

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DR. LEDERBERG SPEAKS OUT ON  
BIOLOGICAL WARFARE HAZARDS

## HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 1970

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Joshua Lederberg, professor of genetics at Stanford University and a Nobel Prize winner for his work in biology, recently addressed the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva.

In his talk he emphasized the hazards which biological warfare poses to the world and urged that the Conference promptly reach agreement on a ban on the development, production, proliferation or use of biological weapons.

His position parallels that of the U.S. delegation, which has urged that an agreement on biological weapons be reached now, with subsequent work on a total ban on chemical weapons. This approach has been opposed by the Soviet Union, its allies, and some neutrals at the Conference.

It is my hope that Dr. Lederberg's message of urgency will help break down the resistance of Communist and other nations and allow a ban on biological weapons to be concluded at the next session of the Conference.

In the thought that Dr. Lederberg's statement would be of interest to the Members of the House, I am placing it in the Record at this point:

REMARKS BY JOSHUA LEDERBERG, PROFESSOR OF GENETICS, STANFORD UNIVERSITY, FOR INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS AT THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT, GENEVA, AUGUST 5, 1970

This is the first occasion at which I have been invited to attend a meeting of this kind. It is also a 24th anniversary of another occasion when I was a young medical student attending my first scientific conference. This was an international meeting at Cold Spring Harbor, near New York, and it could be truly labeled as the birthdate of a new scientific field, the genetics of bacteria and of viruses. My first published work was presented at that meeting and it concerned the discovery, contrary to decades of previous supposition to the contrary, that bacteria were indeed possessed of a mechanism like sexual reproduction which made it possible to crossbreed different bacterial strains. These observations, together with related ones by many other colleagues have gone into the emergence of the most powerful of new methods and insights in experimental biology, going generally under the name of molecular biology.

From the very beginning it was inescapable to me that these new approaches for the understanding and manipulation of living organisms had potential implications for human progress of very great significance. On the one hand molecular biology could increase man's knowledge about himself and lead to revolutionary changes in medicine in such fields as cancer, aging, congenital disease, and virus infections. It might also play a vital role in industry and in agriculture. On the other side it might be exploited for military purposes and eventuate in a biological weapons race whose aim could well

become the most efficient means for removing man from the planet. As a student of evolution, and having studied it in the microcosmos with bacterial cultures, I knew that man had no guaranteed place on our earth. He has faced and continues to face natural disasters like the infestations that have wiped out the American chestnut and the European grapevine. To these long-standing threats would now be added new ones, potentially of our own invention.

These past 25 years, in the course of which the world community has reached a certain degree of familiarity with the problems of nuclear power, and has undertaken some of the steps needed to contain it as a servant for rather than against human aims, have seen a sustained, remarkable development of molecular biology. For example, Professor Gobind Khorana recently reported the synthetic assembly of a small gene through chemical operations on DNA components. It will be a step of another order of magnitude to extend this technical capability to the synthesis of small viruses, but this surely will be accomplished within the next decade. This procedure will allow an unlimited range of experimental variations of the genetic structure of different viruses, a process which has many important potential applications for human health. It also offers us the prospect of engineering the design of viruses to exquisite detail. Accomplishments like Khorana's have been possible in a small laboratory on an annual research budget which is minuscule compared to weapons hardware. A serious military investment in this area could be expected to outstrip this already breathtaking pace of advance by many fold.

I could mention many other intriguing scientific advances from my own work and that of others, and fear only that my enthusiasm in discussing these details might outrun your patience in hearing about them. I will be glad to engage later in informal discussions on any aspect of molecular biology that may be of interest to you. I will just mention the discoveries of three methods of modifying the genetic structure of microbes: 1) cross-breeding them through what is, essentially, sexual reproduction; 2) inserting new genes carried by a virus, a process called "transduction," and 3) direct manipulation of DNA as a chemical substance, and reintroducing this into microbial cells.

I deeply appreciate the gravity and importance of the work of this Committee. Its principal significance is, of course, for the security of all the people of the world; and to that it is only a small addition to mention my own moral pre-occupation with whether my own career will have been labeled a blessing or a curse to the humanity from which I spring. This comment may have more force if I offer it as not only a personal testimony but as typical of the dilemma that faces my entire generation of biological research scientists and our younger students at this very moment. I am therefore many times indebted to you not only for your present labors but also for having offered me the privilege of a more personal participation in a process that may yet result in civilizing this branch of science.

For many years BW has been given only incidental attention as a subject of diplomatic discussion; for it seemed to have little bearing on the adjustments of power that were the main work of specialists in foreign affairs. However, BW does have something to do with efforts to reduce the barbarity of warfare. BW stands apart from all other devices in the actual threat that it poses to the health and life-expectancy of every human being whether or not he is politically involved in belligerent actions. In a word,

the intentional release of an infectious particle, be it a virus or bacterium, from the confines of the laboratory or of medical practice must be condemned as an irresponsible threat against the whole human community.

The Black Death, the great bubonic plague that ravaged Europe in the mid-14th century is in fact a well documented historic example of just this process. The plague first entered Europe in 1346 via the sailors, rats, and fleas on the ships that returned to Genoa after having been expelled from Theodosia in the Crimea where the attacking Tartars had catapulted some of their corpses into the Genoese fortifications. This plague which reduced the population of Europe by at least one-third, would of course, almost surely have made its way West sooner or later, the nature of the disease being quite beyond the comprehension of the medical science of that era.

The Black Death in Europe was only one of many visitations of the plague suffered by Europe during the last 2000 years. We do not know why this one should have been so much more disastrous than many others. The progress of a disease in any given individual is subject to many factors of which only a few are well understood. A large epidemic, involving millions of people spread over time and space, is an immensely more complicated phenomenon about which it is very difficult to make accurate scientific predictions. This combination of very grave potential hazard with a high degree of unpredictability is a peculiar attribute of biological weaponry at its present stage of development. This has a great deal to do with the rational doctrine that so far has placed a relatively low value on its military utility.

The present situation thus might provide the most favorable opportunity for international action to regulate the further development and proliferation of BW. I am convinced we know enough about it to have legitimate concern about its future prospects. Until now no nation appears to have staked its security to any significant degree on BW armaments. I would therefore hope this provides a basis for accord. If we wait until BW has been developed into a reliable armament for use under a range of military doctrine, we must all fear that it could then be too late to disengage important powers from their commitment to it.

If I may return to the Black Death, the main barriers that may today keep bubonic plague from being a great threat in advanced countries are: 1) understanding of and the use of quarantine, 2) the suppression of rats and fleas by general urban hygiene, and 3) the use of modern therapy, especially antibiotics, to control the disease. Each one of these barriers could be breached by further technical developments if a substantial effort were to be applied during the next decade to making the plague bacillus into a weapon.

Other infectious agents might be even more adaptable. Some of man's deadliest enemies are viruses which, like yellow fever, are transmitted by mosquitos or other arthropods. These have the advantage, from a military standpoint, that they may not start a potentially retroactive epidemic in areas where the vector insect does not normally abound. It is already evident that such insect-borne viruses could be applied in the first instance by direct aerial dissemination, with little or no further spread from the first wave of infected targets. Recent reports of airborne or pneumonic rabies, a terrible disease, which as you know is normally spread by the bite of an infected dog or other animal, illustrate this possibility.

There is then the danger that, if a large nucleus of people is attacked in this way, further evolution of the virus will occur to give rise to a new form of the disease that does spread from person to person, contrary to the calculations of the attacker. The Black Death itself underwent a similar evolution from the original bubonic flea-borne plague to outbreaks of the far more contagious pneumonic variety.

We have learned in recent years that viruses undergo constant evolution in their own natural history, not only by mutations within a given strain, but also by the natural cross-hybridization of viruses that superficially appear to be only remotely related to one another. Furthermore, many of us already carry viruses in our body cells of which we are unaware for years, and which may be harmless—though they may eventually cause the formation of a tumor, or of brain degeneration, or of other diseases. At least in the laboratory, however, we can show that such latent viruses can still crossbreed with other viruses to give rise to many new forms.

My gravest concern is that similar scientific breakthroughs of a rather predictable kind will be made and their potential military significance exploited, so as to result in a transformation of current doctrine about "unreliable" biological weapons. We are all familiar with the process of mutual escalation in which the defensive efforts of one side inevitably contribute to further technical developments on the other and vice versa. The mere existence of such a contest produces a mutual stimulation of effort; moreover, there is no practical system of counterintelligence that will protect secret work for an indefinite period of time from becoming known to others. And the potential undoubtedly exists for the design and development of infective agents against which no credible defense is possible, through the genetic and chemical manipulation of these agents. It is thus clear to me that if we do not do something about this possibility, work will go forward and my fears will become realities.

Permit me now, to ask a rhetorical question: Can we establish a world order that will, in effect, protect "you," as representatives of the global community, from the subversion of the scientific advances to which my own peers and myself have dedicated their careers.

I wish I could be sure that such a remark would always be received with an understanding of the ironic spirit with which it is uttered. I do not have to tell you of the worldwide attack on science, the flight from reason that has tempted so many young people and makes so many dilemmas for those of us in university life.

This generational revolt has probably had its worst impact in countries which have already achieved a degree of affluence, but it is eroding the morale of the young even in those countries whose economic future most depends on their development of a high level of technical and scientific skill. What the youth see as the perversion of knowledge is, I believe, an important aspect of their repudiation of us. Among the undergraduates at my own university, there is no prospect more disheartening than the idea that even health research is subject to exploitation in the most inhumane direction imaginable.

For many years I have advocated that the control of biological warfare be given a special place in international and national initiatives for reasons I have mentioned. I am deeply gratified that President Nixon's announcement (last November 25) which disavowed offensive biological warfare development has made it possible for me to address these issues in terms fully consistent with the policy of the government of my own country.

As you know, soon after President Nixon's announcement it became apparent that the problem of toxins had been left ambiguous. "Toxins," as the term is understood by biologists, are chemical substances, usually (but not always) proteins of modest molecular size which are by-products of bacterial growth and which may play a lesser or greater role in the disease manifestations of a bacterial infection.

For present purposes we might think of a toxin as a chemical substance which would be unknown to science except for its association with microbial growth and one which has an extraordinarily high lethality per unit weight. Many toxins are nerve poisons, resembling the nerve gases in their effect on the body, but far more potent. For example, the lethal dose of botulinus toxin is about one millionth of a gram. This means that one could easily carry in a dispatch case a quantity of toxin sufficient to wipe out the human population, although the image would imply that the human herd would line up for the slaughter. The very high potency of such toxins is certainly a factor in their military potential but may even be outweighed by other considerations, like the possibility of specific immunization of an aggressor force or population.

Even after agreement to eliminate biological weapons, we will still remain very vulnerable to a form of biological warfare which is beyond the reach of any covenant that we can make. This is the warfare practiced upon us by nature, the unremitting barrage of infection by old and by new agents that still constitute a very large part of the perils to normal and healthy life.

We have all had vexing, perhaps even tragic, personal experiences with virus infections. You will all recall the global epidemic of influenza that was first identified in Hong Kong about three years ago. This was not a particularly severe form of the virus and its eventual mortality was probably only in the tens of thousands. It is wrong, however, to believe that there is any assurance that the next epidemic of this kind will be as mild; and we have still developed only the most feeble and precarious protection against this threat whose impact is shared by all the nations, but against which very little common defense has been erected.

You will also recall having read from time to time about small outbreaks of mysterious new diseases like "Lassa fever" and the "Marburg virus." These were both extremely dangerous threats; and while much credit must be given to the diligence of the medical people who dealt with the outbreaks, a large element of pure luck was involved in localizing these incidents. We must expect that there are many additional viruses already indigenous to primate and human populations in primitive areas and to which the inhabitants of advanced countries are extremely vulnerable.

Yellow fever is a historically important disease which now belongs in the same category. It is now maintained on earth mainly through an animal reservoir of infection, in the monkeys in tropical jungles. Urban populations are now protected from yellow fever by campaigns to abolish the fever-carrying species of mosquitos in South America and by the availability of excellent vaccines in advanced countries. Mosquito species very well capable of transmitting yellow fever are, however, abundant in South Asia and the accidental introduction of yellow fever, for example, into India would be a human tragedy of catastrophic dimensions. Specialists in epidemiology are quite puzzled that this accident has not already eventuated and we have no good explanation for this good fortune. I would not mention facts like these which might stimulate psychotic imaginations if they were not already well

known. My purpose is not to suggest the vulnerability of the Asian continent to biological military attack but rather to point out immense gaps in the pattern of international cooperative defenses that should be mounted but which have a relatively feeble standing in the present-day world. This is in no way a derogation of the splendid efforts of the World Health Organization which is centered here in Geneva but an indication of the limitations of its budget and a suggestion that much more needs to be done and could be done with resources that might be given over to biological work in the future.

Countries which are undergoing a transition in the development of their agriculture are vulnerable to analogous threats in biological warfare directed against crops as distinguished from human targets. The introduction of new crop varieties, that has had all of the human benefits attached to the expression "the green revolution," also means that the food supplies of vast territories are now committed to specialized strains of wheat, rice, and so forth. These are now newly vulnerable to destruction by plant pests of either natural or artificial origin. A potentially tragic outbreak of "coffee rust" is at this moment a serious threat to the agriculture and economy of Brazil.

The promulgation of an international agreement to control biological warfare in a negative sense should, therefore, be accompanied by steps urgently needed to build positive efforts at international cooperation, a kind of defensive biological research against natural enemies of the human species.

One of the best assurances that any country might have that the microbiological research of its neighbors was directed towards human purposes would be constantly expanding participation in international health programs. Any country that publicly and avowedly subscribed to the total renunciation of secret BW research might conceivably be able to continue clandestine effects without revealing their substantial content. It would, however, have great difficulty in maintaining such an effort, at any substantial level or quality of operation, while still keeping its very existence secret. This applies especially to those among its own citizens who are specialists in health-oriented research and who are deeply involved in furthering health research activities within the framework of the international community. Therefore, besides the obvious direct health benefits of expanded international cooperation we would also be rewarded by a higher level of mutual assurance that every party was indeed living up to the spirit of its obligations under a BW convention.

In conclusion, let me say that some of the speculations I have mentioned are ones which all of us must fervently hope will never materialize. But it would seem to me both foolish and arrogant to assume that our good will alone, without concrete arrangements, will serve to forestall the further development, proliferation and possible eventual recourse to what surely is one of the most ghastly methods of warfare imaginable.

As a scientist whose research career has centered on the genetics of bacteria, I have a profound personal interest in efforts being made in this forum to minimize the risk that infectious disease will become a routine weapon in future conflicts, civil or international. You have heard reasons, that I believe are compelling, for promptly reaching a ban on the development, production, proliferation or use of biological weapons. I will be indebted to you for this opportunity if I can return to my laboratory with the hope of having made the most modest contribution to the fulfillment of the urgent task before you.

Good luck.

THE RED BLOC PUPPET NATIONS  
SUMMIT CONFERENCE

## HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the so-called nonaligned nations summit conference just concluded at Zambia—Africa's base for Communist guerrillas—seems to parrot the party line being resounded by other Communist and socialist movements around the world.

The nonalignment claim must mean their influence as nations—UNO vote—is up for sale to the highest bidder.

Now that their anti-USA saber-rattling, subsidized with foreign aid, has passed over, they can be expected to approach our diplomats for more foreign aid handouts and to receive the usual support for give-a-ways in the name of aid for friendly backward emerging nations.

Mr. Speaker, I insert several newsclippings and a report by George S. Schyler:

[From the Evening Star, Sept. 11, 1970]

## ZAMBIA TALKS END, RESULTS ARE UNCERTAIN

LUSAKA, ZAMBIA.—The third summit conference of nonaligned nations ended yesterday with host President Kenneth Kaunda singing a revolutionary freedom song—but there was no official word on what was accomplished at the meeting.

Kaunda kept more than 100 newsmen waiting an hour and a half for a scheduled news conference, then canceled it without explanation. A government statement said resolutions which were approved at the three-day gathering would be distributed Monday.

There were conflicting reports on whether the conference passed a resolution dealing with the Middle East, and if so, whether it demanded U.N. sanctions against Israel or merely asked the United Nations to act if Israel does not withdraw from occupied Arab territory.

Sources within the conference said draft resolutions that were likely to be passed included a request for the withdrawal of all foreign troops from South Vietnam, a call for the United States and other nations to stop aiding Portugal and South Africa and a request for all nations of the world to help people "fighting against colonialism, racial discrimination and apartheid in Africa through the Liberation Committee of the Organization of African Unity."

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 11, 1970]

THIRD-WORLD TALKS END WITH RASH OF  
MILD ATTACKS

(By Jim Hoagland)

LUSAKA, ZAMBIA, Sept. 10.—The third non-aligned nations' summit conference closed today in a blaze of moderately worded resolutions praising peace, justice and economic development.

Obviously striving for a show of unity that would dispute critics who contend that the self-styled nonaligned nations have few common interests, the conference toned down a resolution on the Middle East, accepted a relatively moderately worded resolution of Indochina and even eased slightly its condemnation of countries selling arms to South Africa.

Zambia's President Kenneth Kaunda, who was chairman for the summit, closed the meeting with a paraphrase of a Christian

hymn. Kaunda, the son of a minister, declared:

"Onward soldiers of nonalignment! Raise ye the banner of the movement . . . fight relentlessly for freedom, justice and peace . . ."

## LIBYANS COMPLAIN

The only outward breach in the day's mood of agreement for agreement's sake came when the Libyan delegation complained that the conference was not being as rough on Israel as it was on South Africa.

Most of the 57 official delegations were from Africa, the Middle East or Asia. Europe was represented by Yugoslavia, which fought for watering down any resolutions that would have produced a walkout.

The dozen or so important conference resolutions were not made public as the three-day summit closed, but most of them had been made available to the press by conference sources.

The Middle East draft resolution, which calls for the withdrawal of Israeli troops from occupied Arab territory, also asks the United Nations to impose unspecified sanctions against Israel for "obstructing" the Middle East peace talks.

## WORDING CHANGED

But during the last-minute deliberations the words "all adequate measures" were substituted for "sanctions." Conference sources said Liberia had pushed for the change.

This led the Libyans to complain that while the nonaligned countries were willing to make demands on and condemn South Africa, they only made requests on Israel. The Libyan delegate later criticized the conference's "dictatorial process."

The conference's final draft resolution on decolonization adopted the tough anti-apartheid program Ethiopian Emperor Haile Selassie once had urged, conference sources said.

The resolution calls on all countries to break diplomatic relations with South Africa, Portugal and Rhodesia, to enforce trade embargoes against the three countries and to refuse landing rights to airlines and shippers that use the ports of the three countries.

It also proposes to set up special funds to aid African nationalist movements attempting to overthrow the white-minority governments in southern Africa.

But in the final resolution concerning arms sales to South Africa the conference dropped a specific condemnation of France for continuing to sell arms to South Africa despite a six-year-old U.N. embargo.

The French were condemned by the Organization of African Unity in its summit meeting last week and had lobbied hard here to avoid being singled out again. With help from their former African colonies they succeeded in changing the statement to a general condemnation of countries that continue supplying weapons to Pretoria.

Britain, however, is specifically condemned in the resolution for its announced intention to resume limited arms sales to South Africa.

Another section assails the United States, Britain, France, West Germany, Italy and Japan for "economic, military and political" ties with South Africa.

On Vietnam, the conference balanced off a paragraph blaming "the presence of United States armed forces" for "the untold suffering and loss of life" in Indochina with an uncontroversial call for the removal of "all foreign forces" from the area.

## OTHER RESOLUTIONS

Two other resolutions ask that the Indian Ocean be made a military-free zone and set out the establishment of a bureau to examine economic development in the Third World.

Speakers at today's open session included representatives from the Vietcong's Provi-

sional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam, the Palestinian Liberation Organization and African nationalist movements. The three had observer status at the conference.

[The Zambian government, seeking to explain its arrests of reporters, covering the conference, said "the monopoly press of the West" was trying to defame the meeting, AP reported.]

[From the Atlanta Journal, Sept. 8, 1970]

## NEUTRAL SUMMIT OPENS IN ZAMBIA

LUSAKA, ZAMBIA.—President Kenneth Kaunda opened the third nonaligned summit conference Tuesday by telling representatives of more than half the world's peoples, "We seek a place of honor and respect."

"We must move nonalignment out of what critics consider mere political and idle rhetoric," he said.

As the president spoke in the crowded main assembly hall at Mulungushi Village, two of the world's best known women leaders listened intently.

Mrs. Indira Gandhi, premier of India, and Mrs. S. Bandaranaike, premier of Ceylon, sat alongside world leaders including Emperor Haile Selassie of Ethiopia, President Tito of Yugoslavia, Archbishop Makarios of Cyprus and Presidents Obote of Uganda and Nyerere of Tanzania.

Cambodia's seat was vacant because foreign ministers failed to agree in day-long debate Monday which government should be admitted—Premier Lon Nol's government or Prince Norodom Sihanouk's government in exile in Peking.

Cannons boomed outside in salute as the heads of state and government arrived. A flourish of bugles announced their arrival inside the hall for the start of the three-day meeting.

Two other nonaligned summits have been held—in Belgrade in 1961 and in Cairo in 1964.

Kaunda, who is also chairman of the 41-nation organization of African Unity this year, told the assembly:

The continued exclusion of Communist China from the United Nations "is a blunder and there can be no legitimate reason for refusing her admission to the world body."

Regarding Western military and economic aid to the white minority governments of southern Africa, "Those who delay the discharge of justice, those who stand in the way of peaceful change toward majority rule, make violence inevitable."

## SIX JOURNALISTS BELIEVED HELD BY ZAMBIANS

LUSAKA, ZAMBIA.—Six foreign journalists were missing and presumed held by security police today as the third nonaligned summit conference opened here.

Three of the newsmen—Kenneth L. Whiting of the Associated Press, Hans Reinhardt of the German Press Agency, and Ron McDonnell of Viesnews, a British agency—were taken by plainclothes policemen Monday night from the conference hall and the university residences where the press is housed.

This morning, plainclothes police escorted Chris Munnion of the London Daily Telegraph, based in Salisbury, from the conference hall.

The other two journalists, Tony White of Reuters and Dan Van der Vat of the Times of London, were missing as the conference began.

No reason was given for the arrests, but all of the newsmen are based either in South Africa or Rhodesia, and Zambian President Kenneth Kaunda is a staunch opponent of the area's white-minority governments.

The American Embassy was trying to make contact with Whiting this morning. It was understood that the British and German embassies were making similar moves.

[From the Evening Star, Sept. 11, 1970]  
**ROGERS ASKS FULL FOREIGN AID FUNDING**  
 (By Dana Bullen)

Secretary of State William P. Rogers, urging approval of the administration's foreign aid fund requests, said today the United States must show Asian nations it continues to back them.

"We must convince our Asian friends that a reduced military presence does not mean we are abandoning them," he said in testimony prepared for a Senate Appropriations subcommittee.

"Our economic assistance program is one of the most effective ways to maintain our credibility as an Asian power," Rogers said.

Rogers called for Senate restoration of \$532 million pared by the House from President Nixon's \$1.8 billion foreign aid request, the lowest administration request for aid funds in 15 years.

Rogers said the House reduction "cripples our entire aid program."

Aid funds provide support technical, agricultural, development and related programs in underdeveloped countries around the globe.

For Vietnam, the administration asked \$366 million for supporting assistance, but the House cut \$40 million of this.

As U.S. military expenditures decline in Vietnam, Saigon needs substantial economic aid to meet increased costs of the war without imperiling economic stability. Rogers said.

"If the House cut . . . is not restored, the goals of Vietnamization will be significantly more difficult to achieve," Rogers said.

Elsewhere in Asia, he said, economic assistance must continue at adequate levels while President Nixon withdraws U.S. troops from Thailand, South Korea and the Philippines.

Rogers said \$8.9 million was diverted from last year's aid program to provide military assistance to Cambodia, and he said the administration expects to divert \$40 million more to Cambodia out of the funds being sought for the present fiscal year.

The secretary of state said this aid does not mean the United States is assuming responsibility for Cambodia's defense. But, he said, it is considered "appropriate" to provide Cambodia material assistance to defend itself "against a foreign invader."

In regard to Latin America, Rogers said, the House decision to cut off a third of the funds sought for Alliance for Progress development loans would require reductions in existing high priority programs in agriculture and education.

Similarly, the secretary of state asserted, a continued decline in assistance for African state could "place in question our genuine interest in the people of Africa."

Rogers' views were contained in testimony prepared for a hearing today that later was canceled. It was not clear whether he would appear personally at a later date or have his testimony placed in the hearing record.

**AFRICA—THE COMRADES BEAT THE BUSHES**  
 (George S. Schuyler is an internationally famous author, lecturer, and syndicated journalist. Mr. Schuyler has written two novels, *Black No More*, and *Slaves Today!* and has contributed to such national magazines as *American Mercury*, *The Nation*, *The Freeman*, *Plain Talk*, and *Negro Digest*. George Schuyler's excellent autobiography, *Black and Conservative*, is currently available from Arlington House.)  
 Since the last *Scoreboard*, the nets of Communist subversion have drawn tighter around Africa. There were foulups and setbacks but the Reds are learning fast.

Where surplus small arms and automatic weapons have seemed inappropriate or premature, there have been generous offers of

aid and trade, scholarships at Patrice Lumumba University and similar schools, all-expense conferences with delegates picked for their loyalty and eager to vote yes, and freebies of shoddy goods and toys for the bush yokelry. There have also been weapons carriers, tanks, bazookas, and occasionally old warplanes for the big boys, either free or on jawbone. Blacks who had never been ten miles across the veldt were flown to China or Cuba to learn how to blow up a presidential palace or assassinate a dusky Cabinet Minister reluctant to toe the Party line.

Varied success has attended these approaches between the Mediterranean and the Zambesi. The Maghreb seems to be more Middle East than African, but this is deceptive. Each of these Mediterranean States impinges upon a Black African country easily accessible in these days of air travel. Morocco has been wooed into accepting Red goodies, while cadging aid from increasingly apprehensive France. Algeria, broke despite its oil riches, is a pliant Soviet preserve. Oil-rich Libya has all the zeal of a recent convert to Communism, and Egypt is completely down the Tiger's throat. Western bases, once outposts of empire, are now available to the Russian fleet patrolling Mare Nostrum. Pro-West Tunis shivers.

Soviet prestige has grown immensely since the end of the Nigerian civil war, and its merchant, fishing, and war vessels make it *persona grata* to the black politicians hungry for help. Only Southern Africa stands strongly in the way of an ultimate continental sweep by the Comrades. With the Red Fleet visiting the Red Sea, the Persian Gulf, and the Indian Ocean, even Southern Africa's remoteness is no guarantee that it will escape the Communist drive.

#### SPANISH WEST AFRICA

Largely desert (102,703 square miles and 48,000 population), this miserable little country so lacks resources that not even Morocco wants it. Curiously, however, it offers an attraction to the Reds, who currently are directly wooing its authoritarian master in Madrid with some prospects of success.

#### MAURITANIA

An even bigger desert than the Rio de Oro to its northwest, its 418,000 square miles and one million wandering herdsmen surrounded by the Atlantic, Algeria, Mali, and Senegal, Mauritania is a politico-economic appanage of Paris. The French control its rich iron ore and copper deposits, its growing fishing industry, and market its cattle, camels, and gum salt. No hidin' place for Reds. President Moktar Ould Daddah has made that clear. But, he broke diplomatic relations with the United States on June 7, 1967, to show his solidarity with the Arab world, citing U.S. support of Israel.

#### SENEGAL

The likelihood of the U.S.S.R. making inroads in this erstwhile French colony of 76,000 square miles and 3,500,000 population is slight. Its black intellectual President Leopold-Sedar Senghor is more French than Pompidou, and there are more Frenchmen in Dakar than before independence—including several thousand white troops. While Dakar is the greatest port south of Casablanca, it remains a nest of intrigue, and the ubiquitous Russian fishing fleets operate nearby. Senghor, the apostle and author of *Negritude*, wields a strong hand. When domestic unrest involving students and workers grew troublesome last June, he promptly declared a state of emergency. In December he cancelled a radio program about the glories of the Soviet Union, suspended a Soviet cultural review, and threatened to expel Russian newsmen after an alleged Soviet press and radio campaign against Senegal. The Reds piped down.

Last December Senegal rushed troops when the embattled Portuguese shelled some Senegalese villages used as staging areas for the Russian-subsidized Party for the Independ-

ence of (Portuguese) Guinea and Cape Verde Islands, headed by the Communist agitator Amilcar Cabral. The arrival of the troops from Dakar sealed off the Senegal-Portuguese Guinea border. With 25,000 Portuguese troops and thousands of local native levies withstanding the invaders from Casamance district, the P.A.I.G.C. militants had to retire to Guinea under the sheltering arm of Comrade President Sekou Toure.

#### GAMBIA

In April, 1970, this most improbable African mini-State voted 84,968 to 35,638 to become a republic within the British Commonwealth. The new Gambian republic, with a population of 360,000 in a territory of 4,000 square miles along the Gambia River, is formed in the shape of a finger pointing into Senegal. Sir Dawda Kairaba Jawara, Prime Minister since 1962, became the first President. What Communists there are remain mum.

Ever since the British bought the colony from Portugal in 1588, Gambia has been subsidized by London, since its one crop (peanuts) will not support it. Outside Bathurst, Russian fishing boats reap a harvest with no competition from the easygoing natives.

#### PORTUGUESE GUINEA

With an area of 13,948 square miles and 529,000 people, this enclave has been Portuguese since 1446. Its Governor, responsible to Lisbon, is a native Negro. Since the Communist-subsidized P.A.I.G.C. attacks from the Guinea springboard provided by Sekou Toure, the Portuguese have with traditional determination stood fast, killing all invaders. Red chances there are non-existent.

#### GUINEA

Following the recent coup in Mali, suspicious President Sekou Toure, the Communist ruler of this 95,000 square mile "republic" and its 3,500,000 people, rounded up suspected subversives and executed seven high-ranking Army officers for plotting against him.

Both Soviet and Chinese Communist instructors operate training camps here. Conakry is headquarters for Amilcar Cabral's P.A.I.G.C., and here extremists of Sierra Leone's All-People's Congress were armed and trained before their Party won power. The new Soviet Embassy is a fortress-like compound where 250 personnel have schools, offices, housing, entertainment—and protection. The rivalry between the Russian and Chinese is intense, but neither group associates with the natives socially. What price integration! Nkrumah, the former President of Ghana, heads Moscow's Gulf of Guinea Project for West African conquest and publishes a Red journal here.

#### SIERRA LEONE

Last September after a long period of Governmental changes culminating in the All People's Congress taking over after its leaders were trained in neighboring Guinea, the East German-African Society (a Government organization) chose Freetown (with the approval of the Sierra Leone Government) as the venue for an "international" conference on how to increase East Germany's "participation" in liberating Africa. It was attended by a hundred delegates from twenty-five African countries. In addition to delegations from the Sudan, Nigeria, Tanzania, Congo (Kinshasa), Ghana, Guinea, Ivory Coast, Somalia, Upper Volta, and Zambia, there were delegates from three Soviet Front organizations: the World Council of Peace, the World Federation of Democratic Youth, and the International Union of Students.

Even though Sierra Leone (27,925 square miles and 2,180,355 population) is rich in alluvial diamonds, accounting for eighty percent of its income, it is assumed that the East German regime paid for the big bash. Sierra Leone's Minister of Lands, Mines and Labor, C. A. Kamara-Taylor, gave the open-

ing address, and the Prime Minister, Dr. Siaka Stevens, gave the closing speech.

All African Heads of State were urged to "normalize" their relations with East Germany and afford it diplomatic recognition. Youth and students throughout the world were urged to intensify the "struggle against imperialism." But, so far, only Tanzania maintains diplomatic relations with East Germany, and that is the Red "republic" which shares with Communist China the rule of the island of Zanzibar.

The campaign to spread love for East Germany in Africa is directed by Professor Albert Norden, a member of Walter Ulbricht's Politburo, who has been successful in setting up cultural relations in many African countries—notably Guinea, where President Sékou Touré lauded East Germany's "positive anti-imperialist policy."

#### LIBERIA

A lot can be said about President William V. S. Tubman, whose one-Party dictatorship has kept him in office since 1943, but the best thing is that he is anti-Communist and has no truck with the Soviet Union or any other Red State. Liberia, about the size of Ohio, was founded by American freedmen in 1821, and has since grown to a population of about a million.

#### IVORY COAST

Covering 127,520 square miles, and with 4.7 million people, this former prize French colony was prosperous before independence (1960) and is prosperous now. Originally President Félix Houphouët-Boigny was a Socialist, a physician (he was Health Minister in the French Cabinet), and a successful agronomist. His current attitude may be gathered from the fact that there are more whites in the Ivory Coast now than ever. Foreign-owned businesses predominate. He is as much at home in Paris as in Abidjan, and is so suspicious of Communists that last May thirtieth Ivory Coast severed diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union and asked Russian Chargé d'Affaires J. Semenov to leave at once—all without explanation.

There have been internal troubles, sternly repressed. Near the capital is stationed a combat battalion of French troops—just in case.

#### GHANA

Left holding an \$800 million debt incurred by Communist Kwame Nkrumah's totalitarian excesses, Ghana is in no mood for further radical adventures. Dr. Kofi A. Busia, the new freely-elected Prime Minister, is strongly anti-Communist and makes no bones about it. Nkrumah's old Convention People's Party is outlawed; the Chinese, North Vietnamese, and North Koreans have been chased home. Unhappily, the new regime has also just banished sixty thousand unregistered black aliens, confiscating their businesses and property (an old African custom). The Russian Embassy remains in Accra, but its bomb-tossers are lying low. Nonetheless, this 92,100 square mile territory, with 8 million people and great wealth in cocoa (one-third of the world's production), gold, manganese, and bauxite, remains a great temptation to Comradely intervention.

#### TOGO

This improbable republic of 1,603,000 people in a 20,400 mile elongated area has since independence assassinated one President (Sylvanus Olympio) and chased out another (Nicolas Grunitzky). Once a colony of imperial Germany, its best friend and customer today is West Germany. Reds are scarce. Its military regime, under Lt. Colonel Etienne Eyadema, seems determined to keep it that way.

#### DAHOMEY

This former slave-selling State has had four putsches and as many Presidents since its 1960 independence. Its 2,500,000 people in 45,000 square miles eke out a precarious existence on tropical products and annual sub-

ventions cadged from France. There is nothing to do but vote. There are innumerable factions but no Reds, and the current President is Emile-Derlin Zinsou.

#### MALI

This immense State (584,942 square miles of largely desert country with an estimated 4,900,000 people) borders Red Algeria and shares its political tastes. After a military coup ousted Communist President Modibo Keita, the young Army officers were stuck with the collectivist set-up Keita had imposed. An estimated one thousand Red Chinese technicians operate the sugar, match, cigarette, and textile factories. The Chinese Reds issue weekly progress bulletins. Mao's propaganda and his little red book are everywhere. There are scores of Russian-trained civil servants. Children are taught Marxism and Maoism.

Some \$320 million in aid has been given Mali by the Soviet Union and its East European satellites since 1960. Soviet and East German goods abound. Even the sports stadium is Russian-built. Although "positively nonaligned," this country supports the Vietcong with fervor.

Following the collectivist bent, Mali is bankrupt yet hires a thousand new civil servants yearly. It's crazy, Man—but that's true of collectivism everywhere. A 500-mile border with oil-rich Red Algeria assures steady communication with the Communist world. Ironically, the trade deficit is astronomical and, believe it or not the military junta is financially dependent upon France. Lieutenant Moussa Traore, the junta boss, has a right to sing the blues.

#### UPPER VOLTA

This landlocked, primitive, impoverished 105,841 square mile "republic" (1960) of 5 million people was carved from the old Mossi kingdoms, long a barrier to onrushing Islam. Four years ago President Maurice Yaméogo was deposed by Lt. Colonel Sangoulé Lamizana, who wisely never moved to his predecessor's palace but remains in his villa inside the Army encampment near Ouagadougou, the capital.

Imposing strict austerity, the military regime has balanced the budget, restored credit, and quadrupled cotton production. More than a half million people, however, aid the economy by working in adjacent and more prosperous Ivory Coast, Ghana, and Togo. Colonel Lamizana fought with the French Army against the Communists in Indo-China, his military staff is his Cabinet, and he stands no nonsense, what with Red Mali on his northern flank.

#### NIGER REPUBLIC

This vast land (484,000 square miles) has some 4 million poor nomadic people in its barrens and only three percent of its population lives in the scattered towns; but it has 14 million cattle, consumer and producer cooperatives, and State-owned corporations. There are rich mineral deposits and much subterranean water, but no money with which to exploit them.

Niger came into being in 1960 after a fierce struggle between pro-Western President Hamani Diori and pro-Communist Djibo Bakary. Diori won and Bakary wisely went into exile. Subsequently, there have been abortive and brief flareups, one Army mutiny, and an attempted assassination of President Diori in a Niamey mosque. This anti-Communist leader has established close relations with Nationalist China, and in October visited Chiang Kai-shek in Taiwan, before going on to Seoul. With three Communist States to its north, and quasi-Red Nigeria to its south, Niger needs friends.

#### NIGERIA

This country has been deceptively united by the conquest of Biafra, thanks to Soviet and British arms and the escape to Ivory Coast of Biafra's Colonel Odumegwu Oju-

kwu. This huge coup-wracked federation (a 350,000 square mile area and 56 million people), with its great mineral and agricultural wealth, is Russia's latest prize. When at the outbreak of the civil war a three-man delegation flew from Lagos to Moscow for aid, it was promptly given, with planes (flown by Russian-trained Egyptian pilots), tanks, and other heavy arms landing at Kano airport within days. This assured ultimate Biafran defeat. Under the guise of Commonwealth solidarity, Britain supplied smaller arms, ever sure of the need to protect the rich oil fields which supply so much of her needs.

Almost daily, Moscow's *Radio Peace and Progress* praises pro-Left Nigerians like Chief Awolowo, the Federal Commissioner of Finance who just authored *A People's Republic* advocating a Communist economy; Bola Ige, Nigeria's Western State Commissioner for Agriculture and Natural Resources, who praised the "reasoned Socialist guideline" of Awolowo's book and urged the promotion of "democratic" Socialism; and, Dr. Tunji Otegbeye, leader of the pro-Russian Marxist-Leninist Workers' and Farmers' Party (S.W.A.F.P.) which publishes the *Advance*, a Communist sheet bankrolled with rubles; Wahab Goodluck and S. U. Bassey, respectively President and Secretary-General of the ultra-Leftist Nigerian Trade Union Congress (N.T.U.C.); Eskor Toyo, National Secretary of the "neutralist" Nigerian Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Organization; and, the chief members of the Committee of Ten, a powerful Leftist pressure group. The extensive Russian radio campaign is masterminded by V. Korovikov on behalf of the Soviet Foreign Ministry. Comrade Korovikov made an on-the-spot investigation last June.

The Red Chinese are active here too. In Benin last May (1969) the pro-Peking Nigerian-Chinese Friendship Society held a two-day meeting in which funds were asked for propagation of Maoism and Communism in Nigeria. The Society has been operating since 1960.

Significantly, Nigeria has effectively destroyed the Christian hierarchy in what was Biafra by ousting or jailing the priests and nuns for aiding the enemy by supervising food distribution during the war. The food had been received through anti-Communist Portugal and Spain. This is a further extension of the Islamic-Christian conflict continuing since the Seventh Century. Biafra was a Christian stronghold surrounded by Moslems.

At war's end, Nigeria's Moscow Ambassador, G. T. Kurubo, strongly praised Moscow's extensive military aid which made victory possible. He said Soviet assistance—"more than any other single thing—more than all other things together," had sealed Biafra's doom. Kurubo moved that the Soviet Union "came out openly and honestly on the side of right," the side of the Federal Government.

The Soviets have flown in sixty Russian doctors—not to tend war victims but to "reorganize and improve" medical services. Which means they are creating cells all over the country. This, however, is minor compared to the commercial and financial agreements between the two countries. Russia has "found a new baby."

#### CAMEROON

This State was born in 1960 after a five-year Communist-led revolt led by Rueben Um Nyobe in the forests and Dr. Felix Moumie abroad. Nyobe was killed and Dr. Moumie mysteriously poisoned in Geneva. President Ahmadou Ahidjo, preoccupied by internal subversion and revolt, took dictatorial powers in 1962, making Cameroun a one-Party State and arresting other political leaders. With great potential wealth in export agriculture and the processing of its bauxite, this "republic" of 6 million people in 182,381 square miles may well look with apprehension at neighboring victory-flushed Nigeria's new, battlehardened, 200,000-man Army.

## EQUATORIAL GUINEA

Save for the excellent Spanish-built airfield and the fine harbor at Santa Isabel, the capital, this tiny (260,000 people on 10,820 square miles) and newest (October 12, 1968) African mini-State has nothing to recommend it—except to Russia, which in January sent a fourteen-man diplomatic delegation seeking air rights. President Francisco Macias Nguema, a Leftist, will grant the concession asked if paid to do so.

## CHAD

François Tombalbaye, President of this 495,450 square mile semi-desert, with its scattered 3,300,000 Berbers and Bantus, has learned the hard way that if you lie down with dogs, you get up with fleas. Strictly from hunger, he flirted with Russian and succumbed to Soviet blandishments, inviting "experts" to show him the way to the flesh-pots. As usual the Russians double-crossed him and supported the northern nomads' *Front de Liberation Nationale du Tchad*, which is out to eliminate the Bantu politicians in Fort Lamy, the capital.

The leader of the Red effort, Dr. Abba Siddick, is a former associate of the President and lives in Algiers, Khartoum, or Tripoli. Wherever he is, he gets active support (including arms) from Algeria, the Sudan, and now Tripoli. The rebel movement is backed by the Afro-Asian-Latin American People's Solidarity Organization based in Havana.

So during the past year war has raged in the barrens, with 3,500 French troops aiding the Chadian Army in this African Vietnam. Since the northern rebel area borders on Libya, that newly-Red Government is aiding them. One of France's reasons for offering the Red Libyan junta 110 French Mirage jet fighters was to lure them to stop supporting the Chadian rebels, but Tombalbaye has learned that if this happens adjacent Red Sudan will give them the necessary materiel and financial support.

Chad is so strategically important that the French cannot afford to lose it. Moscow feels the same way. So, despite rising criticism in the French Chamber of Deputies, the Foreign Legion is continuing its *Beau Geste* war here.

## CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

General Jean Bedel Bokassa, a bull-necked veteran of the French Army, runs his 240,000 square mile "republic" with an iron hand and has no trouble with Reds. When he suspected that his Minister of Finance and closest associate was plotting his assassination, he tried and executed him at dawn. Jailing whites and blacks with a grand sense of equality, Bokassa is a bemedaled tyrant with whom the Communist Conspiracy has not sought to tangle. The only thing he cannot control is the "republic's" location. It is landlocked.

## GABON

This country of 450,000 people in 103,317 square miles is well-off with diamonds, iron, uranium, natural gas, gold, cocoa, and coffee. There are more whites here than ever and resources are being developed by big French corporations. No wonder the Russians are so interested in a foothold in neighboring Equatorial Guinea. President Bernard-Albert Bongo is as anti-Communist as Leon M'Ba, his predecessor, who died in office on November 28, 1967. President Bongo maintains close ties with Nationalist China, but France is his second country.

## CONGO REPUBLIC (BRAZZAVILLE)

A coup-ridden country of 900,000 people in an area of 139,000 square miles, this former French colony is as Red as a place can be. *The Internationale* is the national anthem and red flags fly from all public buildings since former President Alphonse Masmaba-Debat was deposed in August of 1968. Soviet aid has been eagerly grabbed; a big irrigation project and a swank hotel and hospital

have been built by Moscow; sixty Soviet teachers have been employed; and, three hundred youths have been sent to the U.S.S.R. for study. The "rival" Chinese subsidize plantations and set up socialist industries. Their nationals are numerous but aloof socially from the natives.

Red Romania is now trying to establish itself here alongside Red Russia and Red China. Two old revolutionaries, Antoine Gizenga and Christian Gbenye, who ran the abortive Communist State around the other Congo's Stanleyville, now live in Brazzaville biding their time. Wang Yu-tien, Peking's most experienced Africanist, is the Chinese Ambassador here. There now seem to be no Cuban troops present.

## CONGO (KINSHASA)

Under the rugged rule of President Joseph D. Mobutu (who took years to learn what Moise Tshombe knew all along), the Communist menace has with Belgian cooperation been greatly reduced. This 905,582 square mile empire, with 15 million diverse peoples, is prospering just as Tshombe foresaw. Chief danger comes from nearby Red Brazzaville. The border has been closed for months.

## ANGOLA

Except for a little bushwhacking in its northwest corner, where occasional rebel bands from the Congo try to break through the string of fortified Portuguese villages, this vast and prospering province and its 6 million multi-racial population is flourishing as never before. A few guerrilla gangs have attempted to penetrate from western Zambia but without success. The Portuguese are too alert and too tough.

## SOUTH AFRICA

During the year this vast (471,440 square miles) land, with its 19,600,000 people of diverse origins, religions, and colors has flouted its traducers and enemies, and flaunted its growing industrial, commercial, financial, and military power. It has perfected its much-denounced system of *apartheid* with Bantustans, border industries, and growing mass housing for the poor. Its expanding fleet and air force is prepared to challenge the Soviet naval expansion in the Indian Ocean designed to cut commerce (especially oil) around the Cape.

The establishment of diplomatic relations with the black countries of Southern Africa has strengthened the buffer against Communist invasion. The recent reelection of the Nationalist Party indicates white approval of the regime. The last remaining (overt) Communists have been detained or forced into exile.

## LESOTHO

This little (11,716 square miles) country of 888,258 people is entirely dependent economically upon South Africa, to which 200,000 men go yearly to work in the mines. Long a hideout for black and white South African Communists, it was once the headquarters of the subversive Pan-Africanist Congress, an extremist Bantu rebel group. Under big beaming Chief Leabua Jonathan, the Prime Minister, Lesotho has been rough on Reds although the Basuto Communist Party still remains—taking orders from the South African Communist Party now domiciled in London. Jonathan apparently lost the February election but retained power through a coup, detaining the opposition leaders and even the "Liberal" King Moshoeshoe II. There are full diplomatic relations with South Africa.

## SWAZILAND

A Massachusetts-size, hilly country within South Africa, and bordering on Mozambique, Swaziland is virtually immune from Communist subversion and infiltration, and old King Sobhuza II and Prime Minister Makhosini Dlamini plan to keep it that way. It has diplomatic relations with South Africa. With

8,000 whites and 4,000 Euro-Africans, it has become something of a vacation spot for those favoring interracial association. Its bars, hotels, and casinos draw no color line.

## BOTSWANA

Completely surrounded by strongly anti-Communist Rhodesia, South Africa, South West Africa, and Angola (and with only a 300-yard border with Zambia), this 225,000 square mile country (550,000 population) is cut off from Communist infiltration. There have been invasion attempts by small guerrilla bands from Zambia but none got through. In the Caprivi Strip on most of its northern border, South Africa has recently established one of its self-governing Bantustans. President Seretse Khama, a London-trained barrister, will have no truck with Communists. There is a treaty with South Africa and a diplomatic representative there. Botswana also has an Ambassador in Russia!

## MOZAMBIQUE

This 302,328 square mile Portuguese province, with its 7,300,000 people, has been part of Portugal since early in the Sixteenth Century, and Lisbon is determined to keep it that way. It is a thorn in the side of the Communists, not only because of Portugal's anti-Red policy but because she has thoroughly thwarted the rebellion and invasion in the north fomented by the Mozambique Liberation Front (F.R.E.L.I.M.O.) and by a new one, *Partazona de Mozambique*. To counter ten thousand Communist-armed troops, the Portuguese have thrown in forty thousand crack troopers. Rebel forces are under the general direction of the Liberation Committee of the Organization of African States, headquartered in Dar es Salaam, with training camps spread over Tanzania and Zambia.

Long-range Red strategy is to delay or prevent the construction of the giant Cabora Bassa Dam on the Zambesi, which will be bigger than Aswan, and will supply power and light to all Southern Africa. Mozambique is rich now and, thanks to the safety in its anti-Communism, will be richer still.

## MALAWI

All Black African politicians have denounced (and envied) this landlocked, Pennsylvania-sized agricultural country which has had the wisdom to oust all Communists, ally itself with Portugal, South Africa, and Rhodesia, and is thereby easing life for its 4 million people. President Hastings Banda maintains diplomatic relations with them all. Though his nation borders on Tanzania and Zambia, Banda has stopped the Red guerrillas and infiltrators with tough military measures. Understandably, Malawi has been a constant target of *Radio Moscow's* slanderers and rumormongers.

## RHODESIA

Next to South Africa, the main African target of the Communist attack is this rich, industrial, landlocked republic of 150,332 square miles and 5 million people, which a supposedly friendly West has sought to make (along with South Africa) an international pariah. By rigorous action it has banned the subversive black conspiratorial Parties, detained their leaders, and freed the people from terror attacks. Its Army has exterminated all guerrilla invasions. Fifteen blacks sit in its Parliament and its Salisbury University is interracial. Rhodesia's destruction is plotted by Communists and non-Communists. Its determination to survive under Prime Minister Ian Smith is admired by all free men.

## ZAMBIA

This lung-shaped, 290,587 square mile country of 4 million people is landlocked and surrounded by Malawi, Mozambique, Rhodesia, Angola, and the Congo. It is rich with Copper Belt mines and smelters. Zambia is now a base for Communist

guerrilla forces. From scattered training camps staffed by Maoist, Russian, and East German military experts, six hundred members of the Angolan Popular Liberation Front have been readied for invasion of Zambia's anti-Communist neighbors. President Kenneth Kaunda, a so-called Christian Socialist (what a contradiction!) and Vice President Simon Mwansa Kapwepwe, a Communist often praised by the Kremlin, are rivals. Both are anti-white. Kaunda has now taken direct charge of the ruling United National Independence Party.

Red China has agreed to build the 1,100-mile Tanzam Railroad to Dar es Salaam, and the two black countries concerned will pay sixty percent of the \$340 million cost by purchase of Chinese consumer goods (\$21 million annually). But, Red China has a limited range of goods they can buy, so they are stuck. A 700-man Chinese surveying team is roaming the country, and unspecified thousands of Chinese workers have been imported—probably enough to man an army division. Everything is set for a Red takeover of this, the world's fourth largest producer of copper. Already the mines and banks have been nationalized.

## TANZANIA

Julius Nyerere, President-dictator of this 363,708 square mile former U.N. Trust Territory of 10 million people, is the perfect Communist stooge. Here the Chinese, Russians, East Germans, and South African and Mozambique guerrillas rule the roost. Mao's propaganda signs are everywhere in military off-limit areas. Zanzibar is a major depot for Communist arms shipment.

Already Americans, building a trans-Tanzanian road, and Chinese railroad workers have physically clashed. More seriously, the Africans are clashing with the socially aloof Asians who run the small businesses.

## UGANDA

When President Apollo Milton Obote took control in 1967 after deposing King Edward Mutesa of Buganda in an armed conflict claiming 15,000 killed, he declared: "Uganda will move left to acquire her new identity." Last December he announced a Common Man's Charter with the basic theme that the rich must be made poorer, and the poor must become rich. In an interview with the late Philippa Schuyler he said, grinning: "You know, I'm a Communist." He is.

There is a one-Party system in Uganda, and the Press, once free, has been muzzled. The Asian tradesmen are being forced out. Anti-Communists took heart when on December nineteenth Comrade Obote was shot in the head by an assassin as he left the annual convention of the Uganda People's Party garbed in a red shirt. Their hopes were dashed when he recovered.

## RWANDA

Since the Tutsi ruling class was slaughtered in the thousands and 140,000 chased out in 1966, the proletarian Hutus have run this incredibly backward mountain enclave of 10,365 square miles and 4 million inhabitants, which even the United Nations hesitated to make free. Despite Chinese Communist activities in Burundi, its neighboring Gold Dust Twin, Rwanda under President Grégoire Kayibanda has steered clear of Reds.

## BURUNDI

Almost identical in area and population with Rwanda, things have been livelier, and bloodier, here. The Tutsi minority brutally put down a bloody rebellion of the eighty-five percent majority Hutu serfs in 1965. The Red Chinese Embassy was active in the intrigue from the start, and one of its attachés almost upon arrival escaped to the U.S. Embassy and told all, whereupon the Chinese were invited out. Last September another Hutu plot was uncovered and heads rolled under President Michel Micombero's

Draconian decree. Two of the three Prime Ministers have been executed, and a Health Minister died "under questioning."

The Red Chinese Embassy is now back in business, but the Maoists are lying low. As one of the four thousand Europeans living in the country remarked, "This isn't a happy time in Burundi. It isn't a happy place." He could have said that again! In December, twenty-three persons, including two former Government officials and nineteen military men, were executed as plotters; two other former Ministers were jailed for life; and the Belgian Ambassador, whose wife is a black, became *persona non grata*. The Communists are understandably mum.

## THE SUDAN

Not since the Ninth Century, when Islam converted this early Christian country with the scimitar, have there been more coups here than during the past year. It is the only big crop that has been harvested, and today this arid 967,500 square mile land and its 14 million people are locked in the Communist Russian camp. Of course civil war in the Christian-pagan South has been going on since independence in 1957, with a half million casualties, but since last April bewildering changes have taken place.

On May 25, 1969, a group of lower-rank military officers staged the year's first coup by overthrowing the shaky Coalition Government, and designating the Leftist former Chief Justice Babiker Awadallah as Premier and Foreign Minister. The revolutionary junta was headed by Colonel Jaafar al-Nimairi, and the new Premier announced "a socialist democratic course." Interestingly enough, the following day the Deputy Chief of Staff, Mohammed Idris Abdullah, arrived hat-in-hand in Moscow. The next step was to recognize East Germany. Then all salaries were cut and bureaucrats had to go to their "work" in buses instead of Cadillacs. The regime was said to be solidly behind the Arab cause in Palestine and against imperialism in Africa. Four of the twenty-four Cabinet officers were Communists, albeit the Party had been outlawed for three years. President Ismail al-Azhari was ousted, of course, and the prestigious former Premier Muhammad Ahmad Mahgoub could not be found.

To prove himself a Tough Oscar, General al-Nimairi said the three Southern provinces would never be allowed to secede, noting: "We do not believe in secession." Then six U.S. diplomats were expelled for aiding local "plotters," albeit the Sudan had broken relations with the United States at the time of the 1967 Arab-Israeli war, and our boys worked out of the Dutch Embassy. A month later Premier Awadallah charged that the U.S.A. was trying to "sabotage" his regime, while al-Nimairi magnanimously gave the Southern (Christian-pagan) provinces the right of autonomy (which they had been fighting for since 1957), and the "right" to establish relations with the Communist bloc. On August 26, 1969, former President Ismail al-Azhari "died after a heart attack," and on October twenty-eighth the new Leftist Premier was deposed and General al-Nimairi replaced him. The 50,000-strong Communist Party was riding high, so it was easy to suppress a fifth coup.

When the Communist revolt in Libya occurred, al-Nimairi stepped forward as pal of the new regime, and of Comrade Nasser. There are 150 Russian military instructors in the Sudan with 250 "technicians" working on "hospital projects," while artillery and tanks have arrived from Yugoslavia, and arms were supplied to the Communist Eritrean rebels against Ethiopia. Last October al-Nimairi visited Moscow, to discuss "expansion of trade."

## SOMALI

This Texas-size semi-desert country of 3 million cattle grazers has also had its share of coups during the past year. Oddly enough for Africa, Premier Mohammed Haji Ibrahim

Egal won reelection last March twenty-sixth in competition with sixty-three Parties, none stable. He then presumably worked out a détente with Kenya and Ethiopia to end the bloody border strife with them over grazing grounds (the main trouble being lack of water). Then, touring the drought-stricken areas on October fifteenth, President Abdurashid Ali Scermarke was assassinated. He had visited the Soviet Union, China, Britain, and the U.S.A. He established close ties with the Kremlin, which supplied the usual weapons. Premier Egal was at the time conveniently away on a visit to America.

On October 21, 1969, the Somali Army and police seized power, announcing a policy of nonalignment and neutrality, and jugged all Government Ministers, including Premier Egal, whom the radio denounced as a "blood-sucker of the people" shortly after he flew home from California. The revolutionary council ruled by decree, a twelve-hour curfew was imposed, planes forbidden to land, all political Parties banned, the Supreme Court abolished, and the sixty-man U.S. Peace Corps contingent told to leave by year's end. Another Moscow victory!

## KENYA

That Old Black Magic probably won't work much longer for Jomo Kenyatta, high priest of the Mau Mau. The assassination in July of Tom Mboya by a Kikuyu, the tribal rioting at his funeral rites where Kenyatta's Mercedes was stoned and Mboya's widow gassed, and the cries of "bull" from the oppositionist Kenya People's Union adherents of Communist Oginga Odinga, were the handwriting on the wall which materialized boldly just three days after the Luo Fabian Minister of Economic Affairs and heir-apparent was killed. Mboya was unpopular, and only two years before had barely escaped another gunman. It will be recalled that prior to that the Army mutinied. Kenyatta responded by sending back a shipment of Soviet arms ordered by Odinga, expelled Russian and Czech journalists, asked for the recall of the Red Chinese Ambassador, and ousted all leaders with Marxist leanings, including then Vice President Oginga Odinga.

Daniel Moi, the current Vice President, hinted that a Communist plot was behind the shooting of Mboya: "an international conspiracy in the world." He absolved the West. Interestingly, it was disclosed that Mboya's killer, a member of Oginga Odinga's Party, had been to "school" in Communist Bulgaria.

As tribalism became more tense, Jomo took to the stump, the old Mau Mau oaths were taken again and the Luos rushed almost en masse to the oppositionist Kenya People's Union. As tension grew, Kenyatta was heckled by Odinga's followers, who were arrested and detained along with their leader after gunfire killed eleven and wounded seventy-three at the dedication of a Soviet-built hospital in Kisumu. The Government charged the K.P.U. was working with "foreign and unfriendly elements to destroy the peaceful running of the country."

At the Parliamentary elections on December 8, 1969, five Ministers lost their seats. A month later 23,000 school-teachers struck because they had not been paid. To appease the mob, the regime ordered nearly a thousand Asians to close their businesses by January 11, 1970, even though six hundred of them were Kenya citizens.

When the K.P.U. was banned on December twelfth, it was charged that Odinga and his henchmen had visited the Russian and Chinese Embassies in Kenya and nearby countries. Indications are that when 79-year-old Kenyatta goes, the takeover will come.

## ETHIOPIA

This oldest Christian nation, with its mountainous 395,000 square miles and its

estimated 22 million diverse tribesmen, is on the verge of disintegration. Surrounded as it is by Communist Sudan and Somali, and hostile northern provinces of Kenya which the Somali shifts control, it is not surprising that arms from Czech arsenals find their way to the Eritreans through hostile Sudan and Somalia.

In 1960 the American-trained Army mutinied, but Haile Selassie flew in from Rio de Janeiro and crushed it. Since then there have been student strikes and hijacked commercial planes. The Emperor, who was born in 1892 and has been in charge since 1930, has seen the Red Sea turn politically Red, with the Communists in power across the narrow Strait of Bab el Mandeb.

Ethiopia is a one-man State, and that man will soon be gone. The Emperor is fully aware of the Red threat and has asked repeatedly for American military assistance. Guerrillas of the Eritrean Liberation Force are getting bolder than they were before Sudan went Communist.

#### MALAGASY

A California-size island of 6,300,000 people flanking Mozambique across the 300-mile Mozambique Channel, Malagasy is of the greatest strategic importance to the Communist Conspiracy. The island was rent by a Red revolt in 1947-1948, which the French crushed with great difficulty. President Philibert Tsiranana, a good-humored, effective Francophone leader who founded the Social Democratic Party in 1956, and won the first election after 1960 independence, is an outspoken anti-Communist.

A moderating influence in African politics, Tsiranana has linked up a bloc of French-speaking African States in the *Organisation Commune Africaine et Malgache* (O.C.A.M.), which greatly irritates Moscow and Peking. Significantly, he last June arranged closer relations with South Africa and Portugal. This came none too soon.

Moscow's mouthpiece politically on the island is the pro-Communist opposition Party called A.K.E.M., which has, its leader says, "total devotion to scientific socialism." A.K.E.M. has proposed the old trap of coalition, and the granting of facilities to Soviet ships "engaged in oceanic survey work." These are really disguised units of the Soviet Far East Fleet serving as liaison vessels with the Red squadrons gradually penetrating the Indian Ocean and the Mozambique Channel, through which all the area's oil ships pass.

The top A.K.E.M. Communist here is the "Reverend" Richard Andriamaniato. He and his Secretary General, Cisele Rabesahala, have become frequent visitors to the Moscow feshpots and other Soviet bloc countries. At the A.K.E.M. Party Congress late last year, there were fraternal delegates from the Russian, French, and Italian Communist Parties. Strong pressure was put on President Tsiranana to hasten the coalition. He wouldn't budge.

The Soviet Union pants for use of the former French naval base at Diego Saurez at the northernmost tip of Madagascar, which the Japanese were desirous of capturing during the dark days of World War II. With a foothold there, along with the Malagasy airports, the Communists could dominate the Mozambique Channel and cut off most of the oil bound for industrial Western Europe.

Allive to this, trade ties were strengthened in October between South Africa and Malagasy as a result of a mission from the Transvaal Chamber of Industries, and efforts are being made to increase tourism from South Africa. So the embattled Southern African bloc has another nonwhite ally, and Mozambique has a protected flank.

#### BUREAUCRATIC LAWLESSNESS

### HON. ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 1970

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, there is a pervasive feeling abroad in the land that things are happening over which people have no control.

Their sons are sent off across the globe and they are taxed to support a war about which neither they nor their elected representatives ever had anything to say; big corporations over which they have no control spew their industrial wastes into the air and water that we all must use; the airlines violate with impunity the peace and quiet of those of us living near airports; manufacturers turn out products that are defective and then do not stand behind them; the rich escape their fair share of taxes through a variety of loopholes, while the middle class is taxed at every turn; more money is spent to finance inadequate and overpriced medical services than in any other country in the world, yet our public health statistics place us below most Western industrial countries; our cities are crumbling eyesores during the day and off-limits at night, and the surrounding suburbs are monuments to greedy development schemes that have left a soulless shambles instead of interesting, well-planned communities—all of these things are happening and the general sense of crisis that they inspire is compounded by the feeling that the people's political representatives are powerless to do anything about it. People from all walks of life simply do not believe their elected representatives can sufficiently get a grip on things to put the times back into joint.

One aspect of this deepening sense of doubt about the effectiveness and responsiveness of our institutions is brilliantly analyzed in the August issue of the *Washington Monthly* by John Rothchild. I am inserting it in the RECORD for those who may have missed it:

#### THE CULTURE OF BUREAUCRACY: WASHINGTON'S OTHER CRIME PROBLEM

(By John H. Rothchild)

The D.C. Crime Bill doesn't mention it, but one of the worst breeding places of lawlessness in the nation's capital is inside the federal bureaucracy.

A pattern of consistent, willful, and open violation of statutes, Congressional mandates, court decisions, and the Constitution has emerged from some of the agencies entrusted with selling poor people on the idea of law and order, the agencies that are supposed to improve the social and economic conditions that harbor crime and produce riots.

Far from eliminating the conditions that create crime in the ghetto, those agencies (the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, among others) have themselves become extensions of the ghetto—pockets where ritual rules over regulation, where power alters and then becomes the law, and where illegal acts are often matters of survival, of procedure, and of business-as-usual. (Similar patterns of lawlessness can

be found elsewhere in the federal government, notably at the Pentagon, but here we are concerned only with agencies that purport to help the poor.)

Out of the illusions of the New Frontier, where the boundaries of justice, law, and a decent life were supposed to extend to include all citizens, we have fashioned an Old Frontier, where the ideals expressed in Congressional legislation are so far removed from the realities of the political and economic power structure as to be essentially unenforceable. What we accepted in principle, and told the government to do, goes far beyond what we are able to enforce in practice; and following the law, in some agencies, has become a courageous act, and therefore an infrequent one. For example, in the wave of firings at HEW and Justice and the Pentagon in the past year, the common factor is that those ousted were held guilty of attempting to obey the law.

It is by no means certain that any of the benevolent federal programs, where rhetoric is often more lavish than appropriation, could succeed even if they carefully followed all of their mandates. Bureaucracy has proven to be an impotent and often counterproductive means of solving human problems. But when a government—whose stated goal is a just society—chooses not to follow its own laws, the damage goes beyond that of mere inefficiency or insufficiency.

The most glaring examples of this condition (and convincing ones, since the agency admits them) are contained in a report recently compiled by HEW. In an unusually self-revelatory gesture, HEW said that 39 states and the District of Columbia are violating federal regulations, acts of Congress, Supreme Court decisions, or all three, in the operation of federally-funded welfare and social rehabilitation programs. HEW continues to fund these programs.

What HEW doesn't say in its report is that this kind of thing has been going on for years and has become accepted practice. Until about four months ago, HEW not only failed to enforce the regulations, it didn't even bother to systematically record the violations.

The violations that HEW now admits, in a state-by-state breakdown, are not mere fine points of law over which reasonable men may quibble. They are not individual abuses; they are illegal state policies. In most cases, they are blatant refusals to submit plans, as required by the government, explaining how regulations will be implemented. This means that most of the states named have not only failed to follow the law, they have refused to register even an intent to follow it—that chronic, scoffing kind of disrespect that judges find in hoodlums.

The violations are stated by HEW in bland federalese:

*Arizona:* Deprivation of parental support; Compulsory inclusion of unrelated man in AFDC assistance grant; income of unrelated male is assumed. (Arizona had eight other categories of violations.)

*California:* Adjustment of maximum payment—AFDC: maximums not proportionately adjusted. (California had seven other categories of violations.)

*District of Columbia:* Adjustment of assistance standards: standards have not been fully updated. (The District had eight other categories of violations.)

*Hawaii:* Need and amount of assistance: differential treatment of applicants and recipients of AFDC in amount of assistance grant. (Hawaii had seven other categories of violations.)

*Indiana:* Prior notice of payment termination: recipients are not being provided prior notice of payment termination and decreases. Fair hearings: not carrying out fair hearings



requirements in practice. (Indiana had five other categories of violations.)

Not surprisingly, HEW's report provides no figures on the importance of the state violations. Its pose is calculated to put any but the most devoted observer to sleep, when, in fact, the law breaking permitted by HEW adds up to a massive deprivation of human rights. Welfare critics like Jonathan Kaufman, research director of the National Welfare Rights Organization, and Richard A. Cloward of Columbia University estimate that if the law were fully enforced, twice as many Americans would be on the welfare rolls, and many now on welfare would draw higher benefits. That prospect—12 million more Americans drawing federal and state welfare payments—is sufficient to explain the nation-wide pattern of government lawlessness.

The very size of the federal operation encourages malpractice from those who believe that laws should be followed not when they are just, but only when they are enforceable. But an even greater asset to federal lawlessness, as illustrated in the HEW report, is its statistical style. When bureaucrats blink at the law, it is not the bizarre, daredevil, and personal kind of scandal that becomes newsworthy and feeds the public fantasy, like the Senator accepting a bribe or free rides in some lobbyist's airplane. For like so much else in the bureaucracy, its illegality is strikingly devoid of flair, of passion, and of individuality. If it is hidden from the public, it hides not behind a well-constructed shield of secrecy, but behind a camouflage of boredom. Federal lawlessness is the result of a systematic series of decisions that become impersonal and eventually uninteresting, except to the victims. It is no thrill; it is a sure thing, accomplished from nine to five, with regular coffee breaks.

The exasperating technicality and organization of this bureaucratic lawbreaking gives it a permanent immunity. The immunity is preserved through channels of correction that are as winding and endless as the channels of violation. Although John D. Twinn, HEW social and rehabilitation administrator, emphasizes that "obviously, we cannot permit non-compliance with federal requirements," his organization continues to do just that.

"We are making every attempt," Twinn says, "through our regional offices, to negotiate with the states to resolve the issues. But when these efforts do not bear fruit, after a six-month negotiating period, we will bring our Washington offices into the picture and examine every apparent violation carefully to determine whether federal hearings should be held."

HEW's enforcement formula in itself seems like undue process. It shouldn't take six months of negotiating (what is there to negotiate about?), while states are still using federal money illegally, to decide to examine what you already knew in the first place—that the law is being broken. But the actual delays in enforcement have far exceeded even the ones that are built into the system.

It has taken HEW more than three years to threaten to hold hearings for states that have not complied with a 1967 law requiring them to adjust maximum welfare levels to correspond with higher costs of living. Recently, HEW announced that it has finally scheduled hearings for three such states, and for Arizona, the latter for failing to comply with residence requirements. But HEW has not announced hearings to deal with the massive list of other violations that it admits continue to occur in 39 states.

Even if HEW hasn't pursued the lawbreakers, it at least admits that the laws are being broken. It is, in this sense, far more civilized than other federal agencies, where it is difficult to figure out exactly what the law is or which conflicting law applies. In some cases, federal lawlessness is not only a

condition where specific laws are not upheld, but also one in which there are so many rules and regulations as to make any law essentially meaningless.

Although bureaucracy, on the face of it, is the opposite of anarchy, being over-organized rather than under-organized, it may be a better means of achieving the ends that anarchy desires. The longer an organization exists, the more chance it has of reaching the point of diminishing returns, the condition of overlaw, where any action can be justified by some rule or another and where no action is any more or less legal than any other. When bureaucracy becomes a memocracy, it also erodes into an on-going federal riot, where any additional regulation only further obscures the meaning of whatever the organization is supposed to be doing, or of what the original statute says. This has happened in the Bureau of Indian Affairs, where the bureaucrats have virtually unchecked power over Indians' lives and can justify any decision through the Indian Affairs Manual, which fills 33 volumes that stack some 6 feet high and contains more than 2,000 regulations, 389 treaties, 5,000 statutes, 2,000 federal court decisions, and 500 opinions of the Attorney General. The manual is the product of years of bureaucratic sedimentation—procedure piled on procedure, law on law—until even legal scholars can no longer make any sense out of it.

When little internal laws help men break larger laws that were the basis for setting up an organization in the first place, we are far along the road to the system that Hannah Arendt describes in her recent book *On Violence*. She defines bureaucracy as:

"The rule of an intricate system of bureaus in which no men, neither one or the best, neither the few nor the many, can be held responsible, and which could be properly called rule by Nobody. (If, in accord with traditional political thought, we identify tyranny as government that is not held to give account of itself, rule by Nobody is clearly the most tyrannical of all, since there is no one left who could even be asked to answer for what is being done. It is this state of affairs, making it impossible to localize responsibility and to identify the enemy, that is among the most potent causes of the current worldwide rebellious unrest, its chaotic nature, and its dangerous tendency to get out of control and to run amuck.)"

But while bureaucracy gets more uncontrollable as it grows, it retains the ability to respond quickly to certain outside pressures. Although it may be government by Nobody, it does please certain people and serves those people very effectively. A few groups have learned to manipulate the bureaucracy to get from it what they want. Unfortunately, they are not the groups that the agencies were set up to help, but the ones they were set up to counterbalance.

Food commodity programs, for example, can be molded to become another asset for producers instead of for the hungry—guided not by what the poor need to eat, but by what the big farmers want to unload. Thus, Nobody operates as a disguise for the designs of those groups that use lawless programs for their own ends. The best example of how interests can accomplish this is found in the relocation programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

In urban relocation, the legislative intent is clear. As early as 1949, Congress required that no contracts for local renewal programs be signed until "there are or are being provided . . . decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings equal in number to the number of and available to" displaced families. When it was found that the requirement was not being complied with, it was reiterated several times by Congress. By 1969, nothing had changed.

Things had even gotten worse, since many slum areas were being replaced by affluent housing while the poor were forced into more compact and squalid ghettos by the same federal money that was supposed to help improve their living conditions.

Requiring that urban relocators provide poor people with housing did not facilitate the quick flattening of areas that was necessary to get the money flowing into the cities, nor did such a requirement please the economic interests who could get much more for their money by building middle-class dwellings and office buildings. Therefore, the deliberate lying to overstate the amount of housing available to displaced people was merely a convenient means of sacrificing the law to benefit expediency and profit.

The Government Accounting Office (GAO) has documented HUD's failure to do anything about such practices: "Although HUD was aware that the City of Cleveland had serious deficiencies relating to existing housing codes and their enforcement and was also aware that the calling of these deficiencies to the attention of responsible city officials was not bringing results, it continued to recertify the city's workable program."

The same thing was occurring across the nation, as substitute housing for renewal victims was compiled from classified ad sections of newspapers, from drive-by inspections, from substandard dwellings, from areas soon to be demolished, and sometimes was even counted three or four times in an effort to provide the illusion that those being moved out of the slums had places to go. All these evasions avoided nasty delays in the "progress" of cities.

There is a long history in urban renewal of discrepancies between local office records and the ones sent to HUD regional offices, where grant applications are processed. In one city, 23 of 24 randomly-selected families from one project and 25 of 35 in another were found to be living in substandard housing, although local reports said that all had been relocated into acceptable dwellings.

The way the housing figures were compiled in Newark, New Jersey, illustrates how many people can be left out in the cold after such relocation shell games. In November, 1967, Newark claimed it had 3,668 vacancies available for people removed by relocation. Of these, however, 1,187 vacancies were located in areas designed for clearance or removal in the near future, which meant a family would be forced out of one demolition area and into another. Out of the remaining 2,481 vacancies, 24 per cent were in substandard condition. So there were about 1,800 vacant dwellings fit for occupation—and of those it is not known how many fell outside the accepted residential zones or could have been disqualified for other reasons.

As a result of this chicanery, at least half of the displaced families in Newark that year were removed from their homes with nowhere to go. In Camden, New Jersey, similar statistical maneuvering meant that housing vacancies were overstated by 1600 per cent. What happened in the Northgate section of Camden dramatizes how people are victimized by such numbers. Demolition was in process there, and many residents, without substitute housing, remained in their old homes, facing daily fires, widespread vandalism, collapsing walls, rubble-littered streets, and rampant rat invasion—conditions that rival any produced by the ghetto riots that occurred across the country at about the same time.

But while rioters are shot or arrested, the bureaucrats in HUD have been protected, individually and collectively, from the consequences of their own illegal acts. HUD, like HEW, according to Edgar Cahn, director of the Citizens Advocate Center in Washington, D.C., refuses to consider sanctions against lawbreakers that would be reasonable and enforceable. It insists that the only remedy

at its disposal is the total abolition of any relocation program in which wrongdoing is discovered. An illegal program, it argues, is better than no program at all.

Aside from the fact that this is not true from the point of view of the person removed from his home (if there were no program, he would not be removed), HUD's all-or-nothing defense protects it from the law as surely as an overtime parker would be protected if capital punishment were the only means of enforcing parking violations. By refusing to ask Congress for lesser sanctions, the agency effectively shields itself against having to act. What HUD means to say is that an illegal program is better than a legal one in that it pleases the right people. And Congress only asks polite questions about why its mandates have been violated. It has never threatened to cut off HUD funds. In fact by 1969, in the 20th year of HUD lawlessness, Congress merely required the Secretary of HUD to "review" local relocation plans and implementations at least every two years.

Thus, the bureaucracy can be molded, even made to break its laws, to fit certain trends or interests. It is when it confronts the powerless, the people it was supposed to help, that the bureaucracy becomes a brutal and invisible enemy. It is noteworthy that one part of HEW, the Social Security Administration, has an excellent record of obeying the law, of handling grievances, and of informing people of their rights. But people on social security have clout; they are not outcasts like welfare recipients.

The benevolent and do-good agencies like HEW were supposed to be the allies of poor people, to fill the vacuum of power that exists with disenfranchised groups, to plug the holes of poverty and despair, to remedy the pockmarks and sores left by the unchecked flows of business and politics in America. But it was illusory to expect that those agencies would not soon have to answer to the same power and interest groups that produced the need for federal intervention in the first place. It was more than optimistic to hope that the agencies set up to work where the free enterprise system had done the most damage would not be thwarted by the same factors that made that system naturally un-reformable.

Bureaucratic lawlessness ends up serving bureaucratic self-interest. It is easier to weather a complaint from a black welfare mother who doesn't get her check this month than it is to outrage a white Senator who wonders why federal or state agencies should waste their time listening to black people. It is easier to "inconvenience" a ghetto resident by removing him from his home during urban renewal without providing him substitute housing than it is to inconvenience some eager developer and his friends in public office who don't want to wait until such housing is found before they start profitably razing the neighborhood. It is more politic to serve the oil man who wants the Indian land than to help the Indian defend that land.

The powerful will accept a theoretical statement about the rights of the poor, as contained in the legislation that sets up federal agencies, but may resist if any real change in the relationship between them and the poor becomes possible. Many times we find that the best way for a bureaucracy to succeed (continue to exist) is not to do what it was established to do. OEO's legal services operation, as described in the June *Washington Monthly*, is one of those programs that is too successful to be continued. Cahn says that the Child Development Group in Mississippi, another OEO program, was arbitrarily discontinued in 1965, without proper hearing because it had achieved all too well the goals of maximum feasible participation of the poor. The reality of the black poor running their own program was too much for OEO—or the white Mississippi politicians—to

accept. So the program was scrapped in favor of more "legitimate" ones.

Lawlessness in the government also results when statutes (what the government says it wants to do) don't correspond to realities (what the government really wants to do). Much of the benevolent legislation is passed during liberal high-water marks, when the composition of Congress is most advantageous and when all available political capital is expended on getting the bill passed, leaving little for ensuring enforcement. Badgering bureaucrats for enforcement is at best unrewarding for the Congressman. He can gain headlines and favor with liberal constituencies by helping to pass the enabling legislation. But those constituencies, not being directly victimized by the agency's lawlessness, will not subsequently press him to fight for enforcement. In his role as ombudsman, the Congressman is much more likely to hear from, and respond to, an urban developer who complains that his profits are being held up by some silly federal technicality, than he is likely to respond to the developer's victims.

The compromise between those who want a good program and those who don't care if there is any program at all turns out to be an unenforced program. Breaking the law bridges the gap between diverse interests, and becomes a political entente, a savvy arrangement in which all interests (those that serve justice and those that serve power) are taken into account, the laws satisfying the former, and the programs the latter.

Federal programs can also serve those who are essentially opposed to their success because the very enactment of a program deprives any disadvantaged group of the legitimacy of protest. When the regulatory agencies took the fervor from the muck-rakers and turned it over to bureaucratic muckpassers inside the government, the policing of industry became automatically the province of the government, not of the people, and any further non-governmental action could be countered with the argument that the problem was now the job of government. Likewise, the poverty and welfare programs, good or bad, deprive the poor of any further public leverage. "You've got welfare, you've got tax money and free food, now why are you bitching?" To the many voters who believe that the enactment of a program equals solution of the problem, the idea of people on welfare protesting about anything (even if they aren't getting the welfare) is abhorrent. One good way to keep people in their place is to establish a bad program that gives lip service to the concept of social progress.

Since poor people have little say in relocation and welfare policy and since the bureaucracy is shielded from the political push and pull of the electorate, a person denied his rights by a government agency has little means of regaining them. The courts are a possibility, but, as Cahn points out, nobody has the "right" to do business with the government, and courts have been wary of using their judicial prerogative to perform what should be government's watchdog function. If a person is illegally cut off welfare, it is hard for him to prove it, especially if he has no access to the basic regulations that are used to justify such decisions. It is usually impossible for him to spend the money and time it takes to sue the government. In some cases where suits are brought, court decisions have not forced bureaucracy to desist from unlawful practices. And often people who bring such suits are induced to settle out of court, so that no judicial precedent can be established.

A more real possibility would be to organize the poor to demand fair and legal treatment, much as the workers banded together in unions to meet the power of the companies. But welfare and other federal program recipients, unlike union workers,

have nothing to give to the government, no services with which to bargain. It is possible to imagine welfare boycotts, where large numbers of people refuse the bureaucratic services until some wrong is redressed, but it is not probable that needy people could refuse welfare checks in an attempt to reform the system. And even if they could, the bureaucracy might find ways to keep on functioning as if those people did not exist, sending the money down and diverting it into other pockets. The government is too large to be treated as the unions treated companies during the early stages of bargaining. And as long as the non-welfare public believes that people on welfare don't deserve it anyway, then any protest against the welfare system, however justified, will not get needed outside support.

The other possibility is that the groups now receiving government services or money will gain political power and become an "interest" to be taken into account. Politicians might have to worry about getting the welfare vote, the handicapped vote, the substandard occupant vote, much as they now worry about the Jewish vote or the Wall Street vote. Depending on their size, such new political subgroups might form a natural check on federal lawlessness and provide the impetus for Congress to police the Executive Branch.

This dream is interrupted, however, by the bureaucracy itself, which, as it grows to take in more areas of social concern, becomes the greatest obstacle to the poor man's chances of acquiring power. America sets up massive legions of experts whose stated goal is to program people into self-sufficiency. The contradiction in this is most apparent where the government has become most all-encompassing, on the Indian reservations.

For non-Indians, the Indian story has in it more than a mere compassionate rendering of the condition of one more oppressed group. It may warn us about the state of our own future under a pervasive and institutionalized banditry that governs in the name of "our own good." For as the Indian was a pioneer on our land, so he is the pioneer in the total trusteeship society, the Great American Welfare State, where in the name of efficiency, expertise, and most qualified leadership, every aspect of his life is controlled—from health, schools, politics, economics, and trade to his private pocketbook. As government grows, more people are becoming Indians.

The Bill of Rights was not extended to Indians until 1968, and they still have almost no judicial access, little political power, and hardly any economic control. But they do have the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and its thousands of experts, to protect them from themselves. BIA, with all those treaties and statutes behind it, carries on a loud and almost obscene monologue with Indians, denying them lawyers, forcing their children to go to schools thousands of miles away, making them pay exorbitant rates on the trading-post monopolies supervised by the BIA, and cheating them out of their land. Although examples of BIA noncompliance could go on ad absurdum, conditions on the reservations speak more convincingly as to the effect of BIA rule.

While white men continue to delve into Indian psyche to find cultural keys to his lack of "development," the real reasons have more to do with the BIA. Since that agency makes all major decisions on reservations and is solely responsible for the Indians *in loco parentis*, who else could be held accountable for the fact that Indians have lost much of the land the government guaranteed them (from 138 million acres in 1887 to 55 million in 1966), that the mineral assets of reservations have been exploited by outsiders, that they have no economic opportunity, and that health conditions are generally among the worst in the nation?

The BIA has made Indians so dependent on it that most Indians, though recognizing the agency as an enemy, do not support the idea of abolishing it. To further this condition, the BIA attempts not to get Indians off welfare but to get them on it. It encourages them to sell their land (a pre-condition for welfare) and then doles out the money in small parcels often below subsistence levels. The more Indians on welfare, the more control the BIA has over their lives, and the more the assets of the reservation can be manipulated to fall into the hands of developers and economic interests. And the more the Indian's life erodes, the more BIA bureaucrats are needed to do something about it.

If this seems like a cynical assessment of the role of a federal agency, consider the Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota, second largest in the nation, where, according to Cahn's study, about \$8,000 a year is spent per family to help the Oglala Sioux, and yet the median income of those same families is only \$1,910. The rest of the money supports the BIA officers—one for each family on the reservation—who are there to raise the Indians' living standard. Although it would seem obvious that the way to do this would be to eliminate the bureaucrats and give the money to the Indians directly, thus immediately raising their incomes from \$1,910 a year to \$8,000 a year, such a move would not inspire Indian "self-sufficiency" or the growth rate of the BIA.

Indian poverty is an important industry, feeding thousands of white men and creating for them the illusion of work. The last thing the industry, as a whole, would accept is the very idea on which it was launched—Indian self-sufficiency and economic equality. Thus lawlessness, in its broadest sense, serves the bureaucracy by continually aggravating the bad conditions upon which it depends. Benevolent bureaucracies grow only if problems grow. Problems grow if lawlessness grows.

Federal lawlessness may be the ultimate solution to the middle-class employment problem, as the bureaucracy becomes a kind of middle-class welfare program where thousands are paid to administer non-programs. If bureaucracy is the tapeworm of despair, its lawlessness may move us toward a nation in which most citizens either work for, or are worked on, by the federal government. If half a nation can administer programs to the other half, we may eliminate unemployment by handing money back and forth between us, while machines do all the real work. The federal government and television may be the two great means of filling in leisure time.

But as the government grows through its own lawlessness and inefficiency, we may find that the highest price will be paid not in the areas the bureaucrats' work affects, but in the offices where the bureaucrats work. Even the actors in an illegal system cannot long believe in what they are doing. Lawlessness inside the government encourages the same sense of degradation, hopelessness, and immorality that the urban ghetto is said to produce. It remains to be seen whether the result of this will be hardcore bureaucratic crime, with administrative muggings, dossier thefts, inter-desk gang wars, stabbings, and smuggling of unwanted memos, or, in the fresh and unlawful vision of George Wallace, all those briefcases floating down the Potomac.

As President Johnson's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice said: "Finally, no system, however well-staffed or organized, no level of material well-being for all, will rid a society of crime if there is not a widespread ethical motivation, and a widespread belief that by and large the government and the social order deserve credence, respect, and loyalty."

## THE FREE PRESS

## HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the American people are becoming increasingly aware that something is wrong with what they are being fed as news. Many read the daily paper only to pick an argument, while others look to see what the liberal extremists are doing.

But, few take the time to analyze in detail why the establishment media has stooped to such distorted reporting that the credibility of news is being destroyed.

Such an analytical report, explaining controlled news, has been prepared by Mr. Gary Allen, which appeared in the September 1970 American Opinion.

I feel that many of our colleagues would enjoy the following exhaustive report:

## THE MEDIA—A LOOK AT ESTABLISHMENT NEWSPAPERS

(Note.—Gary Allen, a graduate of Stanford University and one of the nation's top authorities on civil turmoil and the New Left, is author of Communist Revolution In The Streets—a highly praised and definitive volume on revolutionary tactics and strategies, published by Western Islands. Mr. Allen, a former instructor of both history and English, is active in anti-Communist and other humanitarian causes. Now a film writer, author and journalist, he is a Contributing Editor to American Opinion. Gary Allen is also nationally celebrated as a lecturer.)

For years Americans have grumbled about the radicalism of their newspapers, all too painfully aware that the "Liberal" Establishment dominates the nation's mass media, slanting the news to the Left with an ease bordering on license. Until recently, however, this general frustration was ignored by mainstream politicians. It seemed not even the bravest paladin dared challenge the terrible power of the media. Then along came Spiro T. Agnew, charging madly on a white steed to do public battle with the dark powers of the Establishment's alley journalists. Here was a man saying, even shouting, in public what Americans had been saying to each other in private for two decades. The people loved it!

Vice President Agnew became an instant hero. Here at last was a public official who dared to protest the nasty little games regularly played in the Establishment Press. Most conservatives nearly exploded in glee. Even the hard-core Right, though dubious of Greeks bearing gifts, was cautiously pleased.

For decades conservatives have known that what Spiro Agnew claims concerning the media is true. Having suffered through the efforts of the mass media to politically assassinate Senators Robert Taft, Joseph McCarthy, and Barry Goldwater, conservatives were all too aware of the commitment of the media to radical interests. But now the polls showed that nearly half of America's citizens believed that television and newspaper reporting regularly served Leftist prejudices. The ruse of objectivity was finished, and the politicians didn't miss the point.

Against this background Spiro Agnew journeyed to Birmingham, Alabama, where the Establishment media are as popular as a tarantula at a nudist camp. There the noble Spiro did vigorously flay the *New York Times* and *Washington Post*—a calculated act of

courage not unlike denouncing maxi-skirts at a convention of Peeping Toms.

Suddenly this former labor lawyer and favorite of the United Auto Workers, this man who had run for Governor of Maryland as a champion of forced integration in private housing, this "Republican" who had refused to support Goldwater in 1964, this protégé and supporter of Nelson Rockefeller, turned up in Wallace country, speaking Wallace's lines, and became a household word among conservatives. That's the Southern Strategy—lots of boula-boula rhetoric from Mr. Agnew while the President skirts Left end on the old "Statue of Liberty" play.

But even as conservatives delighted in the writhings of the media boys after the Agnew attack, few doubted that if the silent majority falls to drive home its demand for an end to managed news the Vice President's words will be as sound and fury signifying nothing.<sup>1</sup> Conservatives know that the Communist Conspiracy has thrived only because its real nature and accomplishments have been hidden from the American people by those who dominate the mass media. The Establishment Press provides a paper curtain behind which Communists and Fabians have operated in America for many years. It, alone, now stands between the people and the greatest anti-Communist renaissance in history.

Communist penetration of America's news media has over the years been the subject of a number of investigations by both the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. Not surprisingly, the results of such investigations were given almost no coverage by the Press and their findings did not become a matter of popular knowledge. While a few Communists were broiled as scapegoats, the reaction by the news industry made further investigation seem to the investigators very unhealthy indeed, with all-out attacks on those members of Congress who dared expose Communist cells operating within the mass media.

Communist efforts to subvert, manipulate, and control our Press are, of course, to be expected. As the conference of the All-Union Communist Party at Moscow declared as early as 1938: "... the chief decisive weapon must be the press." In America the key to infiltrating the bourgeois Press was the Newspaper Guild, which for many years was dominated by the Communists. As former top Communist Joseph Kornfedder commented:

Years later (1937) came the organization of the "Newspaper Guild" and through it the communists moved into the news field in a big way . . . . Through the "Newspaper Guild" the communists moved into the big "daily" press itself. Those were the days of the "red honeymoon" with the "New Deal." Infiltration was conducted on a large scale all around, but the "Guild" device was a big operation even for those days.

The "Guild" is an organization which takes in news personnel from the news services (U.P. and A.P., etc.) down to the individual newspapers. Included is the official Communist press. The Guild, from the ground up, was designed and carried forward by the communists, using the late Heywood Brown (a fellow traveler) as a front man (president). As usual, most of the men who joined it did not know what they were being used for and some do not even know it today.

As late as 1960, in its Report called *The Technique Of Soviet Propaganda*, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee observed:

There are in the world few organs of the press, even when "bourgeois," in which the Soviet apparatus has no intelligence. The main task of auxiliaries in the press is to manipulate the editor, or if that is not

Footnotes at end of article.

feasible, the reporters, without the editor's knowledge. General notions like "this paper is conservative" or "Catholic" are not at all sufficient any longer to recognize the policy it follows toward Moscow. Sometimes the managers themselves are unaware that their newspaper is "permeated."

The Communists know that one story slanted to their purpose in a non-Communist periodical is worth hundreds of articles in official Communist publications which are read only by dutiful members of the Party. And the Communists do not care whether an article is written by a Party member or a mere sympathizer. They still operate under what is called the "Stalin Standard":

*Some are members of the Party, and some are not; but that is a formal difference. The important thing is that both serve the same common purpose.* (Speech by Joseph Stalin, February 9, 1946, House Document 169, 80th Congress, 2nd Session.)

Yet, most of the Leftward slant of our mass media is created neither by members of the Communist Party nor of their conscious sympathizers. Rather it is a product of that "Liberalism" grafted into budding journalists while studying under Fabian Socialist professors in America's colleges. And the first law of the politicized campus is that if there is only one Leftist professor on an entire faculty, he will gravitate toward journalism and the school newspaper.

In days of yore, editors lashed their galley slaves with the whip of objectivity. Reporters received on-the-job training where they were taught to present the facts and leave the opinions to the boys who wrote the editorial page. Then, comparatively recently, college social science departments added schools of journalism which began promptly to promote a modern, up-to-date, progressive version of reporting. The traditional five Ws—the who, what, when, where, and why—were abandoned for a new approach called "interpretive reporting," in which every cub reporter was to be converted into a philosopher king to stencil the reaction of his own glands onto the developments of the day.

The interpretive reporter, rather than faithfully recording a speaker's words in an orderly way, would explain instead what he "felt" to be the "meaning" and "overall importance" of what had been said. This view is usually justified with the contention that otherwise the average reader, who hasn't had his mind improved in the brain laundry at Old Siwash, might not understand the report. And, it is pointed out, the broadened attitude given the reporter permits him to bring in explanatory background material (which he selects), and to employ a writing style which is more lively and interesting. Where such training in "journalism" has been combined with that presented by the other laundry masters within the social sciences, the result has proved devastating to the quality and honesty of American journalism.

Pulitzer Prize-winner Morrie Ryskind was one of Hollywood's best and most highly paid screenwriters until he "lost" his talent as a writer on a train returning from Hearings in Washington at which he gave testimony against Communists in the film industry. Now a nationally syndicated columnist, Mr. Ryskind says of contemporary reporting:

*If I return to the subject of "interpretive reporting," it is because it remains the biggest psychological weapon in the armament of the Liberal Establishment. In the bright lexicon of revolution—and that's what we're going through, whether we realize it or not—the news is not nearly as important as the manner in which it is filtered down to the public. And no item is too small to be passed without going through the screening process. After all, war is war.*

The Establishment Left has for a number of years supported such key journalism schools as those at Harvard and Columbia with multi-million-dollar grants from the Ford Foundation. The boys who know that the Ford (Foundation) Has A Redder Idea are not unaware of how best to invest a revolutionary buck. Graduates of the Columbia School of Journalism, for instance, now include 45 newspaper publishers, 152 newspaper editors, and 71 magazine editors. There is not a conservative in the carload.

While it is usually admitted that the workaday editor or reporter tends to be a "Liberal," it is generally believed that the owners of the media are very conservative. And, though many owners are still nominal Republicans for purposes of social or business camouflage, they are, on the whole, men of the Left. If the owners of the media were conservatives they would not permit the flagrant Leftist bias that pervades the news industry. The Brinkleys, Cronkites, Krafts, *ad nauseam*, are obviously retained on the payroll to promote the line that the Establishment owners want propagated.

We are talking, of course, about the Establishment Press. More specifically, about who owns and runs it. But that term "Establishment" has been used far too loosely in recent years and needs to be defined before we can proceed further.

#### WHAT IS THE ESTABLISHMENT?

In general, as the term "Establishment" is used here, it refers to the men who belong to that mysterious group known as the Council on Foreign Relations (C.F.R.) and/or its satellite organizations. The C.F.R., housed at Park Avenue and 68th Street in New York City, counts in its exclusive membership some 1,450 of the most powerful men in American politics, industry, finance, communications, and the academy. Yet, so far as the American public is concerned, it operates almost anonymously.<sup>2</sup>

The C.F.R. is a subsidiary of the Royal Institute for International Affairs in London, which was founded to promote the concepts of One World Government as envisioned by Cecil Rhodes and his financial angel, Lord Rothschild. In his extremely revealing book, *Tragedy And Hope*, Professor Carroll Quigley (Harvard, Princeton, Georgetown, Brookings Institution, etc.) writes:

*... the relationship between the financial circles of London and those of the eastern United States ... reflects one of the most powerful influences in twentieth-century American and world history. The two ends of this English-speaking axis have sometimes been called, perhaps facetiously, the English and American Establishments. There is, however, a considerable degree of truth to the joke, a truth which reflects a very real power structure. . . .*

From its inception, the C.F.R. Establishment was the tool of international financiers who sought to establish a socialist World Government under their control, through which they could eliminate competition and exercise hegemony over world trade, communications, transportation, finance, and natural resources. This can only be accomplished within a socialist World Government, and it is the above objectives and not any do-gooder urge to uplift downtrodden masses which have motivated the international banking interests and their colleagues in the C.F.R. to work for international socialism. Certain obvious strategies were employed immediately. For example, in order to maintain control over government you must control the mass media; therefore, the C.F.R. Establishment has been deeply involved in financing and manipulating the American communications industry.

The Council on Foreign Relations has been financed and controlled from the beginning by the Rockefellers, those in control of the

Andrew Carnegie fortune, the J. P. Morgan organization, and the five American satellites of the European Rothschild banking interests. Because of the role they play in controlling the Establishment Press, the satellite firms merit a quick synopsis.

Most important in the group is Kuhn, Loeb and Company, whose head (Jacob Schiff) invested \$20 million in financing the Russian Revolution of 1917.<sup>3</sup> According to a report from Paris forwarded by U.S. representatives to the State Department on March 3, 1932, Kuhn, Loeb and Company also laid out and financed the Soviet's first Five Year plan. (This Paris report is, incidentally, still in the State Department archives.)

Congressman Louis McFadden revealed that Schiff was sent to the United States by the European Rothschilds to gain control of the American railroads. Whatever the original objective, his efforts proved highly successful. Kuhn, Loeb and Company, today headed by John Schiff, Frederick Warburg, and Thomas E. Dewey Jr., is still a leader in investment banking. As the *New York Times* noted on January 29, 1967: "It has handled more international syndicated issues of securities in the last four years than any other financial institution in the world except the Deutsch Bank."

Another Establishment banking house famous for its support of Leftist activities is Lehman Brothers. The late Herbert Lehman (C.F.R.), in addition to serving as U.S. Senator from New York, was a founder of the Fabian Socialists' Americans For Democratic Action, served on the board of directors of the N.A.A.C.P., was a sponsor of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship and of the American Association for the U.N., and was a favorite of the Fabian Socialists' League for Industrial Democracy. Lehman served as Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (U.N.R.R.A.) which, according to U.S. Ambassador to Poland Arthur Bliss Lane, was used to ensure Soviet subjugation of Poland.

So important was Lehman in the Establishment that on May 29, 1950, the *Chicago Tribune* published photographs of Henry Morgenthau Jr., Felix Frankfurter, and Herbert Lehman accompanied by a commentary declaring that "a person with highest state department connections identified these three figures as the secret government of the United States." A bit hyperbolic, perhaps, but close enough to the truth as to be disconcerting.

Lehman's niece, Helen Lehman Buttenwieser, kept Alger Hiss and his family at her Westchester home while the Communist spy was being tried. She later posted \$60,000 bail for convicted Communist spy Robert A. Soblen, who fled the country. Her husband Benjamin Buttenwieser (C.F.R.) is a Kuhn, Loeb partner and a trustee of the Socialist New School for Social Research.<sup>4</sup>

Because Lehman Brothers is a partnership and not a corporation, we do not know its total wealth, but the *Los Angeles Times* of March 29, 1964, observed:

*Certainly in capital assets, or money available, Lehman Brothers is one of the richest firms in the world. The fortune of the Lehman family, high into the hundreds of millions, is a factor, as well as the wealth of many of its partners.*

Another key Establishment firm is Lazard Freres & Company of New York, a subsidiary of the Rothschilds' Paris operation of the same name. A power within Lazard Freres is Eugene Black (C.F.R.), a member of the secretive Pilgrim Society, a director of the Rockefeller's Chase Manhattan Bank and of the *New York Times*, a trustee of the Ford Foundation, former President of the World Bank, and former trustee of the Brookings

<sup>2</sup>Footnotes at end of article.

Institution and the Atlantic Council. Retired head of the firm is Frank Altschul (C.F.R.), a Lehman brother-in-law.

Until his death last year the big man at the Establishment banking firm of Goldman, Sachs & Company was Sidney Weinberg, who once sat on the board of directors of thirty of the nation's largest firms. Though a key insider in getting business support for F.D.R.'s New Deal, Weinberg raised \$6 million before the 1952 Republican Convention to stop conservative Robert Taft and deliver the nomination for Eisenhower. Among the new partners at Goldman, Sachs & Company is Henry Fowler—perhaps, next to Henry Morgenthau Jr., the worst Secretary of the Treasury in the history of the Republic. Fowler is apparently receiving his reward from the international banking fraternity for denuding the nation of its gold and silver reserve, much of which has wound up in the coffers of the banking insiders.

The last of the Rothschilds' "big five" is Dillon, Read & Company, headed by C. Douglas Dillon (C.F.R.), Secretary of the Treasury under John Kennedy. Dillon is, or has been, chairman of the board of the ultra-Leftist Brookings Institution, a director of the Chase Manhattan Bank, and a trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation. It was Douglas Dillon who arranged the demise of America's silver certificates, our last redeemable money. Another officer of Dillon, Read & Company is August Belmont, grandson of the original August Belmont sent here in the 1840s by the Rothschilds as their first American representative. The Rothschild representative on President Nixon's staff is Peter Flanigan, Assistant to the President. He is on loan from Dillon, Read & Company, where he is a vice president.<sup>5</sup>

The above firms represent the Establishment interests about which we are speaking when we talk to the Establishment Press. We will get to the details of ownership and control shortly.

#### THE ESTABLISHMENT'S TIMES

Few will doubt that the *New York Times* represents the kingdom and the power of the Establishment communications system. As John C. Merrill observed in his *The Elite Press*: "With the exception of the *Wall Street Journal* or the *Christian Science Monitor*, the *New York Times* is the nearest thing in the United States to a national newspaper."

The *Times* is found in practically every academic library (there are 2,500 subscribers to its microfilm service) and is read by more than half of the presidents of our nation's colleges. Ultimately, it is *The Important Paper For Important People Everywhere*. Fifty copies of the *Times* go to the White House every day. Most Congressmen and Senators read it as a daily bible. Seventy-one embassies in Washington subscribe, including that of the Soviets. It is even read by the Comrades in Peking, and thirty-nine copies are sent to Moscow. (See *Saturday Evening Post*, October 9, 1965.) "A significance of the *Times*," Timesman James Reston has written, "is its multiplier effect. What appears in the *Times* automatically appears later in other places."

Concerning this multiplier effect, Alice Widener, columnist for *Barron's*, notes:

*It is a fact that most editors and newsmen on the staffs of Life, Look, Time, Newsweek, etc., and most editors, reporters and commentators at NBC, CBS, and ABC take their news and editorial cues from the New York Times. Technically, it is a great newspaper; but it reports much of the news in conformity with its editorial policies.*

The smug, self-important arrogance of the *Times* is reflected in this statement by James Reston (C.F.R.), its vice president,

syndicated columnist, and former chief Washington correspondent:

*Our primary responsibility is not, perhaps unfortunately, an obligation to the commuter reading the paper on the train down from Westchester. Our primary responsibility is to the historian of 50 years from now. Unique among newspapers, the Times is prime source material—and we must never poison the stream of history.*

Future generations fishing in the *New York Times* for details of the activities of the International Communist Conspiracy will do well to run the most vigorous tests of that stream before drinking the water or devouring the fish. Doubtless the best expert on how the stream is poisoned is Mr. Herman H. Dinsmore. After serving thirty-four years on the news staff of the *Times*, including many years as associate foreign editor and nine years as editor of its international edition, Mr. Dinsmore could no longer take the increasingly Leftist slant of the paper and retired to write a book exposing it. In his book, *All The News That Fits* (a parody of the *Times*' slogan, "All The News That's Fit To Print"), Dinsmore observes:

*... The New York Times took no really effective steps to counter these Communist thrusts and all too frequently appeared to back them, as if to play the Soviet regime off against the United States and other democratic nations of the West. The New York Times in more recent years has stated that it wants a balance of power in the world—as if it were possible to maintain such a thing. Editorially, it has freely criticized the United States while but sparingly finding fault with Communist actions. . . .*

*The attitude of the New York Times toward the Soviet Union has resulted in remarkable distortions in its news columns and in its editorial judgments. . . .*

The *Times* is, incidentally, the sole U.S. recipient of news from Russia's TASS news agency. And, it has employed a number of reporters whose pro-Communist diatribes are notorious. Such men as Herbert L. Matthews (C.F.R.), Harrison Salisbury (C.F.R.), Lester E. Markel (C.F.R.), Ralph Parker, and Walter Duranty spent the greater portion of their careers with the *Times* as side-show barkers for every Communist regime able to rattle a cage.

When the noted philologist, Dr. Medford Evans, set out in 1956 to do a two-year study that he thought might prove the *Times* followed the editorial lead of the *Communist Worker*, he discovered that just the opposite was true. As Professor Evans noted in *American Opinion* for September 1969:

*When John B. Chapple, of Ashland, Wisconsin, publisher of the Ashland Press, was a young man he went to Yale, became a Marxist, joined the Communist Party, and took a trip to Russia—this was about 1927—in the company of Robert Minor, subsequently editor of the Daily Worker, one of the top Communists of this country at that time. Chapple, who long ago renounced Communism and is now a devout Christian, still remembers vividly that Minor once said to him, "Son, read the New York Times every day so that you will always know what the line is."*

Not surprisingly, when the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee began to investigate a Communist cell within the *Times*, publisher Arthur Hays Sulzberger (C.F.R.), Pilgrim Society, Rockefeller Foundation, and Norman Thomas Foundation) nearly blew a tube. Sulzberger, it seemed, wouldn't recognize a Communist if one attacked him with a hammer and sickle. He wrote in the *New York Times Magazine* that he would not "institute a witch hunt" to eliminate Communists from his staff. You see, he noted, "even if we found a Communist or two . . . we would run the risk of destroying the atmosphere needed for the production of the kind of newspaper we

are publishing." Which is, of course, the point, Sulzberger's feeling of comradeship extended to the point of loaning newsprint to the *Communist Daily Worker* when it ran short. (*Harpers*, January 1969, Page 72.)

Despite the extreme discomfort of Arthur Hays Sulzberger, the government questioned a number of *Times* employees about their Communist connections and activities. These included: John T. McManus and Allan James Aronson (both of whom later went to work for openly Communist publications), Jack Shafer, Samuel Weissman, Seymour Pect, Nathan Alexkovsky, Robert Shelton, Matilda Landsman, Jerry Zalph, James S. Glaser, and Alden Whitman. What was absurd about an investigation at such a level is that it is not the card-carrying streetbunder Communists who make this voice of the C.F.R. Establishment so dangerous. The danger comes from the insiders of the so-called legitimate world" who control the *Times*. Let us look at that part of the story.

The modern history of the *New York Times* dates from 1896, when Adolph Ochs took over the paper. Gerald Johnson notes in *An Honorable Titan* that Ochs' mother, Bertha Levy Ochs, had been so involved in the Communist Revolution of 1848, that her family was "advised" to leave Bavaria. Doubtless Comrade Bertha regaled young Adolph with tales of workers throwing off their chains and of world revolution financed by the humanitarian insiders of international banking. The debt-ridden Ochs jumped from the *Chattanooga Times* into the big apple by taking over the foundering *New York Times* for the borrowed sum of \$75,000. Johnson tells how Ochs arranged it:

*He had arrived in New York almost unknown; but by August 17, 1896, he was well and favorably known to a group of men whose power in the financial, business and political worlds was out of all proportion to their numbers.*

Mr. Ochs' backers in taking control of the *Times* were international bankers J. P. Morgan; August Belmont; and Kuhn, Loeb's Jacob Schiff. The latter two were Rothschild agents. (Johnson, Pp. 130, 132, 137-138.) Later, the Lehman Brothers began working with the *Times* on other ventures. Ferdinand Lundberg reports in *America's 60 Families*: "Although not conspicuously connected with publishing, this banking family stands close to the *New York Times* . . . It has the outstanding interest in the Kimberly Clark Corporation, a paper-making enterprise which, with the *New York Times*, jointly controls the Spruce Falls Power and Paper Company . . ."

The Rothschilds' voice of the American Establishment passed from the publishing hands of Adolph Ochs (C.F.R.) to his son-in-law Arthur Hays Sulzberger (C.F.R.) to his son-in-law Orvil E. Dryfoos (C.F.R.) to the current publisher, Arthur Ochs "Punch" Sulzberger (C.F.R.). "Punch" Sulzberger's cousin, John Oakes (C.F.R.) is editor of the editorial page and is described by Herman Dinsmore as a "foaming-at-the-mouth Leftist who has done much to destroy the paper's objectivity." So far to the Left is John Oakes that he chose to attend the national convention of the Socialist League for Industrial Democracy in other than a reportorial capacity. He boasts that his militantly Leftist editorial policy is carefully contrived:

*We try to take a point of view that we think is beneficial to the country—broadly called Liberal and generally internationalist—and then we go ahead and argue it as vigorously as possible. I rule the expression "on the other hand" off the page.*

Another high official in the *Times* empire is Amory Bradford (C.F.R.), who had the good fortune to marry Carol Warburg Rothschild. Harding Bancroft (C.F.R.), of the Interstate Broadcasting Company and Carne-

Footnotes at end of article.

gie Endowment for International Peace, serves as the *Times'* executive vice president. Bancroft, who is closely associated with C.I.A. Director Richard Helms, was responsible for the *Times'* hatchet job on former State Department security evaluator Otto Otepka. Mr. Otepka had in his files information about Bancroft's pro-Soviet activities which established that he had been under the influence of Alger Hiss.

Alger Hiss had many friends at the *New York Times*. Richard Nixon notes on Page 20 of *Six Crises* that it was *Times* Vice President James Reston (C.F.R.) who recommended Alger Hiss (C.F.R.) to John Foster Dulles (C.F.R.) to head the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Reston is regarded as the Establishment successor to Walter Lippmann as journalistic spokesman for the *Insiders*. Follow his columns closely and you will soon suspect that you are plugged into an *Insider* intercom.

Yet, as large as the influence of the *New York Times* is now, it is about to be multiplied many times. Its news service, which provides editorials and "interpretive" news stories to 212 daily papers, is planning to offer a computer service in 1971. According to *Editor And Publisher* for April 5, 1969, *Times* Vice President Ivan Veit has announced that the *Times* Information Bank is programming a third generation I.B.M. 360/50 computer to provide background information on people and events for newspapers, broadcast networks, university researchers, and government planners. Of course, the decision as to what information goes into the computer and what goes into the "Memory Hole" is up to the unbiased judgment of the Establishmentarians who run the *New York Times*. Almost certainly this service will be used by the networks and wire services so that "All The News That's Fit To Tint" will go into virtually every home in the country.

#### THE ESTABLISHMENT AXIS

New York, of course, is one end of the Establishment axis, and New York's afternoon Leftist daily is the Establishment's *New York Post*, headed by Dorothy Schiff, granddaughter of Jacob Schiff, the Daddy Warbucks of the Russian Revolution. The *Post*, which had once been the property of the notoriously radical family of Thomas Lamont (C.F.R.), and which was later run by Jacob Schiff's son-in-law, George Backer, an executive in the Red American Labor Party, makes the *Times* look conservative by comparison. It is now edited by James Wechsler, a former official of the Young Communist League who discovered he could be more effective on the outside. Dorothy Schiff, who is related to both the Warburgs and the Rothschilds, has had five husbands. Like many people who are incapable of manning their own lives, she is sure she knows how to run those of everybody else.

The Washington end of the Establishment's New York-Washington newspaper axis is the redoubtable *Washington Post*, often referred to in the Intelligence community as the Washington edition of *Pravda*. What the *Post* prints is important as it is the capital's only morning newspaper and is read by most members of Congress. What the *Post* does not print is also important and notorious. A long-time staffer at the Library of Congress told us that fully half of the articles cited in Congressional debate (not including appendages in the *Congressional Record Appendix*) come from either the *Washington Post* or the *New York Times*.

The *Post* is the creature of the late Eugene Meyer (C.F.R.), whose family immigrated to America in the backwash of the failure of the Communist Paris Commune of 1848. Meyer's father, Gunther, was named U.S. representative of the Rothschilds' firm of Lazard Freres. Eugene studied interna-

tional banking in Hamburg, Berlin, Paris, and London and also became associated with Lazard Freres. Later he became a partner of Bernard Baruch in Alaskan mining adventures and Baruch brought Meyer to Washington in 1917 to head a division of the War Industries Board. Messers Baruch and Meyer held almost complete dictatorial control over America's wartime industry and placed billions of dollars in war production contracts with friends and associates.

President Wilson soon put Meyer in charge of the War Finance Corporation which had charge of selling War Bonds. Eugene Meyer's dealings there were shady to say the least. According to Congressman Louis McFadden, then Chairman of the House Banking Committee:

*I call your attention to House Report No. 1635, 68th Congress, 2nd Session, which reveals that at least twenty-four million dollars in bonds were duplicated. Ten billion dollars worth of bonds were surreptitiously destroyed. Our committee on Banking and Currency found the records of the War Finance Corporation under Eugene Meyer Jr. extremely faulty. While the books were being brought before our committee by the people who were custodians of them and taken back to the Treasury at night, the committee discovered that alterations were being made in the permanent records.*

Meyer, who held important positions in every Administration between Wilson and Truman, was author of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, and was made Chairman of the R.F.C. when the Act was passed. He was also a governor of the Federal Reserve Board and the first head of the World Bank.

Using money made from his World War I manipulations, Eugene Meyer bought the *Washington Post* in 1933, ostensibly to support F.D.R.'s New Deal, but also reportedly to squelch investigations into how Meyer and his partners in New York and Europe had helped to maneuver the United States into the war and then helped themselves to enormous profits. Eugene Meyer's first move was to fire the *Post's* editor for refusal to editorially support U.S. recognition of the Soviet Union.

Over the years the Establishment *Washington Post* has done everything possible to promote Leftist interests in all matters foreign and domestic. It has sought to smear every investigation of Communist subversion, and its talented cartoonist, Herblock, has performed the most vicious sort of hatchet job on every conservative personality to impress the Washington scene over the past three decades.

The *Post* is now in the control of the Eugene and Agnes Meyer Foundation so that the Meyer family will not have to pay the taxes which the *Washington Post* advocates for those of us who are unilluminated. After the death of Meyer control over the operation was vested in Phillip Graham (C.F.R.), Meyer's son-in-law and a former law clerk of *Insider* Felix Frankfurter. Graham ran the show until he could take it no longer and put a bullet in his brain in 1963. Control is now in the hands of his widow, Katherine Graham, Eugene's daughter. Chairman of the board of the *Washington Post* Company is Frederick S. Beebe (C.F.R.).

The Establishmentarian *Post* has recently become so overtly revolutionary as to resemble a high-class undergrounder. New Leftist staffers like firebrand Nicholas Von Hoffman are so radical that Mrs. Graham has let it be known that even she is worried about the revolutionary rhetoric which appears in her paper. Sophisticated Washingtonians say this is social camouflage, noting that Mrs. Graham would certainly terminate the employ of any staffer whose rhetoric so much as suggested anti-Communism.

The *Washington Post* Company now publishes the powerful *Paris Herald Tribune* in partnership with the *New York Times*. The

*Post* also owns a wire and feature service specializing in editorials and "interpretive" news stories which it operates in cooperation with the formerly conservative *Los Angeles Times*. Sixty-eight daily papers, with a combined circulation of over 12 million, use the *Post* news service. The *Post* Company also owns the C.B.S. outlets in Washington, WTOP-TV and WTOP-AM and FM (an all news station). The firm's newspaper, radio, and TV outlets—plus its magazine, *Newsweek*—all reel out the same editorial line. They combine to give the *Insiders* a powerful ideological pull in the nation's capital.

#### ON THE OTHER COAST

The West Coast end of the Establishment's newspaper complex is the *Los Angeles Times*—gross sales, \$396 million, the nation's third-largest news medium. Before 1960, it would have been difficult to find a more conservative newspaper in the United States, but in less than a decade the paper did a virtual about-face. While it remains nominally Republican, its Republicanism is strictly of the Rockefeller (C.F.R.) stripe and conservatives regularly take a bludgeoning in its feature articles and on the editorial page—which more and more resembles that of its partner the *Washington Post*.

The *Times* is not the least bit shy about taking strong political stands, almost always on the "Liberal" side. Gone from its pages are such stalwarts as Morrie Ryskind, Henry J. Taylor, Robert Allen, Paul Scott, Holmes Alexander, and (the crowning blow!) Al Capp, whose savage satires of the hick ideologies of contemporary "Liberals" just aren't funny to the *Times*.

A key figure in helping to ruin the *Los Angeles Times* is reported to be E. O. Guthman, its national news editor. Guthman rose from obscurity while a reporter for a Seattle newspaper when he did a series exonerating a University of Washington professor charged with being a Communist. For his effort he won a Pulitzer Prize, a Nieman Fellowship, and a place on the staff of Senator Robert Kennedy. From there he came to roost high on the staff of the *Times*. The ex-wife of the man who provided us with this information, himself a former Communist, was a member of the same Communist Party cell as the professor whom Guthman is said to have cleared.

The *Times* began to move Left after Dorothy "Buff" Chandler successfully pushed her husband Norman out as publisher, using a series of flagrant indiscretions by Norman as the lever. Replacing Norman Chandler was their son Otis, a man of imposing physical (but limited mental) qualities. Whether Otis is a foil for his Machiavellian mother or is manipulated by the entourage of "intellectuals" for whom he flaunts admiration is an oft debated subject.<sup>2</sup>

For whatever reason, Otis Chandler indicated in a speech at the 1969 stockholders' meeting of the *Times-Mirror* Corporation that he sees the role of the *Times* as the "education" of its subscribers to adjust to the revolution which he says has already begun. Here is Otis Chandler's amazing statement:

*Our role as a major class circulation newspaper is a difficult one to fulfill. For this nation is in the midst of a revolution. Our job on The Times is to patiently and gently, but honestly, reveal this fact to our nearly million reading families, most of whom do not want to believe what is happening in our society. . . .*

*It seems to me that the core of our problem as a nation—and more specifically the core of our problem on The Times—is to be able to accept the fact that a revolution does exist, that it will not simply wither away, that we must determine how to adjust our institutions and modify our living styles to meet the conditions of the latter half of the 20th century.*

*And just that—recognizing the existence*

Footnotes at end of article.

of the revolution—will be a traumatic experience for most of us. Traumatic for what is called the "power structure" or the "establishment," traumatic for the very solid middle class which is the real power structure in this community, traumatic for our romanticists and our idealists, even traumatic for those of us on *The Times*.

A mass newspaper—like the *Los Angeles Times*—must remember that the preponderance of its subscribers have a basic interest in preserving the status quo—or they think they have.

A mass newspaper, then, once it has begun slowly to grasp the dimensions of the problems of its society, can begin slowly to document them—to fulfill one of its primary purposes, which is to educate.

This is what we are now doing each day with our many staff by-line exclusive articles . . .

I think this is the most difficult of all our roles—to educate—because more often than not we will be attempting it against the will of our subscribers. . . . The preponderance of them will not want to believe anything about "the system" has become obsolete. The preponderance will insist that most of the blacks and most of the young are really quite happy with the way things are, and that only the kooks and the racists are objecting, and that even these kooks and racists are doing it solely because they are only troublemakers.

They will not want to believe that the hearts of our cities—in which most of them do not live after 6 p.m.—have become unlivable and ungovernable.

They will want us to stop talking about it—stop breeding discontent—stop inciting riots—stop publicizing troublemakers. I hear it every day.

They will accuse us of destroying respect for the Flag, respect for our elected officials, respect for private enterprise, respect for self-respect itself.

They will find it very hard indeed to believe that we are not determined to destroy a society and a nation that they live. . . .

They will, indeed, Mr. Chandler!

Since the *Times*, Los Angeles' sole morning newspaper, has joined the Establishment's created revolution, it has won the plaudits of the "Liberal" elite and is now declared to be one of the Top Ten newspapers in America. As John Merrill writes in *The Elite Press*:

. . . If there is a paper on the West Coast which comes closest to being like the *New York Times*, it is the *Times of Los Angeles*. It is the West Coast's biggest and wealthiest daily; . . . It consumes more newsprint than any other American daily, and accounts for at least 20 per cent of all newsprint used in the eleven Western states. . . .

The *Times* is extremely aggressive in acquiring other media properties. It now controls *New American Library*, a large Leftist paperback publishing company which produces Penguin, Mentor, and Signet books. The *Times* also recently purchased the *Dallas Times Herald* for a staggering \$91.4 million. It then turned around and bought fifty-one percent of the *Long Island Newsday*, which has the largest circulation of any suburban newspaper in America, for \$33 million. And, oh yes, the *Times-Mirror Corporation's* chief executive officer is now former U.C.L.A. Chancellor Franklin Murphy (C.F.R.).

Another very important newspaper group in California is the strategic McClatchy chain, which owns the *Sacramento Bee* in the state's capital, as well as other newspapers and eight radio and TV stations. In his will founder Charles K. McClatchy required his heirs and assigns to fight for socialism. The will states:

One fundamental issue will never change and that is the vital issue of government

ownership. I want the McClatchy newspapers to battle for that principle at any and all times no matter against what odds.

The McClatchy clan has lived up to the will both in letter and spirit.

#### IN MIDDLE AMERICA

Voice of the Establishment-financed revolution in middle America is the extremely wealthy Field family, owner of the *Chicago Sun-Times* and *Daily News*, WFLD-TV, The Publishers-Hall Syndicate, and *World Book Encyclopedia*. Revolutionary activity in the Field Family began with Marshal Field III, who inherited a fabulous fortune which made him one of the world's richest men. When young Field, a Catholic educated in England, became severely disturbed after two unsuccessful marriages, he put himself in the care of psychiatrist Gregory Zilboorg. The *Saturday Evening Post* of December 6, 1941, noted:

What the *New Deal* failed to accomplish in altering Field's outlook psychoanalysis did. In 1935, after being divorced by his second wife, Field spent a year in baring his psyche to an eminent psychoanalyst. It was after emerging from the medical confessional that this instinct for public service . . . began to lope, then to charge. The main course of the charge . . . happened to agree with the political orientation of Field's psychoanalyst, who mixes pure science with an intellectual sponsorship of liberal causes. . . .

The *Saturday Evening Post* continues:

Dr. Zilboorg, whose clientele includes many rich Manhattanites, once identified himself as an "intellectual revolutionist." Before becoming a soul doctor he was a busy politico in Russia, where he was born. . . .

In 1941, encouraged by F.D.R. and his "intellectual revolutionist," Field bought the *Chicago Daily News*, already in the control of the Kuhn, Loeb Company, in order to develop a more powerful Leftist voice to offset the booming conservatism of Colonel Robert H. McCormick and his *Chicago Tribune*. Later he created the *Chicago Sun-Times*, a grisly Leftist tabloid. Field became active in such subversive causes as the Titoist American Committee for Yugoslav Relief, the American Society for Russian Relief, the Chicago Civil Liberties Committee, and the Chicago Council of American-Soviet Friendship.

During World War II, after inheriting another 97 million tax-free dollars, Field started the pro-Soviet *New York newspaper PM*. As the House Committee on Un-American Activities reported: "Our investigation has shown that a steady barrage against Congress comes from Marshall Field's *PM*. (Sometimes described as the uptown edition of the *Daily Worker*. . . .)" (*House Report No. 2277*, Page 3, June 25, 1942.) Field lost more than \$4 million on the effort. He could afford it.

The Field Foundation, endowed by Marshall Field, was found by the Cox Committee, a House Committee to Investigate Foundations, to have been heavily infiltrated by the Communists. The Field Foundation, at one time headed by Adlai Stevenson, has funded such officially cited Communist Fronts as The Open Road; the People's Institute of Applied Religion, Inc.; the Southern Conference for Human Welfare; the Institute of Pacific Relations; the Highlander Folk School; and, the American Committee in Aid of Chinese Industrial Cooperatives. And, of course, the Field Foundation was a major financial backer of the late Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference and poured \$250,000 into backing the Communist project known as "Resurrection City."

The latest Left Field is Marshall Field V, at twenty-nine the youngest major newspaper publisher in the United States. The *Daily News* publisher was educated at Harvard and worked for the embarrassingly Leftist *Boston Globe*, the defunct *New York*

*Herald Tribune*, and *Random House*. Young Field makes no bones about his commitment to the revolution. As he puts it, ". . . the Field Newspapers will continue to support the dissent and protest that historically have produced social change." Master Field indicated to *Newsweek* that he has no regard for those historic forces which have produced Western Civilization:

I guess I'm part of the new generation. I don't feel I owe anything to the past. The toughest thing at my age is to see a problem and want to change it and then run into people, politics, heartache and agony. The faster I can go, the better I will like it . . .

The mod-dressed, sideburned Field is especially proud that his newspapers are aimed at countering the conservative *Tribune*. He says: "The audience in Chicago gets quite a choice of representation in the news if they want two sides to a story. All they have to do is buy a *Tribune* and a *Sun-Times* the same day on the same story."\*

The *Daily News* is the fifth-largest evening paper in the country and the *Sun-Times* is the fifth-largest morning paper, but the Field group, represented in the C.F.R. by William Osgood Field Jr. and Leland Stone, has a voice which carries far beyond the Chicago area through its news service, which is subscribed to by seventy-two newspapers having a combined circulation of 12.5 million.

Two years ago young Field bought out the Hall Syndicate and turned it into the Publishers-Hall Syndicate, which pushes a battery of Establishment columnists including Joseph Kraft (C.F.R.), Carl Rowan, David Lawrence (C.F.R.), Roscoe Drummond (C.F.R.), and Evans and Novak. Included for syndication are Leftist political cartoonists Herblock, Mauldin, Feiffer, and Fischetti.

And, with the purchase of the Hall Syndicate, Field inherited Paul Scott, possibly the foremost conservative columnist in the nation. Scott was quickly told by Publishers Hall that he would not be allowed to criticize Communist activity in the nation for six months, and that he must no longer make any references to Martin Luther King's connections with the Communists. When Mr. Scott discovered that important facts were being edited out of his columns before they were sent by Publishers-Hall to the newspapers who had contracted for them, he told the Field crew to find themselves a hack Leftist to fill the spot and began to distribute his own column.

The owner of the largest group of major newspapers in the country is the mysterious Samuel Newhouse, who runs twenty-two important daily papers, three radio stations, and six television stations—having an estimated worth of \$300 million.<sup>10</sup> Not surprisingly, our Wall Street sources tell us that Kuhn, Loeb and Stern-Rosenwald (the Sears, Roebuck fortune) arranged many of the loans with which Newhouse obtained control of the papers which form his chain. He is a "Liberal" Democrat and outspoken admirer of Nelson Rockefeller, but the claim is made that he runs his newspapers strictly for money and avoids ideological commitment. Yet when Newhouse—who counts among his properties newspapers in Portland, St. Louis, Denver, Cleveland, and Birmingham—purchased the *New Orleans Times-Picayune* and the *New Orleans States-Item*, he crowed, "I just bought New Orleans." (*Time*, July 27, 1962.) He paid more for them than did President Jefferson for the entire Louisiana Purchase.

There can be little doubt that Samuel Newhouse, an immigrant from Russia, knows that as an outsider in those areas where he owns newspapers he is mistrusted and must move slowly. In some conservative areas, and in special situations like St. Louis where his *Globe Democrat* couldn't possibly take a stance to the Left of the Pulitzer family's *Post Dispatch*, Newhouse keeps his finger out of the editorial pie. Yet, by coinci-

Footnotes at end of article.

dence, anti-Communist columnist Paul Scott was recently dropped by *ten* Newhouse papers. Hardly a coincidence.

While Newhouse is the largest owner of major dailies, the equally mysterious Lord Thomson of Fleet (Roy Thomson of Toronto) has added to his international publishing empire some fifty-six American papers in small and medium-sized towns. Thomson is also owner of the *London Times*, traditional voice of the British Establishment—where the Royal Institute for International Affairs is controlled by the same people who control our C.F.R. Thomson is a member of the elitist Pilgrim Society, which seeks to merge the United States into the British Commonwealth as a base for World Government. The major international banking firms on both sides of the Atlantic are well represented in the Pilgrim Society, and recently made it easy for Thomson to lay out \$72 million for a dozen Busch-Moore newspapers in America. This was accomplished with the recent purchase of the *Philadelphia Inquirer* and *Daily News*, from U.S. Ambassador to the Court of St. James, Walter Annenberg (owner of *TV Guide*). The Knight chain is now one of the top three chains in the country in circulation. Cost of the latest acquisitions: \$55 million. John Knight (Detroit C.F.R.) controls such increasingly Left-leaning dailies as the *Detroit Free Press*, the *Miami Herald*, the *Akron Beacon Journal*, and a dozen others. The Establishment *Insiders* lean Left, Leftist, Leftist.

#### DEVICES FOR CONTROL

Though newspapers are increasingly supplanting A.P. and U.P.I. with the wire and feature services of the more blatantly Leftist *New York Times*, *Washington Post*, *Los Angeles Times*, and *Chicago Daily News*, the Associated Press and United Press International are used by practically all newspaper, radio, and TV stations as basic sources of news. The wire services are in the main Establishment vehicles. One notes that Arthur Hays Sulzberger was one of the organizers of the Associated Press in the South and was a director of A.P. from 1901 until 1952. Former Timesman Dinsmore maintains, "The Associated Press and the United Press follow the *New York Times* closely, and I mean that these news gathering agencies follow it deliberately."

Associated Press is a co-operative, and the reliability and slant of the news it puts on the wires is largely dependent on the local bureau chief. The United Press International is owned by the Scripps-Howard organization, a chain of eighteen newspapers. Scripps-Howard decides on editorial policy based on a vote of all of its editors and pursues what is today a moderately "liberal" approach.

Next to outright ownership the most effective Establishment control over what appears in our newspapers lies in the power to make or break a paper through control of advertising. The average newspaper depends on advertising for from two-thirds to three-fourths of its revenues. Ike McAnally, for four decades a reporter with the *New York Daily News*, comments in *Counterattack*:

*The most persistent influence upon the editorial policies of metropolitan newspapers today is the large advertiser. In many instances these advertisers are department stores. Some of these make open and contemptuous demands upon the front offices of newspapers to support the left wing. Others relay "suggestions" . . .*

*. . . Newspapers have surrendered unconditionally to left wing front office pressures, real and imaginary . . .*

*. . . They realize that if they write a story which might draw unfavorable reaction from, for instance, a department store, the city editor is apt to throw their copy back at them . . . It is inevitable that with front offices swinging over, individual newsmen have more elastic principles.*

Here's how it works. Every one of the

major department store chains—R. H. Macy & Company, Federated Department Stores, Gimbel Brothers, Sears, Roebuck & Company, J. C. Penney Company, The May Department Stores Company, Interstate Department Stores, and Allied Stores Corporation—has on its board of directors at least one officer who is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations and/or a partner in Kuhn, Loeb; Lazard Freres; Lehman Brothers; Dillon, Read & Company; or Goldman Sachs. These chains own most of the major department stores in America's great cities, although you might not recognize them by name as the names of store founders are usually retained when they are sold out to a chain.

Establishment adventures will, of course, permit a paper to take a moderately conservative stand, but it is taboo to discuss the Establishment and its links with the International Communist Conspiracy. This is largely the reason why the information you read in *American Opinion*, which is readily available to all reporters, is not found in your local daily.

The fact of the matter is, in short, that the Establishment *Insiders* have virtually sewn up control of America's newspapers. They have control of our major television networks and newsmagazines too, but that is an area of The Media which we shall save for discussion in next month's issue of *American Opinion*. The details are as bizarre as they are fascinating.

#### FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> The Vice President has now become not only the President's best life-insurance policy against the ultimate excess of the unsophisticated Maniac Left, but also his ticket to re-election. The conservative wing of the G.O.P. will likely be kept from bolting the Party in 1972 by the prospect of Agnew for President in 1976.

<sup>2</sup> See "The C.F.R.—Conspiracy To Rule The World," *American Opinion*, April 1969.

<sup>3</sup> For details of the role played by Schiff and his Warburg brothers-in-law in the Communist Revolution, see "The Bankers," *American Opinion*, March 1970.

<sup>4</sup> For his service while in the Kennedy-Johnson Administrations, George Ball (C.F.R.) was made a Lehman Brothers partner.

<sup>5</sup> The direct representative of the English Rothschilds in the United States is Peter Fleck (C.F.R.), a partner in the bank of N.M. Rothschild & Sons of London. He has an office at 70 Pine Street, New York.

<sup>6</sup> Herman Dinsmore's well-documented exposé (*Arlington House*, New York, 1969) got the silent treatment from the Establishment media at the same time Gay Talese's *The Kingdom And The Power*, a gossip book written with the help of the *Times* to offset the influence of Dinsmore's book, received the full hullabaloo treatment from the Establishment Press.

<sup>7</sup> The *Times* has voiced opposition to every federal official who ever opposed domestic Communism—from A. Mitchell Palmer in 1918 to Otto Otepka in 1969.

<sup>8</sup> Certainly other members of the Chandler family are extremely patriotic and conservative, but they have been frozen out of all authority in the running of the newspaper.

<sup>9</sup> The *Chicago Tribune* has moved a long way into the middle of the road since the passing of Colonel McCormick. The *Trib's* Sunday Book Review section now comes from the *Washington Post*, a fact which must cause the Colonel to spend Sundays spinning in his grave.

<sup>10</sup> Naturally enough, Establishmentarian Newhouse keeps much of his wealth carefully protected within a tax-exempt foundation. He has 18 million readers, many of them in cities without competition. As Newhouse brags: "I've got more circulation around New York—765,000—than the *New York Times*."

## HOPE FOR WORLD PEACE IN CURRENT SALT NEGOTIATIONS

### HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 1970

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the strategic arms limitation talks—SALT—between this country and the Soviet Union have developed to a point where it now appears that a meaningful treaty is likely to emerge. I have continuously urged that such negotiations be conducted, and hailed the President's action at starting the talks last year.

The possibilities of halting the ever-escalating number of offensive and defensive missiles, such as the MIRV and the ABM, and the further possibility of reduced troop requirements in Europe fills the mind with a hope for real world peace.

However, though the potential may be there, success in the area of national security can only be measured in terms of hard facts and proved safety. Therefore, before the final treaty is signed, we must be sure that it contains the safeguards necessary to insure against violation of its covenants and that it does not leave the United States at a disadvantage from the start.

A treaty with the dimensions this one could have, and the fact that it is between the two superpowers of the world, is often difficult to relate to the domestic front and particularly to each individual and each family. Nevertheless, if we can meet with success in this area during the next year, the beneficial consequences for every American are innumerable.

#### OFFENSIVE MISSILE LIMIT

The broad aspects of agreements, as briefly outlined in the communique issued by the negotiators last month, indicate that present offensive missiles will be limited quantitatively. This would mean that our present arsenal of ICBM's and Polaris/Poseidon missiles would be frozen at present levels as would that of the Soviet Union.

This in itself would mean a substantial savings in offensive weapons production. We have a parity position—or perhaps a slight edge—with the U.S.S.R., at the moment which assures us of substantial firepower in case of nuclear attack. At present levels, our offensive weapons can inflict a degree of damage that would be unacceptable to the Soviets.

#### ABM LIMITATION

But there is a further and more significant provision being discussed in the current talks. This is the limitation of the U.S. defensive antiballistic missile systems—ABM—and the giant SS-9's. Freezing the development of these multi-billion-dollar systems would reduce the need for increased defense spending in the country over the next 20 years.

The ABM system became necessary when the Soviet Union began deployment of its massive SS-9's, an offensive missile which threatens to upset the balance between the two superpowers. At the same time, the U.S.S.R. began de-



velopment of its own ABM system around Moscow. The combination of fully deployed Soviet SS-9 and ABM systems would make the U.S. nuclear deterrent meaningless.

Top officials of the President's staff made public the offer of abandonment of the ABM system at a press briefing recently. It was also revealed that the Soviets have a 64-site antimissile system now installed around Moscow compared with the two U.S. sites under construction and two planned for locations out West.

#### BLUE CHIP ABM

The administration argues that the present ABM development planned by this country will serve as a blue chip in the table stakes during the Vienna conference. It is said that the system, once completed, would nullify the effects of the SS-9's; thus serving as an effective bargaining point. Be this as it may, if these talks are successful, the need for development of the ABM would be eliminated.

However, if the U.S.S.R. continues its production of the SS-9's and its ABM system, and pressures in the United States for reduced defense spending continue to prevail, the Soviets could be placed in the dominant position of being able to launch an all-out nuclear attack without fear of significant retaliation.

However, the SALT agreement could put a halt to this dangerous escalation and serve as a vehicle for further talks that might lead to multilateral reduction of international tensions between the two giants.

#### TROOP REDUCTION IN EUROPE

It is this latter possibility that offers the greatest hope for the future. The United States presently maintains over 300,000 troops in Europe as part of its commitment to NATO and as a first line of defense for this country. These troops cost the U.S. taxpayer \$14 billion annually.

The Soviets and their allies in Eastern Europe have indicated a willingness to reduce U.S.-Soviet troop levels on the continent on a bilateral basis. This would result in significant savings for the U.S. Government without compromising our national security position.

The billions of dollars that are presently slated to go for the ABM system, the MIRV system, and other necessary nuclear deterrents, could be channeled into needed domestic programs and lowered taxes. A successful treaty negotiation will definitely help ease the economic pressure that the increased defense spending needs have placed on the average taxpayer.

More importantly than the savings of billions of dollars, however, is the new national sense of security that eased international tensions and a real world peace would bring—a sense of security that is not based on a reign of terror and compounded by the fear of a possibly misguided and completely ruinous nuclear war.

#### HISTORICAL BACKING

This Nation shed the blood of many of its citizens in two world wars during this century. Their efforts were supposed to bring peace to the world and an end

to war for all time. That dream and that goal have yet to be realized.

At last this Nation is in a position to negotiate a treaty that will make the lives of those men lost so many years ago worth the terrible cost this country and their families have paid.

Peace! Peace through mutual realization of the life that the world can give, not the death that nuclear destruction could bring.

It is difficult not to express some words of joy at the hope that the dreams of our predecessors in this century may finally be realized at our hands. Every effort must be made—every channel pursued—to assure a U.S.-U.S.S.R. treaty on strategic arms limitation that will bring this goal to fruition. I am confident that the time for a lasting world peace is at hand and the writing on the wall spells SALT.

#### ROBERT ALEX BARON—FIGHTER FOR QUIETER CITIES

#### HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 1970

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, there is increasing awareness of the dangerous environmental hazard of noise pollution.

Scientists have proven that noise is not only damaging to the hearing, but also to the physical and mental health of human beings.

I have introduced legislation with 22 cosponsors—the Noise Control Act of 1970 (H.R. 16520 and H.R. 16708)—which would set up an Office of Noise Control within the Office of the Surgeon General of the United States.

The problem of noise has also aroused citizen group concern.

One such group is in New York City. The Citizens for A Quieter City, Inc., led by its director Robert Alex Baron, is working hard to document the danger of noise, to bring it to the attention of New Yorkers, and to see that something is done—before it is too late.

Recently, this organization received a \$300,000 grant from the Ford Foundation to make an initial study on noise and its effects.

I am including in the RECORD a profile from the August 25 New York Post, "Daily Closeup—The Storm Before the Quiet," by Lindsay Van Gelder. This article tells of Mr. Baron's work to make New York City a less noisy one.

I urge my colleagues to read this article, and to join the fight against noise pollution.

The article follows:

#### THE STORM BEFORE THE QUIET

"Unlike air pollution, noise doesn't kill you outright," says Robert Alex Baron. "It just makes every day a living nightmare."

Baron, executive director of Citizens for a Quieter City Inc., adds that excessive noise has been shown to cause fatigue, stress, accidents, irascibility, pain, occasional deafness and possible harm to unborn children. He's trying to do something about it.

The danger zone for human ears starts when noise, especially if prolonged, registers 85 decibels. Rumbling trucks and buses often

register 95, jackhammers 100, lawnmowers 98, building-top air conditioners 100, motorcycles 115, overhead jets 115, and amplified rock bands 120. One recent experiment showed that laboratory rats suffered death after prolonged exposure at 150 decibels.

"Big city noise is getting worse all the time, as new noisemakers are invented and put into use and congestion gets worse," said Baron, sitting in his Park Ave. office not far from a clattering Xerox machine.

"The problem now," he added, "is to get people moving before noise reaches the crisis level. We don't want to wait until the blood is running out of our ears."

Baron's organization recently received a \$300,000 grant from the Ford Foundation to study noise. The group plans to go into a New York neighborhood—as yet undisclosed—and begin sometime this fall.

The next step will be to "develop concern for the issue within the community and get people to demand quieter equipment and the implementation of the present anti-noise laws." Baron calls it "a sort of urban noise abatement demonstration project."

Baron got into the noise abatement business six years ago, purely by accident. Born in 1920 on Chicago's West Side, he was the oldest of four children of Morris Baron, a dairy technician, and the former Emma Bagus. Following in his father's footsteps, he graduated magna cum laude in dairy technology from the University of Illinois.

"That means I could make cottage cheese," he explains wryly. "Cheddar cheese was a graduate course." Baron worked briefly as a milk sanitarian outside Chicago and then joined the Army, serving in France and Germany in World War II.

While in the service, he helped produce soldier shows. After the war, he earned an M.A. in theater at Smith College and came to New York. He spent the next 20 years in the entertainment business with "a checkered career" of stage managing, running a theater tour service and doing research for the theater industry.

Six years ago, Baron and his wife, theater manager Joan DeKeyser Baron, were living on Sixth Av. and 55th St. with their daughter Stacey, then 2. Across the street, the Transit Authority was building a new subway station.

"The construction noise began at 7 a.m. and went to 5 p.m.," Baron recalled. "Plus a few evenings by permit." Tranquilizers didn't work.

The Barons and other frazzled tenants organized the Upper Sixth Av. Noise Abatement Assn. and appealed to their local legislators. "To our shock, we found that most of the noise was legal. Even today, only a fraction of city noise is against the law—like undue horn-honking. The noise ordinances are incredibly out of date."

Baron began spending increasing amounts of time buttonholing people at City Hall, the Transit Authority and the Health Dept. Then he went to Cincinnati for a six-month stint as a theater manager and stayed at a hotel located in the midst of a sand-blasting urban renewal project.

"I began to realize that this was a national problem, but there wasn't any national organization to combat it," he said. Baron joined a British noise abatement society—"I was so desperate to find some rapport."

Since his organization was officially incorporated in 1966, Baron has traveled to Holland, Germany and England for noise abatement conferences and he points out that Europeans have placed a high priority on the use of quieter sanitation, subway and construction equipment.

Baron now works full time as a noise fighter, with lecture work, writing (a book, "The Tyranny of Noise," will be published in the fall) and consulting.

He is a member of the Mayor's Council

on the Environment and the Commerce Technical Advisory Board Noise Abatement Panel of the U.S. Dept. of Commerce.

His hobby? "Reading everything I can get my hands on about noise."

**EARL WARREN OF THE UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION**

**HON. JOHN R. RARICK**

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations Association Chairman, Earl Warren, and his guests were quite outspoken recently on the recent hijacking of the U.S. aircraft.

Many find it strange that Chairman Warren did not explain his complicity in the international situation which he worked so many years to create and nurture, and which continues to destroy constitutional government and reduce the strength of the American people.

Perhaps the reason Mr. Warren and his group are more concerned about the hijacking of an airliner in the Middle East than about the hijacking of the USS *Pueblo*, the EC-121, and the USS *Liberty* or the many hijackings to Cuba, is that the Boeing 747 was not owned by Pan American but rather by a New York City bank.

Mr. Speaker, I include two related newsclippings at this point:

[From The Evening Star, Sept. 10, 1970]

"ALMOST UNBELIEVABLE"

(By Ymelda Dixon)

Secretary of State and Mrs. William P. Rogers stopped by briefly at the John Quincy Adams Rooms of the State Department last night.

He was outspoken on the hijackings: "It is almost an unbelievable situation. How could any people do these things?"

Rogers was deeply concerned about the welfare of the women and children on the planes. "It is so hot in those planes. I checked with Charles Tillinghast, president of TWA today. The airlines people are very helpful, and the other governments are as concerned as we are."

The Rogers, taking time to stop by at the reception which honored Henry Cabot Lodge, U.S. envoy to the Vatican and chairman of the President's Commission for the Observance of the 25th Anniversary of the United Nations, showed their esteem for Lodge and the United Nations.

Lodge, in town for meetings of the commission, will return to Rome in November.

He looks 10 years younger than when he was handling the peace talks with the North Vietnamese in Paris. He laughingly admitted it is much easier to deal with Rome than with the North Vietnamese.

Hosts at the magnificent 6 to 8 o'clock reception was the chairman of the United Nations Association of the U.S.A., former Chief Justice Earl Warren and Mrs. Warren.

Guests of honor with Lodge, were Frederick L. Ehrman and Spyros P. Skouras.

Skouras is general chairman of the annual United Nations Concert and Dinner in Washington, set for Oct. 17. A former movie mogul, he now is chairman of the Board of Prudential-Grace Lines.

In the manner of the Golden Greeks, he is building a great shipping line and hopes to help restore the prestige of the American merchant marine.

Mrs. Skouras is a rarity among the wives of film families—the first and only wife.

Last night, Mrs. Skouras and the Skouras' daughter, Mrs. George Fowler, wife of a Connecticut surgeon, both wore Dior gowns with diamond and turquoise jewelry.

Ambassador of Israel and Mrs. Rabin came to the reception, Rabin plainly showing the strain of the past weeks.

Leah Rabin was smart in an Israeli midi dress.

"Israeli women, with all their troubles, take time to think of fashion and are wearing the midi," said Mrs. Rabin, who recently returned from her homeland.

Secretary of Agriculture and Mrs. Clifford Hardin and many chiefs of diplomatic missions and their wives also attended.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 11, 1970]

TERROURISM: FALLOUT ON PAN AMERICAN

(By Robert J. Samuelson)

The Arab terrorists who destroyed a Boeing 747 in Cairo earlier this week may have channeled \$24 million into the coffers of Pan American World Airways.

Although the plane carried Pan Am's insignia, the jet actually belonged to the First National City Bank, which leased the aircraft to Pan Am.

Pan Am, however, shouldered the responsibility for insuring the plane, and now the company is considering keeping the \$24 million in insurance payments, airline officials said yesterday. Another Boeing 747—owned outright by the company—would be substituted in the lease agreement.

With large, unused lines of bank credit, Pan Am faces no immediate cash shortage, company officials said yesterday. Nevertheless, the extra \$24 million would provide an additional cushion of funds during a period marked by increasing anxiety over "liquidity."

Last year, Pan Am lost \$25 million, and so far in 1970, the company has recorded a \$12 million deficit, although these losses don't

accurately reflect the airline's cash flow. Depreciation on equipment, for example, officially counts as an expense but doesn't represent an immediate cash outlay.

According to one high Pan Am official, the airline could also decide to repay First National City Bank for the jet and simply eliminate the lease. In that case, he said, the airline actually might record a small profit, because the lease price is \$23 million and the insurance coverage is nearly \$24 million.

Precisely what happens, this official said, depends on a multitude of highly-technical factors—including which of two insurance policies covers the Cairo explosion. One policy protects the company from ordinary losses against airplane destruction (this is called "hull" insurance), and the other (called "war-risk" insurance) comes into force only as a result of a wartime loss.

"The war risk (insurers) claim that the loss is commercial, and the commercial (insurers) claim that it's war risk," the official said.

Reports that international airlines are receiving cancellation notices of insurance, industry experts said yesterday, probably center on war-risk policies. According to these experts, it's likely that hijacking losses will be classified universally as "war risks" for international carriers, and the policy rates may be raised.

These experts, however, minimized the possibility of a permanent loss of insurance.

For Pan Am, the loss of the 747 may constitute something less than a grave hardship, one airline analyst said yesterday. Like many other airlines, he said, Pan Am may have too many planes—too much "capacity"—for the available traffic.

If Pan Am decided to substitute another Boeing 747 for the destroyed plane in the First National City Bank lease the \$24 million in cash would not be recorded in as profit but simply as a transfer of assets from capital equipment to cash.

**MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?**

**HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 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.

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, September 14, 1970**

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*The just shall live by faith.* Romans 1: 17.

Almighty and most merciful Father, we begin the week conscious of our own need and yet aware of Thy great power to sustain us in our endeavors on behalf of our beloved land. Keep us faithful in the performance of our duties, loyal to every high and holy principle, responsive

to the needs of our citizens, and above all receptive to the leading of Thy living spirit.

We pray for our country—that as a people we may be delivered from malice, bitterness, and ill will. Strengthen within us all a true sense of justice, a due regard for the rights of others, and a genuine spirit of good will. Together may we get in step with Thee and with one another as we go forward to one Nation with liberty and justice for all.

In the Master's name, we pray. Amen.

**THE JOURNAL**

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, September 10, 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 a bill of the House of the following title: