State Penitentiary, Fort Madison.

1941—1944—Chief Psychiatric Resident—Psychiatric Institute of Grasslands Hospital, Valhalla, New York.

1947—1951—Psychoanalytic training in Southern California Psychoanalytic Institute.

1951—: Member of the faculty, Southern California Psychoanalytic Institute.

1954—1963: Attending psychiatrist, Los Angeles Psychiatric Services.

1955—1965: Research Project "A Study of the Psychotherapeutic Process" at the Psychiatric and Psychosomatic Research Institute, Mount Sinai Hospital, Los Angeles.

1960—1964: Associate Clinical Professor of Psychiatry, University of Southern California.

1962—: Research Associate, Postgraduate Center for Mental Health, New York.

1963—1965: Research Fellow, Foundations' Fund for Research in Psychiatry, New Haven.

1970: Associate Clinical Professor of Psychiatry, University of California at Los Angeles.

Scientific and Professional Societies:

Fellow, American Psychiatric Association, American Psychoanalytic Association.

Fellow, Academy of Psychoanalysis, International Psychoanalytical Association.

Fellow, American Association for the Advancement of Science, Federation of American Scientists, American Medical Association.

Past-President, Los Angeles Group Psychotherapy Society, Association for the Advancement of Psychotherapy, World Federation of Mental Health, New York Academy of Science, American Academy of Political and Social Science.

Member, Board of Directors—Viewer Sponsored Television Foundation.

Member, Board of Directors—National Association for Better Broadcasting.

Member, Advisory Board—Crenshaw House (A Quaker residential center for reorientation of discharged prisoners).

Member, Executive Committee, Californians Against State Executions.

Member, Board of Directors—American Civil Liberties Union, Southern California Chapter.

Member, National Board, National Committee for a SANE Nuclear Policy.

NATIONAL AIRPORT AND A MODEL POTOMAC ESTUARY

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1970

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, residents of the Potomac Valley continue to be harassed nightly by jet air traffic departing National Airport after the 10 p.m. curfew which was carefully negotiated last year by the responsible authorities. According to information provided to my office by the Federal Aviation Administration, delays due to mechanical difficulties seem to be the chief cause for the exception permitted in scheduling flights authorized for departure following the curfew.

There was a relaxation of the curfew along with lifting of the ban on the use of the large stretch jets at National last winter during the air controllers' operational "slowdown." At the time, the FAA stated that its action was in the "best public interest." I cannot understand how the overcrowding of National Airport with larger jets and failure to thoroughly adhere to the nighttime curfew can be in the best public interest. The continued scheduling of larger planes in the form of the stretch jets into National can only lead to increased congestion at National and pressure for expansion of the airport and terminal facilities there.

Local planning officials have called for a halt to any further expansion of these facilities at National, and have recommended the most efficient use of Dulles Airport which was designed and built with taxpayers money to serve the Washington air traffic needs. These Washington area planners have now been joined by the Department of Interior in expressions of concern with the increased concentration of airport traffic at National. The Department's recent report, "The Potomac—A Model Estuary" speaks to this point and I am submitting here today for the benefit of my colleagues, a pertinent section of the Interior Department's report:

NATIONAL AIRPORT

Work toward the phasing out of major commercial air traffic at Washington Na-

tional Airport concurrent with development of rapid public transit from downtown areas to Dulles and Friendship Airports. Water-front portions of this facility should then be considered for recreation use. Noncommercial airport facilities could be retained and portions could be converted to other use.

While regulation and control of public air traffic is a function of the Department of Transportation, it is within the province of this Department and this report to point out the great recreation and open space needs which this installation could meet and also to call attention to the increasing air and noise pollution that a major airport almost within the city presents and its serious adverse effect upon recreation use of the river. Airport traffic could be accommodated at Dulles Airport in Virginia and Friendship Airport in Maryland, and rights-of-way for rapid access from downtown Washington to these airports are already in public ownership.

ANOTHER FOURTH

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1970

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, Thomas Jefferson said:

When the press is free and every man able to read, all is safe.

The weekly community newspaper is one of the backbones of the American way of life. It is, in essence, a small business with the problem of making ends meet and in maintaining employment for others. As such, the paper shares the problems involved in running a business and yet performs a service for the community.

One of the leading weekly newspapers in Nassau County is the Valley Stream MAILER. In its edition of Thursday, July 2 it editorialized on the importance of the Fourth of July to our Nation in a way that struck me as touching an important aspect of the greatness of our country. The editorial follows:

ANOTHER FOURTH

It has often been said that U. S. citizens have lived in a condition of freedom so long they have forgotten the evils of oppression. We take for granted the individual worth of a person, equal rights under the law, acceptance of government as a protector and referee for all citizens and the presumption of innocence until proven guilty.

With the approach of another Fourth of July, the words of Dr. John A. Howard, president of Rockford College, as he views these matters, should have a special meaning: "Having grown up with these concepts as the conditions of our living, we cannot comprehend, we cannot register upon how they were when first proclaimed, nor do we realize how they contrast with what exists in the police state nations, nor how they differ from contemporary democracies that carry still the deep-rooted psychological mind-set of their monarchical heritage. The existence of a House of Lords and a House of Commons maintains the message that the common man, even risen to the highest position, remains a commoner. By contrast, in our country, with our inheritance of assumptions, the phrase 'second-class citizen' very rightly stirs indignation. . . ." We should think about these things on this Fourth of July, 1970.

THE CHASM AHEAD

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in the RECORD the second in the series on the creation of an Atlantic Union written by Aurelio Peccei. The suggestion that an Atlantic Union be formed is one which merits much consideration. I am advised that currently there are 110 House sponsors of the Atlantic Union resolution, and I am hopeful that soon this proposal will come before the House.

The world—although both large and diverse—grows smaller and smaller as more countries realize that isolationism is no longer a viable national policy. A myriad of common problems could be solved by a joint effort if Atlantic unionism develops. I look forward to the day when our country joins with others in seeking such common solutions.

Dr. Peccei's article follows:

[From Freedom and Union magazine, May 1970]

THE CHASM AHEAD: AN URGENT CALL FROM EUROPE FOR ATLANTIC UNION—II

(By Aurelio Peccei)

The need to assert the principles of priority and Atlantic interdependence is quite as pressing for Europe. However, one should not lose sight that Europe's *primum vivere* requirement is rightly to exist as Europe. Like Hamlet, Europe faces the dilemma: To be or not to be. In this respect, hope is pegged mainly to the preservation, strengthening, and expansion of the 1957 Treaty of Rome, by which the six signatories sought to end their historical hostilities and rivalries, and established an unprecedented partnership among sovereign states—the European Economic Community.

We have seen that much pessimism prevails nowadays about the future of the Community. Despite all misgivings and delays, a point of no return in its evolution has now been reached. And lamentable though the present state of European affairs is, there is reason to hope that the goal, the actual economic and political unity of the continent, is after all not as remote as it may appear. There is a steady march forward in the implementation of the Treaty of Rome.

The catalyst of Europe's unification cannot be other than the Community. Though its current membership is still only six, and some of its postures are self-centered and inward-looking, it represents a nucleus capable of eventually attracting all other European nations. There is no alternative to it. It is the Community that embodies the ideal of economic integration, conducive to the ultimate goal of political unity, and it is the Community that may have in the European Continent a function similar to what one would imagine for the Atlantic community in the wider world.

Of course, there is no basis to presume that the process of giving birth to a continent by amalgamation and conviction, not conquest and dictatorship, is an easy one. Whatever the desire and rationale of more effective progress, one should not forget how deeply Europe is implicated in history and how its unification is contrary to age-old traditions, memories, feuds, interests, and taboos deeply set in its psyche.

Therefore, to achieve a stronger community—this prerequisite of unification in Europe—the obvious strategy is to rally all elements, the active, dormant, lukewarm, or

still unconvinced ones in the Community itself and in all the other Atlantic nations, including the United States, and induce them to support this Community-centered process as the only method now available of building Europe.

Everyone must be prepared to pay a price, even a high price, for this first step toward one Europe to be made. The orthodox "Europeist" must accept that Europe will consolidate itself somewhat erratically, *à la carte*, rather than assume at once the majestic and harmonious shape conceived by its early political designers. The advocates of the quick entry of the United Kingdom must be patient while that momentous event is postponed for a few years more. In the meantime, they should aim at consolidating the present Community of Six and its external ties with the U.K. and the other EFTA countries. And the "Atlanticists" of the two shores must absorb and placate the sprinkling of anti-Americanism occurring in Europe as an inevitable byproduct of this belabored process, and obtain forbearance and restraint in the United States in the face of it.

However, even if their high hopes and spirits are maintained against the difficult hurdles still to come, there is no way out for Europeans but to recognize the principles of priority and Atlantic interdependence. Europe's inferior potential dramatically underscores this imperative. It is principally in this sense that I said that Europe should reject all temptations to become a carbon copy of the United States. Instead of being hypnotized by the United States' successes in applied science and advanced technology and trying to ape and duplicate them without a critical assessment of their consistency with a set of over-all European objectives, Europe must first define these objectives.

It is again a question, also in the case of Europe, of starting with the right approach. Once Europe has decided what are the goals and priorities that best respond to its genius and needs, then it can launch programs that are feasible with its human and material resources. Against this, the objection may be raised that if a rational study of national objectives and priorities is so difficult in Washington, the magnitude of this difficulty will be much greater in Europe, where, besides at least equally muddled issues, in the absence of unified institutions, there is still a great measure of nationalistic tug-of-war between Paris, Rome, Bonn, London, etc. But this is really still more reason for considering the definition of priorities itself as a high-priority question.

As to the selection of European priorities, I would for example, suggest that information technology and its applications, a sector where very little coordinated effort is made, but good results could easily be obtained—are more important than nuclear, a sector where the excellent qualitative results obtained do not, however, compensate the effort and money lavished. I would also suggest that a sustained aerospace effort is justified at this stage only when directed towards developing directly usable civilian applications.

Preferential attention should be given to the conservation and development of Europe's cities, most of which have been in the past high expressions of erstwhile technology, but now must be enabled to absorb the technology of modern times rather than be crushed by it, and remain one of the great patrimonies of mankind. I would enlarge this concept to that of safeguarding the "quality of Europe," a continent of high and ancient civilization, dense population, and a unique heritage of historical, artistic, and sacred monuments. This objective should probably take precedence over new ventures in oceanography, and certainly should be strenuously upheld against, for instance, the temptation of competing in advanced weaponry with the United States or the Soviet Union.

With his usual expertise, Christopher Layton in the not yet published book *Europe's Advanced Technology*, outlines a tentative institutional framework for Europe with a Directorate of Science and Technology, a Science Foundation, a Technology Fund, and several Management Agencies. In my own view, much essential work can also be done well before these or other formal European institutions are established.

Pierre Piganol too outlines the basis of a unified science policy for Europe, and considers the prime need to be the creation of a European Science Foundation, whose initial task would be to take stock of existing facilities, means and programs, and provide cross-references to the situation in the United States and the Soviet Union.

Although I do not share all the views held by these two friends of mine, they, and a growing number of dedicated Europeans, point out the right direction. And it is this growing willingness to unite in the face of the gap that may produce the embryo of a science policy even before Europe is born. If this prediction is fulfilled, and also an industrial policy that would be designed to foster the development of truly European corporations is eventually adopted, great headway will be made toward all the objectives we have indicated. These will be two momentous breakthroughs, because they will cause tens of thousands of government and corporate decision-makers not only in Europe, but also in the United States, to redirect their minds and activities toward longer-term, wider-horizon, future-oriented goals—which means that they will inevitably work for, and not against, further European unity and Atlantic cooperation. The outcome will be a new renaissance, and a galvanization of energies throughout the old Continent.

In the process, Europe will find that it cannot alone accomplish all its immense tasks and objectives. For this reason, those who want to build the new Europe should always aim at making it not an autarchic continent, but an outward and forward looking "Europe plus," as it is sometimes called, projected onto the Atlantic platform of cooperation and mutual fulfillment.

In Europe's case the principle of interdependence has become quite imperative at this stage, when European industry is deeply infiltrated by American investment or is dependent upon American patents and production, distribution, and managerial know-how. Whatever beliefs its leaders may hold about Europe's goals, they have no alternative for their attainment but long-range cross-fertilization and ties with America.

However, a weightier reason will become apparent for Europe to combine with the United States. It is that the outside world, although mesmerized by American might and bewitching technology, expects from Europe something that Europe in self-interest cannot refuse and has the capacity to conceive, something which it has the vocation to offer, but not the power to produce alone: *How to organize peace.*

The United States is not considered, by and large, to be engaged on this path. *Pax Americana*, whatever it may be, and despite its merits, sounds more a catchword than a convincing way of spreading peace across the planet. In world public opinion, the United States and the Soviet Union have been too busy watching each other and responding to mutual threat by arming to the teeth and dragging others in their wake, and in particular the United States has considered herself too powerful to be interested in making the supreme effort necessary to create the conditions, and undertake the organization, of a stable peace situation over the world. Conversely, the credibility of Europe, in my opinion, is not by and large questioned in this respect—notwithstanding some militarist regurgitation, here and there. Therefore, a united and respected Europe

may bring into the Atlantic community this invaluable new component. And this role of Europe will be a determinant in the definition of its own and Atlantic objectives.

Europeans must not shirk facing these realities and new responsibilities for another, overriding reason. The sooner they realize that closer complementation with the United States is inescapable, the sooner they will discover that in the *quid pro quo* game with the Americans they still hold unexploited cards. After all, in advanced societies—and I would say this particularly of modern American society—people are becoming more sophisticated and strive for a higher quality of life. In its interplay with America, Europe is especially capable of making original contributions toward this end. Traits of its multiple civilization—aesthetic, ethic, spiritual, philosophical, and generally humanistic—will bend with the present triumphant techno-scientific mainstream, pouring out mainly from its great fountainhead in America.

In conclusion, if the perspective of a continuum of European-American cooperation and interdependence, leading to some form of stricter union of the two sides of the Atlantic, gains acceptability, then many serious problems—from the brain drain to the balance of payments—will look less serious even before being diluted in a wider area when the Atlantic institutions are in place; at any rate, their inconvenience will become much more bearable.

In this perspective of an Atlantic community, federation or commonwealth, whatever this closer European-American nexus will eventually come to be in the next decades, asymmetry across the Atlantic and the disparities among its component peoples will not matter very much—in technological achievements, in productivity, techno-structure, institutions, and even ways of life.

Indeed, considerable degrees of diversification among them may be considered a healthy feature of the mass society we are going to have, as they will enrich it with multiple experiences and foster the research of alternative solutions. Thus they will permit it to grow more versatile and creative, and offer a more interesting spectrum of opportunities to its people, and enhance the intercourse and mobility of their talent, entrepreneurship and capital all over the Atlantic area.

Only by purposeful research, study, and implementation of the tenets of priority and interdependence, coordinately by America and Europe, can the technological gap and its consequences be overcome. This is indeed the strategy that will automatically, I would say naturally, stop the two continents from drifting apart.

With this approach and this change of direction in the conduct of their own affairs, Europeans and Americans will then be able to devote much more attention to the outside world, from which the future threats and challenges will come.

THE PRINCIPLE OF LEADERSHIP

These observations bring us to the third principle beside those of priority and interdependence: that of *leadership*. If only this principle were understood, both the United States and Europe would promptly set aside their other differences and devote more energy to bridging the technological and other gaps that hinder the exercise of leadership.

To understand the full import of the consequences of the Atlantic split in the years to come, we must envisage the Atlantic platform as the very middle of the great stage rocked by the forces of the contemporary world. For the Atlantic platform is indeed the epicenter of movement in today's world system. In other epochs the center was in the heartlands of Asia or the Mediterranean, and from there, by foot, horse, or sail, trade and crafts moved and invasions started, and by word of mouth and by script, the wall of

the powerful and the faith and ideas of the sage irradiated, and in time, conquered the known world.

In our own era, when time and distance no longer cushion the impact of change, what happens in the world largely depends on events occurring, decisions taken, or signals called in the central Atlantic area. Trade and traffic, technology and information, currencies and values, arms and fashion, hope and delusion, boom and slump: All in great measure originate from, head toward, or are controlled by, the Atlantic nations. As a consequence, the fate of the whole world hinges to a great extent on the policy and action of the Atlantic nations. In turn, the United States and Europe are no longer in a position to isolate themselves from either friend or foe. It is these new situations that have altogether changed their relationship with the rest of the world, and have thrown at them an extremely demanding burden of leadership.

In a world system characterized by uncontrolled growth and imbalance, the Atlantic nations not only ought to realize that they cannot possibly discharge these new heavy responsibilities if they are not united, but they must be well and quickly convinced that they cannot renounce this role of leadership even if they wish to do so.

Three principal circumstances in my opinion oblige them to accept this role. First, their own interests are basically affected by what happens in the outside world. Therefore, they cannot possibly sit back aloof, but are forced to step forward and take a good hand in controlling and directing what happens elsewhere on our planet. Second, the peoples and nations of the world who are friendly to them are, at the same time, weak in the contemporary world. The need for help of these less advanced friendly nations will probably grow, not diminish, as their economies and institutions become more complex and interpenetrated with the stronger and more sophisticated ones. Third, if the Atlantic nations demonstrate that they possess true qualities of world leadership in this difficult time, they can progressively win over the nations that are less friendly, and eventually even those presently openly antagonistic.

Now, what are the indications that the Atlantic peoples will be able to understand and resolve the problems they have to face—and actually exert leadership?

Again, I have no assured answer. But this book, I hope, may serve to clarify some of the issues, and contribute to building up the resolve to meet them. As the reader proceeds to Parts II and III, he will see that the nature and proportions of the problems that are thrown at the Atlantic nations and the world are discussed at some length, and the general framework required to reach valid solutions outlined. Here are a few introductory remarks to show some of the lights and shadows of the task ahead.

Since World War II the advanced nations have found ways of largely governing the politico-economic stability and growth of their own individual systems. They have achieved this by means of complex mechanisms and policies, conceived empirically rather than doctrinally, which combine market automatism with government planning and control—plus a modicum of international solidarity when need is matched by goodwill. Because of the imperatives created by the onrush of technology, their governments and corporations have grown in stature—both in dimensions and functions—their spheres of action overlapping with each other.

Government and business have joined together, with the participation sometimes of the academia and the unions, in developing new forms of organization and management of such elements as the economy, market, demand, output, wages, prices, R and D, and up to a certain point higher education. This has been accomplished by means of an inter-

weaving of corporate and state decision centers, executive agencies, planning boards, think tanks and their operative dependencies. This new form of governmental-productive-financial-scientific establishment more or less represents what is now being called a modern nation's "techno-structure."

Here is the secret of power and efficiency of the advanced nations and the fundamental and cumulative difference between them and the countries below the take-off point. These mechanisms and procedures and the entire techno-structural buildup are continuously evolving to adjust to changing conditions. Until recently we were proud of our techno-structure, even if we somehow resented that what was once called the "invisible hand" regulating our marketplace and economy was now superseded by a more exacting power which took hold of most reins in the nation and society. However, we had the certainty that nothing better had ever been conceived.

Now, our advanced nations are in the grip of a crisis whose origin and consequences are deeper than those of an economic recession, though a recession may be one of the forms in which it will manifest itself.

Consequently, we are assailed by a new kind of doubt and are inclined to question whether our techniques and our mechanisms and our entire art of governing ourselves can actually keep pace with the high-speed and bewildering transformations happening in our modern industrial societies. A symptom of some malfunctioning in our system as it operates at increased pressure is the technological gap itself, it is similar to what happens with complex mechanisms, when a minor flaw, tolerable in itself, may provoke major disarrangements, necessitating a complex revision and overhaul of the entire system.

Other signs also indicate that our mechanism does not function well and is far from being under firm control. I have already indicated some malfunctioning of a social and political nature. There are examples also in fields related to the economy:

The difficult negotiations of the Kennedy Round to liberalize trade, and subsequent wave of protectionism that threatened and partially succeeded in offsetting the results obtained in the round;

The difficulty of reaching and now implementing the Rio de Janeiro agreement, aimed at increasing international liquidity by means of new reserve instruments;

The unsuccessful defense of the British pound, and its devaluation;

The chronic difficulties of the United States balance of payments, then the run on gold and its uncertain final outcome;

The historic step of the United States away from international liberalism as represented by her imposition of curbs on capital exports, and the other proposed measures, which were once the necessities of the weaker economies, not the prerogative of the greatest world power—the list could continue.

Even if, for a moment, we escape the air of crisis hanging over the strong nations of the world, the need for leadership remains dominant. It is appropriate to quote here a statement, which invites reflection made by Hasan Ozbekhan, the noted mathematician and economist, in a recent paper for the Massachusetts Institute of Technology: "When our situation is viewed in its current immediacy, its most striking aspect is complexity. When we try to imagine it in terms of the future what strikes us most are the *uncertainties* it unfolds in the mind. Thus we stand, perhaps more conscious and knowing than ever before, in the grip of present worldwide complexities and future uncertainties trying to define those modes of action that will best order the one and reduce the other."

If this is the predicament of the advanced

Western nations, the reader may well imagine, then, what under these prevailing conditions is the situation of the other nations and peoples of the world system—how fragile and defenseless today, and how hopeless tomorrow. Never forget that they are the great majority, and that—leaving aside for one moment the communist countries—they gravitate in one way or another toward the Atlantic platform, even though they belong to geopolitical areas and probably also sociopolitical systems different from ours. Their development record during the 1950's and the 1960's is not altogether negative, but it is by no means encouraging.

We must not delude ourselves that this passably acceptable past experience is likely to repeat itself in the 1970's. In the years to come their condition and the over-all condition of the world will be substantially worse, the struggle for life harsher, the expectations of people higher, the impact of technology even more brutal, and the capacity of these nations to move ahead far below requirements.

These nations will need and request a great deal more permanent or long-haul economic aid and technical assistance, which can be offered only by the industrialized world. They will also require as well some kind of long-term planning support and guidance to set their course in the right direction. Only the Atlantic nations as a bloc can give them this combination of leadership and aid, and they ought to remain ready to provide it. Should they fail, several of the needy nations, which are already in danger of breaking down now, will drift toward chaos and anarchy, thus further disrupting the entire international system.

Where, then do we stand? The world is at a crossroads, and so are the Atlantic nations.

The revolution of our time is gaining momentum, and the signs indicate that during the next decade it will gather speed and force. It is up to the Atlantic peoples, and only to them, to unite and take the lead in an unprecedented movement to face the future. Their leadership in thinking, in devising new approaches, and in action is indispensable for the world to solve its problems.

For the first time in the history of man, many of the major problems have become truly global and represent a challenge and a threat to the whole of humanity.

LASTING PEACE

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1970

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have received informed and interesting letters from a gentleman in my district, Mr. David J. Hofer of Garden City, N.Y.

Recently he has sent me a copy of a letter written by him and published in the Nassau Illustrated News—Nassau County—on June 2, 1970. In this letter Mr. Hofer, as a citizen of the United States, sets forth his program for a lasting peace.

He has asked me to include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I am pleased to read it into the RECORD at this point:

LASTING PEACE

LETTER TO THE EDITORS:

Never in my recollection has there been so much tumult within and outside our nation, the United States of America, as in this present day and age.

What is the reason for it all and what can we as individuals do about it?

The Reason: The reason may be summed up in one word—selfishness. There is today indication that even well ordered persons think in terms of "What do I get?" rather than "What can I give in order to make this a better world?" (not necessarily money, but service).

What can we do about it: In order to decide this, we must first consider what attempts have been made in the past in the hope of attaining lasting peace. We remember first the League of Nations which failed. Now we have the "United Nations Organization" a debating society. The "stuffed shirts" at the head of some centralized Church Organizations say "we want peace" but what are they doing beside unjustly criticizing our beloved President for making a very hard decision, and just, about the Cambodia situation. Legislators in all nations have passed all kinds of acts in the hope of forcing people to be law abiding citizens.

When all is said and done, all of the foregoing, however well intended, has been a mere temporary makeshift device.

Nothing of a lasting nature will ever take place until you and I and everyone persuade people throughout the world to follow the principles expounded in the teachings of the "Prince of Peace" (Jesus Christ). If your religious belief is of a different order I'm sure it comprehends the practice of unselfishness.

A good start in the U.S. will be to reinstate prayer and Bible reading in our schools and colleges and to get rid of any teacher or other educational representative if we can prove that he is a Communist sympathizer.

To sum up—the solution to Lasting Peace is unselfishness and love of God and his commandments throughout the World.

There is no other way. Unless every nation follows along these lines each will disintegrate in time. When? I do not know.

Let's all start doing something decisive today—don't wait till tomorrow, you may be dead by then.

DAVID J. HOFER,
A citizen of the United States.

BROTHER SHOOTING SISTER ON ORDERS—IT COULD HAPPEN

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1970

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, when we think of the Civil War, one of the most poignant images is that of one brother in gray and another in blue fighting to the death. But the tension between the generations—and the regrettable eagerness of some public officeholders to capitalize on it—has created the possibility that this situation could face us tomorrow.

I have recently received a letter from a constituent who has a daughter at Berkeley and a son in the California National Guard. She says:

DEAR SIR: I have nightmares. My son is in the National Guard and my daughter is a student at Berkeley. I am haunted by the thought that Jerry could be ordered to shoot his sister. For the first time in my 50 years, I'm afraid of my government. Each day brings more rabid hate statements from men of supposed authority. This is horror that will lead to civil war.

LUCILE E. CASE.

Let us hope Mrs. Case is wrong. But as I listen to the statements of the Vice President of the United States, I see little reason for confidence.

WHAT IS RIGHT ABOUT AMERICA

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the President that rather than criticizing and tearing down our country, we should be spending more time standing up for and speaking about what is right about America. I am one of the majority of Americans who still believes in the American promise that Thomas Wolfe talked about:

To every man his chance
To every man regardless of his birth, his shining, golden opportunity
To every man the right to be himself and to become whatever his manhood and his vision can combine to make him
This seeker, is the promise of America

You really do not have to look far for examples of this promise. The opportunity that makes careers such as H. Ross Perot's possible is one of them, obviously. Recently, Mr. Perot was asked to write on the theme of "What's Right With America," for the Nation's Business magazine. I commend to the attention of my colleagues the article he wrote:

WHAT'S RIGHT WITH AMERICA

(By H. Ross Perot)

In spite of the cacophonous criticism of the "system" these days, you don't really have to look for examples of what's right with America. The opportunity that makes careers such as H. Ross Perot's possible is one of them, obviously.

A Texarkana, Tex., cotton broker's son whose first experience as a businessman involved breaking horses at \$1 a head (at age seven), Ross Perot founded Electronic Data Systems Corp. in Dallas with \$1,000 of his savings in 1962. EDS profits have doubled every year since then, and his net worth today (he's just turned 40) is in the many millions, even after a stock price nose dive.

Mr. Perot, an energetic, articulate philanthropist who preaches that more Americans must become involved in public affairs, has been particularly concerned about freeing, or at least helping, U.S. prisoners in North Viet Nam. At one point he offered, in vain, to ransom them. At Christmastime he tried to bring supplies to them, but got no closer than Laos. To show sincerity, at Eastertime he visited POW camps in South Viet Nam and tried to pass on to Hanoi information about the well-being of its captured men. He was rebuffed again, but he's still trying to help our POW's.

When NATION'S BUSINESS asked Mr. Perot to write for it on the theme headlined here, he took pencil in hand while on a business trip, and produced this article.

The greatest thing about America is that its people are free.

The concept of freedom has a new, special meaning for me, after having visited refugee camps in Laos. Like most Americans, I just assumed freedom was my birthright and did not think much about it until I talked with the refugees in Laos and saw the awful sacrifices these primitive, illiterate, tribal people were willing to make to be free—to protect their families and keep them together.

I asked every refugee I talked with, "Why did you flee the North Vietnamese?" I had read that the refugees were fleeing the bombing. I was unable to find a single refugee who was doing so.

The refugees in Laos flee the North Viet-

name to keep them from impressing the boys and men as slaves to carry goods down the Ho Chi Minh Trail. They flee to keep them from sending the girls and women to North Viet Nam into other forms of slavery. Freedom assumes a new dimension when you learn of the absolute brutality of North Viet Nam in dealing with these people.

The next time you read about the North Vietnamese taking another village in Laos or pursuing refugee groups through the jungles, realize that they are simply capturing slaves. As you sit comfortably in your home, surrounded by your family, try to picture yourself and your family fleeing through dense jungle, trying to run ahead of the North Vietnamese, knowing that if you are overtaken your family will be broken up, put into bondage and lost.

That does not happen in America, but it is happening every day throughout the world in cultures where human life is subjugated to national goals.

The American society's concept of concern for others is another thing that is right about America.

THE BEAUTIFUL AMERICANS

One of my finest experiences has been meeting the "Beautiful Americans" scattered all over the world who have dedicated their lives to helping people less fortunate than we are.

Some of these people are missionaries in the classic sense. Others are carrying out missions of medicine, education, agriculture and construction, just to name a few. I wish every American could get to know these people as I have, and could actually watch them working to help others. What other society has ever produced selfless people in such great numbers?

What other government or culture would want to—or could—produce men willing to fly, day after day, into North Vietnamese anti-aircraft fire, to drop rice—not bombs—to Laotians fleeing the North Vietnamese?

Only America produces men like that. These pilots who risk their lives daily to bring food to helpless people are missionaries of the air, willing to face death to keep life and freedom alive among people who can offer them nothing in return.

What other nation in the history of man has produced men willing to fly through North Vietnamese gunfire, land on dirt strips and absorb gunfire while on the ground, to pick up plane-loads of Laotian refugees about to be captured by North Viet Nam—to rescue them from slavery? This is happening every day in Laos.

Cynics might ask, "What is in it for us?" The answer—nothing but preserving the lives and freedom of a very primitive people. Our country produces men and women who will risk and give their lives to help others. What other nation can claim that?

When my group went to Southeast Asia in an effort to aid American prisoners in North Viet Nam, the most difficult thing for the North Vietnamese to understand in dealing with us was that any private citizen could be free to do the things we were doing. Having the freedom to do such things was far more impressive to them than having the economic resources.

The paramount importance of the individual, the uniqueness and preciousness of each life in our country, is a great American strength. The North Vietnamese just cannot understand why anyone, particularly a capitalist, would be concerned about "just 1,500 men"—a phrase they use repeatedly when referring to the prisoners. I have tried to convince them that, in our country, the entire nation can become concerned over one person in need.

They just cannot accept this, because in North Viet Nam people are merely instruments to further national policy. The individual is subordinated to the national goals

of North Viet Nam—he is a tool to be used by the state.

The North Vietnamese see our country as "inherently weak," because the people select the leaders, and the leaders are the servants, not the masters, of the people. North Viet Nam feels that having the people determine the future is a great weakness. I feel that this is one of our greatest strengths.

It is great to live in a country where the government can be changed by its people to adapt to changing conditions. It is difficult for the North Vietnamese, or any other closed society, even to comprehend that concept.

Speaking of closed societies, after having seen them, I have an even deeper appreciation for our open society. The North Vietnamese do not understand the concept of public opinion, since there is no public opinion in North Viet Nam—only the official position. Dissent is not tolerated. There are no demonstrations in North Viet Nam.

An exchange of differing views, and respect for another's position on an issue, are basic to our society. I was amazed to learn that the North Vietnamese could not argue. They would take the official position but become ineffective when asked, "What is your reasoning behind this position?" There was no reasoning. It was policy—not to be questioned or debated, just carried out. Contrast that to our society.

PRACTICAL DREAMERS

It is great to bring up a family in a nation where each person decides what type of work he will do, where he will live and what his goals are. In our country, one person can move mountains. We have a nation that provides a climate that produces practical dreamers—men and women who have great dreams and the desires, discipline, capacity and freedom to make these dreams materialize.

Compare that to societies that are indoctrinating children instead of educating them. The children are trained to be loyal to the state—not the family. The child's life is planned for him by the state. The child may want to be a composer, but the state needs scientists, so he becomes a scientist.

This is a more subtle form of slavery than that imposed on the Laotians, but nevertheless, it is slavery.

Take a minute; think about your children. Would you want some bureaucrat, armed with aptitude tests and national manpower quotas, determining your child's fate? That is another thing that is right with America.

You have probably noticed I have not mentioned that we provide our people with a standard of living that is unique in the world, and in the history of man. I have not pointed out that persons living in poverty in this country would be upper-middle-class in most of the world. I have not boasted about our highways, schools, medicine, industry and technological prowess.

I have confined myself to the real American Dream, the one the Pilgrims had—the dream of freedom.

TRUE RICHES

When we boast that America is the richest nation on earth, we should only be boasting of our true riches—our freedom, our people and our concern for others.

In this article, I have limited my examples to personal experiences of recent months. If I were to include all the pertinent examples from just my personal experiences, this article would become an encyclopedia. The neighbors, friends, teachers, children's organization leaders, Sunday school teachers, businessmen, policemen, firemen, military and religious leaders and elected officials who touch our lives and build our nation are intertwined in a magnificent web that represents the strongest society ever devised by man. It is bound together with powerful glue—concern for one another and a dedica-

tion to building an even better nation and world.

I would like to describe my own American Dream to you. I dream of an America that has a strong family unit and deep religious conviction in each home. I dream of an America made up of families who have a great sense of destiny for their nation, and a deep, unabashed love for it. I dream of these families developing great men and women, who will have the wisdom to manage our vast resources and technology, and direct them toward the best interests of our nation and the world.

These families will produce leaders who are honest, intelligent, disciplined and concerned enough to melt away the problems facing us today. They will keep us free.

I plan to spend the rest of my life as a private citizen and a practical dreamer, working to make that dream materialize. Only in America could a private citizen have such a dream, and the freedom to direct his energies toward it.

EACH GENERATION'S CHALLENGE

The challenge for each generation is to preserve and enhance our great freedoms, passing them on to the next generation, stronger and better, never forgetting that they are precious and fragile, and require continuing care by each of us.

This article is a love story—the story of one man's deep love for his country, and his dreams for its future. I hope you share my dreams for this great country.

The key to our future is for millions of private citizens, like you and me, to start once again to act like proud part owners of our country.

We will not always agree, and that is not important. We will be involved in doing everything we can to see that the things we feel need to be done are done. We can be the generation that made the real American Dream come true. We can deliver the constitutional guarantees to our people—to our children.

Let's stop talking, accusing and fretting. Let's get to work!

THE LATE HONORABLE CLIFFORD DAVIS

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1970

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am saddened to learn of the passing of the Honorable Clifford Davis of Tennessee, who, for 24 years, represented the people of Memphis and Shelby County here in the U.S. House of Representatives. I knew Cliff Davis for most of those years, having first served with him on the House Committee on Military Affairs when I came here in the 78th Congress. During World War II and in November and December of 1944, with other members of that committee, we visited the Western and Italian Fronts in Europe and formed on that trip a close and lasting friendship. Cliff Davis spent most of his adult life in public service, first as a city judge in Memphis and then as vice mayor and commissioner of public safety. He was a hard working and devoted man and a friend to many of us here. To his wife, Carrie, his family, and his many friends I express our deepest sympathy.

A SENSIBLE EDUCATIONAL POLICY

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1970

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in the many campus disruptions which have plagued the Nation in recent years it is not unusual to read of members of faculties working right along with students engaged in illegal activities. The State of California has taken steps to prevent the hiring of future teachers who as students had been arrested in connection with campus disruptions. The committee of credentials of the California Department of Education is the body which screens applications and weeds out proven troublemakers. This precautionary policy should in the future be a source of reassurance to parents whose children were not intended by them to be the target of radical philosophies and activities served up by persuasive, accredited teachers. The next step, of course, is how to get rid of the characters with tenure who are presently infecting impressionable minds in the classroom.

The Philadelphia Inquirer of July 16 carried an article reporting on this sensible and much needed policy, and I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

ACTIVISTS' RECORDS BAR FACULTY JOBS TO SOME SENIORS

(By Noel Greenwood)

LOS ANGELES.—An increasing number of college graduates face being barred from teaching in California because of their arrests in connection with campus disruptions while they were still students.

"How many we've got going right now I don't know," H. Richard Shipp said. "But I think the committee is taking a harder line on any acts that involve violence on campus."

The committee Shipp refers to is the Committee of Credentials, an arm of the California Department of Education. It screens prospective teachers, and Shipp is its executive secretary.

The committee is not bound by court action that cleared a student of a charge against him.

Instead, it makes its own investigation of the incident. If it is displeased by what it finds, the credentials are denied.

"There are many other kinds of incidents which are unacceptable conduct but not criminal," Shipp said. "We're judging professional and moral conduct."

Once denied by the committee, the applicant for credentials has 30 days in which to appeal the decision—either to the committee itself or through an administrative process that eventually ends with the state Board of Education.

But usually the committee's action is upheld and the denial is made final.

All prospective teachers run the risk of being refused credentials if they have arrest records and the charges are serious. But only in the past few years have campus-connected arrests entered the picture.

Dr. Carl Larson, committee chairman and chief of the Bureau of Teacher Education and Certification, said that in such cases the committee denies credentials only when the student is guilty of a violent act.

"There's a difference between being told to disperse and doing something violent," Larson said.

He said the committee recognizes that some students arrested during demonstra-

tions "take part in a very innocuous way" or are innocent bystanders.

"The big question that's always asked is, 'is he really violent? Does he do harm to someone? Does he really do destruction of property as much?'" Larson said.

In the past, he added, the committee has granted credentials "to people who have been in demonstrations, have been arrested have been fined and in the estimation of the committee really aren't violent persons."

College placement officers confirm that this has happened.

But there are indications that the committee is now taking a much sterner approach toward student applicants who have disruption-connected arrests.

OUR SOUTHEAST ASIA COMMITMENT

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1970

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been constantly concerned that the Nixon administration would be mired in Southeast Asia. The President's Cambodia decision did nothing to allay this fear. Recent reports of U.S. air cover for Cambodian troops under the guise of protecting American troops reconfirms my gravest fears. Now there are reliable reports that our military leaders in Southeast Asia are counseling a continued American presence involving 200,000 U.S. troops for the indefinite future.

On numerous occasions, I have pointed out that the Nixon Vietnamization plans required an indefinite commitment of 150,000 to 200,000 U.S. troops. On those occasions, I pointed out that the semantic definition of "ground combat" or "support" troops did little in the way of ending our direct military commitment in Southeast Asia. This should be the short term goal of our foreign policy.

We are now receiving reports, with increasing frequency, that our military mission is exerting pressure to assure a large U.S. military presence in Southeast Asia for the foreseeable future. I urge the President to reject this counsel. The internal division in our Nation—the ravaged nations of Southeast Asia—are all eloquent and tragic testimony of the bankruptcy of our policy in Southeast Asia. This counsel—that there is "light at the end of the tunnel," or "just a few more years to solidify our gains" has involved us in this quagmire.

There is another important factor. I do not think that the Thieu-Ky regime will be required to seek a negotiated peace when they can rely on a massive U.S. presence. To keep a massive U.S. presence will prolong the war and suffering without any reason.

I urge my colleagues to read the article by Neil Sheehan which I am including in my remarks. It summarizes the latest developments and describes some of the pressures being exerted on the President. I hope the President rejects the fallacious reasoning that serves only to prolong our direct military commitment in Southeast Asia.

The article follows:

OFFICERS DOUBT A SPEEDY PULLOUT—EXPECT 150,000 TO STAY AFTER 1971 TO BOLSTER SAIGON

(By Neil Sheehan)

WASHINGTON.—Knowledgeable military sources here believe that the Nixon Administration's Vietnam strategy may require it to keep a large American military contingent in South Vietnam, roughly 150,000 to 200,000 men, as late as 1972.

One experienced officer derided as "a pipedream" recent reports that the Government hoped to draw the forces in Vietnam down to 50,000 by the end of 1971.

In a meeting with newsmen yesterday, Mike Mansfield, the Senate Majority leader, even said that President Nixon had told him privately he intended to "get out" before the 1972 elections. Senator Mansfield said he believed the President meant "all out, air cover, support troops, everything."

Currently scheduled withdrawals and those expected in the future will reduce American troops in Vietnam to 200,000 or 240,000 men by mid-1971, military sources say.

What Gen. Creighton W. Abrams Jr., the United States commander, will have left, in the view of the sources, will be a minimum contingent that still has enough power to protect itself and to come to the aid of the South Vietnamese in the event of surprises.

U.S. FORCES ARE DETAILED

This force will consist of helicopter, artillery and logistics units, to take care of the Saigon Government until the United States can train and equip sufficient South Vietnamese units of this type, and the equivalent of two or three American combat divisions.

Once the level goes much below 200,000, those Americans left will become dependent upon the South Vietnamese to protect them against North Vietcong attacks and this dependence will grow as the number of Americans decreases.

The implication of this military assessment is that President Nixon may well have to face the electorate in 1972 with a sizeable war still under way in Vietnam and significant numbers of American casualties, barring a dramatic breakthrough in the Paris negotiations or a lowered aim for the Administration's Vietnamization program.

The sources base their calculation on the assumption that Mr. Nixon has an ambitious objective for Vietnamization—building a Saigon Government and an army that can sustain itself against both the Viet-Cong guerrillas and the North Vietnamese.

The President's incursion into Cambodia to protect this aim is interpreted by these officers as evidence that he is serious about accomplishing it.

LAIRD FAVORS PULLOUT

They acknowledge that Mr. Nixon and his civilian advisers could "force-feed" troops out of South Vietnam in 1972 for domestic political reasons regardless of the state of the Vietnamization program.

Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird, for example, is known to be intent on pulling out troops as quickly as possible. General Abrams and other military leaders would have preferred a slower schedule.

Military sources fear the consequences of troop withdrawals after mid-1971 that are not matched by progress in Vietnamization. Their fear is that the pullouts would cause the unraveling of the Saigon Government and its armed forces and produce a military and political collapse.

The period after mid-1971 is thus viewed as the crucial test of Vietnamization.

"After next July," one source said, "you will pretty well have to play things by ear and take out Americans only as the South Vietnamese can replace them."

Even if the program goes well between now and mid-1971, the officers do not see the probability of pushing Vietnamization fast

enough to go below roughly 150,000 American troops by the late summer and fall of 1972.

TRAINING TAKES TIME

Just to train the South Vietnamese is time-consuming. By the end of this year, the United States will have trained 1,200 helicopter pilots, but the need has been determined so great that the training programs for civilian administrators and pacification workers are also not scheduled to end until then.

Besides these training programs, the South Vietnamese military leadership on the senior and middle levels will have to be developed and tested.

Some military sources do not expect General Abrams, or his successor, to accept rapid withdrawals after mid-1971 if the risk appears too great.

"No general wants to preside over a disaster," one officer said.

And the officers insist that General Abrams is not committed to any preset schedule of withdrawals after next July. "He'd quit if they tried to make him agree to them," one source said.

TRIBUTE TO ALVIN G. LUGG

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1970

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, too often in these days people overlook the goodness that surrounds them and likely because violence and evil are provoking of more attention and headlines.

However, some good deeds that are taking place do not go unnoticed because of enterprising news reporters and concerned publications. Fitting fully into those classifications are Mr. Michael Stearns and the daily newspaper for which he writes, the Record of Hackensack, N.J.

In its effort to let people know of the good deeds taking place in its area, the Record regularly reports on the thoughtful and dedicated work of individuals in Bergen County, N.J., of which my congressional district is a part.

Thus, I proudly place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article written by Mr. Stearns about the life and activities of Mr. Alvin G. Lugg, a hero of World War I and now chaplain of Bergen County District 2 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

I know all of you will join me in expressing warm appreciation to Mr. Lugg for his outstanding deeds, thoughtfulness, and kindnesses to so many and wish for him a speedy recovery from his own illness.

TRIBUTE TO ALVIN C. LUGG

(By Michael Stearns)

Alvin C. Lugg is a World War I hero who has visited thousands of injured veterans and, in his 75th year, has learned firsthand what it's like to be a hospital patient himself.

Lugg, who estimates he has driven more than 138,000 miles to visit hospitalized veterans since becoming visiting chaplain of Bergen County District 2 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in 1961, is recuperating at his home at 207 Eastern Way, Rutherford, after undergoing an eye operation at Hackensack Hospital.

He plans to get right on with his hospital visits as soon as he's better.

Since 1932, Lugg not only has visited ill veterans, but has taken them books, magazines, and puzzles to keep them occupied.

In one report filed with the district VFW commander, Lugg said he made 1,257 visits, delivered over 19,000 books and magazines, and drove almost 25,000 miles between April 1969 and February 1970.

Since he became district visiting chaplain, he estimates that he has made over 5,000 visits. He is not paid and thus donates his time and car.

One VFW member in Rutherford remembered one of Lugg's visits to a fellow veteran three years ago. Lugg took three buses to visit a man in a Point Pleasant hospital, recovering from a heart attack.

Up until recent years, Lugg would take multiple sclerosis patients from their homes to hospitals for treatment and bring them back. He stopped this only after his doctor ordered him to.

In the last year, the district VFW commander estimates that he has received more than 100 cards and letters from local hospitals praising and thanking Lugg for his work.

Lugg, an active member of the Rutherford Methodist Church, also visits ill members of all the Rutherford churches.

Both local VFW posts and churches tell Lugg of those who are ill and also donate most of the reading matter that he delivers. Right now, he says he has stacks of the National Geographic magazine piled in his garage, waiting to be delivered.

Lugg says, "I will keep it up as long as I can."

Lugg, a retired corporal, who won a Silver Star for World War I heroism, was recently honored by being grand marshal in the VFW of New Jersey Convention Parade at Wildwood.

Last November, the Rutherford Chamber of Commerce named Lugg an outstanding citizen.

Lugg holds six other war medals, which include the Purple Heart, the Croix de Guerre, and a citation from Gen. John J. Pershing, commander of U.S. troops in World War I.

In 1960, Lugg retired from the Erie Lackawanna Railroad after 40 years of service. His last position was to keep tabs on all passenger trains in the railroad's New York division.

Lugg was born Feb. 6, 1895, in Bristol, Conn. He was a planter before enlisting in the First Connecticut Infantry on July 12, 1917. He was soon sent to the trenches in France, where he was wounded in July 1918, and sent home to recover.

Lugg has lived in Rutherford for 40 years and is a long-time member of the VFW Post 227 in that borough.

QUANG NGAI PRISON

HON. WILLIAM R. ANDERSON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under previous unanimous-consent request, I submit for the RECORD a letter I received from Dr. Marjorie Nelson of Connecticut. I have discussed the letter at some length with Dr. Nelson by telephone. It is a most revealing letter, giving further explicit evidence of the outrageous treatment of political prisoners by the Saigon government. Dr. Nelson has advised me that the children of whom she speaks generally range from infants to youngsters of 10, crowded with their mothers into 15-by-15 feet cells—as many as 50 in a cell. Are these children "Communist criminals"?

Dr. Nelson proved to my satisfaction that her reporting is objective by point-

ing out in our telephone conversation that the head of Quang Ngai Prison was a very humane, understanding, and helpful man, concerned about the conditions in the prison under his direction, but unable to alleviate conditions because of the lack of physical resources available to him.

The letter follows:

JULY 8, 1970.

HON. WILLIAM R. ANDERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: I have read with more than casual interest the accounts in the *New York Times*, July 7, and July 8, of your visit to Con Son Island prison in the first week of July. I worked as a doctor with the American Friends Service Committee Project in Quang Ngai from October, 1967, to October, 1969. From September, 1968, to October, 1969, as part of my work there, I made regular visits once or twice a week to the Quang Ngai civilian prison where I examined and treated prisoners. I would like to share my experiences with you as I feel it is directly related to your own brief visit.

The prison in Quang Ngai was built by the French to house approximately 500 prisoners. During the time I worked there, the prison population ranged from 800 to 1300—usually between 150-300 of them women. Many of these women had their children with them—40-120 children. Crowding was compounded by the fact that in August, 1967, the NLF troops attacked and overran the prison (releasing some 1000 prisoners) and damaged several buildings. At least two of these large buildings were still partially or completely roofless in the fall of 1969. I quote from a letter I sent to the American Friends Service Committee in Philadelphia in February, 1969, shortly after I had returned from a furlough to my work in Quang Ngai:

"In addition to the room I described to you in [a previous letter], I found the following: two small square rooms approximately 15x15 at most with only small slit windows at the top of three walls held respectively 50 and 40 women and children. No beds provided in either one. A large room approximately 45x15 with two-tiered wooden bunks filling the room leaving an aisle between housed 200 women. They sleep on the floor as well as on both tiers. Another room, slightly smaller, houses 75 women and 3 children, but contains only a couple tables and no beds. Two other small rooms, perhaps 12x30 housed a total of 74 women—also with no beds. These latter two rooms have now been emptied and another large building without a roof is now being occupied by an undetermined no. of women. Large tarpaulin tents have been spread over the rafters to provide a roof of sorts.

"My first visit after I returned, I found widespread colds and diarrhea among the patients, especially the children, which is to be expected when a lot of people get thrown together like this. The dispensary was completely out of all cough medicine and diarrhea preparations and had been for several days."

We were invited by the Prison Chief in the summer of 1968 to make regular medical visits to the prison because he had many sick prisoners. Successive Prison Chiefs were very helpful to us and eager for us to continue our work. We were given free access to the prison by day and cooperation from the Prison Chief on several occasions when our work required it. We were informed both by prison officials and by prisoners that 80% or more of the inmates were "political prisoners". Personal conversations with prisoners seemed to indicate that in many cases their "political crime" was improper or incomplete papers, presence in an "unauthorized place", or, in the case of the women, inability to account for the whereabouts of their husbands who were therefore assumed to be NLF guerrillas.

In addition, many prisoners paid bribes to gain their release and on several occasions the assertion was made to me that they had been arrested for the sole purpose of extorting money from them.

We were told by officials that this was a minimum security prison and no one was supposed to stay who had a sentence of more than four to six months. However, prisoners never met their accusers (except in the Province Interrogation Center), never had a trial, and never knew the length of their sentences. I talked with several who were in for as long as a year.

It is my understanding that regulations provide for a nurse to be assigned to the province prison. However, the nurse assigned to Quang Ngai prison was an opium addict and I only met him in the dispensary once in my 13 months there. Prisoners themselves manned the dispensary using whatever knowledge had been passed on to them about administration of drugs and treatment of disease. In addition to crowding, there was neither running water nor latrines in any of the rooms where prisoners were confined from 6:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m., and food and water were both provided in unsanitary if not contaminated condition.

In addition to treating the common ailments and the infectious diseases and malnutrition occasioned by these conditions, I also regularly examined and treated prisoners who had been tortured. This seems not to have occurred in the prison itself but in the Province Interrogation Center. I saw dozens of patients with bruises of varying severity. I also examined patients who had coughed up, vomited, or urinated blood after being beaten about the chest, back, and stomach. On at least two occasions I was able to document by x-rays fractures of bones following beatings. Prisoners also told me of being tortured by electricity with wires attached to ears, nipples, and genitalia; by being forced to drink concoctions containing powdered lime and other noxious substances, and by being tied up and suspended by ropes often upside down from the rafters for hours. On at least three occasions, patients seriously ill or injured and under my care were removed to the Province Interrogation Center without my knowledge for further interrogation.

In April, 1969, another team member and I presented this situation to the American Province Senior Advisor asking his advice as to how to seek to stop these practices. He shared our distress at this and promised to speak to the man in charge of the Province Interrogation Center—a project started by the U.S. to teach "enlightened intelligence and interrogation procedures." In a subsequent visit he informed us that the Province Interrogation Center was no longer under U.S. control but had been turned over to the Vietnamese and therefore he would encourage us to go directly to Colonel Khien, the Province Chief. On April 20, 1969, we spent approximately thirty-five minutes with Colonel Khien and I presented my experience and we expressed our conviction that this was self-defeating on political grounds as well as unacceptable on humanitarian grounds. He essentially acknowledged that some beating did take place and that he was aware of it; that some prisoners were "very hard" and refuse to talk and in such situations physical force was necessary and was employed to get information. However, he said, "there are limits." We suggested that he might need to intervene with the Province Interrogation Center authorities to see that this was adhered to, but my impression was that he was not willing or not able to substantially alter the practices.

In August, 1969, in my prenatal clinic in the prison, I examined a woman, seven months pregnant, who had been badly beaten the previous week. This was the worst example of the beatings which I continued to see so I again called on the American Prov-

ince Senior Advisor and brought this latest case to his attention. He promised to raise it with the Province Chief again. He went on to say, due to a recent directive from Saigon to free prisoners whose guilt was only suspected and the general pressure about the treatment of prisoners, that quite a few prisoners had been released (the census at that time was down slightly—about 1100). He also said that the Americans had been sending fewer people into the interrogation center. He seemed to imply that the Americans were largely responsible for sending detainees to the Province Interrogation Center although they did not control the center itself. There were very few going through it then compared to the one hundred per month previously, he stated. He said, "That means at least fewer people will be getting 'the treatment' and supposedly only those people most likely to be 'productive'." I replied that in my opinion even if that woman, for example, was a known NLF cadre, I didn't consider it acceptable to beat a pregnant woman.

Since returning to the United States I have shared my experience with a few Senators and Congressmen or their aides. My concern and that of the American Friends Service Committee has always been to alleviate the suffering of these prisoners. I urge you to do whatever you can to end these inhuman practices and I am ready to offer you any further help that I can.

Sincerely,

MARJORIE NELSON, M.D.

THE "ESTABLISHMENT"

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the so-called establishment is not so bad after all. Freedoms that prevail in this country under our system exceed those available in other places and under other systems of Government. As David Lawrence points out so well in the following editorial appearing in yesterday's *Evening Star*, the "facts of life in America today themselves refute charges of 'repression'."

The article follows:

FREE EXPRESSION ALMOST UNLIMITED

(By David Lawrence)

Despite the extremes to which open dissent on public questions has gone in demonstrations and marches in recent months, critics on the so-called "New Left" side are beginning to argue that there is a new "repression" arising in the land. But the truth is that never before has freedom of expression had so much license as it has been given in the past two years.

Antiwar demonstrations have been carried on in unprecedented size and scope. Free expression has been almost unlimited on the campuses, in auditoriums, in open spaces in the national capital at the very edge of the White House grounds, at the doors of draft offices and in the halls of Congress.

Unfortunately, regrettable incidents have arisen when free dissent has been transformed into physical violence. Yet even violence has met with relatively little repressive punishment. During the past college year, there were 73 efforts to burn or bomb reserve officers training corps buildings, and there were 281 attacks on ROTC units with injury to persons or property. Although these are part of the equipment of the armed services of the United States and it is a criminal offense to destroy or injure any part thereof, few persons have been brought

to trial. Those who have were dealt with leniently.

There were 1,785 campus demonstrations and 313 "sit-ins" or seizures of buildings, according to the annual report of the Federal Bureau of Investigation just issued.

But marches have taken place in many other schools and universities, and these were concerned primarily with questions other than the Vietnam war. University administrators have tried to reason with the protesters and have yielded some of their power to the students, who have been given not only control of housekeeping affairs but an influential voice in the government and important policies of the institutions.

Boards of trustees have been restructured, and curriculums have been "modernized" to meet demands for "relevance." Recommendations from school youth are getting the attention of school boards and superintendents of education, and community school control is being introduced in some of the big cities.

So it is apparent that the dissent has had some success, even though there are continuing complaints about discrimination against minorities.

Altogether, there are 51 mayors who are black, as well as 173 state legislators, 701 city and county officials other than mayors, 9 U.S. representatives and one U.S. senator. The total is expected to be larger after the next election. So progress is being made for the removal of racial barriers.

Whites have to a large extent encouraged the "freedom march." By legislation and private action, employment has been opened up for Negroes in unions that have hitherto been all-white. Government jobs are increasing, and many corporations are making efforts to enroll a larger number of black employes and to promote able workers. College officials are going out of their way to recruit and increase the proportion of black students.

Under the current administration, which has been accused of slowing the integration process, the number of blacks in integrated schools in 11 Southern states at the beginning of the next school year is expected to be more than five times what it was in June a year ago.

There have been many incidents where violence has been provoked but has not been handled with "police brutality" or severe measures of repression. The big question is really how long the majority of the American people will tolerate mild steps in dealing with acts of violence.

Extremists will undoubtedly continue to be defended as having become embittered or else to have been subjected to acts of hostility which they are merely trying to counter. But the truth is that today freedom of expression is being given more leeway than ever before and that the complaints voiced in the protest movement are getting plenty of attention.

On the whole, governmental authorities have exercised restraint, and while there is every intention to provide adequate police to guard against disorders when huge gatherings assemble, the facts of life in America today themselves refute charges of "repression."

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 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 1,500 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1970

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, this is the age of Aquarius in the parlance of the younger set. It now is also the age of Aquarius for the Nation, and I am pleased that President Nixon has started this country toward a full, functional program of oceanography. It will pay big dividends—in scientific knowledge, in better defenses, and in development of rich resources now untouched.

The President's Executive order, which creates a new National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—NOAA—within the Department of Commerce, is a small step for Government, but a giant step for oceanography. I first introduced such legislation in Congress in 1964 and many of my colleagues and I have been working since to gain recognition for oceanography as one of our national priorities. President Nixon and Vice President AGNEW have been keenly aware of the importance to our Nation of a full-scale program for the oceans. Now, under the authority of the Reorganization Act, the President has established a home for the many and varied functions of oceanography.

The Stratton Commission's report on reorganization was detailed and proposed considerable change in the form of administrative function. The President's action in setting up NOAA, is a beginning toward putting some of these worthwhile innovations into Government. I am hopeful that this Congress will recognize the wisdom of the President's decision, and can proceed with improvements and growth for NOAA as a reality, a fully functioning branch of the Department of Commerce, devoting full time and effort toward setting national goals for oceanography.

The 1970's promise to be a decade of great progress for our Nation. As we begin to concentrate on the pursuits of peace, oceanography will loom large as an intelligent investment of our tax dollars. The benefits will touch the lives of millions of Americans. Studies of the oceans' marine life, tides, currents, and their effect on atmospheric conditions will help us improve our environment. Oceanography is essentially an environmental program, and will mesh with the President's desire to restore our natural surroundings to beauty and usefulness.

When I first began, along with several of my colleagues, to stress the need for an oceanographic program, it was little more than a big new word in the American vocabulary. The path has been long and bumpy, but I feel certain that with President Nixon's action, his interest and

cooperation, along with recognition by Congress that we have a new national priority, we stand on the threshold of an exciting and rewarding decade in which we will learn to understand and use the seas around us.

NATIONAL SERVICE ACT

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1970

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, once again, I would like to reprint some of the letters I have received commenting on the National Service Act. Letters are still coming into my office at the rate of 10 to 1 in support of this measure.

The letters I have selected are written by people with different backgrounds ranging from the president of La Salle College to a student from Wayne, Pa. These are thoughtful letters, written by people genuinely concerned about the draft's detrimental effect on young people.

The text of the letters follow:

THE DIOCESE OF NEW YORK OF THE
PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH,
New York, N.Y., June 29, 1970.

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BINGHAM: It was a pleasure to read your letter on alternatives to the draft which was published in today's New York Times. I would wish to assure you of my support of your position and of the bill which you have introduced, about which I would be pleased to know more.

There is no question in my mind but that loyalty to one's country (or indeed to one's own family) stems from some direct, personal contribution to it in terms of service. Your recommendations and proposals would seem to underline that point of view in large measure. I would hope that your bill will receive prompt approval and that it can be effectively implemented.

In another area, but related to the general problem, I would hope that in any revision of the Selective Service classifications the IV-D category for ministerial students will be abandoned. As one with some responsibility for theological students in this Diocese, I am constantly embarrassed by those who would appear to be taking refuge from national service under this classification not only with little sense of the vocation of the ministry, but who, even with ordination as their goal, would be quite content to belong to a special group of citizens exempt from selective service and yet who would presumably minister to those who faced their national obligation without such protection. In my opinion the ministry is much the loser by this kind of double-standard, and many seminary deans agree.

Thank you again for your letter in the New York Times.

Sincerely yours,

CANON PETER CHASE,
Secretary,
Board of Examining Chaplains.

CHARLOTTE, N.C., July 8, 1970.

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BINGHAM: I am very much interested in the National Service System bill which I understand you and others have recently introduced in the House. The newspaper article I saw gave a survey of public

opinion from the American Institute of Public Opinion poll but did not list the bill number or give much specific information.

I would greatly appreciate it if you would send me a copy of this bill or let me know where it is available as I believe it deserves public support and there are many in this district who would be glad to support it if they had more information.

Thank you for your concern for our young men.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. WARREN H. LINDE.

LA SALLE COLLEGE,

Philadelphia, Pa., June 30, 1970.

Representative JONATHAN BINGHAM,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BINGHAM: I would be most grateful if you could send me a copy of the bill you introduced (H.R. 18025) concerning a voluntary civilian service as an alternative to military service. Your thinking seems to parallel my own on the matter and I would like to see the bill in its entirety.

Since we are so concerned with the same problems I am enclosing a copy of a letter sent to George Alexander Heard which might interest you.

Sincerely,

DANIEL BURKE, F.S.C.,

President.

LA SALLE COLLEGE,

Philadelphia, Pa., May 26, 1970.

GEORGE ALEXANDER HEARD,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. HEARD: It is difficult to know whether to congratulate you on your courage or to commiserate with you on the problems you face in your new position. A little of each, perhaps.

The difficulties are so involved and directed at you from both sides of the spectrum, that I hesitate to add to them, but in the considerations being made, could some thought be given to allowing those of draft age—students in particular since they seem the most involved and concerned about the issues—a wider latitude of choice in the manner in which they fulfill their national duty? Should not the question of National Service be taken up again seriously? Could there be more options open to young people, could the Peace Corps, Vista, social work, medical research and other necessary and vital (and appealing) elements be introduced to satisfy the requirements? Between now and 1976 when we celebrate the 200th anniversary of our "noble experiment" might not some experimental ways be found which would allow each man's obligation to this country to be fulfilled and each man's honor to be kept intact? It seems a more fitting method of realizing the American dream.

Sincerely,

DANIEL BURKE, F.S.C.,

President.

DEARBORN HEIGHTS, MICH.,

July 7, 1970.

Representative J. B. BINGHAM,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BINGHAM: Thank you so much for sponsoring a bill to give our young men a choice of service in this war. There are many of them who would be very willing to serve in a civilian capacity but who feel so strongly that they do not want to be a part of any war. Please keep pushing, and urging your co-sponsors to do likewise. May God please you.

Mrs. A. VALENTINE.

WAYNE, PA., July 9, 1970.

Hon. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BINGHAM: I read in the paper several weeks ago, of a bill co-sponsored by a bi-partisan group of representatives, led

by you. The bill dealt with reforming the draft laws so that a young man could have a truly free choice in the way that he is to serve his country. I know of many people who are opposed to President Nixon's idea of a volunteer army, because there would be no liberal faction in the military to control things a bit. Your bill seems to have gotten around that problem by maintaining the lottery as one choice. Your bill also would serve a great need by putting a lot of our Youth power into civilian service so that we could work to fix this country up, which it needs desperately. Right now all I really have to choose between is Viet Nam, jail or Canada; not a very good choice. Your bill would provide me and my friends with a real choice, which should be our right.

One thing puzzles me about your bill, though. After that one article, I have heard nothing. I have met no one here in Pennsylvania who had heard of it before I told them. I don't know whether it has been killed or put into committee or what, but I would appreciate knowing what happened to it.

I know you are not my representative and have no obligation to me, but I have written my representative, Mr. Watkins, and he only said he would consider it. This bill needs more than consideration, it needs to be passed. Millions of kids, myself included, have recently seen their birthdays pulled out of a drum and placed on a board. This game of chance is ruling our lives. We are allowed no voice. We want a voice. Please notify me of what has happened to your bill, and push to get it passed. There isn't a minute to lose. We are waiting on you, and I'm not sure how long some people can wait.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL M. DENNISTON.

CHICAGO, ILL., June 22, 1970.

DEAR MR. BINGHAM: Thank you for introducing a bill which suggests that something besides war can be an honorable activity.

If mankind survives it will be because the rulers finally decided that people not guns make a country.

Gratefully,

CHARLOTTE LOVERDE.

FOREST HILLS, N.Y.,

June 16, 1970.

Representative JONATHAN B. BINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: An item in the New York Times refers to a bill introduced in the House on June 10th that "would replace the current draft law with a system allowing young men to choose between military and civilian service." As a "dove," I would like to support such a bill. May I have further information?

Sincerely,

MARGARET B. BREHMER.

CICERO, ILL.,

June 13, 1970.

Hon. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I am writing in response to an article printed in the Chicago Tribune on June 13, 1970.

The article concerns the bill you sponsor and introduced which would replace the current draft law with a system allowing young men such as myself, to choose between military and civilian service.

I have done research in the past, and I am still doing research on conscientious objection. I was brought up in the Catholic religion and believe it is religiously and morally wrong to kill. I feel that I qualify for a C.O. classification, but because of the trials and tribulations where a group of men have and do now unjustly decide on the sincerity of one's beliefs, I strongly support your bill.

I give much thought to the future and, being a member of the Future Teachers of America club at my school, I plan to teach because I think it is the profession I would best succeed in, and an opportunity whereby I could better advance our society. Under the proposed bill, I would qualify as a volunteer for civilian service, and would not have to waste time missing school to go to lengthy court sessions to determine my military classification.

I would like more information, and if possible a copy of the bill. Please respond and inform me of ways that I could help the passing of this bill. I am sure many people will support your bill.

Very truly yours,

MATTHEW EBBING.

BLOOMINGTON, IND., July 4, 1970.

DEAR MR. BINGHAM: I read with great interest and approval of your recent letter in the New York Times concerning your sponsorship of a national service act.

I am an enthusiastic supporter of such an approach, and I believe many young Americans would also consider it a great positive step.

A year of two ago, at a dinner at the University of Notre Dame, Father Theodore Hesburgh and Congressman John Brademas both supported the idea. I should think that a man like Father Hesburgh, with his role in civil rights and his national position as a university leader, would be eager to play an important role in pressing for such an act.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT F. BYRNES.

VISTA, CALIF., June 10, 1970.

JONATHAN B. BINGHAM,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: your bill concerning a change of the draft law undoubtedly will have a big appeal to millions of our people. But, I suggest that you introduce a bill which will require all members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives including yourself, who are not opposed to war, regardless of age, physical and mental health to be inducted into the ground forces of our military and sent to the front in Vietnam. If they are so blockheaded, after all these years, that they still don't know war is a big money making racket to benefit a comparative few at the expense of the many, they should be choice cannon fodder.

Ed WELCH.

NEXT TIME TRY THE TRAIN?
MAYBE

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1970

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I note an article in the U.S. Transport publication this month consisting of a caption under a picture of the New York Metro-liner that reads as follows:

While the Penn Central system is suffering from the financial staggers, one bright penny is the Metroliner, a forerunner of an advanced rail passenger national transportation service to be operated by the proposed Federal Rail Passenger Corporation now under study in Congress. Penn Central and DOT presently are negotiating the terms of a two-year demonstration of the Metroliner. But its promise already has been proclaimed in Penn Central figures showing a 70 per cent occupancy compared to 50 per cent on conventional trains. "Public response has exceeded our expectations," the railroad said.

Being a curious fellow and formerly a strong supporter of subsidized rail traf-

fic, I took my family to New York last weekend on the Metroliner.

The trip began trying to find a place to park in the proximity of Union Station. This effort ended leaving the car in a metered zone. We next summoned our courage and entered a filthy, dilapidated un-air-conditioned station that contained accouterments to match.

Having purchased our one-way tickets, I determined to purchase the return reservation. Two automatic control data ticket machines were marked "out of service." A long line in front of a single window staffed by one man operating another control data machine with a "hunt-and-peck" methodology marked the only available ticket facility. Being resourceful, I called Penn Central on the telephone, made return reservations that could be picked up in New York.

The train embarked on schedule. In place of airline multiple choice free breakfast in first class, served by attractive stewardesses, we were given "take it or leave it" French toast for \$1.75 plus tip by pullman porters that could stand retraining.

In place of the smooth trackbed of the Tokyo to Osaka express, we lurched to and fro balancing our coffee for the full trip.

No magazines, no music. In place of the parkways and beautiful freeways, we traversed the slums and filthy rail stations of Baltimore, Wilmington, Trenton, and Philadelphia.

The lavatory facilities failed to include the flush toilets of the 1960's, but included the splash toilets of the 1940's.

A stalled train on the track ahead converted a 3-hour trip to a 3¾-hour effort after a 4-mile reverse ride.

On arrival, we found the same efficient control data machines operated by a scowling railroad clerk. In New York we could only elicit two return tickets—somehow losing the third in the electronic process between Washington and New York. A frustrated, reluctant clerk finally wrote by hand the elusive third ticket after a 30-minute effort.

The return trip was unremarkable save for an emergency stop that discovered we had an arcing pantograph—a defective overhead electric connection—and an announcement by the engineer "that due to engine trouble we were stopped for an indefinite delay."

We limped back into Washington again after 3¾ hours.

A few days later at 6 minutes to 8 a.m., I boarded the Eastern Shuttle that had wheels up by 8:06 a.m. and wheels down at LaGuardia at 8:40 a.m. after a ticket was purchased en route.

I have not lately seen a sign, "Next time try the train" and it's no wonder.

MY YOUNGER GENERATION

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1970

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, a most significant and topical article, "My Younger Generation," appeared in the

May 13 edition of the page 1 magazine of the Newspaper Guild of New York. Because of the timeliness and appropriateness of its contents, I would like to share this piece with my colleagues in the House.

The article was written by a noted publicist and writer from my district in Queens, N.Y., Robert I. Queen, a resident of Flushing. Some of the Members of this House may recall Bob Queen when he served as an assistant to Congressman Alfred E. Santangelo from 1960 to 1963.

Mr. Queen has enjoyed a most enviable record in the field of public relations and has authored many books, a recent one being "Creative PR for Your Special Events," which is currently a reference text at a large number of universities throughout the country. Robert Queen has also written for such dramatic productions as "Suspense," "The Green Hornet," "The Web," and for Greater New York Fund panel shows and interview programs.

Besides his literary achievements, Bob Queen serves as public relations counsel to the distinguished and able State senator from Nassau County, N.Y., John R. Dunne, and has performed public relations activities for the New York City Transit Police Patrolman's Benevolent Association, the Housing Police PBA, the Police Athletic League, and the New York City Health and Hospitals Corporation Task Force.

This is surely a most commendable record of activity, experience, and achievement and I am pleased to extend my heartiest compliments to Mr. Queen.

The article follows:

MY YOUNGER GENERATION

(By Robert I. Queen)

In the last few years much emphasis has been placed on encouraging creativity and individuality in children. With absolutely no encouragement of that sort, we seem to have landed in the forefront of the movement.

We are raising three individualists with no effort on our part, though we have to admit that our nerves are shot.

Our apprenticeship started early with our first born, Alan. Once he had finished "peopling" our home with a score of imaginary persons and animals, he faced the realities of life seriously. At age four he announced that when he grew up he planned to be a "turtle doctor" and a "thinker."

At seven he decided to be an "inventor" and he refers to himself as "Con Edison Jr." When not inventing, he plans to be an artist.

Meanwhile a good part of all level surfaces in the apartment are covered with his inventions, paintings and sculptures, all of which are expected to be preserved indefinitely.

Our younger son, Joseph, who at time of writing is almost five, is in love with the English language. He plays with words as other children play with toys. In addition, he is a genuine wit and something of a philosopher.

Joseph's approach to getting into a locked bathroom is simple. First he knocks. When told to wait a few minutes, he resorts to words. He tries "abbacadabba," "dump truck," "tiger" and "Winnie the Pooh." When these fail, he gives up and just kicks at the door.

From the time he learned to talk, Joseph never used a one syllable word when a multisyllable word would do as well. At two, his excuse for doing something that he wasn't supposed to do was that he was doing it "temporarily."

At three, he informed his nursery school teacher that he was wet because he was "aspiring." At four, he made a mistake in writing his name because he was "abstracted" in the course of his endeavor.

Ann Claire, who is fifteen months old, shows every indication of being as much of a character as her brothers. Her approach to picture books, for example, is strictly in terms of individualized research. She sits off by herself and pores over her books until she finds something of special interest. Then she comes to one of her sources of information and points.

Told that she was pointing at a "doggy" who goes "bow wow," she goes off again and ponders the implications of this scientific information.

When shelves were put into her room recently, her first act was to gather up all her books and put them on the one shelf she could reach.

What she will be like at age 15 staggers our imagination.

She definitely prefers red tights to mundane white ones and when not "researching" likes to dance in front of a mirror. This we accept as a hopeful sign.

All three children have entered into a solemn mutual assistance pact against parents. They quickly drop all internecine arguments to resist the common parental enemy.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

JULY 12-18, 1970

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1970

Mr. FARBSTEN. Mr. Speaker, all participants and peoples lost in the last war. But some peoples lost more than others, and the most grievous loss was suffered by the helpless peoples of small states in central and eastern Europe. Their loss consisted not only in worldly possessions and in several millions of lives, but they were robbed of their freedom—their most cherished heritage and inalienable right. This situation was brought about by the Soviet Government's aggressive posture policy—an understandable but exaggerated reaction to Nazi treachery, which had reinforced the historic Russian fear and suspicion of foreign peoples and pre-occupation in the security of Russia's borders.

Even before the victory of democracies over Axis totalitarianism was assured, the Soviet Union had occupied and annexed a number of hitherto independent countries in Europe. At the time, however, these moves on the part of the U.S.S.R. were not regarded too seriously; they seemed partly justified by the Soviet Union's apprehensions. Moreover, the governments of the West hoped that these excesses could be corrected amicably in calm negotiations. This tolerant and patient attitude on the part of the West toward the Soviet Union proved illusory and, as we ruefully admit today, a grievous mistake. For the past 25 years the governments of the free world have been trying to correct that mistake and undo the resulting mischief but without much success, drastic action has been out of the question—nobody wants to start world war III.

The captive nations, occupying lands

between the Bay of Finland and the Black Sea, include the Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Poles, and Germans in the Soviet zone of Germany, and the peoples of Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania. They number more than 100 million. Some of them could boast of highly developed political and economic institutions while others were, until recently, somewhat underdeveloped and lived under severe handicaps. But all of them had managed to attain their freedom and independence by the end of the First World War and to institute their own democratic governments. Now that is past history; they live under Communist totalitarianism, imposed and mostly maintained by the presence of the Red army.

One might suppose that having endured hardships and privations, and having lived without freedom for 25 years, these people would be reconciled to their lot. As we well know, however, from resistance shown against heavy odds in East Germany, Hungary, Poland, and Czechoslovakia, they are not reconciled. They may accept socialism, but they want humanity with it.

We in the free world offer our wholehearted sympathy to these gallant people in their quest for humanitarian forms of government. We wish that international conditions made it possible for us to be of effective aid to them. For the present, however, the most—but also the least—we can do is to encourage them to keep up the spirit of freedom and independence. Thus it is by way of providing moral support that we annually observe Captive Nations Week. I am indeed happy to voice my sympathy for these peoples on this annual occasion.

E. PERRY SPINK OF BUFFALO, A
LEADING CITIZEN

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of my home city's leading citizens, E. Perry Spink of Buffalo, N.Y., is stepping aside as chief executive officer of the bank he has headed actively since 1956.

While giving up the reins as chief executive officer, he will continue as chairman of the board and chairman of the executive committee of the Liberty National Bank and Trust Co.

In playing his outstanding role in revitalizing Liberty National, Mr. Spink still has taken considerable time to show active and vigorous concern with general affairs of our community.

One activity which I particularly desire to call to the attention of my colleagues is Mr. Spink's key role in saving the historic Ansley Wilcox House, the home in which Theodore Roosevelt took the oath as President in 1901 following the assassination of William McKinley.

DESTINED FOR DEMOLITION

An imposing edifice, the Wilcox House had had a varied career of usage over the years—more recently as a restaurant—when the owner decided to tear it down.

Our history-minded citizenry in Buffalo was appalled at the prospect that this historic structure was to be destroyed, but it was Perry Spink who halted the bulldozers. Mr. Spink, whose bank has a branch next door, arranged to purchase the property and hold it for the historians.

The bulldozers having been stopped, I sponsored legislation in Congress—now known as Public Law 89-708—which set the stage for making the Wilcox House a national historic site.

Indeed, it was just last month that the Interior Department officially took over the property and the final restoration work is now well underway.

SAVED FOR ANOTHER DAY

Mr. Spink's bank sold the property to the Government for the bank's purchase price, because Mr. Spink was and is convinced that the Wilcox House is a piece of American history that deserves to be preserved for future generations.

It was indeed an extreme pleasure for me to work with Mr. Spink, clearly a man of foresight, and other citizens in this community project which has enjoyed the strong support of all media in our city.

Regrettably, two of those who also played important roles in this project did not live to see it come to fruition. One was the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy, who was a key factor in getting my bill through the Senate after it became stymied in committee. The other was the late Owen B. Augspurger, prominent civic leader, who headed the organized community effort.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I include a profile of Mr. Spink which was published in the Buffalo, N.Y., Courier-Express last week:

SPINK LED BANK TO GOOD HEALTH
(By Peter C. Andrews)

The names E. Perry Spink and the Liberty National Bank have become almost synonymous during the more than 13 years since Spink took over Buffalo's third largest commercial bank.

When Spink took over the reins at Liberty on Oct. 17, 1956, the bank was in a pretty sickly situation.

It had recently been turned down in an attempt to merge with the Manufacturers and Traders Trust Co. and its former president, Edward F. McGinley, had been fired by the bank's board of directors. It had total resources of about \$156 million, and 315 employees.

It had opened only one new branch since 1929. The bank's stock was selling at \$27 per share and total dividends paid out that year amounted to \$315,000.

With the election of Avery H. Fonda as chief executive officer, Spink is stepping down from the top job at Liberty, but he will still fill an active role as chairman of the board and chairman of the executive committee.

In contrast to the day he took over, today the bank is in good health.

FIGURES TELL THE STORY

The proof of Spink's and Liberty's success is shown by the fact that the bank's total resources now stand at \$464 million, almost three times what they were when he took over. The number of employees has increased to 924. The bank has opened or acquired 17 new offices, but since four offices have been consolidated, the total number stands at 33 branches now as against 20 when Spink took over.

From an investor's standpoint, the progress of Liberty has been magnificent. The stock is now trading at about \$48 per share (down somewhat from its all time high in the mid-50's).

When two stock dividends of 25 per cent and 10 per cent respectively that were granted in the intervening years are taken into account, Liberty stock has a relative value now of \$65 per share for the same \$27 per share of stock of 1956. Best of all, Liberty has increased its dividends over the years so that last year it paid out \$1,898,000 in dividends, compared to the \$315,000 paid out in 1956.

HARD WORKING EXECUTIVE

Spink has been one of the hardest working executives ever seen on the Buffalo scene. Although he has in the past taken a few days off for brief Florida trips, frequently the real purpose of the trips was the working out of prospective deals with other bankers.

Liberty was converted from a state bank to a national bank by Spink and during his tenure as its head made eight acquisitions which substantially improved its competitive position in the area.

Spink also tried to make the major merger with a New York bank that would have brought the bank into full competitive equality with Buffalo's other two major banks. Unfortunately for Spink and Liberty, both these proposed mergers, one with the huge Chase Manhattan Bank and the other with the smaller, but still substantial Bankers Trust Co. were turned down by regulatory authorities.

In addition to not allowing Liberty to obtain a meaningful New York connection these reverses had the drawback of preventing the bank from making any other moves while the proposed deal was being considered. Despite these disappointments, Spink today is not a bitter man. On the contrary, he is glowingly optimistic about the prospects of his bank.

ATTRACTIVE MERGER PARTNER

If the banking authorities will unplug the logjam that is preventing effective statewide banking operations by other than the Marine Midland Banks, Liberty's future looks rosy indeed, since it would be one of the most attractive merger partners available in the entire upstate area.

He said that a recent two-month holiday he and his wife took in Spain, Portugal and England—his first real vacation in more than 15 years—convinced him that his new management team is excellent. "I found the bank in such good shape when I returned that I decided it was now time to turn the reins over completely."

Reminiscing over what he considered the turning point in his administration of the bank, he cited the sale of the bank's building in 1957 for \$5,650,000 as the key to his later success. "We were able to get the bank back into really sound shape by that move and could start operating the way we wanted to," he commented.

CAPITAL, RESERVES INCREASE

Today his bank has more than \$30 million in capital funds compared to only a little more than \$9 million when he took over, and total reserves have more than doubled from \$3.3 million in 1956 to \$6.7 million now.

Spink, who joined the bank 46 years ago, has held every position in the entire organization at one time or other during his career. He is now just a shade over 66 years old, and despite his change in status, feels in no way that he is turning out to pasture.

He is the picture of a man who looks back with pride in his and his bank's accomplishments, and is happy to have found someone else to carry on the job he held for so long and did so well.

It was with an intimate knowledge of the problems ahead and the problems that have been overcome in the past that he recently commented "We have always tried to be flexible and liquid. I feel this bank now is in an

strong or stronger position as any other bank in the state that I know of."

Coming from "Mr. Liberty", that means a lot.

VIETNAM TROOP WITHDRAWALS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who is not satisfied with the pace of our troop withdrawals from Vietnam.

The President's policy of troop withdrawal, reversing the policy of troop buildup initiated by the Johnson administration, is the correct policy. The fact that troop strength has been reduced from a high of 543,500—April 30, 1969—to 411,500 as of July 9, 1970, represents progress. But, I cannot be a silent supporter of the present withdrawal policy when the most optimistic prediction is that there still will be over a quarter-million U.S. troops in Vietnam next summer.

Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to get into a numbers game over troop withdrawal figures. The important issue is total withdrawal of our troops and not whether news media are conned into putting a better face on existing withdrawal plans than these plans deserve.

However, the Secretary of Defense, at his July 9, 1970, news conference repeatedly made the point that troop withdrawals "will beat" the President's "troop ceiling which is 384,000" by October 15, 1970. On July 14, the Washington Post reprinted a Los Angeles Times dispatch from Saigon indicating that 60,000 troops will be withdrawn between April 15 and October 15, rather than the 50,000 President Nixon announced on June 3.

The important point to remember is that troop ceilings always exceed troop strengths by 1 or 2 percent. With this in mind, the 60,000 troop figure becomes suspect.

The Post story quotes "responsible sources" as saying the troop level—read this "troop strength," not "troop ceiling"—after the October 15 withdrawals will stand at 374,000. On April 16, 1970, the troop strength was 425,500. Thus, when one compares troop strengths with troop ceilings, it becomes apparent 51,500 men will be withdrawn between April 15 and October 15. The troop ceiling will be reduced from 434,000 to 384,000.

Secretary Laird is not inaccurate when he says that "we will beat" the President's announced withdrawal goal. I sincerely hope he will beat it by a good deal more than 1,500 or even 10,000. But before newsmen engage in the withdrawal numbers game, the ground rules must be firmly understood.

The Post story follows:

NEXT VIET WITHDRAWAL MAY TOTAL 60,000 MEN

(By George McArthur)

SAIGON, July 13.—Various American military sources indicated today that the next troop withdrawal from South Vietnam would amount to about 60,000 men instead of the 50,000 originally projected by President Nixon.

Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird announced Thursday that the withdrawal would be quickened, but he did not give precise figures. He said, however, that the troop level after the next withdrawal would approximate that of the November-December period of 1966.

On Nov. 1, 1966 the troop level was 351,000. On Nov. 30 it was 362,000. On Dec. 31 it was 385,000, the last figure being practically the official goal of the latest Nixon projection for this year.

Responsible sources said, however, that it is expected the troop level after the Oct. 15 withdrawals will stand at 374,000 men—down 60,000 from the 434,000 men here when the President made his April 20 speech.

On that date, Mr. Nixon announced that 150,000 troops would be pulled out by spring of 1971. On June 4 the President said 50,000 of those men would be out by October.

To achieve the 60,000-man goal, at least one division-sized ground unit and possibly two would have to be withdrawn.

There has long been speculation that the U.S. 1st Marine Division, now in the northern I Corps area, would be among the next major units to be withdrawn. This would enable the Marines to pull back to their traditional role as a mobile amphibious strike force ready for deployment anywhere in the Pacific.

It is also expected that the 50,000-man Air Force contingent in Vietnam will undergo sizable cuts in the Oct. 15 withdrawal, but this reduction has probably been modified because of the spread of the war into Cambodia.

(U.S. troop strength in Vietnam decreased by 2,400 men last week to its lowest level since February 1967, the U.S. Command reported today, according to wire services. The command said 411,500 American troops were on duty here.)

CONGRESSIONAL REPORT TO THE NINTH DISTRICT RESIDENTS, JULY 13, 1970

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1970

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from my supplemental report to the Congress on the U.S. military involvement in Southeast Asia:

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following are excerpts from Congressman Lee H. Hamilton's supplemental report to the Congress on the U.S. military involvement in Southeast Asia. The Ninth District Congressman was one of 12 picked by the House Speaker for the fact-finding mission, and he filed a separate report to that filed by the committee as a whole.)

You will find in Vietnam evidence to support the view you had before you arrived. The complexity and variety of the scene is such that the "hawk" and the "dove" will each observe, investigate and leave assured of the wisdom of the view he had when he arrived.

I came away from Vietnam with a keen appreciation of what we cannot do. In a word, we cannot build a nation for the South Vietnamese. By the expenditure of enormous resources, we have given South Vietnam a chance to survive, and that's probably the best we can do. Their severe political and economic problems can only be solved by them. We can do our best to assist them through economic and technological aid, but much as we would like to, we cannot assure their security, their prosperity, or their democracy.

The United States must consider Vietnam in the context of Asian policy. I believe we should downgrade the U.S. interest in Southeast Asia, and certainly subordinate it to our interest in Japan. We should be interested in the long-range development of the nations of Southeast Asia, but our immediate, vital interests are limited.

A key to our future Asian policy is to recognize our limitations in bringing about development in Asia. The United States should do all it can to encourage and support an Asian collective security system, supplying economic and technical assistance, but we should be most reluctant to commit American troops. We must look, instead, to the nations which are threatened to provide the manpower.

An important step in the future of the United States in Asia is to end, in an orderly way, our involvement in Vietnam. This will be a task calling for the utmost skill. The nervousness of friendly Asian leaders about the U.S. role in Asia is apparent. They genuinely fear that the United States will desert them. They accept the fact of U.S. disengagement reluctantly.

One of the things I tried to do in my conversations with South Vietnamese citizens was to persuade them that the United States is withdrawing. Although they invariably nodded their heads in assent, I wondered whether they actually believed it with the still-massive American presence all around them.

We are in better shape in Vietnam than we have ever been before, and after five years of major combat, we have done about all we can do. We ought to accelerate withdrawal if at all possible, being careful to protect the U.S. position in world affairs, to insure the safety of U.S. forces, and to encourage the safe return of American prisoners of war.

The American prisoners of war create a special problem. Pressure must be kept up by the Congress to push at every conceivable opportunity for the identification of all prisoners, the establishment of regular communication between them and their families, the prompt repatriation of the seriously sick and wounded, the observation and inspection of prisoner of war camps by impartial observers, and the eventual release of all prisoners of war.

I returned less optimistic than many of our officials. North Vietnam is a highly organized, patient, disciplined society and South Vietnam is a highly inefficient, fragmented society. The United States can—and indeed has—given the South Vietnamese a chance to survive. As the United States withdraws from South Vietnam, we must be very firm—even tough—with the South Vietnamese in order to give them an opportunity to survive.

YOUNG WORLD DEVELOPMENT

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1970

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, today, while modern technology has landed man on the moon and developed weapons powerful enough to destroy his earthly existence, it has pitifully failed to provide freedom from hunger and malnutrition for nearly half the earth's population, including 2 million Americans. Realizing the complexity of current social problems, it is indeed frightening to look ahead 30 years when there will be 7 billion mouths, twice as many as there are today, competing for food.

Action is needed, and fortunately numerous organizations, newspapers, mag-

aines, public officials, and private citizens have become aware of the gravity of the situation. But it is necessary to turn more people around to speak out strongly in favor of corrective policies.

Young World Development, a national organization of concerned individuals is playing a significant role in this national awareness campaign. And so they are educating the public to the need for legislative action and making them feel the urgency of the situation. I would like to call the attention of my fellow colleagues to their goals and activities.

Young World Development, part of the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation, is an organization dedicated to fighting poverty and malnutrition. In addition to sponsoring discussion groups, films, fasts, disseminating information, and other activities, this group walks to feed the hungry—literally, it is youth on the march. Such constructive treks have turned to be excellent catalysts for responsible community involvement—both time and money—in many areas. A recent newsletter summarized this walk for development.

Such walks began in this country about a year ago, under the auspices of the American Freedom from Hunger Foundation in Washington, D.C., a private, nonprofit organization supported by leaders in business, labor, social welfare, agriculture and education. Since then, an estimated 150,000 largely-middle class young people, from 35 communities, ranging in size from Aurora, Iowa (population 600) to Los Angeles, have turned their "sole power" into dollars for the needy.

Each walker recruits "sponsors" to pay him, from a few cents to several dollars, for every mile he hikes over a charted 26- to 32-mile course. So the youngsters not only draw public attention to the problem of hunger but earn hard cash for a variety of imaginative self-help anti-poverty projects in the United States and abroad. Thus far, youthful walkers have raised almost \$1,000,000, with more walks scheduled for this fall.

Although the Foundation offers some basic guidelines for conducting a walk, the teens themselves handle the details planning, organizing and problem solving. They learn first hand how to cope successfully with the adult system, from slow-moving city governments to vicious extremist groups. And in the end, they have the satisfaction of having helped bring meaningful change to a world they never made.

I commend the efforts and determination of these young people and feel that they have left a challenge for our Congress to take up. Solving the hunger-population-pollution problems will largely depend upon governmental action—it is time that our national priorities are changed if the world is to be spared the terrible consequences of massive famine and social chaos.

HARRIMAN CHARTS U.S. FOREIGN POLICY FOR THE SEVENTIES

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 16, 1970

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the House Foreign Affairs Committee held hearings in May and June on "U.S. Foreign Policy for the Seventies" to review the President's state of the world mes-

sage. We heard testimony from many distinguished experts in the field who evaluated the Nixon policy and where it was taking this country in the 1970's. One of the most outstanding statements was made by W. Averell Harriman, whose record of service to this country is unequalled.

I commend Governor Harriman's testimony to all my colleagues and to other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, especially to those who are concerned about our policies in Indochina. The text of the statement follows:

STATEMENT BY W. AVERELL HARRIMAN

Mr. Chairman, with your permission I would like to discuss first the most pressing and overpowering problem that affects all the aspects of foreign policy. I refer to the war in Vietnam.

It is important that we analyze how we got into this tragic war. President Roosevelt stated in my presence on several occasions during the war that he had no intention of allowing the French to return to Indochina. He sent an order to the Pentagon not to make plans for this area after the defeat of Japan, but he did not outline the political moves he had in mind.

Unfortunately the French were allowed back and failed in their attempt to come to an agreement for the independence of Indochina. As the French war in Indochina grew, we gave them increasing military assistance.

Even more unfortunately, when French military efforts failed and Ho Chi Minh's forces got control of North Vietnam through the Geneva Accords of 1954, we took over from France in South Vietnam and undertook political, economic and military responsibilities to support the Diem regime. To do our military justice, I understood that General J. Lawton Collins, former Chief of Staff of the United States Army, cautioned that the situation in South Vietnam might not be militarily viable. But step by step we became more and more involved, and we are now in an untenable position.

When the new Administration took over in January of 1969, agreement had been finally reached between the two sides to commence negotiations for a peaceful settlement. As publicly stated by Secretary of Defense Clark Clifford, the first order of business should be the reduction in the level of combat and violence. We were encouraged to believe that progress in this direction could be made. In late October and early November the North Vietnamese had taken 90% of their troops out of the northern two provinces of I Corps, half of which had been withdrawn above the 20th parallel—some two hundred miles to the north. Fighting almost stopped in this area which had been previously one of the most active. Because of this, General Abrams was able to take the First Air Cavalry Division from I Corps to the III Corps, to strengthen our position there.

However, the new Administration permitted President Thieu to pull the rug out from under the negotiations. President Thieu announced that he would not sit down in the private meetings that had been arranged for, although he knew full well that it was only in the private meetings that any progress could be made. Two months later he was finally persuaded to participate, but at the same time he announced that he would not in any circumstances agree to a coalition government or permit the NLF to become a political party in South Vietnam. By then the NLF refused to sit down privately with his representatives. No progress has been made in Paris since.

The plan for Vietnamization of the war is not, in my opinion, a plan for peace; it is a plan that will perpetuate the war. At best, we can only hope for a reduction of less than half our forces in South Vietnam two and a half years after this Adminis-

tration took office. After that there is no assurance whether or when the balance of our forces will be withdrawn. Although South Vietnamese troops are able to take on more combat, they cannot continue to operate successfully without American air, artillery and logistic support.

Furthermore, Vietnamization is dependent on an unpopular and repressive military government. With all of the military influence, President Thieu and Vice President Ky got less than 35% of the votes cast in 1967, whereas over 60% of the votes were cast for civilian candidates with some kind of peace plank in their platform. This election confirms the judgment that the people of South Vietnam want peace and not a continuation of the war.

While the Vietnamization plan is reducing American casualties, South Vietnamese losses are increasing, with up to 800 killed a week and with many civilian casualties as well. Clearly, our concern should be to put an end to the violence, not prolong it.

Our political objectives in Vietnam cannot be achieved by military means. We can expand the war to include Cambodia, Laos, North Vietnam and then China, and even the Soviet Union, but we cannot win the war. Unfortunately, this Administration refuses to learn from the mistakes of the past or to listen. They have closed their ears to outside opinion. The Administration is concentrating on military action, not negotiations.

On April 20th, the President held out hope that a just peace was in sight, yet since then the war has been expanded. There seems to be an idea that military blows can force the other side to negotiate on our terms. All our past experience in Vietnam shows that this is a delusion.

Our participation in the war in Vietnam must be ended and our troops brought home. The simple truth is that there is no way of achieving our political objectives in Vietnam through military action. That is not the fault of the United States but the nature of the problem that exists there.

The withdrawal of all of our troops from Vietnam should be on a fixed schedule. This will compel the Thieu government to undertake serious negotiations for a responsible settlement.

Our withdrawal must be responsible, and I believe that it can be—without delaying the return of our troops. We helped set this country on fire, and we must help put it out. I am convinced that the other side will agree on one point at least—that there be no reprisals by either side, with international supervision.

Meaningful negotiation will require a decision by the Administration to compel President Thieu to bring into his government political elements which wish a negotiated settlement and to send a team to Paris that is willing and capable of negotiating with the NLF for a compromise. Of course, the President himself must appoint a high-level negotiator. Until he does, it is hard for people around the world to believe he is really interested in negotiations. If these actions are taken on our side, I believe the other side will join in serious negotiations.

We have been told that "not our power but our will and character" are being tested in world opinion. This appraisal is not correct. What is being tested in our judgment and the wisdom of our actions.

With regard to the North Vietnamese, in the many discussions I had with them, there is one thing that I learned. They are fiercely nationalistic. They particularly want to be independent of China. With this in mind, they established friendly relations with the French after the war with France ended. Now if our war can be ended, they have indicated they want similar relations with the United States and other non-Communist countries. Like Tito, they recognize the need for an alternative to being compelled

to rely on their powerful communist neighbor.

I therefore believe that it is important for us to come to an understanding with Hanoi. We must recognize that the North Vietnamese did not keep the Laos Agreement for a single day and some understanding must be reached which is to their interest to keep for a period of years. If we are to have peace in Southeast Asia some understanding must be arrived at along the lines of President Johnson's Johns Hopkins speech of April 1965 for the reconstruction and cooperative development of Southeast Asia with the participation of the North Vietnamese.

Recent events have made this more difficult. Peking has consistently taken a negative position on a peaceful solution in the area. Peking's influence, I believe, was at its lowest point in 1968. Recent Cambodian developments have, I believe, increased their position to a new high. I am satisfied the Soviet Union would like to see a non-aligned Southeast Asia, strong enough and independent enough to check extension of Chinese influence in the South. They helped us in Paris both in October and in January to overcome certain obstacles. The Soviet influence has today been reduced while the Chinese influence has increased.

Southeast Asia is in some respects similar to the Sub-continent. It is significant that both the Soviet Union and we have been giving assistance to India and Pakistan. We have found ourselves in parallel positions.

The Soviet Union, however, will continue to give military support to North Vietnam which it considers its "sister Socialist State". There is no doubt she believes this is necessary in order to maintain her prestige with other communist countries and communist parties elsewhere in the world. No temporary military gain resulting from the destruction of North Vietnamese and Vietcong weapons in Cambodia will offset the far greater complications in the international political situation.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion this Administration has made serious mistakes in Indochina during the past sixteen months. I am heartened that members of Congress have been indicating their grave concern. Specific action is being proposed in the Senate to control military expenditures in the area. I agree with the fixed schedule of withdrawals as proposed by Mr. Clark Clifford, former Secretary of Defense. I earnestly hope that this committee will give profound consideration to all of these proposals. I strongly believe the crisis, which affects profoundly our national interests at home and abroad is so grave that the Congress should assert its constitutional authority. It should act to bring to an end the waste of human and material resources in Indochina so desperately required for the pressing needs of our country.

In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, the negotiations of greatest significance in the long run are the SALT talks on nuclear arms restraint. President Nixon has expressed his strong desire for progress in this field, and most Americans are hoping for success in Vienna. Recent press reports indicate the talks are proceeding in a serious manner.

Unfortunately, during its first 15 months the Administration showed little sense of the urgency demanded by the rapid developments in the arms race. The Administration disregarded recommendations that we take the initiative by deferring MIRV testing and further deployment of offensive and defensive missile systems providing the Soviet Union took similar measures of restraint.

The announcement that MIRV deployment would begin next month was deeply disturbing, as was the decision to seek Congressional authorization for a second stage of ABM. Such steps seem to invite reciprocal escalation instead of mutual restraint during negotiations.

President Kennedy successfully concluded the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty with the Soviets by taking the initiative. He made a speech at American University on June 10, 1963, that was quite conciliatory. He announced he would stop nuclear testing as long as the other side did the same. That was a signal that our intentions were serious, and Premier Khrushchev responded. As a result, in spite of the years of fruitless discussion, our delegation went to Moscow and negotiated a treaty in two weeks time.

In dealing with the Soviet Union, we must recognize that we cannot have an overall detente. Their ultimate objectives and ours are still in conflict. However, there are some areas where important understandings can be reached.

I believe the United States should welcome and support Mr. Brandt's initiatives for improving relations with the nations of Eastern Europe and with the Soviet Union. Furthermore, the European Security Conference between the NATO and Warsaw Pact countries presents an opportunity to reduce tensions in Europe now.

I am concerned by indications that the Administration considers that the conference should be postponed for at least a year. There are important issues to be discussed such as the mutual reduction of force levels. A NATO-Warsaw Pact agreement on balanced reductions in force levels is the soundest way to reduce the number of American troops stationed in Europe.

Expanded East-West trade in non-strategic goods could be a commercial profitable step toward better relations. Today it has wider support in the business community than ever before. However, the language of the "State of the World" message suggested that the Soviets must pay with political concessions for the right to buy from us. Yet the bulk of what they wish to purchase here they can already obtain in large quantities from Western Europe and Japan.

This approach in my opinion is not merely fruitless but harmful. This idea of "linkage" is badly mistaken. It seems to me we should make progress where we can and, when an agreement is reached it makes it easier to negotiate others.

The Administration has taken constructive steps in several important areas. The President's actions in the field of chemical and biological warfare, including the elimination of biological-toxin weapons and his submission of the 1925 Geneva Protocol prohibiting use of such weapons, have been highly commendable. I would hope the Senate acts speedily to ratify this treaty.

The resumption of the American-Chinese discussions in Warsaw and the initiatives towards relaxing barriers to commerce and travel between the United States and Mainland China are in my opinion modest steps in the right direction.

Among the casualties of the Vietnam has been our aid program. We have fallen behind other industrial nations in terms of our capability. In 1968 we ranked eighth among the sixteen principal Western donor countries in percentage of GNP devoted to development assistance.

Recognizing the problem, President Nixon appointed last autumn a Presidential Task Force on International Development with Rudolph A. Peterson as chairman. Your Committee is undoubtedly familiar with its report, and I will not review it. I wish, however, to strongly endorse the basic findings of this group. I trust that your Committee will also give attention to the report of the United Nations Commission on International Development, headed by The Honorable Lester Pearson. Many of its recommendations deserve serious consideration in our national interest.

We must continue our concern for and our assistance to the developing nations, first of all, because it is our moral obligation. We have been endowed with resources which have made it possible for us to achieve a

prosperity unheard of in history, and surely we have an obligation to give a helping hand to the less fortunate.

Secondly, our own economic life can be strengthened and expanded as other nations develop. Expanding trade and markets will add greatly to our own continuing prosperity.

Lastly, the very survival of our civilization is at stake. It is not conceivable that a few countries can live indefinitely as islands of luxury in a sea of poverty.

NUCLEAR ENERGY

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1970

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago today, the world's first atomic bomb was tested at Alamogordo Air Base, N. Mex. This marked man's unleashing of the first nuclear device and the creation of a force unequal in potential to anything he had previously conceived. At the close of World War II in 1945, the United States was virtually the only nation in the world able to assign a substantial part of its scientific manpower and equipment to nuclear sciences. When an immediate end to World War II was viewed as an imperative by the United States in 1945, President Truman determined to use the atomic bomb to avoid the necessity for an invasion of Japan. A little more than 3 weeks after the first test, an atomic bomb was used in warfare by the United States in the raid on Hiroshima. Shortly thereafter, the city of Nagasaki was destroyed by a larger nuclear device. We cannot hide the horrors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki which resulted from the atomic discovery. However, today, we look with hope toward the beneficial qualities of atomic energy which have been unveiled and are being constantly improved.

With nuclear powerplants in 31 States, it is not difficult to realize the possibilities of nuclear energy as it affects all our lives. Some of the ways in which nuclear energy has been applied positively to scientific development have been seen with the application of radioisotopes in the fields of agriculture, industry and medicine. In agriculture, irradiation research has been used to determine the possibilities for the preservation of food. Nutritionists have also benefited from the discoveries of the researchers as to the life of various food.

With the problems of our environment seemingly now in the forefront of scientific development, nuclear power has been assigned to aid the desalinization process to meet the requirements of clean water. In addition to research and industry, the atom has been used in space programs. The Atomic Energy Commission has developed shielded units containing high concentrations of radioisotopes which generate heat. This energy is then converted to electric power for use in space flights.

The restraint which man has used in handling the atom for destructive purposes since Japan, and the benefit of the vast positive contributions afforded by the continued research of fundamental nuclear energy are products of the atomic age. I would like to take this

opportunity to praise the scientists, technicians, and engineers, and all those involved with atomic research for their accomplishments in the first quarter century of the nuclear age.

The far reaching powers of the atom have been found powerful to the extent of total world annihilation. This possibility of total destruction looms over the heads of the world, and the decisions that can result in that destruction reside in the hands of a few. We can only hope that the responsible leadership of this country and the other nuclear powers will direct their policies toward peace in an atomic age.

CZECH AND SLOVAK REFUGEES

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1970

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, there could hardly be a more appropriate time than Captive Nations Week to say a few words in behalf of political refugees who seek asylum in the United States and to discuss practical means for assisting them. On January 27 I introduced H.R. 15541, which would, if enacted into law, amend section 203(a) (7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to make available annually an additional 10,200 conditional entries for certain refugees.

My primary reason for sponsoring this measure was a desire to at least partly alleviate the plight of the large number of Czechs and Slovaks who were driven from their homeland by the Soviet invasion of August 1968. Many of these refugees would like to come to the United States but they are prevented from doing so because of oversubscribed quotas.

The people to whom H.R. 15541 would give special consideration would neither swell the ranks of the unemployed nor add to the relief burdens of local communities, because they would have to be sponsored by American families and organizations that would assume responsibility for them. A large number of those who would become eligible for admittance to the United States under my bill possess special skills that are desperately needed in key industries, including vital defense installations. They would neither displace domestic workers nor keep the unemployed from obtaining work.

Many of those who are presently jobless either do not have the special skills that are required for positions that employers find difficulty in filling or they are reluctant to move from their present homes to distant cities where their skills are in demand. The refugees from Czechoslovakia who have acquired unusual skills are not only willing but anxious to journey several thousand miles in order to begin new careers in America.

Certainly these would-be immigrants would receive tremendous benefits in freedom and opportunity if they were permitted to come to the United States, but they would also make numerous worthwhile and lasting contributions by way of compensation. For example, among them is an engineer who holds

over a dozen patents for air purifying processes. He would be of inestimable help in our war on pollution.

We are all too often inclined to feel that the day of immigration is over and that the United States no longer needs transfusions of new blood. Certainly the day when millions of people left overpopulated European countries for the wide open spaces of America has ended, but our gates ought to remain at least slightly ajar for immigrants of unusually high quality.

As I speak here this afternoon on behalf of a comparative handful of refugees, I cannot help but recall a few outstanding examples of great Americans of our generation who began life as Europeans. Great inventors include Alexander Graham Bell and Charles P. Steinmetz. Eminent scientists were Albert Einstein, Enrico Fermi, and Edward Teller. Outstanding business leaders include William S. Knudsen and David Sarnoff, while Samuel Gompers and Philip Murray were distinguished leaders of labor.

Aircraft designers Alexander de Seversky and Igor Sikorsky helped to accelerate the progress of aviation. Numerous immigrants became prominent at all levels of government, including Felix Frankfurter, an Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court. Great names in music include Irving Berlin, Lauritz Melchior, Leopold Stokowski, Igor Stravinsky, Arturo Toscanini, and Bruno Walter, while literature is represented by George Santayana and Hendrik Willem Van Loon.

These are, of course, but a few illustrious examples of the many prominent Americans of foreign birth who have lightened our burdens, enriched our lives, and helped make our dreams become realities. We would have been poor indeed had harshly restrictive immigration statutes kept them from sharing our God-given liberties and our material blessings.

Let us not make it too easy for immigrants to enter America, but let us not make it too difficult, either. We should keep out those who are anxious to come here only because of the loaves and fishes, but we must not slam the door in the faces of those who are willing to work in the heat of the day in order to help us solve our problems.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Committee on the Judiciary will schedule early hearings on H.R. 15541, which means so much to the Czechs and Slovaks who would prefer life in free America to coexistence in Communist-dominated Czechoslovakia. I am confident that these people, who have suffered much under both national socialist and Communist tyrannies, would make America richer by their presence.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1970

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in com-

memorating the 12th annual observance of Captive Nations Week.

During this week each year, citizens across the country pay tribute to the courage of the people of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania. Throughout the many years of oppression and subjugation that these people have endured, they have continually displayed their courage to the world. It is important that in observing Captive Nations Week we should honor and remember these enslaved people suffering under totalitarian forms of government. But it is also a time for us to reaffirm our own commitment to freedom and the principles of democratic government. As citizens of a free and independent country, it is sometimes difficult for us to imagine the hardships which these people have had to undergo since World War II.

On this occasion, Mr. Speaker, we express our deep concern over the plight of these countries and hope the time will soon come when freedom and self-determination will be restored to the captive nations.

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1970

Mr. PHILBIN. I am deeply saddened to learn of the passing of my dearly beloved friend and outstanding former colleague, Hon. Clifford Davis of Tennessee.

I saw Cliff not long ago here in the Capitol when he was here for a visit, and I thought he looked very well. News of his passing, therefore, was shocking and surprising to me, as it must have been to his many friends.

Cliff Davis was a very fine, highly esteemed Member of this House for years, with many warm admiring friends on both sides of the aisle. His outstanding services here were in the best traditions of his historic State of Tennessee and our country.

He was a man of deep convictions and strong opinions on public questions, and he always stood up for them with great ability, firmness, and resolution. He was especially well informed on public questions, and endowed with an alert, active mind, and spirit of dedication and loyalty to his friends, and the many great causes in which he believed that commanded for him the respect, admiration, and affection of every man in this famous Chamber.

Cliff was endowed with many amiable personal qualities that endeared him to those who knew him, especially to his colleagues here, who always found him a delightful companion, a most cooperative, helpful colleague, and dear friend, who was deeply committed to his service in the House, and willing at all times to lend a hand to those who might need his assistance.

His great contributions to the people of his district, State, and this country, which he loved so much, and served with

such deep patriotism and fidelity, will long be remembered by those who had the privilege and honor of serving with him, and by his constituents and a grateful American people, for his devotion to duty, his brilliant career in the House, and for his unflinching interest and efforts for the cause of the great, inarticulate masses of people who benefited so greatly from the splendid services that he rendered them in this great free, representative body of national leaders.

The House has lost an esteemed friend and former colleague, the Nation has lost a great distinguished patriot and the illustrious State of Tennessee has lost one of its ablest, dedicated and most famous sons.

To his sorrowfully bereaved wife and family and all his dear ones, I extend most heartfelt sympathy for the truly great irreparable loss they have sustained in the passing of this great American, our beloved friend, and which I and other Members who served with him here so sorrowfully share with them.

Our prayers will be with all his dear ones, and we humbly ask that the good Lord bring them the strength to bear their sad bereavement with true spiritual resignation, and bless them with reconciliation and "that peace that passeth all understanding."

May our dear friend and valued colleague Cliff, find eternal rest in his heavenly home.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HON.
CLIFFORD DAVIS

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1970

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most rewarding experiences of being a Member of the Congress of the United States is to form valuable personal associations with one's colleagues. Such was my good fortune when soon after coming to Congress I made the acquaintanceship with Congressman Clifford Davis of Memphis, Tenn. He preceded me in Congress by some 10 years and I was the recipient of much good advice from him.

Clifford Davis was a pleasant and honest friend with all of his colleagues who sought such a fortunate relationship with him. He was always willing to take the time to advise his colleagues and help them wherever possible.

One of the memories that I have of his membership in the Federal Legislature was the time of the shooting on March 1, 1954, by the Puerto Ricans. After helping with the care of one of my colleagues who was unfortunate enough to be hit, I walked down the aisle to where our colleague, Clifford Davis, was sitting. He had been shot through the calf of the leg and was sitting in his seat contemplating what had happened to him. As usual, he was most cool and self-poised.

Our late colleague possessed a most pleasant personality and one always enjoyed being in his company. After his retirement from Congress, he visited in the House Chamber several times and he was

always surrounded by his friends who never tired of his company.

He shall be sorely missed by all of us and I extend to his charming companion of many years, Carrie Davis, and to the others of his family and friends my most sincere sympathy in the passing of their loved one.

ST. JOSEPH COUNTY URBAN
COALITION

HON. JOHN BRADEMÁS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1970

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, the National Urban Coalition, founded by former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable John W. Gardner, attempts through its national program and through local coalitions to encourage Americans in a wide range of vocations to join together in working on the problems of our Nation's cities.

One of the local coalitions endorsed by the National Urban Coalition is the Urban Coalition of St. Joseph County, Ind., on whose board of advisers I am privileged to serve.

Mr. Speaker, a unique feature of the St. Joseph County Coalition is its affiliation with the Youth Coalition of St. Joseph County. Under the guidance of Joseph Dickey of the South Bend YMCA and the chairmanship of Alvin Levy, the Youth Coalition seeks to enhance opportunities for recreation, employment, and education for the community's young people.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that many of our cities are faced this summer with inadequate recreational facilities and, perhaps more important, too few summer jobs for young people.

In this regard, the Youth Coalition's Recreational Task Force, chaired by Tom Beck, approached the local Urban Coalition with a proposal to open more recreational facilities this summer to the entire community.

The St. Joseph County Urban Coalition approved the Youth Coalition's plan and appointed a committee of three men to pursue it. This committee consisted of John J. Powers, coalition board and executive committee member and managing editor of the South Bend Tribune; Robert Laven, coalition executive committee member and president of the common council of the city of South Bend; and Rev. Milton Willford, coalition board member and executive secretary of the Council of Churches of St. Joseph County.

Under this committee's guidance, and especially with the initiative of Mr. Powers, all high school gymnasiums and swimming pools in the city of South Bend have been opened for public use this summer.

Mr. Speaker, the activities of the St. Joseph County Urban and Youth Coalitions are an outstanding example of what young and old, working together, can accomplish in their community.

Mr. Speaker, I include an article and editorial from the South Bend Trib-

une on July 5 and 8, which describe the successful summer recreation program which I have discussed, be printed in the RECORD at this point:

[From the South Bend Tribune, Sunday, July 5, 1970]

OPEN SCHOOLS TO FAMILY RECREATION

PROGRAM SCHEDULED TO START MONDAY

Recreational facilities at the city's five high schools will be opened to the public for a complete family-type recreation program starting Monday and continuing daily from 6 to 9 p.m.

The program is the result of a well coordinated effort by several governmental agencies and civic-minded organizations.

Ed "Moose" Krause, chairman of the Recreation Commission, a five-member body representing the city, the Park Department and the South Bend Community School Corp., announced the recreational facilities to be opened to the public include the swimming pools at Adams, Jackson, LaSalle, Riley and Washington, and the gymnasiums at Adams, Jackson, Riley, Washington and Coquillard. Due to construction now underway at LaSalle High School, the Coquillard Junior High School gymnasium has been opened to serve the northwest area.

RESULTS FROM REQUEST

The program is the result of a request of the Youth Coalition of St. Joseph County. The group last May contacted the Urban Coalition regarding the possible use of the recreational facilities in the South Bend school system for a pilot project for two weeks during the summer months. The presentation was met with enthusiasm by the Urban Coalition's board of directors and a special committee, headed by John J. Powers as chairman, assisted by Councilman Robert Laven and Rev. Milton Willford, executive secretary of the St. Joseph County Council of Churches, was formed to pursue the matter.

The result of the special committee's work is a recreational program geared for the entire family.

SCHOOL POOLS AVAILABLE

Swimming will be available at the five high school pools. The swimming program is intended for accomplished young and adult swimmers. No instructional swimming programs will be offered. These same pools are used daily from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. for instructional purposes.

Three qualified lifeguards will be on duty at each pool at all times.

Basketball will be available in the five school gymnasiums, but the program will not include organized games due to a ruling by the Indiana High School Athletic Assn. The IHSAA prohibits organized basketball for high school athletes. No attempt will be made to provide official games or coaching.

Two paid supervisors will be in the gymnasiums at all times and will be assisted by two volunteers from the University of Notre Dame's varsity basketball team. The Notre Dame varsity members, all of whom are attending summer school, are among the athletes who provided supervision for the basketball program known as "Reach Up" for the past two summers. The "Reach Up" program will not be a part of this summer's program because of the restrictions imposed by the IHSAA against participation of high school athletes.

Among the other indoor activities available will be table tennis and volleyball. Running or jogging will be available on the high school tracks. The exception will be at Coquillard, where there is no track.

The program will be financed in its experimental stage by the Public Recreation Commission, with the total program to be evaluated at the end of a two-week period.

Mayor Lloyd M. Allen has applied for federal funds which, if they become available,

will enable the program to be continued through Aug. 14.

Among the agencies co-operating in the program are the Public Recreation Commission, the city administration, the Urban Coalition Committee, the Youth Coalition of St. Joseph County and the South Bend Community School Corp.

SUMMER PROGRAMS NEW

Paul Boehm, director of public recreation of the South Bend Park Department, explained that public schools have been heavily used in the recreation programs during the winter season, but this is the first time they have been opened as recreation centers during the summer season.

"Such a program is in keeping with the recommendation that unites the school corporation and the park department in providing available facilities for community recreation," Boehm said.

There will be no charge for any of the recreational activities.

Persons are free to come and go according to their personal plans. Among the rules which will apply for all participants are: gym shoes must be worn in the gymnasium, swimmers must take a soap shower before entering the pool, swimmers must wear regulation swimming suits, and towels must be provided by participants. Basketball players will not be permitted to bring their own basketballs into the gym.

Persons are urged not to bring valuables with them because there will be no checking or locker service available.

[From the South Bend Tribune]

EXPANDED RECREATION PROGRAM

The Youth Coalition of St. Joseph County started something last spring when it approached the Urban Coalition with the idea of expanded use of the recreational facilities of the South Bend school system. The latter took up the idea with enthusiasm.

The result is the development of a wholesome complete family-type recreation program making better use of the facilities than ever before.

The pools at Jackson, Adams, Riley, Washington and LaSalle High Schools and the gymnasiums at all except LaSalle, where construction work is under way, plus the gymnasium at Coquillard, are open daily from 6 to 9 p.m. Lifeguards and other supervision are provided. Use of the facilities is free.

The program is a sensible extension of the use of the facilities. Our hats are off to those who pushed the idea and all who co-operated in bringing the idea to fruition.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1970

Mr. DADDARIO. Today, as free men all over the world observe Captive Nations Week, let us pause for a moment to remind ourselves of the continuing plight of millions of the world's peoples, still suffering under the domination of the Soviet Union and China.

Perhaps the greatest allies of the free world are these very peoples, muzzled at present, but determined to one day reassert their rights as human beings and to redeem the proud histories of their native lands. Just as they have not forgotten that heritage nor abandoned their dreams of liberation, let us not forget them nor abandon our progress toward the day when all men everywhere will enjoy their "inalienable rights."

If any in our country had forgotten the plight of the captive nations of Eastern Europe or minimized its seriousness, the invasion of Czechoslovakia in the summer of 1968 came as a rude shock and a grim reminder. That attack should serve as eloquent testimony to the hard realities of Soviet authoritarian rule. In Eastern Asia, in Europe, in scattered points all over the globe, millions of people, alien to the Soviets and the Chinese, but subservient to their powers, await the day when their captivity will become an unpleasant memory, when they can begin anew to determine their own destinies and shape their own societies.

And so, this week, the free world honors the courage and fortitude of all these dominated people, hoping and working for their liberation, confident that that goal will soon become reality.

ANOTHER WARNING AGAINST REPRESSION

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1970

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep concern that I have witnessed the gradual erosion of the most basic of American rights—the right to hold a dissenting belief. There have been frequent attacks on this and other fundamental freedoms, in an attempt to silence those who would criticize our Nation's policies. Such political or ideological repression, anathema as it is to a system based on recognition of individual rights, can only result in a generation of cowed conformists.

A recent editorial, appearing in the July 13, 1970, Hartford Courant, discusses this grave threat to our American democracy. I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

ANOTHER WARNING AGAINST REPRESSION

Mayor Lindsay of New York recently warned that the nation appears to be headed for a new period of repression. An extension of this view is held by Henry Steele Commager, who says in a Look magazine article that we are already in such a period, and it is more formidable than before because it has official sanction and is encouraged by popular indifference.

In his view, the most ominous development is the erosion of due process of law, a concept that has been upheld by the courts but has suffered many setbacks in politics and public opinion. Equally flagrant, he says, is the attack on the First Amendment freedoms of speech, press, petition and assembly, an attack that takes the form of harassment rather than overt repudiation.

He admits that it would be an exaggeration to say that the United States is a garrison state, but none to say that it is in danger of becoming one. He believes the purpose of the broad attack on American freedoms is to silence criticism and to encourage the attitude that the government knows best.

The philosophy behind all this, he says, is that government belongs to the President and Vice President; that they are the masters and the people the subjects. But in the American system the people are the masters and all officials are the servants. The fundamental question, as he understands it, is that many leaders today are mistaken because they don't understand the relation of freedom to security, to order and to law. In

his view freedom is a necessity for justice, progress and survival. And society has an interest in the rights of the individual because without them it would decay.

We foster freedom, he reminds us, in order to avoid error and discover truth. A nation that penalizes criticism is left with passive acquiescence in error.

Professor Commager reminds that American history is one of rebellion against authority; we have a long history of experimentation in politics, social relations and science. Since we have not found final truth in politics or law, he asks what will be the consequence of policies that repress freedom, discourage independence and impair justice? This is worth thinking about, as is his warning that it is not ideas that are subversive, but the lack of them.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

SPEECH OF

HON. SHIRLEY CHISHOLM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1970

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Captive Nations Week, which has been proclaimed as July 12 to 18. Americans have been urged to express their concern for the future of individual rights in Central and Eastern Europe and wherever else those rights are being violated and threatened.

I acknowledge this occasion and, in rising, I remind America that I am a representative of the black people, an American captive. There can no longer be any thinking and aware person who does not understand the reality of my position, Bedford-Stuyvesant and Harlem in New York, Chicago's South Side, Roxbury in Boston, Watts in Los Angeles, all these are "ghettos." A resident of one of these or a similar area seems to have no rights that anyone is bound to respect. Every action of an individual must have the approval of an outside authority.

The killings of innocent students at Jackson, the shootings of black men in Augusta, these, and more recorded infamous deeds, make it impossible for black people to determine and realize any of their own goals. In most areas, the old saying about the black neighborhood being on the other side of the tracks remains true.

While black people are the largest "ghetto," they are by no means the only racial or economic group to be subject to America's whims or to be set apart from the mainstream. Mexican-Americans, or as they prefer, Chicanos, white migrant workers, Puerto Ricans, and, still the American Indians are in the same predicament. Indeed, women are also a captive nation.

These six groups can do nothing that the Americans have not officially approved. Indians are forced to live on reservations; migrant farm workers—white and Chicano—are forced to work for next to nothing on a precarious seasonal basis in miserable conditions; Puerto Ricans are confined to the lowest menial jobs in the cities where they abound.

Mr. Speaker, Chinatown, Harlem, and El Barrio are not historical, different, exciting, or flavorful places to visit. They

are the preserves for the United States captive nations.

LEIGH STEINBERG

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1970

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I have on a number of occasions over the past few weeks commented on the distressing events which threaten to destroy our universities as sanctuaries of free inquiry.

I am pleased to learn of the election of Mr. Leigh Steinberg to the office of student body president at the University of California, Berkeley. The newly elected president has clearly stated the need for reform and change, but reformation within the system, not destruction from without.

I am hopeful that Mr. Steinberg will be able to rally the student body at Berkeley to effect the much needed reforms while at the same time insuring the continued function of the university as a bastion of free intellectual inquiry and search for truth.

I enclose for the benefit of my colleagues a statement by Mr. Steinberg and a recent news article commenting on the election:

STATEMENT OF LEIGH STEINBERG, ASUC PRESIDENT

Two months ago, amidst the teargas and windowbreaking of the anti-ROTC demonstrations, a group of students got together and decided that there had to be a better way for the achievement of social justice. It became clear to us that the current round of skirmishes was not only morally reprehensible, but that they were counterproductive. We formed the nonviolent action party and pledged ourselves to find a creative alternative to the endless cycle of violent confrontation. These efforts culminated in the recent ASUC elections in which we were able to elect all five of our executive candidates and seven of our ten Senate candidates. On that ballot was a referendum which we sponsored by gathering 3,000 signatures, which reads: "It is the sense of the associated students of the University of California, Berkeley, that we do not support those violent

actions that have recently taken place on campus and in the community and that such violent acts are wholly unrepresentative of the will of this student body." This referendum passed by a three-to-one margin.

But it is not enough to simply condemn violence. There is a new resolve today at Berkeley, powered by a vision of a more ideal society, one without foreign wars, racism, or poverty, a world of harmony and equity. To achieve this dream we are calling for a partnership between the people of the State of California and their sons and daughters on its campuses, a partnership for progress.

We are still convinced that this dream can be achieved through the existing system. We are determined to make this system work. And we will try to the best of our abilities to see that rationality and persuasion prevail over rock and bottle throwing, that non-violent, creative, constructive talent is harnessed in productive ways. We see electoral politics, lobbying, and canvassing as the proper arena for these energies.

Being over thirty is a malady which will strike all of us some day, and we feel that it is not the calendar but the spirit which is the true gauge of youth. And so, we ask today for your help, your brains, your skills, your experience, and yes, your money, to help us live up to the ideals which you instilled in us.

[From the Washington Post, July 16, 1970]

BERKELEY STUDENT HEAD IS A MODERATE

BERKELEY, CALIF., July 15.—The University of California's new student body president is clean cut, deprecates violence and says campus militants have been guilty of "incredible arrogance."

"The radicals cry 'Power to the people'—but the people would like to see them shot," says Leigh Steinberg, 21.

The Berkeley campus has been torn periodically by student-police clashes since 1964 and violent demonstrations against ROTC and the U.S. move into Cambodia were going on when Steinberg's Nonviolent Action Party swept the student elections last spring.

Steinberg, who says he prefers to work within "the system" for change, defeated a coalition of blacks and Mexican-Americans and a third party of white radicals by a 3-to-1 margin.

In a typical turnout 3,900 of the school's 27,500 students voted.

"If someone wanted to end the war in Vietnam, the right way to do it would be to go into middle America and convince them," he said in an interview.

"You don't do it by throwing excrement at their cars, or spitting on the flag, or burning down the university."

"You sit down and try to reason, find things in common."

Steinberg, son of a Los Angeles high school principal, will be attending law school in the fall. He succeeds Dan Seigel, 23, fiery orator who was formally prevented from taking office by the campus administration.

Although acquitted of an inciting-to-riot charge, Seigel was suspended last year for his role in the "People's Park" riot on May 15, 1969.

"There's not going to be a revolution in our country within our lifetime," Steinberg said. "The people don't want a revolution."

"The majority of the people in this country have never heard a real argument against the war. All they've seen is placards and demonstrations."

"I have more in common with them than with the people working for the revolution," Steinberg said, although he added he opposes the war.

His election victory, he said, indicates that Berkeley students believe "society is far from ideal, but they are sick of confrontation."

THE PLIGHT OF THE VETERANS ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1970

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, our soldiers in uniform have always received the finest medical care possible. In the field and on our bases we have insured our men proper medical attention. But, the heroes of battlefields who take off their uniforms and become veterans return to a different story. They return to a situation in which their vast contributions to society are ignored. We have relegated them to a second class citizenship as evidenced by the medical treatment we offer them in VA hospitals.

In the first 4 months of the war this year we lost over \$166,500,000 worth of helicopters. But Congress will barely allot enough money to provide \$1.20 worth of food per day per patient.

Considering the nature of many VA hospitals, it may well take more courage to be a VA hospital patient than to have fought in the war.

VA patients and staff cannot keep battling such bad odds any longer.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, July 20, 1970

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let the peace of God rule in your hearts and be ye thankful.—Colossians, 3:15.

O God, our Father, we rejoice in the dawning of another week and pray that we may be so conscious of Thy presence and so receptive to the leading of Thy spirit that we may walk more worthily in Thy wholesome ways. We know that Thou art with us and we want to feel that we are with Thee.

Deepen our faith, increase our love, strengthen our hands that we may be faithful to Thee, devoted to our country, and true to the best within us. We do not ask Thee to remove our temptations but to give us power to meet them cou-

rageously, to manage them confidently, and to master them creatively. We do not pray for tasks equal to our strength but for strength equal to our tasks; not for responsibilities we can carry easily but for an inner spirit to carry our responsibilities, however heavy.

Grant unto us such greatness of soul, such gentleness of spirit, such goodness of heart that we may do our duties with due regard for the rights of others. So may we be just and kind in all our ways and honest and straightforward through all our days.

In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 16, 1970, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 14452. An act to provide for the designation of special policemen at the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 14453. An act to authorize the Public Printer to grant time off as compensation for overtime worked by certain employees of the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles: