sending combat troops to South Vietnam in 1963, there would not have been the search and rescue mission over the weekend, and had it not been for the expansion of the war in the 1960's, the issue would be much simpler today.

Mr. KENNEDY. Does the Senator have a question?

Mr. DOLE. The question is: Does the Senator consider the total war or does the Senator consider it on a day-to-day basis?

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator remarked earlier about the operation which we have addressed ourselves to. If the Senator is prepared to talk about the total war, I have stated my position and I am ready to state it again. I thought the total matter was expressed very well in the marvelous statement of the Senator from South Dakota today. We all remember the statement of the President in taking office that he had a plan to end this war. The Senator from South Dakota discussed that plan line by line and in detail. It remains to be rebutted by the Senator from Kansas or any other administration supporters. That was about as fine a detailed statement as has been made of our involvement over there, contrasted with what this administration pledged.

If the Senator is looking for a comment by me on whether mistakes were made by Democratic administrations during the 1960's, I say, "Amen. There certainly were."

The question now is, as I think what was stated so well by the Senator from South Dakota, let us look at the record in terms of this administration, and in terms of its pledges in the campaign. That has not been rebutted.

But I would be glad to discuss in further detail the Senator's earlier statement, although I think we have covered it adequately. I would be glad to remain if the Senator wishes to remain.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. DOLE. To bring the debate back into proper perspective, I return to one statement made by the junior Senator from South Dakota who stated:

American prisoners continue to languish in prison camps in North Vietnam.

I called attention to efforts made by a certain rescue operation to rescue American prisoners. I pointed out there was a continuing effort by this administration, by our Government, to protect American forces and to rescue Americans who were held captive for many years.

The Senator from Kansas feels as he did an hour ago: This is an obligation we have. It is a continuing obligation. I applaud Secretary of Defense Laird and those who participated and trust further efforts will be made to obtain the release of American prisoners and those missing in action.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE TWO HOUSES OF CONGRESS FOR THANKSGIVING HOLIDAY

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on House Concurrent Resolution 786.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPONG). The Chair lays before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 786, which will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 786

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on Wednesday, November 25, 1970, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, November 30, 1970.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 1, line 2 strike out "the House" and insert "Congress".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 786), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when Congress adjourns on Wednesday, November 25, 1970, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, November 30, 1970.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR PROXMIRE TOMORROW

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow immediately following the remarks of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN) during the morning hour, the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) be recognized for not to exceed 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment in accordance with the previous order.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 24, 1970, at 10 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL FOR OLDER AMERICANS, INC., DEDICATED TO IMPORTANT GOALS FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 23, 1970

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the Legislative Council for Older Americans, Inc., is dedicated to the advancement of Senior Power as a means of attaining a better life for senior citizens. I call to my colleagues' attention the important goals to which these citizens are dedicated:

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL FOR OLDER AMERICANS, INC.,
Boston, Mass., November 17, 1970.

The Legislative Council for Older Americans, Inc., a Boston-based senior citizens organization, is dedicated to the proposition that America's twenty million senior citizens are entitled to share in the American standard of living. To that end, we propose:

RETIREMENT INCOME

The enactment of social security during the depression years was a recognition by our nation that a planned retirement income maintenance plan was an essential ingredient in our economy. When the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed the social security act into law he commented, "We have laid the cornerstone for security for our older citizens." However, something has happened and we have not built the structure on this cornerstone. The deteriorating social and economic position of our retired population demands that we begin immediately to modernize and streamline our social security complex. The payroll tax has become regressive and is no longer a sufficient base to finance an adequate retirement income system. The Federal Government must become a financial partner in this field by adding a new financial dimension to the Social Security Trust Funds. The first step is to divert funds from the general revenues to supplement the payroll taxes until we achieve an arrangement whereby the employee pays one-third of the pension fund, the employer one-third and the Federal Government one-third. Only then will human needs become the dominant consideration in meeting the requirements of our Elders whose lives have been revolutionized by involuntary retirement, inflation, and the increased life span.

LOW- AND MODERATE-COST HOUSING

A large segment of our older citizens is faced with the problem of substandard housing. The home environment is of great importance to a retired person. He spends a good deal of his time in the home and the environment factors have an important bearing on his health, mental outlook and his general welfare.

It must be obvious that the private segment will not build the required housing for our low- and moderate-income Elders. It is, therefore, the job of the Federal Government and non-profit organizations to fill this void in our lives. States and municipalities can also share in this great task.

We need homes and we need them now!

MEDICAL CARE

Medicare was an important forward step in the problem of health care for senior citizens. However, it needs drastic revision to fill in the service gaps such as prescriptions, dentures and other services presently omitted in the Medicare program. Moreover, the rising cost of Medicare and the various supplementary medical insurance plans now threaten to drive thousands of Elders on the rolls of charity medical plans. The ultimate solution is a National Health Insurance Plan which will incorporate Medicare and give our senior citizens complete medical protection.

EMPLOYMENT

Millions of senior citizens possess the skills, experience and energy to continue their contribution to Government and private industry. However, we have practically been banished from private industry and government plans to provide service opportunities to Older Americans have been too fragmented and too insignificant to have an impact on this serious matter. A National Senior Service Volunteer Corps which will provide additional funds and opportunities for services to Elders, to children, and to the nation in general, should engage the immediate attention and action of the Congress of the United States.

The Legislative Council for Older Americans, Inc., is building Senior Power to accomplish the goals enumerated in the preceding paragraphs. We invite all Americans who believe that the generation which did so much to build the wealth and resources of America is entitled to a fair share of our national wealth to join with us in this great American crusade.

FRANK J. MANNING,
President.

PAUSE FOR PEACE

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 23, 1970

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, last October 29, during the recess of the Congress, it was my privilege to be the guest speaker at the regular meeting of the Kiwanis Club of Danville, Ill. Once a year the club affords me this opportunity to address them on current national and international problems and proposed solutions. I look forward to these occasions, when all political considerations are set aside and we simply endeavor to examine, as objectively as we know how, what has transpired and is likely to transpire in Congress and in the councils of Government.

My remarks on these occasions have been in the nature of a report from Washington—a nonpartisan accounting of my stewardship over the interests of the people I represent.

At the meeting last October the club called my attention to a "Pause for peace" resolution that they had adopted. It provided that at each regular club meeting, prior to the invocation, there would be a 15-second period of silent meditation on world peace as our common goal and what each of us might do to achieve that goal.

I am putting a copy of this resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks. You will note that the Danville Kiwanis Club seeks to have this same resolution adopted by all Kiwanis Clubs. This in itself is a contribution to the realization of world peace and of itself bespeaks the vision and the earnestness of the members of the club of Danville, Ill. It is with pride that I call this patriotic action to the attention of the Congress:

RESOLUTION

By action of the Board of Directors of the Kiwanis Club of Danville, Illinois, U.S.A.:

Whereas World Peace should be the goal of all mankind, and

Whereas Kiwanis International and each Kiwanis Club throughout the world should dedicate itself to achieve worthy goals, and

Whereas each Kiwanian and Kiwanis Club should become involved in attaining such worthy goals; therefore

Be it resolved that each Kiwanis Club adopt a "Pause for Peace" 15-second period of silent personal meditation prior to the invocation at each regular Club meeting, and

Be it further resolved that each Kiwanis Club, upon adoption of the "Pause for Peace", endorse its name upon this resolution and thru an interclub visit present same resolution to another Kiwanis Club in order that the power of Kiwanis and its membership might be directed toward the cause of World Peace.

We the undersigned Kiwanis Clubs, endorse the above resolution.

Resolution Endorsement _____.

Upon completion of the space for endorsement upon this resolution, it should be returned to the Kiwanis Club of Danville, Illinois 61832, U.S.A., for presentation to the Resolutions Committee of the annual convention of Kiwanis International in order that the "Pause for Peace" might be officially adopted as a project effort of Kiwanis.

A NEW LOOK AT THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 23, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, printed in the Prescott Courier on Veterans' Day was an interpretation of the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag by Mrs. Flannery's First Grade at Washington School. I would like to share with my colleagues its simplicity and beauty:

WHAT DOES THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE MEAN?

(By Alex Perkins)

(EDITOR'S NOTE: When pondering over what to print on Veterans' Day, we ran across the following interpretations of the "Pledge of Allegiance To The Flag" from Mrs. Flannery's First Grade at Washington School—wouldn't it be great if all people of the world were as unafraid to speak the truth as six and seven-year-olds?)

I—Means anyone who lives in the United States. Sven Holt.

Pledge—Is a promise. If you make a promise you should keep it. Chris Spackey.

Allegiance—Means loyalty. You are a good friend to the United States. Charlie McCormick.

To the—Just this one flag, not the flag of any other Country. Pablo Alvarez.

Flag—White is for honesty, red is for the blood of Americans, blue is for being a good friend. Terry Ford.

Of—Our flag stands for our Country and no other one. Jim Scofield.

The United States—There are 50 states but we are one together under one leader. Scott Boerner.

Of America—We are Americans but our Country is a part of North America. Lewis Pendergast.

And to the—Besides the flag we pledge allegiance to our government. Danny Tomlinson.

Republic—That is a kind of government where there is a President that we vote for. Joanne Sudbrink.

For which it stands—The flag makes us think of the U.S.A. We don't have a king or dictator. Dan Soriano.

One Nation—50 states together in one country with lots of different people. Pamela Ott.

Under God—The men who began our Country prayed to God, and we still do. Dawn Boraski.

Indivisible—That means you can't break our Country apart. Laurie Despain.

With liberty—We are free to do what we want to, except if it is against the law. Tina Wilson.

And justice—In our Country people are treated fair and we don't cheat. Karen Brock.

For all—Everybody in the United States gets liberty and justice. Grace Madrid.

THE SUPPRESSED REPORT—A CASE OF POSSIBLE JUDICIAL PREJUDICE

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 23, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, in No. 78, Federalist Paper, Alexander Hamilton said:

Making the proper deductions for the ordinary depravity of human nature, the number (of Justices) must be still smaller of those who unite the requisite integrity with the requisite knowledge.

For the first time in the history of our Nation, a Federal judge has issued a permanent injunction against the public printing of a report compiled by a duly authorized congressional committee.

Congressional investigations serve several purposes. In the first place, the Congress must inform itself in order to determine whether existing laws are meeting the needs of the people. The Congress must have the investigatory power if it is to carry out the duties for which it was established.

Congressional investigations also act as a check on the other branches of the Government. The fact that the various executive departments are subject to scrutiny by Congress serves as a brake on some of the more outstandingly bad schemes devised by shortsighted bureaucrats and arrogant pseudo-intellectuals. Some of the recent reports emanating from Presidential commissions show how far into fantasyland those not directly responsible to the voters can wander.

The third function of equal or greater importance performed by congressional investigations is getting information to the citizens of the Nation, who otherwise would be forced to rely almost entirely on the mass media, now controlled to a large extent by people of "radical-liberal" inclinations. This is the congressional in-

vestigatory function at which the recent Federal court decision has struck.

Judge Gerhard Gesell has decreed that while the list of college speakers attached to revolutionary organizations—see my newsletter 70–17 "Campus Violence and the War"—can be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the price of which recently tripled, the Public Printer's cannot make this information available to the general public. Judge Gesell has decided that the American people should not have access to this much-needed information through the regular channels which exist for the dissemination of material which their elected representatives regard as vitally important. It is a clear case of censorship.

The reasoning exhibited in Judge Gesell's decision—Hentoff et al. against Richard H. Ichord et al.—is incredibly twisted. In fact it is even worse than that revealed in the "Gesell report," a Presidential commission report issued in 1963 with equal opportunity in the armed forces. Gerhard Gesell was Chairman of this "distinguished panel" which included such notables as Abe Fortas. In my opinion, the implementation of the findings of this commission has been one of the main factors in the increasingly poor morale and growing racial violence in our Armed Forces. If the Judge's decision in the case under discussion stands, it will have even graver effects.

In finding against the House Committee on Internal Security, Judge Gesell says that the publication of this committee's report will tend to inhibit "free speech." The use of the term "free speech" in this case is somewhat ironic. One of the major points the committee wished to make was that a very large amount of money was being dispensed by the colleges and universities to various persons preaching revolution. Nat Hentoff, the individual represented by the American Civil Liberties Union in the suit against the congressional committee, received $4,700 for the four free speeches he is listed as having made.

Judge Gesell seems to think that responsible college administrators might, in the light of the information presented by the committee, think twice about paying speakers to radicalize their students. He seems to feel that this is unfair to the revolutionaries. He seems to feel that their right to indoctrinate young people to hate their country and their form of government stands above the right of the citizens of the Nation to know who the sowers of hate are, and how much they are being paid. Therefore he has ruled that the list voluntarily supplied by various colleges and universities may not be distributed through the regular channels.

Existing legal precedent is flatly contrary to Judge Gesell's opinion. In 1956, a panel of three Federal judges decided in a similar case that "we have no more authority to prevent Congress, or a committee or a public officer acting at the express direction of Congress, from publishing a document than to prevent them from publishing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD." Exactly.

If Gesell's decision is upheld, there is no telling how far it may lead. For the past several years J. Edgar Hoover has been testifying to the burgeoning influx of Communist speakers on the college campuses. His annual testimony is printed at public expense and distributed to interested citizens. Under the Gesell decision, it is quite possible that this could no longer be done.

The interesting question has arisen as to whether Judge Gesell should have disqualified himself from deciding this particular case, since his father, Arnold Gesell, was once listed in a previous report by the same committee whose report he is trying to suppress, as a speaker at a conference organized by a group which the Attorney General had declared Communist and subversive.

If anything can awaken Congress to call a halt to the erosion of its power which has been going on since 1933, it will be this decision.

THE SHINING STAR OF CHRISTMAS

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 23, 1970

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mr. Henry T. Voltz, a teacher in the Orleans Parish Public School System, has written a poem entitled "The Shining Star of Christmas," which contains an important message for all of us.

It is heartening to note that we have men of his caliber educating our young people today. We can look to the future with confidence with men like Mr. Voltz molding our leaders of tomorrow.

Because I feel so strongly about the poetic message expressed by Mr. Voltz, I want to include his effort in the RECORD at this point:

THE SHINING STAR OF CHRISTMAS

(By Henry T. Voltz)

I

Amidst the joys of Christmas
With holly and mistletoe,
Let's not forget its meaning
In the lustre of the glow.
So give your fellowman today
God's gifts of hope and love
That He gave our country long ago
With the olive branch and dove.

II

May the guiding star of Christmas
That shone bright that holy night,
Give our country Thy protection
Lasting through each morning's light.
Let it guide all nations' freedoms,
Cleanse the world of fear and hate
Thanking God for our own homeland—
Always help us keep it great.

III

Keep the Shining Star of Christmas
With our flag's red, white, and blue,
Let us welcome Christ the Savior
As we honor our country too;
Let the stars in our Old Glory
Shine as one on Bethlehem
And thank God for our great country—
Never Let the Star Grow Dim!

THE PRIVILEGE OF BEING AN AMERICAN

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 23, 1970

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, several of my constituents brought to my attention a speech given by Maj. Harry Pawlik of Nellis Air Force Base to newly naturalized American citizens in the Federal Court in Las Vegas, Nev., on September 17, 1970. After reading a copy of the speech, I felt it would be of interest to many others to read this very fine statement concerning the privilege of being an American. The following is a text of that speech:

MAJ. HARRY PAWLIK'S SPEECH

Your Honor, Ladies and Gentlemen. It is an honor and privilege for me to share this memorable moment with you, our new American Citizens. Twenty-three years ago on the 22 of September 1947 I came to this great Free Country. On the 17 of July 1953, I had my memorable moment. On that morning I raised my right hand, took an oath, and became a part owner of the greatest free nation in the world. Today you have joined that partnership which we share with some 200 million fellow American citizens. With this partnership, you have inherited numerous privileges, rights, and freedoms as well as some obligations.

The God who gave us life also gave us liberty. There is a voice in the soul of every human being that cries out to be free. America has answered that voice of many languages. Today, that voice is again answered in several different languages in this Court Room.

As new American citizens, you are now entering a way of life and freedom called Democracy. It recognizes liberty of the individual to determine the course of his own actions, subject only to restrictions the same for all. Democracy allows every citizen to go as far as ambition, ability, knowledge, and skill will permit.

With your citizenship, you have inherited some precious rights and freedoms. You have the right to pursue a happy life—you can vote for the person of your choice—each citizen has the right to accumulate property and possessions—and you have the right to a just and speedy trial by jury. Under the Bill of Rights, we have guaranteed to us what we call the big four freedoms: Freedom of Religion, Speech, Press, and Assembly.

Each citizen is guaranteed the right to worship as he sees fit.

Each citizen has the right to say what he pleases as long as he does not harm others.

We have a press which is free to print the news without fear of government action.

And you and I have the right to get together and ask Congress to write new laws or abolish old ones.

The Constitution of the United States recognizes the dignity of the individual, but it also suggests that each citizen would have to make certain sacrifices in order to preserve and protect his freedom. He will have to pay taxes, submit to the will of the majority, and obey the law of the land. He might even be required to bear arms in defense of his country. Freedom has never been free. It has always been very costly. Over a million of our countrymen have died for it. Freedom always has to be earned.

As new American citizens, you should be glad to be free to work, eat, sleep, and pray

and love and live as you desire, as you believe. Rights, freedoms, and privileges will soon become a part of your everyday life—you should never take them for granted. You have inherited these rights—freedoms and privileges from generations of men and women who valued them enough to work and to fight for them through hardship and suffering.

Their work, hardships, and suffering should not have been in vain. In these modern and sophisticated times, many people seem to get embarrassed at the words patriotism and service for our country. I am not one of these persons—I hope that you will never be. Patriotism to me is a conviction that what I am upholding and preserving is right. Patriotism isn't marching behind a band and throwing out your chest. It isn't a flash of fireworks one day of the year—nor is it found in the screams of a crowd. Patriotism is the sum of the three cardinal virtues: Faith, Hope, a d Charity.

Faith in the principles of our Government.

Hope in the future of our Country.

Charity toward all and malice toward none.

Partiotism is loving one' country, respecting its traditions, and honoring its people, be they rich or poor, white or colored, young or old. Patriotism is standing firm and unselfish for the right, for the common good, and the people and well-being of all—sacrificing yourself if need be and standing unafraid against all opposition.

Fellow Americans, I am proud to live in this great land of ours—a land where there is always the chance to dream and then work till those dreams come true. I value highly the opportunity to serve as a professional among professionals in the defense of freedom and our country. I will endure many hardships for my beliefs and love for my country. I owe freedom and the chance for a new life to this great nation. America is our country, yours and mine, all fifty states of it. We are heirs to a brave and Godly Heritage. With so much we have responsibility. Government by the people means Government by you and by me. Its successful functioning demands that every citizen carry out his obligation to make it work. We must care for our country, keep it strong and beautiful, perpetuate its freedom, and preserve our nation's position as the number one free country in all the world. We must work hard and dream big, and keep the torch of Freedom burning.

This great land is our land, yours and mine—we are Americans. Thank you and best of luck always.

LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAM

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 23, 1970

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, the dismissal of Mr. Terry Lenzner and Mr. Frank Jones from the OEO legal services program this past weekend is most regrettable.

Contrary to the best advice in the country, the legal services program has been regionalized and demasculated.

This acquiescence to local political pressure will increasingly prevent OEO from vigorously asserting the legal rights of the poor.

I am extremely concerned that the legal services program, which is badly needed in our disadvantaged communities, will no longer be able effectively to promote the best interests of its clients in politically sensitive areas. To the extent that regionalization reduces the professional integrity and independence of the program it does a disservice to the very people whom the program is intended to benefit.

I strongly urge that OEO reconsider its recently issued regulations and restore the legal services program to the independence which the public interest requires it to have.

EXTENSION OF U.S. FISHERY LIMITS

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 23, 1970

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, conservation of our coastal fishery resources is of the utmost concern to U.S. citizens, both economically and as a source of food. It was with considerable apprehension several years ago that we first viewed the appearance of Japanese and Russian fishing fleets off the coast of Alaska. As time went by and these foreign fishery operations steadily expanded their efforts to include all species of fish on the entire Pacific coast, the matter of conservation became serious enough to warrant Federal legislation. This legislation provided for a 12-mile fishery zone—an extension of 9 miles seaward in addition to our 3-mile territorial waters.

We said at the time that this was a step in the right direction, but by no means sufficient to protect and preserve our coastal stocks of fish. The problem was extremely serious at the time of the enactment of the 12-mile limit, but it has reached crisis proportions today.

In my district, the Alaska Fishermen's Union has set forth a policy in this regard which is of interest to all Americans, and I insert this statement at this point in the RECORD:

EXTENSION OF U.S. FISHERY LIMITS

Recognition of conservation in waters outside present territorial waters came to a head at the Law-of-the-Sea Conference held in Geneva, Switzerland, in 1958. Out of that conference came four specific conventions, one of which deals specifically with the Conservation of the Living Resources of the High Seas This convention recognizes the rights of all nations to fish on the high seas but it also recognizes that a coastal state has a special interest in its coastal fisheries, and imposes an obligation on participating nations to meet with such coastal states for the purpose of reaching agreement pertaining to conservation.

Nations which are not signatories to the convention are not bound by or under obligation to adhere to regulations enacted by the coastal states. The U.S.S.R. and Japan are not signatories to the Geneva Convention dealing with Conservation of the Living Resources on the High Seas; consequently, 33,000 miles of shoreline in Alaska as well as the coastlines of Washington, Oregon and California are without any protection conservationwise outside the 12-mile limit, except for some bilateral agreements, which, in themselves, are not adequate to do the job.

Bilateral agreements with Japan and the Soviets which are now in existence involve king crab which has been badly overfished, as well as abstention from fishing in certain areas where Pacific perch and rockfish have experienced depletion.

While quotas on king crab have been established, limiting Japan and Russia to a specific number of cases, these quotas do not include incidental catches of crabs which are caught in the foreign vacuum cleaner dragging operations. Consequently, the take of this valuable specie of shell fish far exceeds reasonable limits required by conservation and we can expect further deterioration of the crab population in the Bering Sea area.

Other bilateral agreements are of short duration, and while helpful during their period of existence, actually they are unable to stop foreign nations, once a stock has been rebuilt, from again wiping out the fruits of our conservation by the tremendous fishing effort they are able to exert.

In any event, the bilateral agreements as we see them can only serve as a stopgap measure and have little or no influence on over-all conservation of Pacific stocks of fish.

While our figures on foreign fishery activities off the Pacific Coast are by no means complete, the Russian and Japanese catches run into billions of pounds. The species fished upon involve every type of bottom fish, such as, cod, sable-fish, sole, flounder, rockfish, pollock, Pacific perch, etc. Foreign fishery operations for herring in Eastern Bering Sea are becoming more extensive every year. The fisheries conducted by Russia and Japan also involve crab and shrimp, as well as a large fishery on hake. Incidental catches of king crab and halibut are a contributing factor to the depletion of those species.

The Japanese have declared their intentions to start a new fishery in 1971 on saury. This fishery will involve thirty-three vessels ranging from 300 to 500 tons each. We can expect a significant decrease in saury, once this operation gets under way.

During the year 1969, there were 1269 large fishing vessels of foreign nations observed off the coast of Alaska. So far in 1970, the figure is 1151. Of course, there may be more, but the number stated here has been definitely established by observation conducted by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries. In our opinion, had the foreign fishing pressure been as heavy off Washington, Oregon and California as we have seen it in Alaska the Congressional delegations from these states would have taken more interest than has been the case so far. With pressure building up and depletion an imminent factor, it behooves all West Coast states to work closely together.

There are definite indications of overfishing on many species of fish, especially rockfish, perch and king crab. The halibut resource is not going to survive unless incidental catches can be regulated and sable fish will eventually become another casualty.

What does all this fishing mean in terms of our future supply of fish? There will be no future supply unless the public becomes concerned enough to demand a national policy which will provide survival for United States fishery resources, and concerned enough to force the bureaucratic setup, wherever it exists, to do a job instead of polishing their backsides in easy chairs. Recently, in public meetings held in Oregon and Washington, members of Congress and other government officials heard a great deal of testimony—mainly by salmon trollers—which would indicate a number of violations of the 12-mile limit as well as harassing tactics which placed United States' fishermen's lives in danger, and caused the loss of considerable gear. Allegations were also made that salmon was being taken in large numbers by the foreign fishermen, and there were many other charges of encroachment by foreign nationals.

Violations of present fishery limits are a serious matter, but even without any violations, our coastal fisheries are being de-

pleted by overfishing outside the 12-mile limit. Therefore, an extended fishery limit is not only desirable, but a *necessity*. Our proposal on this would be full jurisdiction over all fish on our continental shelf, plus 200 miles where the shelf would not adequately protect the resource.

Our proposal would provide for management control for conservation purposes, and in cases where the United States did not ultilize the resource, foreign fisheries could be allowed to fish by a licensing system under conservation rules which would allow the maintenance of the resource on a sustained yield basis. We feel this is a rational approach to a most difficult problem, and, certainly if steps are not taken in time, there will be nothing left to regulate in the future.

Available information dictates stern measures. We are aware not all of the United States fishing industry is in agreement on the measures we are recommending, but, in the final analysis, regardless of recommendations by individuals or any particular group, our national policy must be based on what best serves the interests of conservation.

We are basing our demands for extended fishery limits solely on conservation and not on any desire to gain more territorial waters. We do not believe the conservation issue can be resolved by bilateral or multilateral agreements with foreign nations because twelve years have passed since the Geneva Conference in 1958 and we have, as yet, been unable to get those nations which are putting the most fishing pressure on us to ratify the convention regarding Conservation of the Living Resources of the High Seas, and, under the terms of the convention, to discuss conservation.

No responsible person or agency in government can justify destruction of our coastal resources by following a do-nothing policy or a policy which prolongs the agony of depletion. Questions have been raised on what will happen to our North Pacific salmon if we adopt the continental shelf principle for free-swimming fish and a 200-mile limit. Our position on adequate protection for salmon has been expressed on many former occasions. For the information of those who may not know the early history of salmon and United States' thinking on conservation, we insert Secretary of State Cordell Hull's statement of November 22, 1937, and also the Truman Proclamation of 1945:

"Large bodies of American citizens are of the opinion that the salmon runs of Bristol Bay and elsewhere in Alaskan waters are an American resource; that the salmon fisheries relate to and are linked with the American continent, particularly the Northwest area, and that, for all practical purposes, the salmon industry is in fact a part of the economic life of the Pacific Northwest Coast. The fact that salmon taken from waters off the Alaskan coast are spawned and hatched in American inland waters, and when intercepted are returning to American waters, adds further to the conviction that there is in these resources a special and unmistakable American interests.

"It must be taken as a sound principle of justice that an industry such as described which has been built up by the nationals of one country cannot in fairness be left to be destroyed by the nationals of other countries. The American government believes that the right of obligation to protect the Alaskan salmon fisheries is not only overwhelmingly sustained by conditions of their development and perpetuation but that it is a matter which must be regarded as important to the comity of the nations concerned."

In September, 1945, President Harry S. Truman issued the following historic proclamation:

POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES WITH RESPECT TO COASTAL FISHERIES IN CERTAIN AREAS OF THE HIGH SEAS

"Whereas for some years the Government of the United States of America has viewed with concern the inadequacy of present arrangements for the protection and perpetuation of the fishery resources contiguous to its coasts, and in view of the potentially disturbing effect of this situation, has carefully studied the possibility of improving the jurisdictional basis for conservation measures and international cooperation in this field; and

"Whereas such fishery resources have a special importance to coastal communities as a source of livelihood and to the nation as a food and industrial resource; and

"Whereas the progressive development of new methods and techniques contributes to intensified fishing over wide sea areas and in certain cases seriously threatens fisheries with depletion; and

"Whereas there is an urgent need to protect coastal fishery resources from destructive exploitation, having due regard to conditions peculiar to each region and situation and to the special rights and equities of the coastal State and any other State which may have established a legitimate interest therein;

"Now, Therefore, I Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim the following policy of the United States of America with respect to coastal fisheries in certain areas of the high seas:

"In view of the pressing need for conservation and protection of fishery resources, the Government of the United States regards it as proper to establish conservation zones in those areas of the high seas contiguous to the coasts of the United States wherein fishing activities have been or in the future may be developed and maintained on a substantial scale. Where such activities have been or shall hereafter be developed and maintained by its nationals alone, the United States regards it as proper to establish explicitly bounded conservation zones in which fishing activities shall be subject to the regulation and control of the United States. Where such activities have been or shall hereafter be legitimately developed and maintained jointly by nationals of the United States and nationals of other States, explicitly bounded conservation zones may be established under agreements between the United States and such other States; and all fishing activities in such zones shall be subject to regulation and control as provided in such agreements. The right of any state to establish conservation zones off its shores in accordance with the above principles is conceded, provided that corresponding recognition is given to any fishing interests of nationals of the United States which may exist in such areas. The character as high seas of the areas in which such conservation zones are established and the right to their free and unimpeded navigation are in no way thus affected.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

"Done at the City of Washington this 28th day of September, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and forty-five, and of the Independence of the United States of America the hundred and seventieth."

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

By the President:

DEAN ACHESON,
Acting Secretary of State.

In his official White House release, President Truman said: ". . . . as a result of the establishment of this new policy, the United States will be able to protect effectively, for instance, its most valuable fishery, that for the Alaska salmon."

We are in accord with these statements and believe our position in establishing fishery zones for conservation purposes does not deviate in principle from what President Truman said in 1945. With regard to salmon, we have claimed ownership, and while the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission has had to adhere to the terms of the Tri-Partite Treaty, the record will show the Commission has taken a strong position in each of its annual meetings that there should be an abstention of high seas fishing on North American stocks of salmon. The abstention principle, which would have precluded foreign fishing on salmon stocks of North American origin, was inserted in the treaty, but, due to ambiguous language, it has not been possible to implement the spirit and intent of the treaty. Thus, a rather substantial part of North American stocks of salmon have been harvested by the Japanese and also to a smaller extent by South Korea. We estimate 33% of the allowable catch in Bristol Bay has been taken by these nations.

We do not believe in high seas fishing for salmon because such fishing violates every principle of good conservation. We believe Japan is fully entitled to the fruits of her own salmon propagation—and so is South Korea—but they should harvest their own salmon in their respective coastal waters and should not insist upon a high seas fishery effort which is not only harmful to conservation but which forces United States fishermen to abstain from fishing in order to provide necessary escapement, thus placing the United States in the position of conserving for the benefit of foreign nations.

While we are unalterably opposed to high seas fishing for salmon, we cannot ignore the fact such fishing does take place, and it is for these reasons conservation rules to protect the resource must be established.

While there are some questions that the continental shelf and/or a 200-mile limit can fully protect North American salmon stocks, it most certainly will offer more protection against foreign fisheries activities for salmon than we have at the present time.

Japan is the only country of potential foreign fisheries for salmon with which we have a treaty. We believe Japan, with her many and varied fishery interests on the Pacific Coast, would have to give most serious consideration to many aspects of her fisheries before embarking upon a course which would decimate North Pacific salmon.

The dire predictions of what foreign nations would do if the United States takes unilateral action and extends its present fishery zones, have come from our spokesmen in the Department of State and not from any foreign nations. With the bargaining lever of the continental shelf and a 200-mile limit, we are in a much better position to deal with foreign nations which are not willing to cooperate with us on conservation. We would like to stress that our entire demands for wider fishery limits are made solely for the purpose of conservation and because we see no other possibility of reaching a meaningful agreement which will primarily provide conservation, and give the American fisherman an opportunity to enjoy the fruits of his own conservation.

Government proposals are pending regarding conservation of coastal fishery stocks, but after careful consideration we have concluded that we must reject them as being inadequate to furnish the protection we seek and need for our fisheries. We cannot agree that any and all nations have equal right to exploit and utilize resources immediately adjacent to United States territorial waters even though there is an attempt to provide conservation. The methods by which the conservation measures would be enforced are cumbersome to say the least, and would entail time-consuming processes which would easily lead to depletion before the question was resolved. In this connection, we respectively suggest that both our national security as well as the future economic strength of the United States will, in a large measure, be dependent upon the minerals and living resources we have in our coastal waters.

Moreover, in addition to conservation, there is a question of utilization on our part. United States interests cannot be served by providing conservation of our coastal re-

sources for the benefit of foreign nations. We believe in securing the benefits for the United States citizens first, and for participating nations secondly.

The steps tentatively proposed by government sources in relation to our fisheries are no doubt designed to provide possible elimination of objections from foreign governments. We believe we most certainly can count on objections if we try to safeguard our resources, and we will never achieve worthwhile results if we are more concerned about objections than we are in preserving our own resources for our own people.

It would appear that the widening of our present fishery limits is too simple in its direct approach to the question, as far as our government is concerned. We still believe it is better than to go through a number of intricate, time-consuming legal steps which have to involve international agreements and which can be prolonged to a point where conservation will suffer irreparable harm.

The United States is now dependent, and will become more so, upon foreign sources for many important minerals. Unless we assert further jurisdiction over our continental shelf for minerals and living resources alike, our future fisheries supply will be another item of dependency. The generosity of the United States is well-known to the world. Many foreign nations have been dependent upon our goodwill and our donations to rebuild their shattered economies and to help them emerge as stable and prosperous countries.

We cannot, forever, continue the giveaway without running short. One must wonder how the American people will react if told that our valuable fisheries resources have been destroyed through foreign fisheries. How can responsible people in government charged with the duties of preserving our fishery stocks explain their role of adhering to and following policies which accomplish depletion?

Perhaps the fishermen do not understand the intricacies of foreign policy and decisions made on the higher levels of government, but they do understand what the loss of the resource means to them economically, and the American public should understand what this loss of a food resource will mean when it is no longer available to us.

If our people could see the unbroken line of foreign fishing vessels on both the east and west coasts of the United States, if they could visualize that this fleet is taking billions upon billions of pounds of fish, if they could understand that the freedom to fish which these vessels now enjoy is freedom to destroy our coastal stocks, perhaps—if these things were fully understood—we would then be in the position to affect the necessary changes to provide conservation and utilization, and to uphold the rights of American fishermen to enjoy the fruits of their own conservation efforts.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 23, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,500 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

CITY WITH PLANS FOR CHANGE

HON. FRANK M. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 23, 1970

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, Beaver Falls, Pa., which is located in my congressional district is the home of the Babcock & Wilcox Co.'s Tubular Products Division.

In the October edition of the company's publication the Generator, an interesting article appeared on the town of Beaver Falls which I recommend my colleagues to read:

CITY WITH PLANS FOR CHANGE: BEAVER FALLS

Ten years ago this fall, a young quarterback named Joe Namath was setting records as he led the Beaver Falls High School team to a Pennsylvania football championship. Over the decade, "Broadway Joe" has achieved creaky-kneed stardom and brought national fame to his hometown.

But more than a century before the "Namath Era," Beaver Falls was known as a flourishing trade center. The locale was once a pivotal transportation point as barge traffic transferred from the Erie Canal to the Ohio River at the mouth of the Beaver River. And later, Beaver Falls became the cradle of the cold drawn steel industry after the process was developed in nearby factories. As other industries burgeoned, the city grew into the retail center for what was the seventh largest manufacturing county in the nation, and its broad Seventh Avenue attracted fashionable stores and shops.

But, like many small American cities, it began to change its role as suburban living became the trend. With the growth of real estate subdivisions, shopping centers sprang up, and the importance of the central city began to decline.

Over the past 20 years, Beaver Falls' population has decreased 25 percent. Municipal planners describe this shrinkage as "out-migration," or the movement from the center of the city to the suburbs. A corresponding growth can be seen in the townships surrounding Beaver Falls.

Over two decades, B&W's Tubular Products division plant in Beaver Falls has enjoyed steady growth. In 1950 the plant employed less than 3,000 people. Today B&W is the third largest employer in the county with a payroll of 7,700 men and women.

This increase in job opportunities results from an overall investment by the company of about $100 million in facilities and equipment. Tube Division employees in Beaver Falls produce some 600,000 tons of steel each year and transform it into a wide variety of specialty tube products. Their average age is 39 and the average length of employment is 13 years. A large number are "second generation" employees, and many have relatives currently working in the plant.

Last year, a comprehensive study of the city's business and industrial climate was published by the Beaver Falls planning commission. The report voices approaches to urban renewal that have been discussed in the town for many years. And it concludes that urban renewal in Beaver Falls waits upon the completion of two highways.

Currently intrastate traffic pours through the downtown area on Route 18. The new Beaver Valley Expressway, which will link the town with Pittsburgh, has already come within 12 miles of Beaver Falls. It will be completed in about a year. The bypass will carry much of the traffic around the town. This bypass, the report concludes, will pave the way for the redesigning of the downtown area—which will hopefully become the business center of northern Beaver County again.

Some of the elements for renewal are already present. For example, the Harmonites a 19th century society who at one time owned the townsite, designed Seventh Avenue wide enough so that two ox carts could make simultaneous "U" turns in it. The unusual width of the main thoroughfare provides ample space for various design changes. The street is lined with more than a mile of stores and shops. Many reflect an appeal to youth in their names.

The planning commission explains that several steps must be taken to improve the economy of the street.

"The influx of several shopping centers—Northern Lights, Kaufmann's, K Mart, and the Route 18 Center—has 'cut into' the Seventh Avenue retail trade; Beaver Falls merchants must innovate programs that will permit them to compete on more equal terms with shopping centers." The planning commission suggests that the recommendations of a Chamber of Commerce program entitled "Operation Face-Lift" be substantially adopted.

These recommendations include: designing additional Seventh Avenue parking areas, constructing shopping malls for pedestrian convenience, and meeting a critical housing shortage in the city by building apartments downtown. Already, the Franklin Towers and Geneva Arms apartment complexes offer several hundred modern housing units. Plans are being made to build more complexes.

Leonard Chiapetta, president of the Beaver Falls Chamber of Commerce, was one of the driving forces behind "Operation Face-Lift" and is presently a leader of the city's downtown renewal effort. "We have spent years studying our problems and trying to organize our efforts to bring about necessary changes. Today, I can see that our work is beginning to pay off," he said.

PLIGHT OF THE FARMER IN AMERICA

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 23, 1970

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I felt very frustrated during consideration of the farm bill by the House of Representatives.

My frustration was caused by the apparent lack of understanding for the role of the farmer in our American economy and of the true economic condition of agriculture.

I have been reading "1961 to 1970, The Farmers' Worst 9 Years," by Frank M. LeRoux.

Mr. LeRoux well knows whereof he speaks.

From 1961 to September 1966, he served as general sales manager of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. He went there after 30 years experience as a farmer, businessman, and civic leader. His extensive farming experiences have included the production of both dry land and irrigated crops, as well as livestock.

He went to the Department of Agriculture with strong backing from Western Agriculture.

His participation in the administrative end of Government in Washington, D.C., was based on the conviction that a successful agricultural policy demands a

balanced representation in the high policy levels of governmental agriculture. He shared the concern of many that the lack of sufficient grass roots farmer and business representation in the high positions of Agriculture was damaging to the interests of the American farmer and to the Nation. He also felt that the best of intention, on the part of even the ablest bureaucrat, cannot make up for the lack of a true understanding of the business end of farming.

Mr. LeRoux points out that the food processors reported net profits of 2,000 percent more in 1969 than the net profit of our Nation's 515,000 largest farmers, based on the same economic standards and that the net profit to food retailers in 1969 over 1967 showed an increase of 477 percent additional, over what the Nation's 515,000 largest farmers' total net profit.

Mr. Speaker, these are figures to be considered.

The operating financial condition of American agriculture today is the worst in the history of the United States based on every economic principle used to determine the success or failure of other business and industry, and this during the period of greatest prosperity in the history of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, our farm people spoke eloquently through the ballot boxes on November 3. I pray their voices were heard here in Washington.

A TECHNICAL DIRECTOR'S VIEW OF NATIONAL OCEANIC INTERESTS

HON. GEORGE E. SHIPLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 23, 1970

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, following is a speech given by Dr. William B. McLean, technical director of the Naval Undersea Research and Development Center regarding research and development aspects of oceanography. This speech was given at a recent meeting of the American Oceanic Organization at which Dr. McLean was the guest speaker. I think this will be interesting reading for my colleagues. The speech follows:

A TECHNICAL DIRECTOR'S VIEW OF NATIONAL OCEANIC INTERESTS

(By Dr. William B. McLean)

I feel it is a great honor to be able to address your American Oceanic Organization on some of the subjects which are of great interest to me. From the introduction, you are aware that I have had some experience in the designing of guided missiles. I hope you will, therefore, forgive me if I use as the basis of my talk the fact that guided missiles have changed our national methods of operating more than we like to believe. In my opinion, the nation has not yet adjusted our military and other oceanographic programs to the full extent necessary to compensate for the efforts yet to be demonstrated, of guided missiles on the world's politics.

To be more specific, I believe first, that guided missiles are making and will continue to make the overflight of defended territory extremely costly if done without political permission. Dominion over the air space from the ground up is well established in international law, and only minimum restrictions exist to shooting down uninvited aircraft with ground and air-launched missiles.

Second, I believe the surface of the sea is losing some of its importance for the transport of people and priority freight. Airplanes can do the job faster.

The submarine is normally considered as the prime threat to our surface fleet. In my opinion this may not be true, since the nature of the ocean is such as to limit the submarine's ability to locate and identify targets as well as to provide a good place to hide. Countermeasures such as decoys have the possibility of doing a good job of protecting our surface fleet by confusing the submarines, but I don't think they will be equally effective in protecting the ships from aircraft and surface launched missiles. There is no clearer and more well defined target for a homing missile than a large ship at sea.

The surface of the sea being a boundary between two markedly different and violently agitated media (water and air) has always been a very dangerous place to operate even in the absence of military attack, as attested by our high rates for marine insurance and the fact that there is no body of Land Laws which compares to the rights of marine salvage. Therefore, I believe as a third principle, that operations below the surface of the sea will become increasingly important in the next generation due to the complete freedom of operation away from the surface provided by the advent of nuclear power. Sea water continues to be an excellent hiding place and freedom of submerged operations seems assured. I think it is clear that we need not expect to lose many submarines if we operate below the surface.

Since I am working in a Navy laboratory, I tend to base our laboratory program primarily on an evaluation of possible potential for future military operations as guided by the three above conclusions. My experience with missiles leads me to believe that they have a great capability which is only beginning to be realized. There are no limiting technical problems in the ability of missiles to ensure that air operations over defended territory will be by permission only. Military control of the surface of the sea in wartime will be from the air in the future. Unrestricted use of the seas will depend on our ability to operate below the surface. Our Undersea Laboratory is dedicated to improving and defining the military alternatives which we have available for undersea operations.

Our oceans cover most surface earth, and there is lots of room for operations both commercial and military in the volume below the surface. Operating below the surface also makes available a new ocean for both commercial and military types of operations. The Arctic is generally restricted for surface operations by ice, but is open for nuclear submarines. It also forms the major coastline of Russia and is the shortest sea route from Europe to Asia for commercial operations.

Our laboratory programs are directed toward understanding the vast quantity of water that is the unique characteristic of our particular planet. It is an important accident of nature that wrinkled the earth's crust so that we walk rather than swim. Without the wrinkles, everything would be under water. In order to use all of this water, we need a program to construct new vehicles to make more direct inspection of this vast underwater area. As in the space program, the Russian policy makers have foreseen the need for undersea craft earlier than we have. They have been building new submarine types in large numbers since 1945. These include Oceanographic research submarines. We are faced with a major job of catching up. If they are successful in establishing a dramatic political first, comparable to Sputnik I, we may be prodded into providing the funds necessary to progress in the direction of building and operating more undersea vehicles. We have been to the bottom of the ocean, but it has not yet had the political impact of our visit to the moon. Perhaps because the bottom of the ocean is more remote electronically than the moon, and we cannot through TV share directly in the experience of visiting it.

I would like to enumerate the things which I believe are needed for the exploration of the undersea environment. I think that it is almost axiomatic that our first priority should be to maintain the invulnerability of the FBM submarines in order to achieve a continued second strike deterrent. From a military standpoint, our second most important need is to have submerged tankers so that our considerable investment in large aircraft for overseas transport can operate at their maximum available range. If fuel can be delivered by submerged tanker anywhere in the world, then our aircraft such as the C5 and the C141 can deliver large numbers of people and equipments wherever they are needed on a rapid time scale. Without submerged tankers, the air transport capability can be interrupted or reduced by missile attack on surface tankers.

Some hope for the generation of a submerged tanker capability may be provided by our commercial oil companies who have a great desire to utilize the recent discoveries of oil reserves bonding the Arctic Ocean. However, the development of a new class of commercial shipping such as a submarine tanker, is an extremely high risk venture and is probably beyond the financial capabilities of even our largest companies and needs government help to get started just as our railroads and commercial aircraft industries did in the past. This is an area where military and commercial requirements may coincide, and government assistance would be beneficial.

If we had submarine tankers operating, they would provide us with the technical experience and cost data for large submarine transports which would make the design of other types of submarine transports more feasible. Commercial, as well as military operations need the safety, the freedom from weather, and the ability to arrive on schedule which can be provided by the undersea routes. Since, to date, only military submarines have been built, no cost data based on experience for commercial designs are available. The military costs are high and new materials need to be investigated for commercial designs.

The third crucial need for undersea vehicles will be generated when we make treaties relative to the use of the sea floor. Vehicles to inspect activities on the sea floor will be required. They will need to operate close to the sea floor at all depths. Good sensory capability both visually and acoustically will be needed.

These are the future needs for transportation in the oceans as I see them, and I believe that if we have the means of visiting the oceans, the other uses of the ocean such as research, farming, mining, etc., will follow logically and will be funded by those needing the information or access. The government needs to assist primarily in the development of vehicles in order to provide the ability to explore this new environment much in the manner that the Lewis and Clark expedition opened up the West over a century ago. The commercial interests can well take care of the exploitation of the environment once it has been demonstrated that access is available and people have had the chance to see the things which will stimulate their imagination.

Since the American Oceanic Organization is dedicated to considering political means for arriving at desired goals, I would like to express some personal opinions on the ob-

stacles of a political nature which face our successful accomplishment of our technical objectives. Stated very simply, the machinery of the United States government does not adequately bring together people qualified to judge in both the real world of politics and people, and the other real world of technical facts. People living in one of these worlds seem to have difficulty recognizing that the other world even exists. Those that work in both are few in number but represent our hope for proper decisions in the future.

The government laboratories are designed to operate in the real world of technical facts and to know what will and will not work in the physical world. Their support and funding comes from the real world of politics, people, and operations. The route by which funding is matched to technical alternatives is much too devious for effective communication. Locally at a laboratory by much conversation we can bring the people from the two worlds together and arrive at reasonable objectives. From the laboratory to Congress, the levels of politics and technology alternate in a multitude of levels with varying degrees of separation from reality. It is too much to expect that adequate understanding can be generated at all of the barriers between the levels. I believe we need more technically trained top level personnel including Congressmen. Such a goal will be difficult since scientists are notoriously poor politicians.

The most important tool that the laboratories have for the allocation of money to the important areas of development is a small amount of money called Independent Research and Development. This money is allocated by a laboratory director and reviewed for accomplishments by higher authority after the fact. Most of our important work starts with these funds.

We have been able to start such things as a study of a semi-submerged ship which promises high speed operation and stability sufficient to allow a small ship to handle aircraft. It will also be stable enough to bring submersibles through the surface. We are studying concrete as a structural material for use in submarines and for large floating platforms. Fabricated concrete is 17 times cheaper than fabricated steel on a price per pound basis and 6–7 times cheaper for equal structural strengths. Large submarine volumes require large weights to get them underwater. Strength is secondary. Therefore, concrete should provide a 17 to one improvement over steel for large submarines rather than a 6–1 improvement.

Underwater observations are at short range, and marine animals move fast enough that high angular rates are involved. The need for all-around visibility in viewing marine ecology is mandatory. We are supporting work on acrylic and glass hemispheres and spheres for use as pressure hulls to satisfy the need for visibility.

Glass fibres for signal transmission, water operated tools, pressure balanced electronics and remote sensors coupled to the operator's head are of great interest. With limited funds our progress is slow, but we hope in the right direction.

The most important function of the leader of any group is to set goals and objectives which will challenge the skills and capabilities of the total population. The Pyramids, the aquaducts of Rome, the Chinese Wall, Sputnik I, and the Landing on the Moon were such objectives. Wars also challenge the total capabilities of the groups involved, although with perhaps limited long-range gains for mankind. Russia and China now have the objective of "World Peace Through World Government." It appears that Japan intends to become the technological leader of the World.

My worry as a laboratory director is how to set the goals for our Laboratory to meet the objectives of the United States. Do we want a world government? Do we want to utilize the resources of the oceans? Are we willing to divide up the sea floor for exploitation and, if so, how will it be managed? With an adequate goal to challenge our total capabilities, we could adopt the management techniques which are instituted in times of national stress and danger.

In an emergency, the government operates well. The money is allocated from the top and spent where needed and directed from where the understanding of the problem is greatest.

I submit that we now face an emergency which is worldwide as well as national. We are being tested by the processes of natural selection to see if we contain the proper elements to allow us to survive. By our gift of rationality we have become the dominant species on earth, and we must use this gift to properly avoid the problems of population density, energy requirements, pollution of the air, the sea, and the earth by waste, insecticides, and heat. A rational approach, however, requires experiments to separate real physical facts from superstitution and emotion.

When we use the entire earth for an experiment, we must be right or vanish. I doubt our wisdom to be right the first time. I would propose that we need to establish closed communities which must learn to survive within a limited environment with only the basic chemical elements as raw materials. Our processing of these materials will be accomplished by a flow of energy and information which will serve as the basic inputs and outputs from our community. Such a procedure will allow us to test solutions to waste processing, atmospheric control, and population density on a scale small enough to provide feedback, in a time shore enough to guide changes in approach, before the entire earth is involved in our test.

I would suggest that one such closed system could be profitably installed on the moon utilizing the basic raw materials which are already present and sunlight for the prime source of power. If a minimum community could be started it could become self sustaining, and the information on the problems involved could be communicated back to earth.

An easier and less expensive and perhaps less useful site for a closed experiment might be accomplished by building caves carved in the rock of the bottom of the ocean. In this case, nuclear energy or the earth's thermal energy would probably be the main source of power using the ocean as the heat sink. Information on the problems arising in the closed ecology and the solutions developed could guide the world-wide attack on pollution and other effects.

A floating island would be less isolated and perhaps cheaper, but could provide good experimental results.

Our previous thoughts about the earth have been that it is almost unlimited in extent and does not in any sense resemble a space station on the moon, a group of people living in an underwater cave or a floating island. However, anyone looking at the photographs of earth taken from the moon doesn't need much imagination to realize that we are traveling on a completely isolated space ship of rather limited volume compared to the distances to any outside source of help. These photographs should indicate to us that man has a closed system in a very real sense and that the time to begin an experimental approach to his problem of survival is now. I believe that these experiments on environmental modeling might be a worthy goal for the United States and could lead us to an understanding of the technological, sociological, economic, and political bases for the long range survival of our species.

I sincerely hope so.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 23, 1970

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable discussion in recent months about the Veterans' Administration Hospital system. Much of the discussion has centered on budgetary limitations that have been imposed on the veterans' medical care program for the past several years. It is true that adequate funds are essential if the Nation's veterans are to receive the highest quality of medical care possible.

Equally important to the successful accomplishment of this worthy objective, however, is the need to recruit and retain highly qualified professional health personnel. It is readily apparent that the Nation's increasing demand for medical manpower has seriously impaired the Veterans' Administration's ability to compete in recruiting and retaining doctors and nurses.

If the Veterans' Administration is to continue rendering the high quality medical care to which the Nation's veterans are entitled, they must be able to compete in today's market for the services of talented and skilled professional medical personnel.

Accordingly, I am introducing a bill today that is designed to make medical service careers in the Veterans' Administration more attractive.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, will establish a minimum staffing ratio, that is the ratio of hospital staff to patients, in each of the Veterans' Administration hospitals.

To help maintain these staffing ratios, the bill authorizes the Administrator, upon the recommendation of the Chief Medical Director, to establish higher maximum rates of pay for physicians, dentists and nurses on a nationwide, local or other geographic area basis where required to meet competitive pay practices.

The bill will authorize night and holiday differential pay for nurses, licensed vocational nurses, and nursing assistants. A pay scale for licensed vocational nurses would be established under the terms of the bill. The pay scale would be equivalent to the pay of classified employees ranging from GS–3 to GS–6.

The bill will also authorize the Administrator to establish for a geographic area a minimum salary and range of rates for nursing assistant positions within the Department of Medicine and Surgery.

The Administrator, under this bill, would be authorized to pay the preemployment interview expenses for prospective employees having technical or professional skills in a shortage category. Under existing law, this authority is limited to payment of the preemployment expenses for physicians, dentists, and nurses only.

The Administrator would also be authorized to pay the travel and transportation expenses of a new appointee and his family from his place of resi-

dence to his first duty station if the individual has technical or professional skills determined to be in the shortage category by the Administrator.

The bill will also authorize leave for a master's degree in hospitalization and leave for the pursuit of other studies after 10 years of VA service for physicians, dentists, and nurses.

These are the principal provisions of this bill, Mr. Speaker. It is a reasonable bill and it will enable the Veterans' Administration to better meet the problem of recruiting and retaining scarce categories of health personnel.

GYPSY MOTH MUST BE CONTROLLED

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 23, 1970

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, DDT has become a dirty word to a host of pesudo-scientists, much to the delight of the gypsy moth, which, in the absence of a suitable substitute for fighting the destructive antics of the gypsy moth, are having a field day in eating up the foliage of our trees and, in the process, destroying our forest environments.

The Weekly News Bulletin, published by the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture, announced in its September 24, 1970, issue that the gypsy moth had invaded the forests of Northeastern United States and caused the third worst record of destruction caused by the gypsy moth since it was imported into the United States from France in 1869. On November 19, 1970, the U.S. Department of Agriculture echoed the same sad story, announcing that woodland environments in various areas of Northeastern United States could be destroyed unless the destructive antics of the gypsy moth were checked.

Because control of the gypsy moth is vital to our woodland environment, I am enclosing the two aforementioned pieces into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and recommending they be studied seriously. The gypsy moth is on a rampage. Unless something is done expeditiously to control him, our forest environments could be destroyed. The articles follow:

PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE: WEEKLY NEWS BULLETIN

RELENTLESS SPREAD: GYPSY MOTH DAMAGE IN UNITED STATES WORST IN HISTORY OF NATION

(By L. H. Bull)

The gypsy moth explosion of 1970 has left the northeastern United States with its third worst record of damage caused by this insect pest since it was imported from France in 1869.

A total of 796,563 acres of forest and woodland in eight states was defoliated during the spring. The defoliated area is equivalent to 1,244 square miles—four square miles more than the total land area of Rhode Island.

Most of the damage was concentrated in four states—Connecticut, New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania. Connecticut had 468,706 acres defoilated; New York an estimated 240,000 acres; New Jersey 129,835 acres, and Pennsylvania 10,500 acres.

In each state, the 1970 gypsy moth damage was the worst in history.

Pennsylvania, on the basis of trapping surveys this summer, can expect much more extensive trouble next year.

Incomplete reports of the survey indicate that moths have been detected at more than 300 sites in a 12-county area east of the Susquehanna River—a section considered to be beyond the generally infested portions of the state. The heaviest concentration in this peripheral area is in Chester County, where moths have been found at more than 120 spots in 40 of the county's 57 townships.

Lancaster is next with moths detected at 80 spots in nine townships in the northeastern section of the county. The area most seriously affected appears to be the Welsh Mountain ridges along the boundary separating the two counties.

The presence of gypsy moths in this part of the state is indicative of the relentless spread of the infestation southward and westward from New England.

The insect invaded Pennsylvania in 1932, but no visible damage was recorded until 1944 when six acres of woodland were defoliated. This was followed by eleven acres in 1945, and 60 acres in 1957.

Trouble struck again in 1968 when another 60 acres of woodland were defoliated. The total rose alarmingly next year to 830 acres, and that was followed by the 1970 explosion that ravaged 10,500 wooded acres in Monroe, Northampton and Pike counties.

New Jersey's damage escalated much more rapidly. From five acres in 1966—the first gypsy moth defoliation recorded in that state—the total shot up to 1,035 acres in 1967; to 5,025 acres in 1968, then multiplied ten-fold to 51,525 acres last year.

In the wake of this year's record of 129,835 acres, New Jersey found more serious trouble. More than 690,000 oak trees had been destroyed by two successive years of defoliation and, Agriculture Department officials say, the total may reach a million trees by the end of next year.

It will take nature 20 to 30 years, perhaps longer, to replace these oaks that were destroyed by gypsy moth attacks.

Fortunately, Pennsylvania so far has escaped this kind of damage, but there is a real danger of it happening here. Continued buildups will ultimately lead to serious tree losses in woodlands and forests.

NATIONAL GYPSY MOTH ADVISORY COUNCIL

(Issued Through the Facilities of the U.S. Department of Agriculture)

Council Requests Increased Research to Fight Gypsy Moth:

Woodland environments in many parts of the Northeast may be destroyed unless gypsy moth research is vastly increased, the National Gypsy Moth Advisory Council told legislators and officials of the U.S. Department of Agriculture during a meeting November 16 in Washington, D.C.

Council Chairman William H. Gillespie asked that efforts of USDA's Agricultural Research Service and Forest Service to develop new and better ways of controlling the gypsy moth be increased by approximately 22 percent in Fiscal Year 1970 and by nearly 45 percent during each of the following 4 years. The request is based on a "program for integrated control of the gypsy moth" developed jointly by USDA and the infested States. The program calls for intensified research into the combined use of nonpersistent chemicals and such biological controls as sex attractants, insect diseases, and increased emphasis on parasites and predators including the introduction of new ones from foreign countries.

In the caterpillar stage the gypsy moth eats leaves. Repeated defoliations will kill trees, thereby polluting, and even destroying, forest environments. During 1970, gypsy moths defoliated nearly 800,000 acres of woodlands in eight Northeastern States, thereby tripling the acreage defoliated in 1969 and causing six times more damage than in 1968.

Caterpillar hordes are currently spreading outward into new States. At present, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Jersey, Maine, New York, New Hampshire, Vermont, and Pennsylvania are infested. The trapping of numerous male moths in Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia this summer indicates that the pest is becoming established in these States.

ARS officials attending the meeting reported that chemical controls will be used for regulatory purposes on 25,000 to 30,000 acres in the Northeast next summer. New York, Massachusetts, New Jersey and Pennsylvania plan control work on approximately 250,000 additional acres.

Mr. Gillespie pointed out that chemical controls are mainly restricted to use on heavily infested parks, camp grounds, and other areas—such as valuable timber land—where there is a strong likelihood of gypsy moths attaching egg masses to trailers or other vehicles and hitchhiking into uninfested areas. The insectide used is carbaryl—a nonpersistent compound low in toxicity to humans and to birds, fish, and other wildlife.

The Advisory Council is an organization of State agricultural officials, conservationists, foresters, farmers, timber industry officials, and others concerned with protecting this Nation's timber resources.

COALITION GOVERNMENT AS A MEANS OF CONQUEST IN THE REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 23, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to insert in the RECORD two complementary documents. The first is a portion of the weekly publication of the Embassy of Vietnam, Vietnam Bulletin, November 2, 1970. This excerpts points out that the Communists are moving to impose a coalition government as a means of conquest.

The second article is an excerpt from Douglas Pikes' book, "War, Peace, and the Vietcong," which explains the coalition strategy as conceived by North Vietnamese politboro strategists.

It is important that we realize that coalition government is not a happy longtime sharing of power by Communists and non-Communists. Rather it is a method by which the enemy gains control of portions of the government and utilizes his power base in these branches together with operations in other areas through the mechanism of the party to take total control.

Any U.S. official who recommended that we form some type of coalition government here making Eldridge Cleaver, say, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be branded an irresponsible demagog if not totally insane. This being the case, how is it that some feel so free to wish such circumstances upon our ally?

The articles follow:

SPECIAL FEATURE: ENLIGHTENING DOCUMENTS

(Viet-Nam Council on Foreign Relations)

October 22, 1970—Two documents have just been captured, which throw some light on the Viet Cong's war and peace intentions.

They also explain to some extent why the Communists have repeatedly spurned all allied peace plans, including the "generous" offer made by Presidents Richard M. Nixon and Nguyen Van Thieu two weeks ago.

The documents, two directives sent out to Communist cadres in the provinces of Binh Tuy and Tay Ninh, declare in roughly similar terms that "the problem of war and peace remains essentially one to be solved by the belligerents on the battlefields of South Viet nam".

Reportedly issued a few days before Nguyen Thi Binh, the "Foreign Minister" of the Viet Cong's Provisional Revolutionary Government (P.R.G.), spoke in Paris last Sept. 17, one of the papers also specifies the P.R.G.'s eight points "only aim at creating conditions conducive to greater attacks in this many-fronted war. They are not aimed at restoring peace".

Contents: By far the more interesting of the two documents is the one found in Binh Tuy. A type-written directive of three pages, it refers to the PRG's proposal as a new element intended to facilitate the emergence of conditions for greater pressure on the enemy on the many fronts of this war. In no case can it be interpreted as being conducive to solution of the present conflict".

"The problem between the enemy and us," the paper also affirms, "can only be solved by the existing balance of forces on the battlefields. That is why everything must be done to present the true meaning of this diplomatic offensive move and prevent illusory tendencies that peace can be brought about at the negotiating table in Paris."

Then, in mentioning the "principal objectives" being sought by the Viet Cong, the paper insists that three of them must be constantly borne in mind by Viet Cong followers, namely "the total withdrawal of all U.S. and satellite forces," "the isolation of the Thieu-Ky-Khiem clique" and "the formation of a broad alliance of all peace elements."

In its final part, the document also says "the new diplomatic offensive must be well coordinated with activities within South Vietnam so as to be conducive to conditions favoring the development of various struggle movements in the cities and townships."

Stepping Stone: Glancing through both documents students of the Viet Cong movement can find little if nothing new. The Communists still appear bent on seeking an end to the American commitment in Vietnam and the overthrow of the constitutional regime presently headed by President Nguyen Van Thieu, Vice-President Nguyen Cao Ky and Premier Tran Thien Khiem.

As early as mid-1968, top Communist leaders in Hanoi and their representatives in the Central Office of South Vietnam (COSVN) are known to have adopted a four-point political strategy that seeks (1) an end to the bombing of North Vietnam, (2) international recognition for the Viet Cong, (3) withdrawal of U.S. troops, and (4) a coalition regime in Saigon.

With North Vietnam now off limits to U.S. bombers, the Viet Cong having metamorphosed into a "government", and America continuing the redeployment of its troops from the war zone, Hanoi apparently is seeking the fulfillment of its fourth objective: the creation or imposition of a coalition regime in Saigon.

FROM: WAR, PEACE, AND THE VIETCONG

(By Douglas Pike, MIT Press, 1969)

Coalition government: The third strategy of the past, never tried, is Coalition Government. Whereas Khoi Nghia or the General Uprising thesis basically is social, and Revolutionary Guerrilla War in any of its various forms is military, Coalition Government is not political, as might be assumed but diplomatic. It is not the same as political settlement. Nor is it power-sharing, which is what the term means in Europe. As the term was used by the NLF theoreticians who espoused it from the earliest days (and they have always been in the minority), Coalition Government is a technique for coming to power; it is not an arrangement but a means. Theoretically it could be used in any country in the world. The scenario, as envisioned by the early NLF advocates, would go something like this:

An elite band of insurgents, beginning in a remote part of the country, launch a political and armed dau tranh (Struggle Movement), shored up if necessary by a social myth such as Khoi Nghia. The brief effort is to organize the peoples of the remote area into manageable units. Farmers, women, youth, students, and anyone else available are persuaded or coerced into joining an appropriate group. Eventually, this organized structure comes to total, say, 10 per cent of the population. Then a political claim is staked out. The incumbent government and the world are informed that the new force exists, represents 10 per cent of the population, and therefore—deserves—and demands 10 per cent of the political decision-making power. It appeals to the world's sence of justice and fair play. The group warns that it will continue fomenting social pathology until its demands are met. Turmoil spreads until the world concludes that peace can return only if the insurgents are brought into the decision-making arena. The incumbent government is so counseled by outside powers. It refuses. The pressure grows.

Finally the government gives in and hands the insurgent leaders a few cabinet posts (ideally, the Ministries of Information and Rural Affairs). Once inside, the leaders use their new positions to extend their influence, not by means of a palace coup de'etat, but openly, by employing prerogatives and advantages that those in power normally enjoy. Gradually the new force broadens its base of support, winning over more followers at the grass roots and perhaps even some of the old incumbent groups in the capital. Finally comes a decisive move, "consolidating" power. Victory is achieved.

The heart of the technique is to generate such external pressures on the incumbent government as to require it to share power with the unsurgents and then, when inside, by infiltration and superior organizational work at the grass roots—all legitimate perhaps—gradually to take over the reins of government. The success of the strategy rests on the assumption that the incumbent political forces—since they are urban, elitist, nonegalitarian organizations (as usually is the case in developing nations)—cannot or will not imitate the techniques of the challenger, even when fully aware of the danger of losing power because of these techniques. Further, its advocates argue, the method effectively bypasses foreign intervention since what is going on appears to be almost totally a matter of internal politics, and since there is no decisive or dramatic moment to arouse the world until the very end. Although never tested—possibly an example was the near take-over by the Communists in Indonesia—it appears that the Coalition Government strategy would have little prospect of success in a developed society, but it might be effective in an underdeveloped society in Africa or South America.

TIM BLECK

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 23, 1970

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to a great journalist and a good friend.

With the death of Tim Bleck, journalism, Congress and the public have suffered a great loss.

Tim Bleck was a man of gentleness and high idealism. When he talked with you about a story you were not sure he was listening. When the story appeared you found he understood all you had said. Indeed, he understood the problem better than you did.

He was the sort of man you would like your son to be. I know of no higher praise.

LET'S GET STARTED

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 23, 1970

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the economic dislocation which many communities throughout the Nation are facing as a result of reduced levels of military and space spending requires prompt, realistic action, and in many instances, hard decisions not only by government and industry, but by those individuals who have been caught up in the forces of economic change.

It is an unpleasant fact, but one which must be recognized by all those concerned, that the solution to these economic problems which have been created over the past decade will not be reached overnight. Creative and concentrated efforts are indeed necessary to develop meaningful answers to these problems, but we must operate in the meantime with a clear assessment of the situation and with the understanding that progress may well involve difficult, and perhaps less than ideal alternatives.

The following editorial which appeared in the Lowell, Mass., Sun of November 13, displays the realistic and constructive thinking that will be necessary in the days ahead, and I am pleased to be able to share this article with my colleagues in the House:

LET'S GET STARTED

We can talk all we want about programs set up to solve the critical unemployment problems of the Greater Lowell area, but the simple fact remains that two things must happen before the problems are solved.

First, there must be a change in attitude among those currently unemployed or underemployed. They must be willing to take a job. Secondly, the local businesses and industries must find a way to convert their business to a new product or new services status geared to the wind-down of the Vietnam War with its resultant adverse impact on the economy.

Obviously there is a need for government help in the way of programs. We need JOBS 70; we need help from the Economic Development Administration; we need help from the Office of Housing and Urban Development. We have no quarrel with the need for help from any governmental instrumentality. Pouring money into these programs will, ultimately, provide more jobs or retrain people for different jobs.

But the fact remains there are many jobs going begging because of the reluctance of some members of the labor force to take them. Perhaps it's a sign of the times. We know some, for instance, who won't take some of the jobs advertised daily in The

Lowell Sun because (a) they pay too little; or (2) they are demeaning—in the minds of the prospective applicants. In addition, some of the jobs require a degree of training not yet reached by some of the younger members of the community who desperately need the work.

We don't have in mind here the job requirements of those highly-skilled members of the firms hurt so badly by the cutbacks in defense contracts. But that brings up the second part of the point we made at the beginning.

Some of the companies in this part of the country have been bemoaning the fact they are unable to produce consumer goods in the exotic products of the space age because of the need to fulfill government contracts. The handwriting has been on the wall for some time—government contracts are (and should be) going down in many areas. It will take a lot of imagination and fortitude to make the switch, not to mention capital investments. But time is running short.

The government's economic advisors have been warning for years that a termination of the war would result in a recession, a flare-out and then an upsurge of consumer products which will benefit mankind. That recession could well become a depression in this area unless steps are taken immediately to put people back to work on new civilian oriented products and services. And then finding a way to encourage the people in the community to take the jobs, train for the day when they can take the jobs, or plan their education so that the jobs will be open to them on graduation. Or is it easier to join a welfare system?

MEMOIRS OF THE PARIS PEACE CONFERENCE AND ITS AFTERMATH

HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 23, 1970

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Lake Providence (La.) Nov. 12, 1970]

MEMOIRS OF THE PARIS PEACE CONFERENCE AND ITS AFTERMATH

PERSONALITY OF THE WEEK

(By Dr. David Muir Amacker)

Fifty-two years ago this week, November 11, there came about the Armistice which ended World War I; and closely following thereafter was the Peace Conference that produced the League of Nations. Only two persons present at that historic League Table in Paris are living today—Wellington Koo who served as the Ambassador of Chiang Kai-Shek and retired as a Judge of the World Court at the Hague, resides in New York . . . DAVID M. AMACKER who retired in 1969 after 30 years as Professor of Political Science at Southwestern at Memphis, returns to the family home in Lake Providence where he was interviewed by a representative of this newspaper. The article carried here (in first person) is exactly as Prof. Amacker told it to us:

President Wilson, Colonel House, Lord Robert Cecil and General Smuts of South Africa were moving to take their places at or near the head of the large oval table; and a dozen other dignitaries were distributing themselves around the table to their chairs. They were the great men named by the Peace Conference to draft a League of Nations charter and bring lasting peace to the world. My task was to interpret English into French for two of them—with the opportunity to see the most celebrated Commission of the Peace Conference at work.

The time was February 6, 1919, about 8:15 in the evening; the place the Marie Antoinette Room, Colonel House's conference salon next to his apartment on the third floor of the Hotel Crillon, American Delegation headquarters near the center of Paris. The occasion was the fourth session of this League of Nations Commission.

In mid-January, a second lieutenant, I had been sent from a lower unit to the American Delegation's Translation Office down the corridor from the salon. This temporary interpreting duty at the League Table had been assigned on a few hours' notice.

The first evening I assisted the French Delegates, but for the next six meetings sat near Premiers Venizelos of Greece and Kramar of the new Czechoslavac government, who with three other Small-Nation representatives were being added to the Commission, raising its membership to nineteen. These two statements understood some English and word for word translation was unnecessary. Thus I was partially free to observe the epochal constitutional convention as a fascinated spectator.

The identities of all the Delegates were soon learned. Colonel House sat on President Wilson's left; and behind them sat Major Stephen Bonsal, Colonel House's aide and interpreter, whose diaries of this period are original sources of history. Next were Lord Robert Cecil and General Smuts (British Empire); Baron Makino and Viscount Chinda of Japan; Venizelos and Kramar; Reis (Portugal); Hymans (Belgium); Wellington Koo (China); Pessoa (Brazil); Dmowski (Poland); Vesnitch (Serbia); Diamandy (Rumania); Larnaude and Bourgeois (France); Sonnino and Orlando of Italy on President Wilson's right. Captain Pierce, also from the Transition Office, was brought in occasionally to aid the Polish and Serbian Delegates.

Two small episodes reflecting Mr. Wilson's benign personality are recalled vividly. The President, then at the peak of his prestige, was obviously venerated by his colleagues. At one point in a discussion of withdrawal from the League, he took the floor and amid an awed silence recounted with moving eloquence how as a child of eight he had watched from the family manse in Augusta, Georgia, Confederate soldiers straggling back after Appomattox, defeated, weary, ragged, hungry, often nursing wounds. Recalling that era, he had concluded that there should be no uncertainty about a nation's right to separate itself from the League association. The grace of his diction and the quiet impact of his words are vivid now. The Delegates seemed to hold their breath; and a sigh was audible when the President ceased and suspense relaxed.

Before one morning session some of the Delegates were milling around as President Wilson was a moment late, Captain Pierce and I were standing with our backs toward the wall near the main door when Mr. Wilson walked in. He was considerate enough at once to turn aside to shake hands with us. Both of us, conscious of his greatness, ethical leadership and noble purpose, were touched by the little act of courtesy and by his kind and friendly "Good morning, gentlemen;" and he was answered with a fervent "God Bless you, Mr. President." He continued around to greet each Delegate by name with that gracious "Good morning, Mr. Hymans"; "Good morning, Mr. Reis," and so on, as he moved toward the head of the Table. Each responded with profound respect mingled with affection.

In the sessions through February 13, the Commissioners analyzed and amended or reconstructed by their collective wisdom the working draft prepared by lawyers Miller (U.S.) and Hurst (Britain) from the original Wilson-House-Cecil-Smuts proposals for a League; and no doubt from this special intellectual preparation for their task these four statesmen seemed pre-eminent, though House did not speak publicly and advised the President in whispers. President Wilson prepared to tower above them all in spiritual and intellectual as in physical stature.

The Commission believed that they were creating a universal confederation where peace and world welfare would be the first business of each nation. The Delegates seemed to move as if stage-struck in the presence of History; as if sure that their work would be forever honored and their names immortalized. They assumed, erroneously as events proved, a general rationality, virtue and will that would promptly unite the nations effectively against war. They attributed to peoples and governments a concern for the good of humanity to match their own deep sense of world responsibility. None seemed to imagine that America would reject the League, or that, in the form so painstakingly drafted at that Table, it would fall apart in a generation—though to rise, after the dreaded cataclysm of renewed war, Phoenix-like, in a new body.

PERSONALITY

Details of those able debates are forgotten. The Founders' learning, transparent sincerity, high purpose, and dedication to the present and future welfare of mankind remain indelibly stamped in memory. On February 14, a Plenary Session of the Conference approved the Commission's work, the first general charter asserting secular responsibility and authority throughout the planet.

If the League charter provided for the future a rudimentary world congress, administrative agencies and an International Court (to be formed), the Conference itself was for the first time in history a temporary, secular world parliament with certain executive powers through Allied governments. To many minds over the globe it was entitled to make decisions and issue decrees righting all the wrongs afflicting humanity. Actually the Conference had jurisdiction over the estates of the ex-enemy Nations: Bulgaria and the shattered empires of the German, Austro-Hungarian, and Ottoman sovereigns. Derivative problems, however, involved most of the globe. And in the mass mind, President Wilson, by reason of his command of military might and his idealistic soul-stirring oratory, had (for a brief span) raised himself to the stature of world leader concerned with the welfare of men everywhere.

Our Translation Office learned this the hard way; and from the inside we saw, too, the insoluble complexities and controversies of World-wide responsibility. Petitions, memorials, claims and counter-claims, arguments and rebuttals, came pouring into the American Delegation in a veritable flood—a large proportion of them addressed to President Wilson and written in French. The documents were routinely shunted to us for Englishing; as were sometimes the French Minutes of certain committees; and occasionally several of us were called to translate for American Minutes the French addresses in the Plenary sessions.

Thus the Translation Office afforded front-row seats at the historic drama, as it seemed, of world reconstruction. Comprising nine U.S. officers-captains and lieutenants—and a bilingual secretary, our Office was linguistically fairly cosmopolitan. Two captains were French-born and had lived many years in Latin America and Near-East, respectively; and with their skills, some twelve or thirteen languages were decipherable; but rarely did non-French items reach us. By the end of May, translations totalled about ten thousand.

In this pressured routine one odd little incident stands out. From Colonel House's office came an envelope marked "Rush", "Urgent". The secretary duly recorded and numbered it but could not read a line or identify the language; nor, at first could neighboring desks; but Esperanto was finally recognized. The "Rush" message was from a group in Washington petitioning President Wilson for justice, rights and self-determination at home. The impact of the missive on Colonel House was never disclosed; but the use of the artificial international language by American citizens seemed a perceptive tribute to the international authority of the Conference.

However, internationalism failed. Wilson's ideal for world responsibility, of individual and national concern for broad-gauge world good as essential guide and standard for the policy of one's own country seems even further from realization today.

What went wrong? Even before League charter ("covenant") and "Versailles" Treaty were completed, particularisms had taken over. International-mindedness in the face of petty interests and claims had largely dissolved. In the United States the President's physical collapse in late September, 1919, with continued disability and seclusion until the end of his term, March 4, 1921, and blunders in political leadership, hastened demobilization and reinforced isolationist trends, bringing rejection of Treaty, League and British-French-U.S. Guaranty Pact (protecting France).

At first sight the surrender of our Naval paramountcy by reduction of capital ships to equality with Britain in the Washington Limitation of Arms Conference, November 1921 to February 1922, seems another phase of the disastrous retreat to isolationism and contraction of power and position that invited War II. In a sense it was; yet there was some justification for it under existing assumptions. Our continued Naval superiority together with political axioms of "free seas" and "neutral rights" might have brought a clash with Britain. If we had made a deal or alliance with the British pledging never to blockage them and not to resist and break through, but to join and reinforce with all our power, their "open" (or distant) blockade of a Continental aggressor, we could and should have continued to build the Navy indefinitely so as to overawe—or certainly overwhelm—aggressors on the European Continent or in Asia or both. Most likely no World War of 1939–45 would have occurred, even if local confrontations or skirmishes had developed. But with the "political" questions left unsettled the Anglo-Saxon Powers kept trying in the late '20's and early '30's to disarm each other on the seas in the face of aggressive enemies of each. What costly and tragic non-thinking!

Elsewhere—in Europe and Asia—nationalist fanaticisms and hysterical ideologies triumphed in the relative power vacuum and culminated in hostilities and World War II ending in 1945. "Not Wilson, but humanity failed at Paris," General Smuts had said very wisely.

Perhaps then from 1919 to '39 continued preponderance of land and sea power deployed in Europe and over both oceans, eastward and westward, would have abated temptations to ultra-nationalists adventurism. Perhaps ratification of the Guaranty Pack alone would have stabilized Europe. But without some of these measures even our membership in the League would probably have proved inadequate for operative world ideals had largely evaporated.

The frightful scourge of War II somewhat revived a general sense of world responsibility and wider interest in universalist organizations like U.N. and International Judiciary. The States, partially converted from its inter-War parochialism, led in such evidences of world concern as foreign aid, international banks, military force against aggressors, defensive alliances like NATO, CENTO and SEATO and support of U.N. and Court.

But realistically, since 1946, trends to world responsibility were still overshadowed by enhanced Big State power rivalry in a "struggle for the world" and defiant Smaller-State nationalism, in the continued international anarchy. The United States was essentially trying to hold the line and preserve its security position, thus ultimately national existence.

In the on-going chess-game of the politics of power certain near-axioms remained relevant: (1) In disarmament conferences each nation tries to disarm the others in the weapons that No. 1 fears most or in which it is weakest (our capital ships, 1922; our undersea ICBM's today?). (2) Power vacuums draw in, almost gravitationally, strong empires toward head-on collision (Balkans 1914; Central Europe pre-War II; recently Korean and Southeast Asia). Mid-East, North Africa, Indian Ocean were such vacuums in 1970. (3) "Encirclement" brings attempted break-out (Germany, 1914; Japan 1941).

In conditions of inevitable suspicion and power rivalry, a defense official would be insane if he let down his nation's guard and invited its ruin by blackmail or sudden thrust. For maximum security and peace by preponderance the U.S. must still lead in weapons and expand and strengthen its alliances with the European motherlands, British nations overseas and Westernized Asian states.

But no Power in the nuclear age is able to achieve domination of the earth without rising or causing world-wide devastation. Thus world responsibility can be effectively exercised, when complete trust and friendship are established among them, only by cooperation of sovereign nations (Great Powers and allies) with full reliance upon U.N.—one modern embodiment of Wilson's vision.

The nation-state has notable merits. The personal pride of its citizens, peace, order, prosperity, security and endless other benefits are its fruits; and it will likely endure for millennia in some form. But it generates or facilitates war. Externally it must be tamed and held within bounds compatible with world welfare and thus with its own ultimate good. To this end a new and wider loyalty to the human family must be developed—not to replace patriotism but to enlighten it, set standards of wise policy, guide it and serve it; but the higher loyalty need be only sufficient to support indispensable world institutions.

Today to propose and implement a policy of national aggrandizement by expansion, whether by arms or guile, may appear short-range cunning but is long-range folly. The true good of the world and each country demands a change of attitude and a new approach. Co-existence is not enough. A different spirit making for genuine friendship and positive cooperation is vital.

How can this conversion be encouraged? How are enlightenment and understanding spread? This is the most difficult task of creative statemanship and is crucial in East-West relations. Projects in such an effort might include: "Summit" meetings; exchange visits by heads of government with TV coverage of friendly speeches; more "people to people" programs and joint professional conferences; full use of media to advertise our good will; books and articles for Russian and Chinese intellectuals; and much more. Guiding principles for a new policy of reconciliation and affirmative cooperation with the West must be voluntarily assumed by our opponents and critics and would accord with universalist standards illumined by religious and ethical insights.

There are myriad intelligent and humane spirits within the populations of our self-made adversary nations who would like nothing better than to clasp hands with us in loyal friendship and work with us for peace and progress the world over. Can they be reached and become effective before it is too late? There are important tasks on a world scale to be done now and greater ones loom: war to be abolished; natural environment conserved; food resources, natural and synthetic, developed and distributed; ocean water desalted to irrigate deserts; swamps to be drained; outmigration and resettlement from overcrowded communities assisted; and innumerable others.

With future needs in view and in memory of the 60 or 70 million victims of war and upheaval since 1900 the civilized and enlightened conscience calls urgently to potentially friendly empires across the Curtains: "Be truly wise!" "Seek the real international good the better to serve your own country."

This essentially is what those illustrious prophets and ethicists around the League Table envisioned in 1919. Impractical? "Practical" Americans rejected Wilson's program and disarmed; then had to fight War II. "Practical" men elsewhere were guilty of incredible miscalculations before and during the two Great Wars. In this sophisticated era, to launch or risk launching universal new religious wars of stubbornly held secular religions, whether economic or nationalist, would be mindless. In any case it is not different economic and social organization but the aggressive power quest, however incited, that is the real enemy of mankind.

Effective world responsibility and matching authority will one day be indispensable to secure men against nuclear suicide or slower death from deprivation and destruction of earth's life support system. Whether such world concern will be operative in 20, 200, or 2000 years; whether developed and institutionalized by ourselves, our descendants or more sensible and cultured peoples elsewhere is beyond conjecture. But regardless of the time and means of its full implementation and perfection, actual world responsibility began at the Paris Peace Conference in the Spring of 1919. I was privileged to witness its birth.

THE CASE FOR THE ROTC

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 23, 1970

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, like many other fine American institutions, the ROTC program is under increasingly strong and grossly misdirected attack.

As if we could prevent war by abolishing the reserve officer training programs on our college campuses, the ROTC has become a focus of student unrest and even violence.

However, any sensible analysis would show that those who are opposing the ROTC programs may be unwittingly aiding the cause they most fear—increased militarism.

The Long Beach Independent, Press-Telegram recently summed up this position:

> The public—particularly the students and faculties of the colleges and universities—should care about what kind of human beings these officers are, about what kind of an education they get and about where they are educated.

The editorial clearly and simply makes the case for continuance of the ROTC

program on our college campuses, and I included it in the RECORD at this point:

THE CASE FOR THE ROTC

From time to time university administrators, under pressure from students and faculty, announced that their school is dropping or curtailing the Reserve Officer Training Program.

This may not be only very short-sighted on the part of those demanding the elimination of the ROTC program, but they may be denying some deserving students the means to get an education.

Most everyone would like to see a world in which the military simply didn't exist. But since that day doesn't appear imminent, we think the country should worry about how it picks its military officers.

The public—particularly the students and faculties of the colleges and universities—should care about what kind of human beings these officers are, about what kind of an education they get and about where they are educated.

Critics on the campus have the duty to ask themselves whether driving officer training from the schools would not lead to the very phenomenon they fear—a military caste system and the Prussianization of the U.S. military.

Even if it were possible to get all the officers necessary from the current service academies, we seriously question whether it would be advisable to do so. The civilian contacts and the public education of the ROTC student provide for a broader background than that afforded by strictly a military academy.

In addition the ROTC provides a source of funds for many deserving students who otherwise would be unable to attend college.

As an example, the Air Force ROTC has announced it will award 700 four-year scholarships to freshmen enrollees in the campus program next year. Another 1525 new grants will go to currently enrolled students entering their sophomore year.

Altogether AFROTC grants will total 5,450—a number not to be sneezed at.

And the grants themselves are remarkable for their coverage.

Recipients of the scholarship receive full tuition and lab fees, incidental expenses, a book allowance and $50 a month subsistence allowance which is non-taxable.

A "UNIVERSAL" UNITED NATIONS—A POSITIVE APPROACH

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 23, 1970

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, the United Nations General Assembly again voted not to seat Red China. The vote, however, was 51 in favor of seating the country, 49 against, and 25 abstentions.

This is the 25th year of the existence of the United Nations, and this vote was the 25th defeat for Red China. But the trend is clearly shifting. Each year Red China gains more votes in favor of recognition. The reason is simple—like it or not, Red China is there.

But Formosa also is there—a quite viable political state with a population larger than all but 30 of the 123 United Nations members.

As the issue of Red China grows more intense year by year, some maintain that the time has come for the United States to rethink its position on this difficult question.

In the November 19 Washington Star, James L. Kilpatrick, one of the more conservative and constitutionally minded columnists of our day, says:

Red China is. And so, for that matter, Formosa is, and the 14 million Chinese who have fashioned a viable state on Taiwan now constitute a political entity that is. . . . A flicker of sanity may be observed as to China. In another two or three years, if the patient manages to survive that long, the U.N. will do what should have been done long ago: It will give the Security Council to Red China, and acknowledge the reality of Formosa with a seat in the Assembly.

The challenge is clearly before us—the challenge is not only to find a viable position on the China question that is in accordance both with the realities of the situation and with our treaty commitments around the world but also to take the lead in securing such a position lest the apparently inevitable entrance of Red China into the U.N. be a defeat not only for the sizable state of Formosa but also for our own country.

The call is for action and for positive action. The question is what course that action should take.

One very serious proposal has been presented by a man who enjoys the rather unique honor in this country of having worked both as an official in the U.S. Government and as a working member of the U.N. Secretariat. Speaking before the Dallas United Nations Association on October 22 of this year, the eminent economic historian, Walt W. Rostow, proposed the creation of a "Universal" United Nations. After a discussion of the United Nations' role in history and the shifting balance of power in the world, Dr. Rostow moves to three specific proposals. On the first, he says:

First, it is clear from the way negotiations and policy are moving with respect to China and Germany that the question of a universal United Nations will soon be upon us. I believe we shall have to face this matter in the time ahead; and that we should face it.

The question of a universal United Nations—containing East and West Germany, North and South Vietnam, North and South Korea, representatives from the governments in both Peking and Taipei—is a matter of timing and a matter of how the job is done.

As for timing, I think the time may soon be ripe.

Moving on to the role of the Security Council, he notes:

Moreover, it is time to examine afresh the structure of the Security Council. There is a tendency still to think in terms of the Big Five; that is, Britain, France, the United States, Soviet Union, and China. This is an odd and parochial way to look at the world. After all, 60 per cent of the world's population lives in Asia. Therefore, it may be time to bring not only mainland China into the Security Council but also India and Japan. I suggest this not only because Asia deserves better balanced representation than a Communist China. I suggest it also because Communist China is unique in Asia for only one reason: it has manufactured nuclear weapons. It is important that this not very distinguished achievement—which India and Japan could duplicate, and more, in very short order—not be rewarded.

The second and third proposals of Dr. Rostow's address call for an increased role in world affairs for the smaller nations and for increased initiative on the part of the Secretary General of the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, as congressional debate will play a significant role in shaping our future response to the China question, I commend this very serious and thought provoking address to my colleagues for their consideration. Certainly, not everyone will agree to his suggestions, but most will agree that his approach is stimulating.

It should be pointed out that Dr. Rostow's recommendations came earlier than other proposals being advanced now. Mr. Christopher Phillips, a member of the U.S. Delegation to the U.N., presented a "two China" proposal to the U.N. on November 12. A week later, a Senator from New York endorsed the idea in a Senate speech. However, Dr. Rostow made his speech on October 22—some 3 weeks before the above gentlemen presented their recommendations. But the same general thoughts prevail.

I do not recommend this proposal in its entirety, particularly in reference to North and South Vietnam, but I do think it is worthy of our consideration and I ask permission that Dr. Rostow's speech of October 22 be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED NATIONS: A LOOK AHEAD

I

After my appearance here was announced, I received a few letters from members of the Dallas community. They were concerned that someone holding the views I do on Vietnam should be invited—and should be willing to appear—to celebrate the 25th anniversary of the United Nations. Those letters reversed an old and familiar story. They seemed to say: "What would a bad boy like you be doing in a nice place like this?"

However my views on Vietnam and Asia are judged, I am wholly at ease in coming to join in this anniversary occasion. I am one of the very few Americans who has served both as an official in the American Government and as a working member of the United Nations Secretariat.

One of the adventures of my life was to join Gunnar Myrdal in 1947 as his special assistant in helping set up the Economic Commission for Europe in Geneva. That is, as you know, a branch of the United Nations. Its membership includes nations from Eastern as well as Western Europe, the Soviet Union as well as the United States.

We set this piece of international machinery into motion at the very worst of the Cold War. Molotov had left the Paris meeting on the Marshall Plan in July 1947. In the months ahead Stalin was consolidating Moscow's control over Eastern Europe. The next year Berlin was blockaded, sustained through a difficult winter only by airlift.

In this harsh setting we worked to hold together in Geneva every strand we could find that might ameliorate the tension between East and West, and provide a future basis for East-West cooperation. We worked in the faith that the tides of history and the work of men of good will would bring better days. We believed that Stalin's satellite empire in Eastern Europe was not history's final decision. It was hard but rewarding work; a good education in the realities of the postwar world, and in the possibilities and limitations of the United Nations.

I believe those that worked together in Geneva at that time were as able and dedicated a team of international civil servants as has ever been assembled. I am proud to have been among them.

In any case, the United Nations and its future have been a living part of my life and my thought for some twenty-three years. And so I was delighted to receive your invitation.

II

The United Nations is not one institution. It is a collection of related institutions designed to serve different purposes. They reflect an international scene where sovereign governments exist; and they act upon the international scene to the extent sovereign governments can agree to let them act—or the Secretariat can goad or negotiate them to act together—or let action go forward.

In its first quarter of a century the United Nations has reflected the political facts of life in the world that emerged after the Second World War. These facts of life decreed that the maximum hopes of all of us, registered in the United Nations Charter at San Francisco in 1945, could not immediately be achieved.

Above all, there was the failure of the great powers to maintain their wartime unity on the central security questions of the postwar world. That continued unity was to have been the bedrock upon which the Security Council of the United Nations would work. Only substantive unity could have permitted the Security Council to perform the functions envisaged in the United Nations Charter. The veto provided in the Security Council might have been merely a powerful goad to find agreement. But once the veto came to be used against the majority will—and against the will of major powers—the result was predictable; that is, a world divided and in contention.

The United Nations has thus had to find its missions—to do what it could do to fulfill the injunctions of the Charter—in a world of Cold War struggle. In the late 1940's and early 1950's that conflict raged along the northern line from Seoul to Berlin. Then it shifted to the south, with the emergence of the post-colonial world of nationalism and modernization. Since the mid-1950's—say, from the Egyptian arms deal with Moscow in 1955—the Cold War contest has suffused the great struggle of Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America to find roles of dignity in the modern world.

And throughout this whole period the United Nations has had to do its job in a world where the Baruch plan was rejected by the Soviet Union and nuclear weapons spread out from one to five national states.

The United Nations has reflected all too vividly the Cold War conflict of this generation—the tensions and crises of a contending and revolutionary world over which was suspended the nuclear sword of Damocles.

But it has also acted upon that world in many constructive ways:

As a forum where diplomats could meet and talk constructively in private after delivering their formal positions for the record and for the folks back home;

As an instrument for limiting conflict and for keeping the peace, for a time at least—in the Middle East, for example; between India and Pakistan; and at certain critical moments in the Congo.

The United Nations spawned regionalism not only in the Economic Commission for Europe but also in regional commissions for Latin America, Asia and the Far East, and Africa;

The United Nations contributed significant elements growth and social progress in the developing regions, through its own programs as well as those of the specialized agencies which are linked to it;

And there is much more to the good in its record.

Despite all its evident weakness—which are mainly the weaknesses of the world in which we live—the United Nations has earned its keep. It is right that the peoples and governments of the world would strongly resist any effort to dismantle it.

III

I recall these elements of the record of the United Nations only briefly because my intent today is to look forward rather than backward.

It is my belief that it is not impossible—I repeat, not impossible—that we shall see in the years ahead a favorable change in the international environment within which the United Nations has to act; and that the United Nations in the future could come nearer than in the past to fulfilling its mission as defined at San Francisco.

In elaborating this theme, I shall try to do two things: first, to explain why I believe the forces at work in the world around us could move us in the direction of a stable peace in the years ahead; and, second, to suggest three directions in which the United Nations might both assist the movement toward stable peace and make the most of that movement as it occurs.

IV

On what grounds can a man stand before his fellow citizens and assert that there are forces at work moving us toward stable peace? How can this be said in a world where two major regions—the Middle East and Southeast Asia—are both caught up in daily bloodshed and confrontation?

I am, of course, aware of these conflicts; and I might add that no one who has served in the posts which I was privileged to hold between 1961 and 1969 can be a naive optimist.

Nevertheless, I believe there are two forces at work in the world which could move us in the years ahead toward stable peace.

First, there is the diffusion of power away from Moscow and Washington.

This is no new phenomenon. It began, in a sense, for both capitals in 1948.

For the United States it began as a matter of national policy. It began when the American Congress voted the funds for the Marshall Plan and threw its weight behind the movement towards Western European unity. We set about reviving a region which we hoped to see emerge as a partner, not a satellite. In effect, we set about purposefully to reduce the power we could then exercise in a critical part of the world.

As for Moscow, the diffusion of power began when Tito defied Stalin and proved that Yugoslavia could survive on that basis.

This diffusion has continued over the past generation, gathering momentum, in particular, after the Cuban missile crisis.

For good or ill, that crisis persuaded men in many parts of the world that the Soviet Union was not as dangerous as it had been in the past, and, therefore, they could act with greater independence of Washington, as well as of Moscow. The missile crisis also brought Moscow's split with Peking into the open and intensified it.

So far as American policy is concerned, I believe we can take pride in the fact that in the first postwar generation we threw our political influence, as well as our economic resources, behind the desire of nations to stand up straight and fashion their own destiny. And we have moved in recent years—notably, under President Johnson's leadership—to the active support of regionalism in Latin America, Africa, and Asia, as well as continuing our support for regionalism in Western Europe.

But what about Moscow?

In 1960, after the Presidential election, I was sent to take part in a Pugwash conference in Moscow on arms control. I was asked to speak toward the end of the sessions. At one point I said this:

"As an historian, I am convinced that the central historical fact of our time is this: power is being rapidly diffused away from Moscow and Washington. What we are seeing in the world is an equivalent of the process which occurred after 1815. In 1815 Great Britain was the only country in the world which had absorbed the tricks of then modern technology. It alone had experienced an industrial revolution. In the century after 1815, the industrial revolution took hold in Belgium, France, Germany, Russia, Japan, and North America.

"Now the industrial revolution is taking hold in the areas which were skipped during the century after 1815—that is to say the industrial revolution is taking hold in China and Eastern Europe; and it is occurring—or it will soon occur—in the whole southern half of the globe.

"The inevitable result is that industrial potential, military power, and influence on the world scene is being diffused and will continue to be diffused.

"Faced with this fact, there are three choices open to the Soviet Union and the United States. We can stumble into a war and destroy a large part of what man has built on the face of the earth and a large part of the world's population. We can continue the Cold War until the diffusion of power removes the capacity to decide from Moscow and Washington. Or, working constructively together, we can create the terms on which power will become diffused.

"This is the limit of the historical powers of the Soviet Union and the United States. I would hope that we would choose the third path. This is the historical responsibility we owe to our peoples."

I believe that assessment was essentially correct in 1960; and it remains correct, although the continued concentration of nuclear capacity in the United States and the Soviet Union makes it necessary to define the diffusion of power with some subtlety.

I cannot say that the Soviet officials who heard me in 1960 immediately agreed; and, much as I should like to believe it, I do not think Soviet policy has yet firmly accepted this doctrine. But I do believe that there are more men in Moscow than there were ten years ago who understand that the world emerging in the latter half of the twentieth century is not going to be dominated by any single power or any single ideology; and that their duty to their own peoples is to help organize the world peacefully rather than to try to control it directly from Moscow. That is what the Nonproliferation Treaty is about, the SALT talks, and the occasional Soviet efforts to join others in damping, rather than exacerbating, crises. What has happened in the Middle East since 1967 and in Czechoslovakia in 1968 should remind us that this doctrine has not been accepted fully. But we are closer to it; and the forces making for the diffusion of power will certainly persist, not diminish.

So far as the United Nations is concerned, it will have more work to do—and more constructive work—in a world of diffused power than in one controlled primarily by Moscow and Washington. Its institutions are designed to organize and make sense of a world of varying interests, not to mediate between two hard blocs.

Related to the diffusion of power is a second major force which could lead us in the direction of stable peace. That is the decline of the aggressive revolutionary romantics.

The politics of developing nations has been marked in the generation since 1945 by a group of autocratic or totalitarian leaders who have chosen to build their domestic politics on "anti-imperialism" and to channel a high proportion of the limited energies, talents, and resources available to them into external expansion: in Asia the

roster includes Mao, Ho, Kim, and Sukarno; in the Middle East, Nasser and the other radical Arab leaders; in Africa, Nkrumah and Ben Bella; in Latin America, Castro. In one way or another these men were deeply involved in the world's major crises since South Korea was invaded, more than twenty years ago.

Some of these leaders are gone and the fate of others—and their policies—is still to be determined. In general, however, they encountered three forces which have tended to frustrate them.

First, they encountered other people's nationalism. Their revolutionary doctrines had a certain resonance in other countries within their regions; but it is one thing to be a radical nationalist Arab, a believer in Black African unity and assertiveness, or to hold that the social ills of Latin America require radical solutions: it is a different matter to agree to take your orders from Cairo, Accra, or Havana.

Second, they have encountered the resistance of those who have not wished to see the regional balances of power upset. Although the United States has carried in our time the major burden of supporting those under pressure of regional aggression, the British and Australians stood with Malaysia; fifteen nations with South Korea; six with South Vietnam; in 1958 British and the United States stood with Jordan and Lebanon; since 1967 the United States has helped keep the balance of regional forces from overwhelming Israel.

Third, the relative neglect of domestic welfare gradually imposed attrition on domestic political support for policies of external grandeur which failed to yield decisive results. It is easy initially to excite the people with visions of quick redress for real or believed old grievances or humiliations; but, in time, the desire to eat better, to see the children grow up with better health and more education asserts itself.

It was in such settings of frustration and disabuse that Nkrumah, Ben Bella, and Sukarno gave way to successors more focused on tasks of welfare and growth; the great debate proceeds between Mao and his opposition; and the North Vietnamese begin to surface their inner debate on the priority of victory in the south versus "building socialism" in North Vietnam.

It is no easy thing for a group of political leaders to abandon a vision to which their mature lives have been committed and which up to a point, granted them success. Mao, evidently, has refused, and will probably refuse to the end, to acquiesce in the pragmatic bent of his "revisionist" opponents who would (in the phrase of one of Mao's opponents) encourage policies based on "objective economic laws" at home and external policies such that "the world can back in the sunlight of peace" and "infants can slumber in the cradles, and mothers and wives may no longer live in nightmares." Kim's dream of ruling all of Korea from Pyongyang will die hard; although Kim has been brought up short by a hard, simple, stabilizing, sobering fact; the rate of growth of South Korea is two or three times the rate of growth of North Korea. The dream of the men in Hanoi—that they alone are the proper successors to the French colonial empire in Asia—will also fade slowly, and with great pain for men who have sacrificed almost a million human beings in its fruitless pursuit. Castro will never find in producing sugar a substitute for his visions of converting the Andes into the Sierra Maestra of South America. And Nasser, tragically, would not hold for long to the idea that occasionally engaged him—that Cairo will only be great when Egypt, by its performance in economic and social development, helps lead the Middle East by example in overcoming its heritage of poverty and reconciling an intractable Arab culture with the exigencies of the modern world.

In the case of Hanoi, Pyongyang, Cairo, and Havana, the availability of large external resources permits postponement of the decision to shift from expansion abroad to growth and welfare at home.

And before these dreams are abandoned, we may see final desperate acts to fulfill them.

But, in the end—soon or late—they will confront the destiny of the first great romantic revolutionary expansionist—Napoleon. And they—or their successors—will echo Napoleon's memorandum to his finance minister in December 1812, when he abandoned the Continental System and the attempt to throttle Britain: "Undoubtedly it is necessary to harm our foes, but above all we must live."

v

I believe the forces at work yielding a diffusion of power and the decline of the romantic revolutionaries are real and strong; but I would not for a moment predict a sudden emergence of our world into the sunlight of stable peace; nor do I expect these two forces to work out smoothly and automatically to hand us peace on a platter.

There are ample forces also at work which could yield disruption and chaos; and there are a number of specific dangers.

For example, the turn away from radical expansionism to a concentration of the tasks of growth and welfare for the people is not yet visible in the Middle East; although the popularity of the American peace initiative among the people of Jordan and Egypt suggests that the latent impulse might be there.

For example, a frustration of growth in important parts of the developing world could induce a shift away from a pragmatic concentration on economic and social progress to more disruptive policies at home and abroad.

Let me pause and underline this point, and make it as blunt as I can. I can think of no worse period for a decline in American aid to the developing world than right now. President Kennedy suggested the 1960's might be called the Decade of Development. And that decade saw much more progress than is generally understood. In every region there are success stories which demonstrate that the job *can* be done: from South Korea and Thailand to Iran and Turkey; to Tunisia and the Ivory Coast; to Mexico, Colombia, and Venezuela. But the job is *not* done. We have at least another decade of hard work before the nations containing the bulk of the population in the developing world will have moved into self-sustained growth.

At just this critical time—when we know that success is possible, but before it has been achieved—the American contribution to development has fallen away. Of the developed nations of the world, we now stand eleventh in terms of the proportion of our gross national product devoted to this task. It is a rather scandalous performance.

Now, of course, increased external assistance to developing countries will not, alone, deal with all their problems; for example, the urgent need to bring down the birth rate in the Indian subcontinent, Java, and elsewhere. But increased external assistance is essential, if we really wish to move the world in the direction of stable peace and to make the most of historical forces which trend in that direction.

There are still other dangers of disruption and conflict which could arise within the Communist world; for example, out of the Soviet fears of a nuclear China and Soviet fears of rising nationalism and liberalism in Eastern Europe.

But the biggest question mark is our own country.

We evidently face a number of searching and difficult problems at home. We have carried a high proportion of the burdens and responsibilities of the world community for a quarter-century. There are those who believe this is enough; and that we should now come home.

I do not doubt that in a world of diffusing power—where others wish to take a larger part in shaping their own destiny—the relative role of the United States should and will decline with the passage of time. It has declined in Europe and Latin America; and it is declining in Asia. And the role and responsibilities of others should and will increase. That, after all, is the whole point of the Marshall Plan and the similar policies we have followed in other parts of the world where we have sought not satellites but partners, preferably working on a regional basis.

But still, if we pull back too fast—in Europe or the Middle East, Latin America or Asia—we could move the world not towards stable peace but towards chaos and enlarged areas of violence and international conflict.

This is the responsibility we Americans bear and cannot escape. We can gradually, cautiously, pull back in degree, as others gather strength; but we cannot safely walk away from our responsibilities.

The world community has come a long way in the quarter-century since the Cold War began: in Western Europe and East-West relations; in the balance of forces at work in Asia; in the process of modernization in the developing regions. And I deeply believe we can make much more progress in the next quarter-century than we did in the past. But much depends on us—on the United States. Our role is diminishing as we wish it to diminish. But we remain the critical margin.

Thus, taking all the doubts and question marks together—ourselves included—it would not be difficult to envisage future movement not towards order and reconciliation and progress but towards disruption, fragmentation, mass hunger and renewed danger in a nuclear world.

What can be said on the basis of a quarter-century's effort against considerable odds is that the task of moving in the next generation towards stable peace does not appear impossible; and those are about as good odds as man is ever granted in great enterprises.

vi

I turn now to my second question.

With these prospects and hopes, possibilities and dangers, how ought the United Nations to change in the years ahead, both to reflect the forces at work and to try to tip them in the right direction.

I have three concrete suggestions.

First, it is clear from the way negotiations and policy are moving with respect to China and Germany that the question of a universal United Nations will soon be upon us. I believe we shall have to face this matter in the time ahead; and that we should face it.

The question of a universal United Nations—containing East and West Germany, North and South Vietnam, North and South Korea, representatives from the governments in both Peking and Taipei—is a matter of timing and a matter of how the job is done.

As for timing, I think the time may soon be ripe.

The confidence in their own capacity to deal with their Communist adversaries, evident in the Federal Republic of Germany and in the Republic of Korea, has lifted many of the fears and anxieties which would have made movement towards a universal United Nations unsettling rather than constructive in the past.

With respect to North and South Vietnam, the invitation of both governments to the United Nations could provide an appropriate framework for the settlement in Southeast Asia, which ought to come in the time ahead if rationality prevails in Hanoi. It is worth recalling that Moscow proposed membership

in the United Nations for both governments as early as 1957.

So far as mainland China is concerned, its fears of the Soviet Union and the many divisions now mounted on the Soviet side of the border are leading Peking towards more normal relations with the rest of the world. Nevertheless, the problem of China is the most difficult of the four—perhaps equally difficult for Peking and Taipei. It has been complicated by the fact that the Canadian recognition of Peking has been accompanied by withdrawal of recognition from Taipei. I do not believe that this is the right way forward.

This brings me to the manner in which a universal United Nations is created. The object must be universality and not tipping the balance of diplomacy and power against one or another of the governments concerned. The object should be simply a universal United Nations, leaving each capital to carry on with whatever theology it chooses concerning its status *vis-a-vis* its adversary.

In the case of the Chinese Nationalist Government on Taiwan, it is clear that its role in the Security Council is anomalous. Nationalist China is not a great power. But it is equally anomalous to remove that government from the United Nations or to reduce the number of governments recognizing Taipei. The Government of Nationalist China, from most difficult and unpromising beginnings in 1949–50, has organized the economic and social development of some 13 million people in a remarkably successful way. It has become a recognized and responsible member of the Asian and the world community. It has contributed in Africa exceedingly effective technical assistance programs. As countries within the United Nations go, Nationalist China is a medium-sized, not a small nation.

In bringing about a universal United Nations, the world community would be most unwise to treat Taiwan and its government casually, carelessly, or with lack of respect for its demonstration of how modernization can proceed in loyalty to the ancient culture of China.

Moreover, it is time to examine afresh the structure of the Security Council. There is a tendency still to think in terms of the Big Five; that is, Britain, France, the United States, Soviet Union, and China. This is an odd and parochial way to look at the world. After all, 60 per cent of the world's population lives in Asia. Therefore, it may be time to bring not only mainland China into the Security Council but also India and Japan. I suggest this not only because Asia deserves better balanced representation than a Communist China. I suggest it also because Communist China is unique in Asia for only one reason: it has manufactured nuclear weapons. It is important that this not very distinguished achievement—which India and Japan could duplicate, and more, in very short order—not be rewarded.

In suggesting that the time has come for us to look afresh and creatively at this whole problem, I would like to underline that I do not believe that the creation of a universal United Nations will be a panacea or yield instant stable peace. A universal United Nations will not be easy to bring about; and with all its new members assembled, there will be difficulties as well as advantages. For a time, some of the work of the United Nations might even be slowed up. But, in the end, the United Nations ought to be a political institution which reflects the realities. And those realities include the existence of the governments not now represented.

To bring them into the United Nations at this time would not only make the United Nations truly representative of how politics is organized on this troubled, striving, turbulent planet but it would also tend to underline a rule which ought to prevail; namely, the unification of countries divided by the Second World War and its aftermath should come about by peaceful means only. If there is any lesson from this difficult quarter-century that ought to be written into the rules of this planet, that lesson should come near the top. And a universal United Nations would make it more likely rather than less likely that rule will be obeyed. We have had two major crises between East and West Germany centered on Berlin; two in the Taiwan Straits; and bloody wars in Korea and Vietnam in which Pyongyang and Hanoi have sought unification by force of arms. That is enough.

Now a second observation on the future of the United Nations.

In a world of diffusing power, trying to move towards stable peace, the smaller nations must assume greater responsibilities than in the past for making peace and keeping peace.

The rhetoric and common law of the United Nations over the first postwar generation needs some changing. The lesser powers have never lacked rhetoric in urging the major powers—notably the United States and the Soviet Union—to increase their efforts in arms control and other forms of movement towards peace. On the other hand, their actions (as opposed to their rhetoric) have sometimes reduced the possibilities for peace in two ways.

First, their tendency to cherish their regional quarrels rather than to settle them. This is true of the Indian subcontinent and the Middle East. It remains true of a few old quarrels in Latin America. It was true of Southeast Asia, but that may be improving a little. In any case, the rule to be stated loud and clear in a world of diffusing power is this: peacemaking is everybody's business; and it begins with your next door neighbor.

Second, the small and medium powers have tended to remain remarkably philosophical when problems did not affect them directly. I find it quite shocking, for example, that the smaller nations of the world should accept so passively the invasion of Cambodia by North Vietnamese forces. Cambodia is a member of the United Nations. It proclaimed its neutrality. That neutrality has been violated systematically over the years; and in recent months it has been violated grossly by North Vietnam in its effort to take over South Vietnam.

Quite apart from the debate on South Vietnam. I should think the smaller nations of the world would take rather seriously this kind of violation of a member's integrity.

Whenever this kind of action is passively accepted, it is for all of us—and especially the smaller powers—for whom the bell tolls.

The representatives of the small nations could, of course, argue for some time that too much power was concentrated in Moscow and in Washington; that the best they could do was to keep out of the way, encourage the Big Two to emeliorate their relations, and exploit—even cynically exploit—the possibilities opened up for them by differences between the great powers.

As an historian, I can understand such a policy without moralizing about it. After all, it was precisely the policy Washington commended to the American people in 1796 and which we followed for a century. But in a world of diffusing power, this is not good enough. Peacemaking must become the business of all. The time for double standards—whether for Communist versus non-Communist nations, or for big nations versus smaller nations—the time for such double standards, which have marked so much United Nations debate and behavior, is coming to a close.

Now a final suggestion—concerning possibly expanded initiatives from the United Nations itself.

The major constitutional difference between the League of Nations and the United Nations is that under the United Nations Charter the Secretary General has the power to initiate a proposal—the power to lay a piece of paper on the table to which governments must react. This power of initiative is a considerable challenge and opportunity for the Secretary General and the secretariats which support him. If used well, it is a positive force for good. It is also a power which, if used beyond the political realities, can reduce rather than increase the stature of the United Nations. Except at rare moments and under rare men, that authority of the Secretary General has not been employed effectively.

But if my general assessment is right—that we could move towards more stable peace—then the Secretary General's constitutional authority might be exercised more fully than in the past.

The power of initiative does not mean that the Secretary General can, as a unique, strong-minded individual, effectively assert what he personally regards as right or wrong for the world. Who is involved is his trying to find, by a most careful process of political analysis and consultation, solutions for particular problems which are within the bounds of reality but which the nations themselves might not be able to negotiate in a more conventional way. There is a margin—sometimes, on some matters—where a creative third party can find a formula on which diplomats themselves might not be able to hit or, even, articulate to each other, unless a third party laid it on the table. It is that kind of disciplined, painstaking leadership in moving towards peace which will be increasingly possible and increasingly needed in the years ahead—if my assessment is correct.

Now a final word.

We Americans have had some peculiar views about the United Nations; and we ought to be candid about them.

Every time the going got tough, there were those who said: Why not turn it over to the United Nations?

I heard this view expressed on Greece and Berlin, the missiles in Cuba, Vietnam, and on many other occasions. The answer is: when the United Nations is prepared to do the job, we should, of course, act within the United Nations; but we must never use the incapacity of the United Nations—or divisions within it—as an excuse for not protecting our interests or accepting responsibilities we have assumed through treaties.

The United Nations in 1950 did act in Korea as the result of the absence of the Soviet delegation. When it acted, the United States had to carry a substantial part of the load—but we were not alone. And that is the way it will be every time the United Nations meets its responsibilities.

The United States will have to take a substantial part of the burden;

But we shall not be alone.

Thus, support for the United Nations is no substitute for American responsibility. It cannot safely be a pious route to isolationism.

On the other hand, the United Nations is the right road—the road we should prefer when it can actually function in conformity to the Charter.

It is my belief—my faith—that we do our job in the world, the historical forces at work could gradually, over the next generation, move us to a situation where more and more of our efforts on the world scene could be channeled through the United Nations and its various institutions.

That will not happen by wishing it so. It will happen only if the American people—along with others—dedicate themselves to a second quarter-century of building, stone-by-stone, the edifice of world order which was destroyed in 1914 and which has not yet been re-created.

There will be no soft answers or quick fixes.

But I do believe the job can be done if we have the stubborn idealism to stay with it.

MURFREESBORO, N.C., ATTEMPTS TO PRESERVE ITS HERITAGE AND HISTORIC VALUE

HON. WALTER B. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 23, 1970

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in this day of the problems of the large cities as well as the small towns, it is indeed refreshing and reassuring to find a small town that is attempting to preserve its heritage and historic value. Such is the case in Murfreesboro, N.C., located in the congressional district that I have the honor of representing.

So that other communities may be so inspired to give attention to and focus upon the cultural heritage of their communities, I am placing in the RECORD some brief remarks which describe that which is being done in Murfreesboro, N.C.:

MURFREESBORO, N.C.

It is hereby recognized that the Murfreesboro Adaptive Restoration Program cosponsored by The Murfreesboro Historical Association, Inc., and the Historic Murfreesboro Commission both of Murfreesboro, North Carolina, in co-operation with public and private sources, is an unusual program being conducted by local citizens on a non-salaried basis for the upgrading of the economic, educational, social, and cultural life of northeastern North Carolina. The program, started in 1966, has reached a level of state and national recognition among noted restoration and preservation authorities uncommon for a small community such as Murfreesboro. Even without a paid staff or any endowment, the program has raised over $25,000.00 within the past four years and has projected a $5,000,000.00 program of development and restoration for the Historic District of Murfreesboro, North Carolina. A mid-18th century riverport and King's Landing, Murfreesboro's unusually large number (75) of 18th and 19th century structures represents one of the last major groupings of unrestored architecturally significant structures remaining in the United States today.

Breaking away from the traditional "museum town" idea, the Murfreesboro program emphasizes the adaptive use of its old homes to fullfill some vital community need. Testifying to this trait is the adaptive restoration of the 18th century Roberts House for a Village Center housing the Murfreesboro Public Library and civic offices. The 1.3 acre grounds around the Roberts House will be developed as a public park. The project is aided by a $75,000.00 matching preservation grant from the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development. The Murfreesboro program will eventually include such features as exhibition buildings open to the public, tours, lectures, lodging facilities, restaurant facilities, art program, children's museum and educational program, formal and herb gardens, green areas and will offer employment to approximately 125 persons.

Murfreesboro's most noted native sons were Col. Hardy Murfree, hero of the Battle of Stony Point, New York, a decisive Revolutionary War engagement; John Hill Wheeler, United States Minister to Nicaragua, State Treasurer, Superintendent of United States Mint at Charlotte, North Carolina, and author of *Wheeler's History of North Carolina* in 1851; and Richard Jordan Gatling, inventor of the famed Gatling gun. William Hill Brown, the first American novelist died here on September 2, 1793.

It should also be noted that the Murfreesboro Adaptive Restoration Program coupled with the community benefits derived from Chowan College and the Murfreesboro Industrial Development Corporation makes Murfreesboro a very progressive small town determined to solve its own problems.

LATEST REPORT FROM CONGRESSMAN ED ESHLEMAN

HON. EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 23, 1970

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have just recently sent to my constituents a newsletter. I am including the contents of that newsletter in the RECORD at this point:

WASHINGTON SPOTLIGHT

(Report From Your Congressman, ED ESHLEMAN)

REAL MAJORITY

After talking to hundreds of people during the past several weeks, I have become convinced there is a real political challenge for the Seventies. Politicians need to set their sights higher than just a majority. We should seek to establish a just majority. That is, a coalition of Americans determined to give this country the kind of inspirational, moral and spiritual leadership which so many of us recognize is a prerequisite to greatness.

FALLEN FOWL

The post-election session of Congress now underway is often referred to as a "lame duck" session. Helen Bowers, writing in the newspaper Roll Call, gives an interesting account of the origins of this rather odd term. "Our fettered feathered friend first appeared in print in 19th century England, where the gentlemen on Change Alley, comparable to our Wall Street, described their bankrupt comrades as waddling out like lame ducks. Borrowing the term, Americans in 1833 were referring to people who did not make prompt payment on stock losses as lame ducks. In 1910, Washington correspondents nicknamed a White House corridor 'Lame Duck' because statesmen who had recently gone down in electoral defeat were gathering there to display their wounds. Lame Duck was applicable, they said, because these were men who had been winged, but hoped to preen their plumage again. The term, however, first entered the general U.S. vocabulary in 1922 when Senator George Morris initiated a proposal for a 'lame duck amendment' to prevent defeated Congressmen from remaining in office and acting on legislation until March of the year following the election. Senator Morris proposed changing the law to begin a new Congressional session in January rather than two months later. The proposal, as might be expected, met with some opposition, however, and the 'lame duck amendment' was not ratified until February 6, 1933. The fiery discussion, though, was quite enough to have made the term 'lame duck' very much a part of our current political vocabulary."

QUOTE TO NOTE

President Nixon speaking to a student audience at Kansas State University said, "What corrodes a society even more than violence itself is the acceptance of violence, the condoning of terror, the excusing of inhuman acts as misguided efforts to accommodate the community's standards to those of the violent few."

SCATTERED SITE SESSION

Recently I called a meeting in my Washington office on the subject of scattered site housing in Lancaster City. The picture below (not printed in the RECORD) shows the participants in that discussion. Shown with me are: three members of the Lancaster City Council—Richard Filling, Benjamin High and Julia Brazill; the State Representative-elect from Lancaster, Harold Horn; two officials from the Department of Housing and Urban Development—Molly Newington, Congressional Liaison Officer and Horace J. Sincore, Assistant to the Program Manager for the New York and Philadelphia Regions. I think some progress was made at the meeting toward resolving the controversial public housing situation in Lancaster.

TWENTY-FIVE AND BEYOND

The United Nations began its 25th year last month. During the past quarter of a century the organization has been the subject of considerable controversy. The effectiveness of its primary role of peace-keeping has raised serious questions, but its importance as a world forum cannot be denied. However, if the U.N. is to continue to be a vigorous center of international debate, some reforms should be undertaken. The need for a major overhaul is shown clearly in the make-up of the General Assembly. A two-thirds vote can be assembled from nations that contain only 10 per cent of the world's population. The Maldive Islands, with a population of 104,000, have an equal vote with the 205 million people in the United States. This kind of discrepancy tends to keep the U.N. from dealing properly with the realities of wielding power and pursuing peace.

BUREAUCRATIC BACKBITING

If you have ever wondered why it takes a government agency so long to act on something, perhaps you should consider the personal jealousies and feuds which interfere with the work of the bureaucracy. The following quotation from an unidentified OEO official shows that things like settling personal scores or hindering a potential rival can be far more important than keeping the government machinery running smoothly. The official describes how he can use the bureaucratic maze to "fix" a subordinate. "All I have to do is change a person's extension every other day, delay the re-routing of correspondence, fail to press for prompt repair or replacement of a broken typewriter, assign a 'dud' to the secretarial pool, forget to authorize secretarial overtime, limit the grade of the secretarial slot assigned to a person, screen all applicants for secretarial positions, place his grant package at the bottom of the pile rather than the top—and that person is a walking corpse."

ANTI-INFLATION SLOGAN

Let's make saving money a means to an end rather than an end of your means.

Economic evaluation

During the past several weeks there has been a good deal of talk about the state of the economy. Since much of the talk has been contradictory, there is a need to examine the economic facts. The Under Secretary of Treasury provides this summation: "This is the record of 21 months. . . . A badly overheated economy has been cooled, inflation is being brought under control, financial markets are operating efficiently, a housing boom is in prospect and the road back towards full employment is clearly charted." That rather optimistic statement is based upon indicators which show that the trend is definitely towards improvement in the economic picture. Yet there are areas of continuing concern: (1) Unemployment—A situation of rising unemployment was caused by a cut in defense spending and a drop in production rates. To ease unemployment, the growth rate of the economy will

have to be increased. Therefore, slightly expansionary monetary policies may be called for. (2) High Interest Rates—High rates are not part of the government's economic policy. Interest rates follow supply and demand in the money market, which in turn are influenced by people's anticipation of continued inflation. An effective anti-inflationary policy is the only way to get interest rates down. Rates have dropped from the highs reached in early 1970, but still need to decline further. (3) Stock Market—High personal savings, a moderately favorable outlook for corporate profits and an easing in the money supply add up to a reasonably optimistic outlook for the market. (4) Balance of payments—Although our exports exceed our imports, we are still building a dollar deficit abroad. This is because of a big liability in a category known as official settlements transactions. An effective anti-inflationary policy in the U.S. will help to balance the international system. (5) Wage and Price Controls—When these methods are tried here and abroad, what they achieved, at best, was a period of apparent stability followed by an explosion undoing whatever progress had been made. Implementation of mandatory wage and price controls would be counterproductive. It likely would result in long-term damage to the national economy and individual pocketbooks.

Downturn to cheer

The following table shows the steady drop in war deaths in the past two years. As the Vietnam conflict winds down, casualties will continue to decrease. Hopefully, the time is not too far away when there will be no deaths to report.

U.S. war deaths in Vietnam

1965	1,369
1966	5,008
1967	9,378
1968	14,592
1969	9,416
1970 (Oct. 10)	3,807

AUTO NATION

A big reason for many automobile related problems—things like pollution, insurance, highways, etc.—can be illustrated with one simple statistic. Motor vehicles on the Nation's highways are increasing at a rate of 12,000 a day, roughly twice the rate of our population growth. All those additional cars mean that more Americans are enjoying greater convenience. But each new vehicle on the road also means that the problems have been magnified.

MUSICAL CHAIRS

At the beginning of each new term in Congress, a sophisticated version of the musical chairs game is played on Capitol Hill. The prize in the game is a bigger office. Winning the prize, however, involves a real ordeal. There are a series of drawings for office space in which you must take a chance. But the real spice is added by involving the seniority system. Even if you are lucky in the drawings, you are subject to being bumped out of your office choice by a more senior Congressman. Over a period of weeks, you may have to choose several different office locations and in the end might not get anything better than you already occupy. My staff and I are not playing the game this year. We are very well satisfied with our present location, 416 Cannon House Office Building, and we will continue to serve you from there during the 92nd Congress.

VIETNAM FACT

National reunification has been used frequently by Vietnam critics as a pretense for "understanding" the Communist position in the Southeast Asian conflict. Remember the argument that Ho Chi Minh was the "George Washington" of both North Vietnam and South Vietnam, and that his fight was simply to unite his divided nation? As with so many facets of the debate about Vietnam, the national unity argument contains more fiction than fact. The Vietnamese are 2,500 years old as a people but have known geographic and national unity for less than 60 years. Their history has been one of great diversity, both regional and social, which partially explains the South Vietnamese reluctance to submit themselves to a monolith of Communist control. The South has never accepted Northern rule. During the only period of unity—that 60 year span—the South dominated the North.

THANKSGIVING HOLIDAY

Thanksgiving is a uniquely American holiday. Americans always have had much to be thankful for and have gratefully acknowledged that fact. This year the Thanksgiving season will remind us again of our blessings. And as we number those blessings, we surely shall be reminded that this season of thanks is also a season of hope.

President Abraham Lincoln, Thanksgiving Proclamation, 1863: "The year that is drawing toward its close has been with the blessings of fruitful fields and healthful skies. It has seemed to me fit and proper that they should be solemnly, reverently and gratefully acknowledged as with one heart and one voice by the whole American people. I do, therefore, invite my fellow citizens in every part of the United States . . . to set apart and observe the last Thursday of November next as a day of thanksgiving and praise to our beneficient Father who dwelleth in the heavens."

UNCLE'S DAY

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 23, 1970

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, November 21, the State of California observed Uncle's Day—a day designated by the State senate to honor uncles who lavish time, love, and money upon their nieces and nephews.

In recognition of this special day, Vista Del Mar, a residential treatment center for Los Angeles youngsters designated as uncles those who accept their community responsibility through substantial annual donations. Recognizing the outstanding contribution Elliot Handler has made to innumerable child-oriented endeavors, the Alumni Association of Vista Del Mar proclaimed Elliot Handler as "Uncle of the Year," and honored him at their annual winter ball November 21.

Elliot, a Colorado native, moved to Los Angeles in 1937 and became intrigued with the many potential uses for plastic. In 1945 he left what had become a flourishing plastic novelty business to form Mattel which was later to become the world's largest manufacturer of toys and youth products.

Besides his outstanding success in business Elliot has pursued his interest in serving the community. He is a founder of the Music Center, a member of the University of Southern California's Associates and an honoree of the Newcomen Society and the City of Hope. Both he and his wife, Ruth, are on the board of directors for Vista Del Mar and devote an outstanding amount of their time and energy in working with a great number of agencies which care for children.

It is a privilege for me to join with the many "graduates" of this Los Angeles orphanage and child-care agency in paying tribute to Elliot Handler "Uncle of the Year."

RED CHINA IN U.N. SOON?

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 23, 1970

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of grave concern to me and to millions of fellow Americans that the United Nations can consider the admission of Red China to this organization ostensibly devoted to the goal of world peace.

It is incredible that it will consider such action on the terms demanded by this outlaw among nations—and that is the ouster of Nationalist China, a founder of this organization, and presumably its seat on the Security Council with veto power.

I know the grave concern over this pending action by many Americans, but particularly by those loyal citizens of Chinese descent who have friends and relatives on Formosa. Indeed, an outstanding young attorney, Mr. Harry Gee, Jr., president of the Houston Lodge, Chinese American Citizens Alliance, wrote me a few days ago:

> We feel that Congress must clearly state its position to the Nixon administration so that our ambassador to the United Nations will represent our interest fully . . .

As expressed in an editorial from the Houston Post of November 11, 1970, which I attach.

There has been a notable softening of the United States' approach to this festering question under this administration which has been toying with a so-called "Two China" policy. This I view as but a prelude to a complete sellout of the Nationalist Chinese, and I strongly urge my colleagues on the appropriate committees to give us the opportunity to clearly and unequivocally voice the position of this Congress, and the American people, in opposition to the seating of Red China.

To our State Department, and others in this administration, and to those mini-states which now comprise the majority of the General Assembly, I would direct the words uttered by the late President John F. Kennedy that cold morning of January 20, 1961:

> . . . To those new States whom we welcome to the ranks of the free, we pledge our words that one form of colonial control shall not have passed away merely to be replaced by a far greater iron tyranny. We shall not always expect to find them supporting our view. But we shall always hope to find them strongly supporting their own freedom—and to remember that in the past, those who foolishly sought power by riding the back of the tiger ended up inside . . .

[From the Houston Post, Nov. 11, 1970]

RED CHINA IN UN SOON?

For a long time now, the United Nations has been suffering an erosion of its effectiveness as an international agency created to promote the cause of peace in the world, and it is in danger of losing what little it has left, in the opinion of some observers.

With Italy having followed Canada in ex-

tending diplomatic recognition to the Communist regime in Peking, and with some smaller countries showing signs of wanting to climb on the bandwagon, forecasts are being made that within a short time—perhaps next year—Red Cina will be admitted to membership and Nationalist China expelled as Peking demands as a condition for its membership.

When and if this happens, the UN will be putting itself in the position of condoning and accepting the use of military force to gain power or domination, and its pretensions of working for the ideal of peace will sound rather hollow, if not actually hypocritical, to a great many people. To those who say the action would be pragmatic, the best answer is that the UN never was intended to be a pragmatic organization. Rather, it was created to work for the attainment of an ideal, peace.

It may be true that most of the world's present nation-states were established as a result of the use of force, but that was done before the establishment of the UN. The Communist conquest of mainland China came later.

If it is argued that the conflict between the two Chinas is an internal matter, then the UN would be putting itself in the position of intervening in a domestic affair, and on the side of men whose devotion to peace not only is questionable and who openly advocate the use of force and violence throughout the world.

Peking does not share the supposed dedication of the organization to the cause of world peace but condescendingly insists that, if it should accept membership, the island of Taiwan now held by the Nationalist government must be treated as a province of Red China. In other words, Nationalist China must be expelled as having no claim to sovereignty. To do this, the UN would have to turn its back on one of its founders and a government that has been one of its most active and helpful members.

The admission of Red China on its terms would be a victory for the Communist bloc but no less one for the mini-states, which absurdly, enjoy equal voting status with the great powers in the UN General Assembly. Many of these are willing to sell their votes to the highest bidder.

If Nationalist China is booted out and replaced with Red China, Red China could claim and undoubtedly would get the seat on the Security Council now held by Nationalist China as a founding great power. This carries with it a veto. This hardly can be interpreted as being in the interest of the United States, the Free World or the promotion of world peace.

Admission of Red China as a member would be one thing and might even be a defensible couse of action. But to accept it as a replacement for Nationalist China is quite something else.

Before embracing an enemy, the organization would be well advised to take into account the possible reaction throughout the world and in the United States particularly. It has been hard to sell support of the UN to the American people from the beginning and the difficulty has become progressively greater in recent years.

It is the United States taxpayers who have been paying most of the cost of the organization. Any greater Communist control of the UN could only increase hostility in this country. It would play into the hands of the neo-isolationists, but the Communists might not object to this, since they have the same long-range objective, the isolation of the United States. But who is going to pay the bills of an anti-American organization?

The United States might be justified in demanding that any admission of Red China be accompanied by some drastic changes and reforms in the UN structure, its charter and its procedures.

PRISON INMATES TO VOTE IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 23, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, announcement that voting registrars are signing up prison inmates to vote for the District of Columbia's new nonvoting delegate in the U.S. Congress may be an indication of the responsible informed electorate that will deliver the balance of power here in the District.

The candidate's promises for this bloc vote can already be heard—a promise to further reduce all penalties for crime in Washington, D.C.

I submit a related newsclipping which follows:

[From the Washington Star, Nov. 21, 1970]

PRISONERS GET CHANCE TO REGISTER FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA VOTE

District prison inmates who are eligible to vote in the upcoming nonvoting House delegate election will be registered by D.C. Board of Elections employes tomorrow and Wednesday.

During the Jan. 12 primary and the March 23 general election, voting registrars will return to the city's jails—including the Woman's Detention Center, the Lorton Reformatory and D.C. jail—to distribute and collect special ballots.

MUST FILL OUT FORM

J. E. Bindeman, elections board chairman, said the special registration—marking the first time that city prisoners will vote—was prompted by a request from Charles M. Rodgers, the jail superintendent.

Those convicted of felonies and nonresidents of the District however, are ineligible to vote.

When a person votes, he must complete a certificate saying that he is still eligible, Bindeman said, "so if anyone is convicted (of a felony) between the time he is registered and the election, then he is picked out at the election."

A Department of Corrections spokesman estimated that about 1,200 inmates at the three facilities will be eligible to vote.

Since Oct. 17, when the registration drive opened, "between 20,000 and 25,000 persons have been registered," the elections board chairman said.

Yesterday five candidates for the nonvoting delegate post said that home rule should be the chief objective of the city's congressman but disagreed over the best means to achieve that goal.

Speaking before about 75 last night in a forum sponsored by the Capitol East Community Organization, candidates Andrew Bell, the Rev. Walter Fauntroy, the Rev. Channing Phillips, John Nevius and Dr. David Dabney fielded questions from the audience after making platform statements indicating the need to work for home rule for the District.

All agreed in substance with Bell, a Democrat, who said citizens of the District are "subjects of Congress who will not be free until home rule is achieved."

But none of the other four agreed with Bell's statement that the delegate "must work ON Congress not WITH Congress to make home rule in Washington a reality."

Fauntroy, also a Democrat, said the delegate must work with the political system, manipulating it to serve the needs of his Washington constituency.

"The efficacy of a congressman," he said, "is not in his one vote. The Congress operates on the efficacy of voting blocs. In Congress they call it 'quid pro quo.' In the streets we call it 'You scratch my back. I'll scratch yours.'"

OTHER VIEWS GIVEN

Republican Dabney didn't outline a definite strategy but said the delegate should concentrate his efforts locally rather than nationally. He said the delegate should fight for an elected comptroller and corporation counsel in his efforts to get home rule for Washington.

John Nevius, also a Republican, said the delegate should be "an employed expert . . . working to persuade Congress of the things his constituency needs." He advocated consistent lobbying as the best strategy, but made no mention of voting blocs or coalitions.

Phillips urged the voters to choose a candidate with enough political sophistication to manipulate Congress in the interests of home rule.

He said the delegate should seek to organize national voting coalitions in favor of legislation to help the District attain both home rule and full congressional representation.

"Choose a man who will take a sophisticated approach to the political process of achieving home rule," said Phillips. "Then if that doesn't produce the goals of self-government we seek, I think enough of us will be sufficiently radicalized to consider other alternatives."

POLICE DEPARTMENT HONORED

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 23, 1970

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues a recent event which took place in McKeesport, Pa., in my 20th Congressional District, where approximately 500 citizens gathered to honor the city's police department.

In particular, they were paying tribute to four members of the department for outstanding performances in the line of duty, and two city physicians for their many years of service to the law enforcement agency.

The salute was given these men at a "Support Our Police" program sponsored by the McKeesport Optimist Club. I believe the remarks made by Police Chief Joseph T. Reddington of McKeesport and Lt. Joseph Blazevich of the Allegheny County Sheriff's Office, reflected the feelings of all law officers.

Chief Reddington told the audience:

We are gratified the Optimist Club bestowed these honors upon our department. We are not used to it. It is a first. We are proud of this club and our citizens.

Lt. Blazevich spoke of the vital importance of citizens helping police in times of dissent and said:

This, I believe, is a beginning—a civic club honoring its police and the community joining in. We need much more of this type of citizenship.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, in this day and age when law officers appear to be "fair game" for certain radical elements within our society, such a public display of support is most heartwarming. I deem it a great privilege to place in the RECORD the names of the honorees and a brief account of their exploits:

Lt. Thomas Hanna for his capture of a suspect following a bank holdup; Officer Robert Morgan for his capture of four suspects in connection with the armed robbery of a parking lot; Officers Ronald Cooper and Robert Mulgado for their capture of a suspect in the slaying of a man in a local tavern.

Dr. M. R. Hadley, director of health services at McKeesport Hospital, and Dr. Milton Mermelstein, staff physician, for aid furnished police officers in times of emergency.

Citations, extolling the work of these men and expressing the appreciation of the community, were presented the police officers by Optimist Club President James Whitlinger, and to the two physicians by Police Chief Reddington.

Mr. Speaker, I too, would like to commend the officers for their dedication and performance to duty, which is particularly admirable considering the existing circumstances today, and to the doctors for their assistance to the McKeesport Police Department. I am proud of the Optimist Club and McKeesport's citizens who saw fit to focus public attention on the men who risk their lives to protect others.

TAX REFORM "MERRY-GO-ROUND"

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 23, 1970

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following comment on tax loopholes was in one of our weekly newspapers over a year ago. Tax loopholes—exemptions and credit bonanzas are talked about always but like the weather "nobody does anything to change it." Not even the House Ways and Means Committee.

The article follows:

WAGE EARNER JOLTED—HE HAS NO LOOPHOLES

Whenever a young congressman, alarmed by letters from home complaining about high income taxes on wage earners, takes to the floor of Congress to issue a plea for a thorough reform of our tax system, a senior and wiser member will pat him on the head and mumble something like, "You're right, son, we sure do need some of that tax reform." And that's just about as far as tax reform ever goes.

If you are a wage earner and most of your income is derived from the paycheck you receive by slaving away at the office or plant, you're hit and hit hard. If you play the stock market or buy and sell real estate, the tax is a gentle one. And if your income is from tax exempt municipal bonds, you don't have any jolt at all.

Joseph Barr, who just retired as Secretary of the Treasury, discovered that in 1967 there were 155 Americans who filed returns on adjusted gross incomes of more than $200,000 apiece but paid not one cent in taxes; 21 out of the 155 had earned more than $1 million each. Mr. Barr predicted the possibility of a taxpayers' revolt. I hope we have one. The tax system at all levels of government is ridiculous.

Tax reform is like motherhood—there is unanimous support for it. There's only one dark cloud on this otherwise unblemished horizon—who gets reformed?

What is for one person a glaring, scandalous and unprincipled loophole is for another a necessary incentive, designed to help create a positive society and foster among all Americans the virtues of peace, brotherhood and thrift.

The oil man with his 27.5 percent depletion allowance is always shocked to hear that others consider his deal a "loophole." "That's ridiculous," he snorts. "This allowance is an incentive for finding new oil and producing it—without that allowance we would still be riding in horse carts. Now I'm for tax reform, but let's begin by closing some real loopholes, not shutting down the oil industry."

The real estate operator with his quick write-off for depreciation might well think that the depletion allowance is a scandal and should be eliminated or at least lowered. But he will fight to the death any change in his write-off for the depreciation of the departments he owns.

"Depreciation is the lifeblood of the building industry. Where do you want people to live—in tents? Loopholes—humbug—go after the real tax evaders, not us."

I thought a change in the complicated loophole dealing with capital gains on assets such as stock which are presently untaxed at the time of death would be relatively noncontroversial. But then just this week a friend who raises money for a private college stopped by my office and expressed shock that I would even consider such a provision.

"Why, if those big estates that give us contributions had to pay taxes (like other people do) on the profit they've made on the increased value of their stock, they wouldn't even look at us. You might well put the private colleges out of business with that change."

And so it goes. If loopholes continue, if tax exemptions flourish, the only one who might be put out of business is the harassed wage-earning taxpayer—but then he could retire to a poor farm sponsored by a tax exempt foundation which is supported as a good tax write-off by some oil man, real estate operator, or stock and bond operator.

STOCK EXCHANGE PRESIDENT SPEAKS OUT

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 23, 1970

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, on November 17 Mr. Robert Haack, the president of the New York Stock Exchange, addressed the Economic Club of New York. In his speech, which has been widely reported in the press, Mr. Haack analyzed a number of recent trends in the securities markets and called for an end to the present system of fixed commission rates as well as a reorganization of the Exchange itself.

Robert Haack's remarks are remarkably candid and they are strongly at variance with what has been the prevailing wisdom of the industry on these matters. I wish to commend Mr. Haack for his courage and candor and I commend his remarks to the attention of my colleagues:

COMPETITION AND THE FUTURE OF THE NEW YORK STOCK EXCHANGE

REMARKS OF ROBERT W. HAACK, PRESIDENT OF THE NEW YORK STOCK EXCHANGE AT THE ECONOMICS CLUB OF NEW YORK, WALDORF ASTORIA, N.Y., NOVEMBER 17, 1970

There is an old forensic principle that speeches should never begin with a disclaimer. At the risk of violating that counsel, let me say that the concerns, assertions and questions which I will pose are expressed by me as an individual and do not necessarily represent the views of the Board of Governors. The policies of the New York Stock Exchange can be made only by that Board.

For 178 years the New York Stock Exchange has been the world's premier marketplace. It continues to be that today. Its reputation has been earned and is warranted by an admirable performance throughout the years. There is no other market which is so highly regulated, which discloses its activities so promptly, which oversees its members so closely, which sets such high standards on the calibre of issues traded, which monitors not only its members but its listed companies, which promptly disseminates price data and which provides depth, liquidity and continuity to the same extent to buyers and sellers of securities. Yet, I am concerned lest we bask solely in the glory of the past, and in the process become oblivious to emerging trends.

I am afraid we too often take for granted the benefits of a sophisticated, efficient central securities market. Without the New York Stock Exchange, our present standard of living would never have been reached. Our economy would function at a much lower level of activity, with capital in reduced supply and less impelled to seek out opportunities for growth. In a world which often sneers at the profit incentive, we may lose sight of the fact that we can afford to focus on improving the quality of life today precisely because our national affluence has made this possible. I take pride in the role our Exchange has played in the development of our economy and I urge you to consider carefully its continued importance to the nation's future growth and well being. It may well be that without the New York Stock Exchange, and the efficient allocation of resources it promotes, all the laudable efforts now going forward to reduce poverty, to restore better health to our central cities, to eradicate pollution, and to improve the quality of life, would be impossible.

FRAGMENTATION OF THE MARKET

Despite prospects for higher volume, and we are planning for 17 million share average days in 1975 and 27 million in 1980, I am concerned about our loss of market share during recent years, and particularly, the last twenty-four months. Available figures point to unmistakable forces shifting relative volume away from the nation's central auction market to regional exchanges and the so-called third market, or over-the-counter market where shares listed on the New York Stock Exchange are also traded. Many of you, as Chief executives of your companies, keep close watch on your firm's percentage of the market. Naturally, I endeavor to do the same for the New York Stock Exchange.

Although the public interest favors increasing concentration of trading in a central securities market, available figures show that exactly the reverse is happening. For example, as recently as 1967, the regional exchanges and the third market combined to account for just over 10% of all trading in our listed stocks. Today they account for almost 20%. Thus, in the past three years there has been a doubling in the share of off-Board trading. One of the regional stock exchanges has trebled its market share in the last two years alone, principally as a result of block transactions. Available data indicate a significant loss of block trades, with an estimated 35% to 45% of 10,000 shares or more traded away from the New York Stock Exchange.

It is an unusual and interesting phenomenon that the market with the greatest degree of regulation, greatest capital, and the most impressive record for depth and liquidity should find itself being fragmented.

I believe that the causes for this fragmentation are not related to any change in the unique economies of scale available on the Floor of the New York Stock Exchange but to the presence of antiquated and unequal rules and the emergence of a new environment for trading in securities.

One of the reasons for the present situation can probably be found in historical evolution. In bygone years, the New York Stock Exchange was the backdrop for a strong community of interest that existed between its floor, which processed business, and its so-called upstairs firms, which generated it. Because there were no other avenues open, the Stock Exchange could, by fiat and order, control the activities of its members. There was no other place in which to do business. However, as other market places have come into being, customers as well as members of the Stock Exchange have found it less necessary to place reliance on the primary marketplace. Trading in other markets, though not necessarily in the public interest, has served their ends.

The New York Stock Exchange, to put it crassly, no longer has the only game in town. The result has been a break in the similarity of interests between people engaged in floor activities, whose profitability depends on the share of business brought to our Exchange, and firms doing business with the public, who have become willing partners to fragmentation. For the fact is that most business is taken to regional exchanges by our own members.

UNEQUAL REGULATION

The fragmentation process, which has developed concurrently with the institutionalization of the market, has been accelerated by several other factors which are highly significant, not the least of which is the disparity of regulation of securities markets in the United States. It is human nature, and common to us all, to seek to play the game by the fewest or least restrictive rules, and unfortunately there are users of the marketplace who seek them out. To touch on a few, and with no wish to be technical, it makes little sense for the New York Stock Exchange to enforce rules against short sales in a declining market when there is no such prohibition in the third market. It is self-defeating regulation to permit customers to short stock in the third market without so stating and then to permit that stock to be resold as long stock in our marketplace. Additionally, the rules of the New York Stock Exchange governing the trading of specialists and floor traders have no parallel in the over-the-counter market. Off-Board trades are permitted by regional exchanges under less restrictive rules than ours. Unhappily, we have found that our prompt disclosure of price and volume data, which has no counterpart in any other market, redounds to our detriment. Some traders deliberately instruct brokers to execute orders on regional exchanges or take their business to the third market in order to conceal their activity from the public view.

I am also concerned about lack of regulation in the recently developed "computer markets" which are highly susceptible to abuse and non-disclosure. Obviously, it does not serve the public interest to encourage investors to seek out a particular market because of a disparity in regulation. To correct the inequities of disparate regulation we need and solicit the aid of the SEC.

Significantly, some of the fragmentation of markets has been linked with the growth of institutional business and the Stock Exchange ban on "give-ups" or commission splitting in 1968. Our willingness to ban the give-up was prompted by the fear that the minimum commission concept was being undermined and by our wish to eliminate certain nefarious reciprocal practices. Our ban on commission splitting was accompanied by the representation from some of our government overseers to the effect that institutional trading practices would be monitored to see that commission splitting and reciprocity did not take other forms, a representation which to this date has not been implemented.

RECIPROCITY AND THE REGIONALS

Further, fragmentation has been accelerated by the proliferation of reciprocal practices in the securities industry today which, in my judgment, are not only threatening the central marketplace but are tending to undermine the entire moral fabric of a significant industry as well. I have been around long enough to appreciate the natural inclination to do business with those who do business with you. I deplore, however, the intrigues and machinations of some of our members and some of their customers. Bluntly stated, the securities industry, more than any other industry in America, engages in mazes of blatant gimmickry, all of which have been disclosed under oath at commission rate hearings. Deals are frequently involved, complicated, and bizarre and do no credit to the donor or beneficiary of the reciprocation.

I have no legitimate quarrel with any competitive success which is properly achieved by a regional stock exchange, and some of them have been innovative in a creditable manner. In the main, however, their success has been predicated on their willingness to adopt less rigid rules concerning institutional membership and/or to engage in reciprocity. As a result, these marketplaces, with little or no depth or liquidity, have become nothing more than rebate mechanisms to get commissions to those who do not qualify or to return them to institutions. On occasion trades are completed on other exchanges at worse prices than could be obtained on the New York Stock Exchange. Our members who will trade one New York commission for one and one-half or two commissions on another exchange, as well as people on the other side of the transaction, detract from the efficacy and liquidity of the central marketplace. The auction market functions best when it brings together the greatest number of buyers and sellers, enabling them to seek out the best price and the quickest execution.

There are at present numerous archaic and anachronistic policies and procedures which fail to respond to the needs of our industry undergoing the greatest change in its history. Subject to enabling legislation, if necessary, I believe we should pursue vigorously the complicated matter of providing non-member broker-dealers access to our facilities by means of a professional discount from the full public commission, as proposed by me in January 1968, and recently reaffirmed by the SEC as a desirable objective. Further, it might be appropriate for the Exchange itself to examine whether or not reciprocal practices of our members, in fact, violate our own rebate rules which say roughly that "thou shalt not give anything of value in exchange for a listed commission." And speaking of rebative practices, our Exchange itself might logically pursue the question as to whether the sanctioned practice of crediting commissions earned against advisory fees charged to customers is not, in fact, a return of commissions.

FIXED VERSUS NEGOTIATED COMMISSIONS

This brings me to another policy issue bearing on the competitive position of our Exchange. I have already spoken about iniquitous reciprocal practices on regional exchanges and the growth of their market trading. These developments are not unrelated to the fixed minimum commission rates on the New York Stock Exchange trades, about which I would like to express a personal opinion.

For many years the members of the New York Stock Exchange have operated under a fixed minimum commission rate structure and the Courts have upheld the fixing of such rates under the Securities Act of 1934. There are even legal questions as to whether the Exchange or the Securities Exchange Commission, under Congressional mandate, can do other than set fixed rates. Just a few weeks ago, the SEC reached a number of conclusions on commission rates after two years of extensive rate hearings, among the most important of which was its advocacy of competitive rates on the portion of orders valued over $100,000.

Notwithstanding my own previous personal and strong support of fixed minimum commissions, I believe that it now behooves our industry leaders to rethink their personal judgments on negotiated rates. While I question whether or not the industry is presently sufficiently strong financially to completely disregard fixed minimum rates, I personally think it might well consider fully negotiated commissions as an ultimate objective. The initial emphasis might be put on larger transactions, and certainly larger than amounts stipulated by the SEC for a specified trial period. The results could be monitored and evaluated, and subsequent action could then be determined. I have altered my own personal thinking as a result of the commission rate proceedings of the last two years and the fragmentation of markets that has simultaneously been increasing. I should like, if I may, to share with you some of my concerns to stimulate thinking on the subject.

First, in view of the increased emphasis that rates be reasonable, there is the concomitant responsibility to set standards by one method or another. No matter what the standard or criteria used, I believe the securities industry is being led down the path of utility-type regulation when it possesses none of the characteristics of a utility. This concern was further buttressed by the SEC's recent request for a uniform chart of accounts for the industry, to say nothing of the new concept of fixed rates, rather than minimums, which for the first time places a ceiling on charges. It is an anomaly that a regulatory body which genuinely professes no interest in rate-making should be importuned by many in the industry it oversees to have them do so.

Secondly, having personally experienced the laborious preparations for hearings and appreciating the task of those who must weigh, evaluate and adjudicate the matter as representatives of government, I wonder whether the inordinate delays and fantastic expenses result in a commission rate schedule which is responsive and timely. Depending upon the conflicting points of view, a fixed rate will be too high or too low the majority of the time, with corrections and adjustments being made at too slow a pace for at least one of the parties concerned. Better would it be for the industry to make its own competitive adjustments as economic conditions warrant, rather than to work on a new schedule as it has for almost eight years, with still no end in sight.

UNBUNDLING OF CHARGES

Thirdly, although I have argued that negotiated rates would bring about a degree of destructive competition, I now ask myself whether fixed rates have not brought about that very same kind of self-destruction. I speak to the indiscreet excesses of the past several years which may have been precipitated in part by the umbrella provided by the fixed minimum schedule. I inquire of myself as to whether overly-zealous service type

competition and inept management has not been fostered by fixed minimum rates.

Fourth, I inquire as to the propriety of one commission rate serving all customers regardless of their wishes or needs or requirements for varying degrees of service. In that regard, it might be appropriate for our Committee to further pursue the matter of unbundling of charges, so that customers do have to trade off-Board to avoid paying for unwanted services.

Fifth, it is difficult to appreciate the reluctance of some to negotiate rates when, in fact, many commissions are presently negotiated on the regional exchanges and in the third market. These negotiations have made a mockery of the fixed minimum rate concept and have produced various forms of reciprocation for institutions and non-member broker-dealers here and abroad, so that they are in effect paying a fraction of the fixed schedule. Perhaps it would be better to legitimize the entire practice.

Sixth, I personally believe that the introduction of negotiated commissions would speak significantly to the matter of institutional membership, for their main incentive in seeking Exchange membership is to save or recapture commission dollars. I believe, too, that reciprocity would largely be eliminated, for if an institution negotiated a commission which still allowed the executing broker to rebate, it might create a legal liability for having failed to negotiate a lower rate.

I realize that opposition from some of my constituents can be expected because as members of the New York Stock Exchange, and under the present industry structure, they have the best of both worlds in that they are afforded the protection of the minimum commission schedule on trades on the New York Stock Exchange while they possess the ability to negotiate commissions in other marketplaces, and to trade with institutional members on regional stock exchanges to facilitate their recapture of commissions.

STAYING COMPETITIVE

Next, I inquire as to whether the fixed rate concept, providing the basis for reciprocity and concurrently developing an incentive for institutions to recapture all or part of commissions paid, is not the single greatest reason for our market fragmentation. We can compete in only two areas, namely, service and charges, and I submit that no entity, not even the New York Stock Exchange, can forever ward off competition from a non-competitive stance so far as pricing is concerned.

Unless the New York Stock Exchange is willing to compete effectively with markets where commission fees are presently negotiated it faces a continued reduction in its share of overall trading, and at an accelerated pace. I submit it is not in the long term interest of our members or the public to permit a continued erosion in the liquidity of our marketplace.

The securities industry must, in addition to considering changes in the traditional ways of doing business, such as I have outlined, do whatever is necessary to meet the needs of millions of investors, present and future, large and small.

RESTRUCTURING THE EXCHANGE

The New York Stock Exchange, as the important institution that it is, must do the same, and an inward look seems timely. The Exchange as an organization, must keep in step with the times so that it continues to be relevant to today's and tomorrow's economic and social environment.

From the standpoint of our membership, bureaucracy at the Exchange should not be tolerated. Rules and procedures need to be updated and simplified so that Exchange regulation is administration with a minimum of bureaucratic detail and a maximum of regulatory and administrative efficiency.

Restructuring of the Exchange, as an organization, needs to go deeper than simplifying rules and regulations. The policy-making body of the Exchange, its Board of Governors, as well as the Exchange's voting and election procedures, should also be examined and restructured as necessary to meet the changing times in our industry. Whatever vestiges of a private club atmosphere which remain at the New York Stock Exchange must be discarded. Understandable economic biases and fear of dislocations must not impede necessary changes, as they so often do, but must be fused and melded to accomplish desired objectives.

In the near future, I will be presenting definitive proposals to our Board for a searching re-evaluation, codification, and simplification program along the lines outlined which, hopefully, may lead to a major restructuring of the New York Stock Exchange. The Exchange must, in my opinion, do all that it can to be a most efficient, business-like organization, responsive to the needs of the public and membership, if it is to continue to serve as the marketplace it has been for more than 178 years.

I have spoken with great candor which will alternately be applauded and deplored. I would entreat our members to harmonize the many diverse interests which make up the brokerage business, for it is my fear that we are tearing ourselves asunder and risking loss of our central marketplace in the process.

If our industry blunts its differences for the common good, and positions itself more competitively, this country will continue to enjoy the significant benefits of having a premier central marketplace for securities.

Thank you.

ADVICE FOR NEW STUDENTS

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 23, 1970

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the News Dispatch of Michigan City, Ind., carried on August 31, 1970 an article conveying the advice that Stephen J. Trachtenberg, newly appointed Dean for University Affairs of Boston University, recently offered to a group of new college students. Because Dean Trachtenberg's are worthy of consideration by students all over the country, I insert the article at this point in the RECORD:

SOME ADVICE FOR NEW STUDENTS

Stephen J. Trachtenberg, an associate dean at Boston University, recently offered new black students some advice that ought to be absorbed and valued by all 1970 college entrants.

"Opportunity," said Trachtenberg, "is only the first name of the game. The second is responsibility . . . to ourselves, to our community, and to this college family of which you are a new member."

That, he said, means W-O-R-K.

"You should seek to improve society, work to eradicate poverty and racism; but you will find that in the long run you may best meet these obligations for relevance by devoting much of yourself to scholarship, to studying by staying on your toes so you won't get hustled out of what you came here for—namely an education.

"If you leave here—even with a degree—without having pushed yourself as hard as possible you will have been cheated—you will have been robbed of a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity and exploited for cruel ends. Remember this: Once you have learned something it becomes yours. Nobody can take it away. What's in your head is safer than what's in Fort Knox."

With quiet reason, Trachtenberg emphasized the enormous power of knowledge in a technological age and concluded:

"As young Americans, you must study for all who have never learned about peace, about bread, and about justice . . . and for all who forget too easily the struggle it takes to get and keep peace, bread and justice."

This is the best possible advice for any younger student with the courage to face life as it really is instead of fantasies out of a pill bottle or pot pipe.

THE FREEWAY TUG OF WAR

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 23, 1970

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the November 1970 issue of Interplay magazine contains an interesting article by Richard Karp on the widespread campaign, both in and out of the Congress, to require the people of Washington, D.C., to accept freeways that most of them do not want. Mr. Karp points out that this battle between the supporters of mass transit and the highway lobby is widely regarded as having significance going well beyond the borders of the District of Columbia. If the people who live in America's cities can successfully insist on mass transit instead of freeways in the District, then the same thing can happen elsewhere, and that is just what the highway lobby does not want.

Mr. Karp's article follows:

THE FREEWAY TUG OF WAR

(By Richard Karp)

In the window of the storefront headquarters of an anti-poverty group in Negro Northeast Washington hangs a large glossy poster. On it is depicted a street map of the city with superimposed broad red lines showing the paths of a proposed city freeway system. Above the map, the poster proclaims: "White Men's Roads Thru Black Men's Homes!"

At the other end of Washington, in upper middleclass Georgetown, a conventionally dressed teenager stands on a street corner handing out leaflets which show an ink drawing of a bridge being knocked to pieces by a clenched fist rising out of the water beneath. The picture refers to the Three Sisters' Bridge, a link in the same freeway system, already under construction, that crosses the Potomac River near Georgetown. The legend reads: "Smash the Three Sisters' Bridge, Free D.C."

This agitation is part of a controversy that has smoldered in Washington for more than a decade, and which in recent years has flared up in a number of sharp political confrontations. The conflict is between those who want "improved mass transportation," *i.e.*, subways, and those who want freeways. For subways and passionately against freeways are dozens of civic groups, neighborhood associations and, by a recent poll, 85 percent of the population. Equally passionate in favor of freeways are the city's downtown business interests, the national road lobbies, the three major newspapers and a majority of suburban legisators. Above all are those members

of the House of Representatives whom *The New York Times* called "the errand boys of the highway lobby."

FREEWAYS EMPTY OF CARS

As for the freeway system itself, one need not inquire very far to conclude that it would at best be useless and more likely disastrous. Contrary to what the downtown businessmen say (or have been told to say by friends in the highway lobby), the roads will not bring the ever-growing number of suburban shoppers into the city. The suburbs are quickly becoming self-sufficient and downtown businessmen are aware enough of this phenomenon so that they are moving their businesses to the suburbs as quickly as possible. The argument that the roads will relieve traffic congestion is spurious; every expert is, in fact, agreed that an increase in roads invites an increase in automobile traffic until the previous level of congestion is reached. Moreover, in sleepy central Washington, the freeways would be mostly empty of cars except for suburban rush-hour traffic on weekdays; trucks and other through traffic need not plow through the heart of the nation's capital. Even if the freeways did manage to alleviate road congestion, the increase in the number of cars in the central city would create an enormous parking problem that might be solved only by building huge ugly garages throughout the downtown area.

READY TO GO TO THE WALL

On the other hand, the freeways, some of which will be 12 lanes wide, are an aesthetic horror, cutting broad paths for miles through residential sections. Thousands of small private homes will be destroyed, many more thousands of people displaced, neighborhoods made ugly and ghettoized, the city fragmented. Most importantly, the roads which would be of use only to commuting white suburbanites have been planned to cut through areas of least political resistance, the Negro neighborhoods, whose residents have few cars and little reason to motor out to white suburbia. Against these arguments, proponents of freeways have countered with little more than the airy abstraction that freeways, as part of an interstate system of highways, are simply necessary to fulfill America's "growing need for improved vehicle transportation." With only this worn-out phrase to mouth, the pro-freeway people are determined to go to the wall rather than allow the freeways to be scrapped. To understand why, one must go back to 1956.

In that year Congress passed the Federal-Aid Highway Act. The purpose of the Act was to facilitate the rapid completion of a 40,000-mile system of "interstate highways" that Congress had authorized in 1944 as part of a 50–50 Federal-aid highway program. The 1956 Act did two things: it increased Federal aid for interstate highways from 50 percent to 90 percent and made sure that the far greater amounts of Federal money needed would always be available by creating a Highway Trust Fund to be filled automatically by gasoline taxes. The Trust Fund was to last until 1972, by which time it was expected the interstate system would be complete.

For people whose financial and political interests are tied up with highways and highway construction, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 has become the basis of power and prosperity. In the last five years, for example, between $4 and $5 billion of Federal money has been spent annually on highways, all but $1 billion of it for the 90–10 interstate program.

The highway interests are represented by three lobbying groups. The American Association of State Highway Officials represents the engineers, commissioners and other personnel of the state highway departments whose jobs and power depend on continued road construction. The National Highway Users Conference is the mouthpiece of petroleum and rubber producers, truckers—almost everyone who has a business or product connected with roads. The American Automobile Association represents motorists and is promoted by the other two lobbies. In Congress, the interests of the highway lobbies are actuated by the House Public Works Committee, whose members are almost always unanimous in favor of more roads. To generate public enthusiasm for roads and perpetuate a momentum for highway construction that will go on after the interstate system is completed—in fact, forever—is the major goal to which these groups are dedicated.

The road-building boom that resulted from the "national commitment" to highway construction and which the road interests had hoped would be perpetual, was being threatened by the mid-1960s. First of all the 40,000-mile network of interstate highways, for which the all-important Trust Fund was established, was nearing completion. To ensure against the imminent end of the massive 90–10 Federal aid program, the highway interests would have to convince Congress and the public that many more thousands of miles of roads were necessary. Considering their previous success, the highway lobby might not have very much trouble getting what it wanted.

A SYMBOL OF THE NATION

About the same time, the entire issue was complicated by the fact that city-dwellers in many cities across the country began to rebel against interstate freeway links cutting through their neighborhoods. With embarrassing confrontations threatening to occur in many urban areas, Congress, toward the end of the Johnson Administration, tightened up the law to require the states to hold two public hearings on road consrtuction instead of the previous single hearing. It was hoped that an expanded public forum would help dissipate dangerous urban anatagonism to freeways. It didn't.

Growing public doubt about highways resulting from successful agitation against urban freeways was the last thing the highway interests wanted to see at a time when they were preparing to foist a massive and unnecessary road program on the country. But there was little they could do to stop the agitation. Although the Federal government supplied 90 percent of the funds for interstate highway construction, the states had the authority to determine what kinds of roads to build and where. Well-organized anti-freeway forces could always persuade their elected representatives in the state legislatures to order the state highway departments to change or scrap freeway plans. For this reason the highway lobby decided to stage a last-ditch battle in Washington, D.C., a symbol of the nation and an urban area ruled directly (or through sham government) by their friends in the US Congress.

Plans to build freeways in Washington and opposition to those plans have existed for more than two decades. Over the years, as one or another plan was submitted, this or that neighborhood or conservation association would protest and the planners would go back to the drawing board. The newer plans usually moved the proposed roads from white middle-class neighborhoods to the less influential Negro sections of the city, but not always. Also during the same period of time, various proopsals were made to build subways for the city. In 1959, Congress passed the National Capital Transportation Act (NCTA) which created an agency to look into the feasibility of subways and other forms of mass transportation. The groups who later rallied against freeways grasped at the subway idea and later publicized it as the only viable solution to congestion. When the pro-freeway forces discovered that they could press their case by threatening to prevent subway construction, the subway issue because a pawn in the game.

Despite all the talk back and forth, neither subways nor freeways were built, because Congress, as usual, had no interest in spending money on its black colony, Washington; that is, until it got the word from the highway lobby.

The road-building industry first sounded the alarm to battle in 1963 when the D.C. Highway Department published a report accusing the NCTA of "killing" highways to sell rapid transit. This move signaled the start of a new and earnest effort to get the freeways built. In Congress, the pro-freeway forces suddenly began to stir. Congressman William Natcher of Kentucky, Chairman of the House Subcommittee on D.C. Appropriations, who had previously been silent on the highway question, warned against "killing off" the freeways to bring about a rapid transit system here in the District of Columbia." Behind the remark was the veiled threat that no subway money would be appropriated until the roads were built.

A NEW WAVE OF OPPOSITION

While they were building up pressure in Congress, the highway lobbyists were also drumming up pro-freeway propaganda in the city itself. They easily got Washington's two key businessmen's organizations to declare publicly in favor of freeways: the Metropolitan Board of Trade, Washington's version of the Chamber of Commerce, and the Federal City Council, a "more progressive" group founded in 1954 by the late Philip Graham, publisher of *The Washington Post*. One reason the businessmen's groups fell readily in line with the highway interests was that businessmen are easy to convince of the need for construction of any kind. The other was that many important members of both groups were actually involved in the highway industry. Philip Graham's group, the Federal City Council, took the lead in proclaiming the virtues of freeways and, in turn, Graham's newspaper, *The Washington Post*, did the same.

Ironically, this newly organized pressure for freeways did not have the expected result. Instead of getting the roads built, it triggered off a new wave of determined opposition by the city's residents. In the next couple of years no roads were built, but the issue became more volatile than ever. With the freeway debate threatening to reach an impasse, President Johnson suggested in 1966 that the D.C. government retain an independent consultant to review the freeway plans. At that time, prior to the 1967 reorganization, the D.C. government was entrusted to three commissioners, beholden to Congress for their jobs and, hence, pro-freeway. These commissioners chose the consulting firm of Arthur D. Little, Inc., of Boston to make a study of the freeway plans, and then waited for a favorable decision.

When the Little report concluded that the planned freeways were not justified, it was a bombshell. The pro-freeway forces rallied to press ahead with construction, no matter what. Congressman Natcher of the House Subcommittee on D.C. Appropriations threatened, this time out loud, to withhold subway money unless the construction of the freeways was promptly begun. The Federal City Council produced a "report," written, in fact, by a noted highway lobbyist, that recommended prompt construction of all freeways proposed by the D.C. Highway Department. The National City Planning Commission, a branch of the D.C. government that reviews road plans, voted to go ahead with construction. To emphasize the point, Congress raised the D.C. gasoline tax by seven cents a gallon.

By the end of 1966, seeing that the crush was on, some 30 individuals, firms and citizen organizations representing 200,000 District residents filed a lawsuit in the D.C. Federal District Court seeking an injunction against building freeways. The plaintiffs asserted that the D.C. government had acted illegally in attempting to carry out certain freeway plans and they cited a section of the D.C. Code that required public hearings prior to any road construction. Because the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 specified that, for purposes of the Act, the District of Columbia would be treated as a state, local ordinances requiring hearings and other procedures would have to be adhered to. In fact, no public hearings had been held.

MOVEMENT FOR HOME RULE

While the lawsuit decision was pending in courts, during all of 1967, Alan S. Boyd, Secretary of the recently created Department of Transportation, told the important Roads Subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee that some of the freeways were "unwise at this time," and that he preferred not to approve them. So unorthodox an opinion voiced by a high government official angered the "errand boys of the highway lobby" on the Subcommittee to the point where they accused Boyd of having a "position tied in with buslines, HUD, OEO . . ." and other disreputable special interests. At any rate, the prestigious Department of Transportation edged over toward the anti-freeway camp.

At about this time, the reorganization of the D.C. city government affected the freeway controversy. For more than 80 years, the District of Columbia was ruled by three Commissioners appointed by the President with the approval of Congress. In effect, Congress ruled D.C., and nobody had anything to say about it. In 1967, to blunt a growing movement for "home rule," Congress passed legislation allowing the President to appoint a "Mayor" and a "City Council" to be "representative" of the city's residents. Congress worded the Act so that neither the "Mayor" nor the "City Council" had any real authority over basic legislation. But they could sit, debate, vote and generally act like governing bodies. Though the Mayor, in fear of his job, wavered over the issue, the City Council, as soon as it was established, threw its support to the anti-freeway forces. Thus, the City Council, a symbol of the "home rule" issue, became a focus of the freeway issue.

BY GOLLY, IF . . .

In February 1968, the US Court of Appeals reversed the District Court decision against the anti-freeway lawsuit and issued an injunction halting any action on freeways that had been approved by the National City Planning Commission. The court ruled that the District government had indeed failed to comply with procedures established by District law in planning and approving the freeway.

The court decision blew the controversy wide open again. Congressman Natcher renewed his threat to withhold subway funds "if the freeway system in our city is halted." More important, Rep. John Kluczynski, Chairman of the Roads Subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee, introduced a bill that would invalidate the procedural safeguards and compel the District government and the Department of Transportation to build the freeways. That same subcommittee moved to include Kluczynski's bill as part of the forthcoming 1968 Federal-Aid Highway Act, an omnibus bill too good to be opposed by liberals on the D.C. issue.

For a few weeks in the spring of 1968, the House Public Works Committee held hearings regarding the proposed road legislation. At those hearings, the agents of the highway lobby showed their hands as they had never done before. One statement, made by Committee member Rep. William C. Cramer of Florida, summed up the case for the highway interests: "If we do not resolve this problem in the District of Columbia [*i.e.*, overcome opposition to freeways] then we give the city councils and state authorities in other areas—such as New York and Detroit and Boston and Los Angeles—license to fail to make decisions. What I am concerned about is that we may give them reason to believe, 'By golly, if . . . the District of Columbia can get away with giving up these metropolitan routes on the interstate system . . . then we can give up these missing links and not suffer any penalty.' "

In an editorial on February 21, 1968, *The New York Times* made the point clear: "The struggle over the Washington highway plan has become a controversy of national significance because the leaders of the highway industry and their allies—the automobile, truck, tire, cement and construction equipment companies, and certain labor unions—have viewed it as the Dienbienphu of a long guerrilla war between themselves and the anti-freeway forces."

In another editorial, the *Times* warned: "Apart from this proposed desecration of the capital, these bridge and freeway provisions set a most dangerous precedent for every city in the nation. If Congress can pick routes and choose bridges in Washington, D.C., and get away with it, there is nothing to prevent Congress from dictating similar decisions in other cities." The *Times* was referring to the 1968 Highway Act and specifically to the provision on the District of Columbia. The D.C. provision bluntly stated: "Notwithstanding any other provision of law, or any court decision or administrative action to the contrary, the Secretary of Transportation and the government of the District of Columbia shall . . . construct all routes on the Interstate System within the District of Columbia. . . ." By this act Congress had torn away the facade of local autonomy in D.C. It said, in essence, that any law or administrative decision made by any branch of government regarding the District of Columbia could be abrogated by Congress and that, in effect, Congress still ruled D.C.

ANOTHER LAWSUIT FILED

But, still trying to maintain the fiction that the D.C. government had some autonomy, Congress, rather than compel construction by legal mandate, increased pressure on the "City Council" to approve the freeway plans. After a year of bitter retreat, the City Council's resistance broke, and in August 1969 it resolved, amid tears and despair, to comply with the 1968 Act. Congress threw the City Council a sop, and appropriated some money for subway construction. On September 22, 1969, construction began on a freeway link known as the Three Sisters' Bridge. A couple of months later a crew of workers began digging up a street behind Union Station for a subway.

At this point, all might have been settled, with the highway industry winning its symbolic victory and Congress reasserting its hegemony over the nation's capital. But the sight of actual construction of the Three Sisters' Bridge raised the ire of the anti-freeway forces as never before. A coalition of anti-freeway groups filed another lawsuit in the D.C. Federal District Court, seeking to halt construction, and a much publicized informal referendum held in conjunction with local school board election revealed that 85 percent of D.C.'s residents were opposed to the freeways.

D.C. CLAUSE IN ABEYANCE

This lawsuit, like the first one, sought a court injunction on the basis of the fact that the D.C. government had not complied with the provisions of the D.C. Code in approving the road plans. But, because the 1968 Act explicitly stated that Congress could override any local D.C. law, the lawsuit went further and challenged the basic meaning and validity of the 1968 Act. In 1956, Congress passed a general law requiring that the District of Columbia, like the states, follow certain procedures; then in 1968 Congress abrogated the law to exclude D.C. from the general provision requiring these procedures. The lawsuit, in essence, asks: Can Congress pass a general law that discriminates against the District of Columbia? In raising this question the plaintiffs, among whom are many "home rule" partisans, sought not only a decision on the freeways but a fundamental definition of the District's exact political status, its degree of autonomy and its relationship to Congress.

On April 6, 1970, the US Court of Appeals ruled in favor of the plaintiffs but, as the politically more sophisticated expected, the court deftly avoided the more fundamental issue. The judges merely reaffirmed their 1968 decision requiring the Federal government to comply with the D.C. Code providing for community participation through public hearings. They stopped short of a pronouncement on the power of Congress to discriminate against D.C. in a general law. The famous "D.C. Clause" in the 1968 Highway Act compelling construction they left in abeyance. Construction of freeways has been enjoined until completion of full public hearings.

In this seesaw contest over the freeways exact prediction about the future is difficult. Cynics say they expect Congress to withhold the money needed to begin the subway system as punishment. More enlightened opinion has it that Congress will relent and let the city's residents work out some compromise. The latter seems more probable. After years of constant, unresolved battle, both Congress and the highway lobby have grown weary of a struggle that seems only to have tarnished their reputations.

For Washington residents, though they are still politically very weak, the court decision marked a clear victory. In a dissenting opinion, one of the Court of Appeals judges rejected the citizens' contention that they were a "voiceless minority" tyrannized by Congress and wrote, "obstructing this project now for [almost] . . . four years is mute testimony that they are not voiceless."

SEE HOW PITTSBURGH GOT ITSELF CLEANED UP

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 23, 1970

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, it is incongruous, I realize, however it is yet possible to encounter people who refer to my city of Pittsburgh as the "Smoky City." Fifteen years ago this was a well-deserved title. Then our mammoth steel industry and other manufacturing giants spewed smoke and debris into the sky of Pittsburgh. But no more can it be said that you need streetlights in Pittsburgh at 12 noon to see your way.

Twenty years ago, an energetic group of Pittsburgh citizens went about cleaning up our town and in the process developed large areas of the inner city.

This renaissance, as it came to be

known, restored much of Pittsburgh's natural beauty and provided an environment that many new businesses found most congenial.

Last Sunday's Washington Post travel section carried an excellent feature story by John Koenig entitled, "See How Pittsburgh Got Itself Cleaned Up." The emphasis here was on "See." In the past few years with the infusion of new businesses, restaurants, cultural attractions, new stadiums and arenas, Pittsburgh again has become a tourist attraction.

For the information of my colleagues, I would like to introduce this article into the RECORD:

SEE HOW PITTSBURGH GOT ITSELF CLEANED UP

(By John Koenig, Jr.)

PITTSBURGH—"Come, O Come, to Pittsburgh," sang Bea Lillie, leading a mixed chorus warbling the song in an old Broadway musical. It was all a joke, of course. At the time of the show, no one except a commercial traveler or a business delegate to a steel or coal industry convention would have thought of visiting Pittsburgh.

It's all different now. The steel and coal delegates and other business conventioners still turn up at this western Pennsylvania metropolis, but now they and other visitors really have something to see. Pittsburgh—once swathed in smoke and a large part of its downtown section an outmoded industrial slum—has set an example for the nation with its spruce-up, clean-up, rebuild and renewal program.

Not so many years ago, the city's most hallowed historic shrine—the blockhouse of the 18th century colonial Fort Pitt—could hardly be found except by the most inquisitive sightseer. Now the blighted commercial and industrial structures all but surrounding it have been cleared and the blockhouse, with the other remnants of the original Fort Pitt, stand in a green park at the point where the Allegheny and Monongahela Rivers meet to form the Ohio River.

Within hailing distance of the park and its sights, motorboats churn their way around the point just as though they were on the Potomac River in industry-free Washington.

And where else but in Pittsburgh can you stride from a tree-shaded promenade into a "bucket shop" and buy stocks while looking out a window at a cultivated greensward? That's the way it is at Gateway Center, a sort of Wall Street Walden.

Leaving the stockbroker's, you can ankle over to Gateway Towers, an apartment building, take the elevator and from the 27th floor have cocktails and dinner while gazing down on the stockbrokers, the grass, trees and other denizens below.

Gateway Center was completed with the opening of the $20 million Westinghouse Electric Corporation's new national headquarters in 1969. This tenth and last of the buildings in the available space capped the country's first and largest urban redevelopment project carried out with private funds. Together with the green plazas interspersing the buildings and with Point Park, where Fort Pitt is situated, Gateway Center helps comprise the Golden Triangle of Pittsburgh, heart of the giant renewal project begun a score of years ago.

All of it—the new Pittsburgh—is easy to reach from Washington. And autumn is a good time to go. By plane, it's only 40 minutes from National Airport—not even enough time for dinner in the sky for either the traveling businessman or the sightseer. By automobile, it's in the neighborhood of 200 miles, with superhighway most of the way, via Interstate 70 in Maryland and the Pennsylvania Turnpike, entering at Breezewood Interchange.

Altogether, the Golden Triangle represents an investment of nearly $200 million, begun by the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States in 1950 with the purchase of 23 acres. About 20,000 people now work in the revived city area each day.

A good place to start a tour of Pittsburgh is at the Gulf Building at Seventh Avenue and Grant Street. From the 30th-floor open observation tower, you get not only a good aerial view of the city but a fine introduction to the people in the person of the Gulf Company hostesses. Garbed like airline stewardesses, they point with pride—as much pride as I've ever encountered in the voice of any exponent of any community in the country—to the sights of "our city", "our university", "our hotels", down there below the tower.

From here, too, you can plan your other ventures around the city—to the Golden Triangle, that is, Gateway Center and Point Park; to the Oakland district, where you'll find the University of Pittsburgh and the city's great museum, and to the hilltops across the Monongahela River, known as Mount Washington and Duquesne Heights, where new restaurants have not only put Pittsburgh on the map gastronomically but provide the greatest aerial view of any city east of San Francisco.

If wining and dining is next on your Baedeker, have a look at these heights. You can go from downtown by taxi all the way, or by taxi part of the way—over one of the Monongahela River bridges—to the Incline stations. There are two of these transportation survivals, or revivals, of Victorian Pittsburgh, which provide you with as quaint a way to ride as you will find anywhere.

The Duquesne Incline takes you up a steep, wooded hill, to Grandview Avenue, where you will find Le Mont and a number of smaller restaurants and cocktail lounges, all with a wall of glass looking down on the city center across the river. Simiarly, the Monongahela Inclined Plane scales a 400-foot high rise of land, planting you at The Edge, another fine restaurant with a spectacular view. Day or night, in the sunlight or under a Cheddar cheese moon such as I have seen hanging over the city, the view is a gem.

The Monongahela Incline marked its 100th anniversary this year. It was designed by John Roebling, who designed the Brooklyn Bridge. In 1890 there were 17 of these inclines operating on the Pittsburgh heights, taking people home, to work or on visits. The only other survivor, the Duquesne Incline, was built in 1877 and restored as a community project in 1963. The little cars are operated as a nonprofit enterprise. This fare is 15 cents.

Back in downtown Pittsburgh there is another singular dining establishment—the "Pilot House," a restaurant aboard a barge tied up in the Monongahela River at the foot of Wood Street.

Despite all the new trappings of the Golden Triangle, Pittsburgh still retains some of its urban neighborhoods of another day. Take a look at the old Market Place, for instance, just off Liberty Avenue.

The 300 block of Sixth Avenue is a great block. Along here are the Duquesne Club, where the city's business elite meet to eat, and those two splendid old church buildings, Trinity Episcopal and First Presbyterian. In the next block is Mellon Square Park, a mid-city garden spot surrounded by the office buildings for the area's great industries, and a grand hotel.

Over on Forbes Avenue is the city and county government building complex. Architect Henry H. Richardson designed the Allegheny County Courthouse, a stone colossus regarded as one of the finest replicas of Norman Romanesque architecture in the United States.

And so to the University of Pittsburgh's Cathedral of Learning, poking into the sky above the city's Oakland district. Here I found a tremendous Gothic lounge on the first floor in the center, and in other rooms beautiful stained glass windows bearing the coats of arms of cities and universities of England. Outside there is the little Heinz Chapel, looking like a chip off a Gothic cathedral. Nearby is the Carnegie Institute Museum, containing among its exhibits on the ancient world a group of Caryatids, which although not originals, look just as good as the original sculptures at the Acropolis at Athens.

Throughout history, Pittsburgh has not forgotten its heroes, and has named streets and places for them. The city itself is named after for British Prime Minister William Pitt, who looked with favor on the American colonists. Formerly, it was Fort Pitt, so named when the British and American forces recaptured the place from the French, who had called it Fort Duquesne, during the French and Indian War. The first outpost there was established by the Colony of Virginia in 1754. Forbes Avenue is named for General John Forbes who led the British-American expedition that took Fort Duquesne in 1758. The area finally was made safe for settlement in 1763, when British Colonel Henry Bouquet won a brilliant victory over the Indians at the Battle of Bushy Run about 20 miles away.

Once the Gateway to the West with early commerce coursing down the Ohio River, Pittsburgh now terms itself the Gateway to the Future. Could be. Maybe Bea Lillie should take a new look at it.

HAMPSHIRE COLLEGE

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 23, 1970

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the First District of Massachusetts, which I have had the honor of representing in this body for 12 years now, contains some of the most outstanding institutions of higher education in this Nation. Western Massachusetts truly is a great college and university center and our region, our State, and our country has benefited from their existence.

This autumn these fine schools were joined by a new 4-year liberal arts college in Amherst. The newest star in this educational galaxy is called Hampshire College and I am confident that it will soon become widely known as one of the great institutions of learning in the land.

It is the result of an imaginative proposal drawing on the facilities and talents of the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Smith, and Mount Holyoke Colleges.

On October 3, Mr. Speaker, Hampshire College held its first convocation ceremony attended by the first complement of 268 students, numerous friends of the new school, public officials, and interested citizens. I was honored to take part in that ceremony as one of three recipients of the school's first honorary degrees. Also honored were Amherst College Historian Henry Steele Commager and Poet Archibald MacLeish who delivered the major address.

Hampshire College President Franklin Patterson delivered an excellent inaugural address spelling out the goals of the new college and its belief that it can "realistically make a difference in the troubled world of higher education."

Mr. Speaker, this was a memorable event for western Massachusetts and for education everywhere. The promise of this new college, so eloquently expounded by Mr. MacLeish, and the school's purpose, so determinedly set forth by Mr. Patterson, should be an inspiration to us all. So that my colleagues will have the benefit of these thoughts I include in the RECORD at this time copies of both Mr. MacLeish's address and that of Mr. Patterson, along with news stories of the event from the Holyoke, Mass., Transcript, the Daily Hampshire Gazette, Northampton, Mass., the Greenfield, Mass., Recorder-Gazette, and the Springfield, Mass., Daily News.

The material follows:

THE OPENING OF HAMPSHIRE COLLEGE

(Address by Archibald MacLeish)

There was a time, not longer ago than an assistant professor can remember, when the innovation of a college was a routine occurrence to be recorded, if at all, on page eighteen or twenty of *The Times* back among the retrospective exhibitions and the amateur performances of the B Minor Mass. Colleges provided education. Education was a good thing. And good things weren't news.

They still aren't but the rest of the equation is out of date. Universal agreement that education is a good thing ended with the invention of the Silent Majority. Nothing, according to those who have been able to penetrate that enormous apathy, distresses the Silent Majority as much as a college unless it be a college student. And as for college students, there are even some of them who share the Silent Majority view. The best college, in the opinion of certain outraged gentlemen at Columbia a few years back, was a closed college—preferably burned.

That kind of intellectual reorientation alters even a newspaper's notion of news. Whatever the opening of a college may have been back in the cheerful days of the Great Depression or the two world wars, it must now be regarded as a major event: not merely news but drama and even melodrama—another fleet of costly buildings, another cargo of irreplaceable books, another crew of hopeful teachers and ambitious students and courageous administrators launching themselves into the eye of the hurricane on a voyage as daring as Magellan's with the wild sea ahead already strewn with wreckage and haunted by confused, faint cries.

I have no idea, of course, what the Editors of the *Times* will think of the college opening we witness here today or on what page they will report it but I know very well what *our* emotions ought to be. We should see ourselves as gathered, not on the comfort of folding chairs under an autumn tent in a quiet inland valley, but on a promontory steep as the Butt of Lewis from which we peer into the driving sleet for a last glimpse of brave departing sails.

I persist in my metaphor not for the metaphor's sake but for the truth's. What is new, and newly exciting, about this occasion is precisely the sense of departure, of adventure, of voyage. We are now in the sixth or seventh year of what, following the mellifluous Irish, we might well call The Troubles—meaning, of course, The Troubles in the University. And the opening of Hampshire College is the first action I can think of seriously aimed at doing something about them.

Down to this time, universities and colleges have acted defensively if at all. They have treated The Troubles as private, or at least internal, ructions between their students and themselves, and have attempted only to gird themselves for each Putsch as it came along. Parietal Rules have been modified not to say abolished. Administrative procedures, meaning disciplinary procedures, have been altered. Relations with the community have been reconsidered and frequently improved. A few changes of a public-relations, rather than a scholarly, significance have been offered in the curricula. But no important, positive efforts have been made by those best equipped to make them, which is to say by university and college faculties, to determine what these famous Troubles actually are or how they affect—should affect—the University's undertaking to educate the young.

We have been hearing, in the last few days, about the development of new police methods for academic use, including body guards for presidents and the F.B.I. on twenty-four hour alert. We have seen a good bit of faculty linen, not all of it well washed, hung out to dry. We have learned that there are still courageous Chancellors prepared to battle not so courageous Regents to the verge of coronary and beyond. But the only confident educational pronouncements of this troubled time have issued, not from the colleges or universities, but from Mr. Spiro Agnew. And all Mr. Spiro Agnew has had to tell us is that the whole thing is the doing of wicked boys and girls egged on by "the disgusting and permissive attitude of the people in command of the . . . campuses." By which Mr. Agnew means that the Troubles would go away if only the trouble-makers were eradicated . . .

This, unfortunately, is a conclusion which fails to satisfy. Those who know most about these wicked boys and girls—the men and women who teach them—are pretty well agreed that, far from being a generation of criminal delinquents, this new generation of the young constitutes the hope of the world—such hope, that is, as this raddled, soiled, abused, exploited world still has. The contemporary young have their faults, obviously. They include in their number the usual shoddy elements familiar to every undergraduate generation: the campus politician, the adolescent marching and shouting association and the plain bad actor—together with a new phenomenon, a certain scattering of young exploiters of the idealism of the young for whom there is no adequate epithet. But by and large the contemporary young are nevertheless, and have been for some years back, the most deeply concerned, the most humanly committeed, generation we have seen in this century with the single exception of the returning veterans of the Second War.

But though it is fairly clear to those who face these facts that Mr. Agnew's simple explanation explains nothing but Mr. Agnew, it is still true that no other explanation has been forthcoming. No one—no one at least in a position to do anything about it—seems to have asked the next, the crucial question . . . until Hampshire. If Mr. Agnew is wrong—if The Troubles cannot be blamed on some sudden, mysterious plague of viciousness affecting an entire generation of the young—where then shall the blame be put? How are we to explain the restlessness, rebellion, indignation, violence in college, university after university, from one coast of this country to the other and in Europe as well as the Americas, Asia as well as Europe?

This would seem to be the one inescapable question of the time, and particularly for the teachers of the time, for the scholars, for the faculties in all their disciplines. If The Troubles are not "student troubles" in the simple-minded Agnew sense they must be something other than "student troubles." They must afflict the universities and colleges, not because the university, the college, has a particular relation to the young, but because it has a particular relation to something else. But *what* else?

The established faculties have not told us, but Hampshire College, struggling to draw first breath, has faced at least the question and has hazarded an answer to its own. It seems the "something else" with which the university, the college, has to do, as something existing not within the academic pale but outside it in the time, in what we used to call the world. The Troubles, that is to say, are not disciplinary troubles whatever the politicians, the hard hats and the middle-aged generally may say about them. Neither are they, as the more romantic of the young believe, "revolutionary"—(meaning political) troubles. They are troubles at the heart of human life, troubles in the culture itself, in the civilization, in the state of the civilization—troubles which cannot be cured by ranting at the government, however misguided or misdirected government may be, or by sending in the national guard, whatever the provocation, but only by restoring the culture to wholeness and to health—which means, by restoring the precarious balance between the society and the self which defines the culture at any given place or time. And that restoration, Hampshire College believes, is the business of the college, of the university.

I may not be summarizing the College beliefs precisely for the crucial word, culture, means more to me, I must confess, that it seems to mean to the learned men quoted in Hampshire's working papers. But on the essential question, the question of the responsibility of the College, of the university, I am not, I think, far wrong. Hampshire proposes—explicitly proposes—to accept for itself a responsibility for the restoration, for the maintenance, of the difficult balance between society and self. And in that acceptance it seems to me not only courageous but entirely right. That balance is the business of the business of the universities and colleges.

Individuals—thinkers, organizations of thinkers, philosophers—can help. A true statesman, another Jefferson, even another Wilson, would be a God-send. But it is the university, the college, which must bear the brunt of the responsibility because it is the university, the college, which is the trustee of the culture, the trustee of the state of the civilization, the trustee of the means by which the civilization descends from the always disappearing past into that eternal becoming which we call the present.

And it is as trustee of the culture that the university has failed in these years in which the culture has lost its human values and deteriorated into a mere technology which exploits knowledge as it exploits everything else, using even science itself not as a means for the advancement of civilization and the enrichment of life but as a ground for gadgetry and invention regardless of the human value of the thing invented, so that the triumphs of the epoch make no distinction between the glories of modern medicine and the horrors of modern war. When a civilization can declare tacitly and even explicitly that whatever *can* be concocted *must* be concocted regardless of the human consequences we are already far into that disastrous epoch for which Yeats provided the image and the name:

Turning and turning in the widening gyre
The falcon cannot hear the falconer,
Things fall apart, the center cannot hold. . . .

Hampshire College, to its eternal credit, has dared to face Yeats' vision and the reading of history which underlies that vision. It has accepted as the critical contemporary fact the failure of the balance between society and self and has found the reason for that failure in the dehumanizing of the cul-

ture on one side and the dehumanizing of the self upon the other: the conversion of a once diverse and fruitful human culture into a crassly technological semi-culture, and the withdrawal of the withered self toward the uttermost wilderness of the self—toward the desert of solipsism in which some ghostly modern selves already wander. Moreover, having accepted the failure of the balance as the underlying ill, Hampshire has gone on to make the restoration of the balance its explicit undertaking: it has committed itself "to a view of liberal education" (I am quoting) "as a vehicle for the realization of self *in* society"—and it underlines the *in*.

It is a measure of the decline of the human in this sorry age that, far from resounding as a declaration of the obvious these words ring like trumpets—like the first courageous trumpets we have heard since The Troubles began. What would once have been a platitude becomes a call to arms. It is only, of course, *in* society that a self can *ever* be realized—in what John Keats called the arable field of events. But what would have been self-evident to the Father of the University of Virginia comes as a shock of blinding revelation to the generation of the depraved Los Angeles murders and the cold-blooded tortures in Connecticut and the brutal killings in Ohio and Mississippi. We suddenly *see*, as we reflect upon those words, what the self which has turned its back on society can become, and what society can be without the sense of self.

Our generation is the first in American history to understand what Daniel Webster meant when he cried, in those dark decades before the Civil War, "Liberty and Union, one and inseparable, now and forever." Even Emerson misread him. Emerson rejected "Union" in that context as the young today reject what they have christened, the Establishment. Liberty was all that mattered—human decency—the freedom of the slaves. But when the Civil War finally came Lincoln took his stand where Webster had taken his—upon the preservation of the Union. For without the Union there could be no Liberty. And this, as always with Lincoln, was no such shrewd political calculation as we know so well today. It was human truth. Yeats' truth. Without a center that can hold "things fall apart. . . . The falcon cannot hear the falconer." Without a center that can hold human liberty becomes an inhuman liberty to multilate and murder. Without a center that can hold freedom becomes the opposite of freedom.

Only when freedom is as human as humanity is free can a nation of free men exist. Only when the balance between society and self is both harmonious and whole can there truly be a self or truly a society. Hampshire has been founded on that proposition.

I do not know, ladies and gentlemen, how it is with you, but as I think for myself of this all but impossible commitment, and as I look around at the faces of the men and women who have made it, I feel a surge of excited hope. In a time like ours it is only the impossible commitments which are believable for only the impossible commitments are now worth making. If the probabilities of the future overwhelm us there will be no future which men, as we have known men in the past, will wish to live. It is precisely the probabilities—even the certainties—that must change. And only education can perform that miracle.

I think we may be present at a greater moment than we know.

INAUGURAL REMARKS BY FRANKLIN PATTERSON, PRESIDENT, HAMPSHIRE COLLEGE

Mr. Chairman, Trustees, Faculty, Students, Members of the National Advisory Council, Representatives of our older sister institutions, Distinguished Members of Merrill House, Staff, and all Friends of Hampshire College:

Thank you for this responsibility and this honor. I will continue to do the best I can to help build this new institution, with God's help and yours.

There is a certain irony in being inaugurated five months into the fifth year of one's service as president of a college. These days in the United States the average actual tenure of a college president is something less than four years. A good many presidents, it seems, do not last nearly that long. Thanks to Providence and a long planning period, my tenure as President of Hampshire College has well exceeded the national average even before this moment of inauguration. I am duly grateful for such longevity.

Manifestly, the important thing about today in this place is that a College is being inaugurated, not a man. We are here to celebrate a formal beginning, a true commencement, not of a man's tenure short or long in a particular office, but of a new institution.

I am profoundly aware that Hampshire College now exists and moves into the critical future of American higher education as the embodiment of the ideas, and hopes, and help, and hard work of many, many people: including the students of this Founding Class and senior scholars, the Faculty here and at our neighboring institutions, individual donors and foundation officers, Trustees and townspeople, government representatives and officials, the distinguished architect, Mr. Hugh Stubbins and his associates, the planning genius of the firm of Sasaki, Dawson, and DeMay, fine contractors and skilled workers, special consultants and Members of the National Advisory Council, and, far from least, a devoted staff with a passion for doing their jobs far beyond the call of ordinary duty.

This, in the deepest sense, is an inaugural ceremony for all of you who have been associated with the forming of the College, all of you who will carry the College forward to a steadily fuller realization.

Because in their way they spurred us on, we may be grateful today even to those few cynics and Cassandras who doubted it was possible to form a new American college at all these days, let alone one which could realistically make a difference in the troubled world of higher education. The fact is we are doing both things. We intend that Hampshire will indeed make a real difference in the lives of students here, and in the character of college education elsewhere.

I would like to speak briefly about both of these aspects of Hampshire.

First, our students and the College. The Founding Class of this College is made up of exceptional young men and women. I do not say this for the reasons you might expect, either out of sheer presidential rhetoric or out of the fact that for every student enrolled this fall Hampshire had to turn down more than seven others. I say it out of a deeper reason. Hampshire's young men and women are exceptional on grounds that have to do with the intelligence, moral purpose, promise, beauty, and joy of the best of a whole new generation being forged in the troubles and opportunities of this time. I think Hampshire's first students are exceptional representatives, across the board, of a great new wave of young adults who are reaching for individual lives and a re-born culture whose range and quality will be worthy of the best that is now possible.

Our students in this sense mark a major positive turning point in the swiftly changing world that we share with them. This is what moves me most about our circumstances here at Hampshire. These young men and women have sought out membership in the community of this College because they want to share in the building of a new kind of institution which is really needed, and whose time has come. They are here because they sense a College can be created in which individual freedom can indeed be joined with individual responsibility, in which intellectual excellence and the informed heart and the sensual beauty and hard challenge of physical experience can be made whole, in which the private person and the public citizen are inseparate dimensions of human existence at its best, in a College community which honors and respects and encourages these things. Hampshire students, as I am coming to know them, believe the College will make a real difference in their lives. In turn, they are making and will continue to make the crucial difference in the College itself. Backed by a remarkable Faculty and with the generous encouragement of our sister institutions, these first students are setting the hallmark of a new undergraduate institution for a new age. That hallmark is simple but striking and dramatic, and I stake whatever I am and whatever I know that it is real and a portent of far better things than we have known until now in higher education. The hallmark our students, and the rest of us with them, are setting for Hampshire is being made manifest in a way of College life, in deeds more than words, in eagerness to take responsible independent initiative, to take on the hard work of learning and learning well, to be concerned beyond oneself, to share in carrying difficult burdens as much as in creating joy, to listen and to contribute, to prove that young and older alike can together make a College worthy of human needs and human possibilities. It is in this sense that Hampshire's students, not alone but in common with most young men and women elsewhere in this fall of 1970, mark a major turning point for our common history. They have many rightful, deep-running concerns and criticisms of the society they spring from, and uncertainties about a future fraught as much by hazard as by promise. With Edwin Muir, they can say:

> One foot in Eden still, I stand
> And look across the other land . . .

well aware that the world's great day may be growing late and seeing as strange the fields we have planted so long with love and hate. But they, and the generation they are part of, are strong enough to be builders not destroyers, to dream as the young should and must, and to accept now as adults what Yeats repeated of old, that in dreams begin responsibilities. Hampshire's main mission, to which we are wholly committed, is to honor and recognize and encourage this strength in our students, and to help them as they build their lives and a new, more fully human world.

Second, a word about Hampshire and college education elsewhere.

If the Founding Students of this College represent a positive turning point in the relationship of the generations to each other and in developing a more human future, Hampshire itself is a turning point, too. Institutions, like people, define itself in by their acts. Hampshire is defining itself in two ways: first, as an undergraduate institution creatively responsive to the human needs of a new generation of young men and women, who are its students, and second as an innovative force in higher education generally.

We believe, with Henry Steele Commager, that:

"[Our society is] required to reconsider the functioning of our whole educational enterprise, . . . to look at it not so much in historical context as in the context of present and future requirements."

And we are brash enough to believe that Hampshire College, small and young as it is, can be a constructive force in this reconsideration, especially now, when the need

for new patterns and a new spirit is so painfully clear.

Proposing that this College will be "an innovative force in higher education generally" means that Hampshire must be bold enough to make no small plans. The College is an "experimenting" one, not tied to a narrow or doctrinaire "experimental" orthodoxy. We do not intend to be pretentiously precious or so special we cut ourselves off from the mainstream of college and university life, or from the wisdom and experience of the great past of higher education. Instead, Hampshire intends to be both an undergraduate institution of educational excellence for its own students—in terms that will be respected by the academic world, *and* to be a useful experimenting, pilot center for that academic world, in a time of great need for change. To have any meaning beyond presidential rhetoric these generalities must be spelled out in specific ideas, and these ideas must be transformed into reality. This is precisely what all of us here are engaged in doing and have been doing since the initial conception of the new College in 1958.

A few concrete examples of Hampshire in action as an agent of experimentation, demonstration, and change are these:

We are breaking the academic lock-step that has been standard American practice from kindergarten to graduate school. Some students here are admitted a year before they will actually be in attendance, others may have sanctioned leaves during their time here, and students may complete their degrees in three, or four, or more years according to their own pace.

We are committed here to seeing the status of teaching as *the* primary obligation of faculty, putting the student in increasing charge of managing his own learning, and creating a College which will not be either an extension of high school or simply a prep school for graduate education.

We are abandoning the time-clock approach which assumes that a student is educated if he spends 128 semester-hours in supervised classroom attendance. Instead, we are placing the burden on the student to demonstrate his progress through a limited number of examinations, whose nature he will help to shape.

We are asking students to take a major share of responsibility in the governance of College community life, and providing students with a substantial share in shaping academic policies and practices.

We are creating a campus, built around the House concept, in which the human scale of a community of learners and teachers replaces bigness, impersonality, and the artificial separation of classroom and other kinds and ways of learning.

We are bringing the newer artistic, instructional, and informational technologies into an active role in liberal education, trying to make the computer, the film, the television camera, the video recording, the electronic music synthesizer, increasingly serve human purposes.

And we are doing everything we can to use institutional planning and financial control, in a context of cooperation with our sponsoring institutions, to prove that the small private college can indeed have both excellent quality and fiscal solvency.

These are bare bones of some of the Hampshire effort to serve as a testing ground and demonstration center for higher education generally. To these, I could add much, much more, especially things having to do with a radically changed curriculum and intentional alteration of methods of instruction. If I were to do that, I would want equally to emphasize Hampshire's commitment to the study of basic things in the sciences, mathematics, language, history, philosophy, literature, the lively arts, the social sciences. And I would want to underline how in all of what we do, we see direct experience, practical actual participation of the student as absolutely integral to learning: experience in the challenge of the outdoors, in the laboratory, in the city, in the arts, and elsewhere.

But enough by way of very general inauguration of the College today. If my words about Hampshire seem to reach far too far beyond our grasp, and make it seem that we are overcome with delight at having, to everyone's presumed advantage, at last discovered the Wheel, forgive me. Chalk it up to our enthusiasm, and chalk it up to our very real sense of promise that Hampshire, though born just now, is born to the spirit of the age, with a future worth all the love and labor all of us can give her.

Thank you.

Hampshire College will now welcome her first honorary graduates.

[From the Holyoke (Mass.) Transcript, Oct. 5, 1970]

HAMPSHIRE COLLEGE, PATTERSON INAUGURATED MIDST APPLAUSE

(By Gena Corea)

Franklin Patterson and a college were inaugurated Saturday to a prolonged standing ovation as some students threw confetti and released balloons and wind rustled against the tent canvas at Hampshire College.

Several hundred guests witnessed the ceremonies in the tent which culminated 12 years of preparation for the new experimental college.

In a battle between a solemn and casual atmosphere, older people and administrators generally wore suits or black robes while students generally wore blue jeans, slacks, flowered maxidresses or ponchos.

One professor wore a sequined black robe made for him by two students.

SEMINARS

Before the convocation, guests and members of the college community participated in spirited morning seminars on the relation of college to various issues. They then ate a picnic lunch under the tent.

Delivering the key address after receiving an honorary degree, poet Archibald MacLeish said that the opening of Hampshire College was the first action aimed at rectifying The Troubles in the University.

Referring to the "restlessness, rebellion, indignation, violence," in colleges throughout the world, MacLeish said that these capital-t Troubles aren't just disciplinary or political troubles, but troubles in the culture itself.

The college bears responsibility for this Trouble, he said, because it is the trustee of this culture which has lost its human value and deteriorated into just a technocracy.

He said this technocracy "exploits knowledge as it exploits everything else, using even science itself not as a means for the advancement of civilization and the enrichment of life but as a ground for gadgetry and invention regardless of the human value of the thing invented . . ."

Hampshire College, MacLeish said, has recognized the dehumanizing of culture and the self and the imbalance of society and the self.

The purpose of Hampshire is to restore that balance between society and self he said, adding, "I think that we are present at a greater moment than we know.

HONORARY DEGREES

At the ceremonies, Henry Steele Commager, historian, and Cong. Silvio O. Conte also received honorary degrees.

Delivering his address, President Patterson noted there was a certain irony in being inaugurated more than four years after beginning service as president.

He was grateful, he said, for already having exceeded the average tenure of a college president even before the moment of inauguration.

Turning serious, he said that Hampshire would be an agent of experimentation and demonstration in education.

Among the changes Hampshire would implement, he said, were a campus built around the House concept, "in which the human scale of a community of learners and teachers replaces bigness, impersonality, and the artificial separation of classroom and other kinds of learning."

Hampshire also saw teaching, not research, as the primary obligation of the faculty, he said. Students would increasingly be charged with managing their own learning, he added.

The idea for Hampshire College was born in 1958 when a joint faculty committee from Amherst, Mt. Holyoke, Smith and the University of Massachusetts completed the "New College Plan."

A STUDY

This was a study considering the possibility of creating a fifth institution with which the other four might cooperate and develop new concepts and techniques of education.

In 1965, Harold F. Johnson, an Amherst alumnus, contributed $6 million to make the new college a reality and two years later, the Ford Foundation gave Hampshire a $3 million challenge grant.

By 1968, campus construction and staff selection was underway.

[From the Daily Hampshire Gazette, Oct. 5, 1970]

KITES CLIMAX HAMPSHIRE INAUGURAL

AMHERST.—The skies over the former Apple orchards that now serve as the campus for Hampshire College were filled with kites yesterday indicating, some observers said, the high hopes for the new college which opened this fall and which had a two-day inaugural celebration Saturday and Sunday.

The kite-flying was part of the open house for the public on Sunday. Saturday Dr. Franklin Patterson was inaugurated as president and honorary degrees were presented at the ceremonies in front of the college buildings, many of which are still under construction.

It began in a tent, under threatening skies. As the first note of music was struck, the audience rose and the procession began.

JOY AND SOLEMNITY

With a combination of the joy and the solemnity of the occasion marked on each face, in traditional formal academic attire, they walked down the center aisle: Hampshire County Sheriff John Boyle; Richard Lyon, marshal of the procession and Dean of the College; Dr. Franklin Patterson, president; Harold Johnson, chairman of the Board of Trustees, and Charles C. Longsworth, Vice President.

They were followed by the Trustees, the Hampshire Sponsors, the degree recipients and the faculty.

After them, came Lois E. Bailey, student marshal and first student admitted to Hampshire College along with four other student representatives.

The Planning Committees were followed by delegates from Hampshire's four sister schools and North Burn, Five College coordinator, and Jackie Pritzen, assistant coordinator of Five Colleges Inc. along with representatives from other guest institutions.

Seats taken, Sheriff Boyle called the convocation to order.

POINT OUT IRONY

The introductory remarks were made by Johnson, chairman of the board, who later presided over the investiture of Dr. Patterson as president.

President Patterson, in his inaugural remarks, began by pointing out the irony of

this occasion occurring five months into the fifth year of his service to the school.

He added that the event taking place was more than the inauguration of a man. It was the start of a college.

Describing Hampshire as not simply an institution, but as a group of highly diverse individuals working as an integrated unit, Patterson told the audience that Hampshire intended to meet the challenge of those cynics, who in an age where the existing institutions maintained only a precarious existence, "doubted that it was possible to form an American college at all, let alone one which could realistically make a difference in the troubled world of higher education."

STUDENTS CITED

One of the main reasons for the possibility of Hampshire's success are its students, he said.

Hampshire students, he maintained are representatives of a new generation, a generation that wishes to reassert the freedom and creativity of the individual, that wishes to help achieve a cultural renaissance.

These students mark what he calls a "major positive turning point" in both the academic and outside worlds.

"They are here because they sense a college can be created in which individual freedom can indeed be joined with individual responsibility, in which intellectual excellence and the informed heart, and the sensual beauty and the hard challenge of physical experience can be made whole . . ."

If its relationship with the other Pioneer Valley institutions as well as those outside the Valley, Patterson stated that Hampshire would be two things.

To its students, it intends to be an undergraduate institution of the highest intellectual and educational caliber, providing the opportunity for creative expression and the challenge of community living.

To other educational institutions, it will be a "useful experimenting, pilot center for that academic world, in a time of great need for change."

Patterson offered examples of Hampshire's departure from normal academic procedure. With an emphasis on individual need and capability, Hampshire allows its students to request deferred admittance and take a year off between the senior year of high school and their first year at Hampshire.

NOT DEFINED

The academic program is not defined by number of credits or years of attendance, but rather by demonstrated ability.

The campus will keep its residence halls, or cottages, small on community living, he said.

Finally, he attempted to explain the devotion and enthusiasm all those involved with the college had expressed. He closed with these words:

"Chalk it up to our very real sense of promise that Hampshire, though born just now, is born to the spirit of the age, with a future worth all the love and labor all of us can give her."

Honorary degrees were then conferred to Archibald MacLeish, poet, and to Prof. Henry Steele Commager of Amherst College, Doctor of Lettters; to Congressman Silvio O. Conte, Doctor of Laws.

After the honorary degrees, Founder's awards were granted to the Planning Committees.

FIRST STUDENT

Lois E. Bailey, the first student accepted by Hampshire College, then spoke as student representative.

Professor James M. Watkins, faculty representative, explained humorously the difficulty of being the faculty representative:

"Spokesmen for a college faculty are equal in number to the faculty itself and the natural state of this body politic is amoebic anarchy."

Referring to the Hampshire community as Hampshire hamsters," Prof. Watkins continued with his description of the diverse personalities involved in the faculty.

"We enjoy in our diversity, the benevolence, the richness of daily warfare."

He thanked the Planning Committees and all those involved with the creation of Hampshire. Of them and the college, he said.

"Nor did you put us in an ivory tower, but smack out here in the open, where, as we "do our thing," barefoot in the apple orchard, we'll be playing to a hard gallery and to Yankee farmers standing in the wings."

On a more serious note, he concluded that Hampshire College will succeed with the united effort of all concerned.

"To know indeed is not enough, to act without knowing is much less," and with the faculty's pledge "to an office . . . to a man . . . and through them both, to the institutions we now become."

Archibald MacLeish, poet, playwright, Pulitzer prize winner spoke.

Stating that good news is seldom newsworthy, the opening of a college up until "the invention of the Silent Majority," never rated more than short coverage in the back pages of newspapers.

Today, however, he said, it is an "event."

He called the opening of Hampshire College, in the sense in which it is a voyage, a departure from the ordinary.

We are now, he stated, ". . . in the sixth or seventh year of what, following the mellifluous Irish, we might well call the Troubles—meaning, of course, The Troubles in the University. And the opening of Hampshire College is the first action I can think of seriously aimed at doing something about them.

The Troubles, he claims, have moved from the private to the public view. Changes have occurred at such a rapid pace that no one, at one moment, can tell what form the university will take in the next.

No one, he told the audience, has really made any kind of confident statement about the current state of the country's educational system with the exception of Spiro Agnew.

And the only reason MacLeish said, that Agnew gives for the Troubles, is that "the whole thing is the doing of wicked boys and girls" spurred by their administrators and faculties, that The Troubles would go away if all these people were simply eradicated.

Statements such as Agnew's do not completely satisfy, MacLeish went on, rather, he said, echoing President Patterson, students today, this generation of the young "constitutes the hope of the world—such hope, that is, as the raddled, soiled, abused, exploited world still has."

If the blame, then, cannot be placed on the students, or faculty, where is it to go, asked MacLeish.

Hampshire College, he maintains has begun to face this question and has begun to answer it in its own manner.

That Hampshire recognizes that the university should be more than merely a storehouse of facts, that it is a community, and that The Troubles are not, he said.

". . . disciplinary troubles. . . . They are the troubles at the heart of human life, troubles in the culture itself, in the civilization . . . troubles which cannot be cured by ranting at government . . . or by sending in the national guard whatever the provocation, but only by restoring the precarious balance between the society and the self which defines the culture at any given place or time. And that restoration, Hampshire College believes, is the business of the college, of the university."

MacLeish commended Hampshire College for its astute observations on The Troubles and for its attempt to reevaluate an antiquated educational system.

He commends it for its attempt to realize its own conclusions, for its determination to succeed and remain flexible.

The university, he explains, has failed as the "trustee of culture." It has failed as it has increasingly devalued humanity and defied technocracy, he said.

Consequently, MacLeish said, we begin to reach that point in time which another poet, W. B. Yeats describes in his poem the "Second Coming."

Quoting from the poem, MacLeish applauded Hampshire College for daring to face Yeat's summation of world events, "the failure of the balance between society and self . . ." He went on to say:

"And having accepted the failure of the essential balance as the underlying ill, Hampshire has gone on to make the restoration of the balance its explicit undertaking."

Continuing and concluding, MacLeish underlined the notion that freedom is the outgrowth of unity. That as Yeats wrote, without a unifying center Liberty, personal freedom becomes warped and eventually commits a kind of suicide.

He ended:

"Only when freedom is human, as well as humanity free, can a nation of free men exist. Only when the balance between society and self is reestablished can the self be realized. Hampshire College understands that and has chosen."

After the remarks of the poet, Sheriff Boyle then called for the conclusion of the ceremonies. As the recession began, to a standing ovation, Hampshire students cheered and threw confetti.

An informal reception followed on the patio of the academic building.

Her remarks were brief and echoed the sentiments of President Patterson, although from her own point of view.

From the first time she came to Hampshire, she felt its promise, she said, adding ". . . and been reunited with an old dream of mine that I'd shoved aside as unrealistic."

She spoke of the renaissance of wonder in learning and living that was the Hampshire College promise.

Closing, Miss Bailey quoted from the poetry of Alfred Lord Tennyson:

"To follow knowledge like a sinking star,
Beyond the utmost bound of human thoughts."

[From the Greenfield (Mass.) Recorder, Oct. 5, 1970]

HAMPSHIRE COLLEGE NOW OFFICIAL

AMHERST.—Hampshire College is finally official.

It all happened Saturday amid some chuckling about the delay in getting around to dedicating a president five years in office and a convocation a month after the first students arrived.

Opening ceremonies were conducted Saturday on the 50-acre campus of Hampshire College. Pres. Franklin Patterson, 54, was officially inaugurated.

He noted that "there is a certain irony in being inaugurated five months into the fifth year of one's service as president of a college."

Sunday afternoon the college was officially welcomed with a barbecue by Amherst and Hadley townspeople. The college campus is in both towns.

The Amherst Rotary Club and other service clubs sponsored the festivities which included the first annual Hampshire College kite-flying contest. The college conducted an Open-House in the afternoon.

Speakers were Amherst and Hadley selectmen, Pres. Patterson and Hamilton I. Newell owner of a printing company in Amherst.

Sponsored by its parent schools—Amherst, Smith and Mount Holyoke Colleges and the University of Massachusetts—the idea for Hampshire College was conceived in 1958 and has been under the guidance of Dr. Patterson since 1965.

Established as a model for experimentation in liberal arts education with a theme of

perpetual change in tune for a changing society, the college accepted its first class of 268 students last month.

Among its innovations the college encourages its perspective students to take a year from studies if they need it to establish goals. After entering students have anywhere from 3 to 5 years to finish graduation requirements.

Approximately 800 students and friends of the college were invited to "rap" seminar style with guests: National President Lucy Benson, League of Women Voters; President Emeritus Esther Rausshenbuch, Sarah Lawrence College; Jerome Wiesner, Provost at MIT; and Pres. Robert C. Wood, University of Massachusetts.

Main speaker during inauguration ceremonies was poet, playwright and three time Pulitzer Prize winner Archibald MacLeish of Conway.

His criticism of the "Silent Majority" and Vice-Pres. Spiro Agnew drew applause from several hundred students and others who participated in the opening on what was once farmland and apple orchard.

MacLeish noted "Nothing distresses the silent majority as much as a college—unless it be a college student."

MacLeish believes, "The opening of Hampshire College is the first action I can think of seriously aimed at doing something about the trouble that has hit campuses in this country and abroad for six or seven years."

He does not agree with VP Agnew who seems to believe "that the whole thing is the doing of wicked boys and girls egged on by, in Mr. Agnew's words the disgusting and permissive attitude of the people in command of the campuses and that the trouble would go away if only the troublemakers were eradicated."

The University, MacLeish believes, has failed as a trustee of the culture—a culture which has "lost its human values and deteriorated into a mere technocracy which exploits knowledge as it exploits everything else, using even science itself not as a means to the advancement of civilization and the enrichment of life, but as the grounds for gadgetry and invention regardless of the human value of the thing tested."

The new hope is Hampshire College, according to MacLeish, because it "has accepted as the critical contemporary fact the failure of the balance of the society and self and has found the reason for this failure is the dehumanizing of the culture and the dehumanizing of the self upon the other. . . . Having accepted the failure of the essential balance as the underlying ill, Hampshire has gone on to make the restoration of the balance its explicit undertaking.

"It has committed itself 'to a view of liberal education as a vehicle for the realization of self in society' and it underlines the in".

MacLeish expressed his faith in today's youth saying that "Far from being an assortment of criminal delinquents, this generation of the young constitutes the hope of the world. . . . The contemporary young have their faults, obviously. . . . But by and large, they are the most humanly committed generation we have seen in this country with the single exception of the returning soldiers of the second world war."

Honorary degrees were conferred during the inauguration ceremonies on MacLeish, U.S. Rep. Silvio O. Conte, and Amherst College professor and historian Henry Steele Commager. Individuals instrumental in creating the college were presented Founders awards.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News, Oct. 3, 1970]

AQUARIUS AGE ENROLLS AT HAMPSHIRE

(By Austin Kenefick and Bill Geissler)

AMHERST.—A college of hope and renewal, Hampshire, was born here today on gently rolling countryside that used to harbor an apple orchard.

The formal convocation held here today was the culmination of more than a decade of planning that started in 1958 with a draft for a "cooperative college" drawn up by four neighboring educational institutions, the colleges of Smith, Mount Holyoke and Amherst, and University of Massachusetts.

Its planning did not go forward substantially, however, until 1966 when Harold F. Johnson, an Amherst College alumnus, broke a fiscal log jam by contributing $6 million to the college.

GAVE IMPETUS

That provided the impetus that brought in more than $3 million in a Ford Foundation grant, together with federal grants totalling more than $10 million.

Today Johnson, now president of Hampshire's Board of Trustees, formally inaugurated Franklin Patterson as president of the college.

For Patterson the inauguration capped more than five years of full-time planning with a basic college staff, including two years of running pilot courses with the help of students from the neighboring colleges and university.

Like its sister institution, Hampshire has the usual assortment of brick and mortar buildings, together with the costs that underlie them, including a $3.5 million library, a $2.5 million academic building; a $2.7 million residence building (Merrill House) and a dining commons.

HOUSED IN HOME

Unlike most other colleges, however, Hampshire's administration offices are still located in Stiles Homestead, the farm house belonging to the family whose apple orchards and gently rolling meadows form the bulk of the college's 550 acre campus.

And unlike other colleges, this one is deliberately designed to be "experimenting" and to help its students develop to a degree hitherto considered impossible.

NEW IDEAS

As a center for innovation the college's founders hope that its ideas will be useful enough to be picked up by other institutions. Two of its concepts, the small seminar for the teaching of freshmen, and the midwinter break for independent study, field work or travel, have been adopted by a small number of other colleges.

But the college's major emphasis is on its students, on helping them develop so that they can be both free and responsible, both intellectually alert and yet sensitive to beauty, both private person and public citizen.

This concern for breadth, balance and wholeness has led some observers to dub the school a college for what the under-30-generation calls, the "Age of Aquarius," the age of hope and renewal and rebirth of humanity.

NO TENURE

To bring this about, Hampshire's faculty has been made responsible for the quality of teaching to an unusual degree. Involvement with the concerns of the students is encouraged. Tenure is gone. In its place is a contract that is subject to review at its expiration date.

Students and faculty have also been organized around the "house" concept in which the smaller scale of a community of learners and teachers replaces hugeness, abstractness and the stiff separation of classrooms from other kinds and ways of learning.

The college has also brought the newer artistic, instructional and informational technologies into play by incorporating the computer, the film, the television camera, the video recording and the electronic music synthesizer into the curriculum.

TO PLAY ROLE

Students and faculty alike are expected to use their learning to contribute, to enrich their own lives and the lives of others, to make the world a more human place.

To redirect the educational emphasis from schedules and requirements to these larger issues, the college has eliminated some of the traditional college trappings, including the requirement that students complete 128 hours of credit.

Students at Hampshire will instead be tested, either three of four times during their matriculation, on what they have learned at the end of a major division in their education.

Class distinctions and the standard, four-year course of instruction are also gone. Some students will graduate in three years; others in six. Many will be allowed credit for work done off campus in some social service capacity, such as a year of working for VISTA.

FACE CHALLENGE

Another major challenge facing Patterson and the college administration will be to see if they can control costs and work out cooperative schedules with Hampshire's neighboring schools so that the college may become fiscally solvent. Patterson hopes to bring this about within five years but admits it will be difficult to accomplish.

Hampshire started its classes two weeks ago after a much less formal convocation in which students and faculty came together to break bread, sip cider and make a toast to the college. By 1975 the college intends to expand its current enrollment of 268 students to between 1,200 and 1,500.

Today's ceremonies were formal and included a scheduled address by Conway Poet Archibald MacLeish, as well as the honorary installation of 12 supporters of the college as "Distinguished Members of Merrill House."

DEGREES AWARDED

Honorary degrees were also awarded to MacLeish, to Amherst College Historian Henry Steele Commager and to U.S. Rep. Silvio O. Conte, R-Mass.

The 12 distinguished members of Merrill House, who spoke at seminars, during the morning here, were: Lucy Wilson Benson of Amherst, national president of the League of Women Voters; Jerome S. Bruner, professor of psychology at Harvard University; Ely R. Callaway Jr., president of Burlington Industries, Inc.; the Rev. John B. Coburn, rector of St. James Church, New York City; Paul A. Freund, Carl M. Loeb University Professor at Harvard University.

Also, Elsie M. Jackson, director of Community Affairs for N.Y. Medical College; Jeremiah Kaplan, president of the MacMillan Company; Dr. John H. Knowles, general director of Massachusetts General Hospital; Esther Raushenbush, president emeritus of Sarah Lawrence College; Charles E. Silberman, of the board of editors of Fortune and the author of "Crisis in the Classroom"; Jerome B. Wiesner, provost of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Lara W. Wiesner, Boston civic leader; and Robert C. Wood, president of University of Massachusetts.

FUTURE OF AMERICA'S ENVIRONMENT

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 23, 1970

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, the future of America's enivronment is vital to us all. I have become convinced, dur-

ing our debates and discussions about this subject in the Congress, that this battle to preserve our land, water, and air can only be won if each of us plays a positive role. The effort of the Government alone is not enough. Business, labor, private enterprise and each American must contribute.

With this in mind, I was extremely happy to see the very positive steps being taken by the Boy Scouts of America. "Project SOAR—Save Our American Resources"—will be a very definite and far-reaching contribution to save our environment.

I wish to present the following material about "Project SOAR" for my colleagues interest and information:

PROJECT SOAR–BSA, 1971

The planet Earth, on which we live, is a kind of spaceship. For millions of years it has been spinning through space with its self-renewing cycles of air and water, soil and planet life, life and death.

Life on this planet, the only known life in the universe, exists in a very thin, global envelope only a few hundred feet deep. This life-supporting layer is known as the biosphere.

But, our spaceship earth is in trouble. Man has seriously disrupted natural processes within the biosphere, processes essential to support life.

Pollution of air, water, and land is our problem; and pollution is caused by people too many people crowding aboard spaceship earth with their needs for clean air, clean water, food, clothing, shelter, and living space.

In this country, we enjoy the highest material standard of living on earth. Our scientific achievements have been tremendous. But they have been bought at the terrible cost of environmental deterioration, pollution of air and water, decrease in living space, urban congestion, and a loss of wild nature. We may well have won the moon and lost the earth in the process.

Thus, the need is great for a nationwide educational Good Turn beyond the traditional conservation program of the Boy Scouts of America. That special activity is Project SOAR (Save Our American Resources). To be launched in Boy Scout Week 1971, it is designed to arouse all members, youth and adult, to their responsibilities for the future—and through them to alert millions of other Americans. In essence, Project SOAR is vitally involved in citizenship training and participation. Its basic objective is to create attitudes of concern for the quality of our environment and to motivate action programs that will improve that environment for life and living.

Boys participating in Project SOAR should develop an understanding of three things:

1. The importance of all natural resources to themselves, their country, and their way of life in a democracy.

2. An appreciation of their interdependence with their environment.

3. An understanding of their responsibilities as citizens to contribute to a better environment in which they live.

Project SOAR highlights are:

1. Kickoff in troops and packs during Boy Scout Week.

2. Launching of environmental-improvement learning experiences and projects on March 22 that will continue through the spring.

3. Explorer Service Weekend—April 24.

4. Scout Keep America Beautiful Day—June 5.

5. Special summertime projects—conservation in camp.

6. Clean Air Week observances—last week of October.

7. Unit forums.

The major thrusts will be in the areas of water and air pollution control and litter prevention. But our program and action must be constructive and not "finger-pointing." President Nixon emphasized this point in his environment message to Congress:

"The fight against pollution, however, is not a search for villains. For the most part, the damage done to our environment has not been the work of evil men, nor has it been the inevitable by-product either of advancing technology or of growing population. It results not so much from choices made as from choices neglected, not from malign intention but from failure to take into account the full consequences of our actions.

"The tasks that need doing require money, resolve, and ingenuity—and they are too big to be done by government alone. They call for fundamentally new philosophies of land, air, and water use; for stricter regulation; for expanded government action; for greater citizen involvement; and for new programs to ensure that government, industry, and individuals are called on to do their share of the job and to pay their share of the cost.

"The task of cleaning up our environment calls for a total mobilization by all of us. It involves governments at every level: it requires the help of every citizen. It cannot be a matter of simply sitting back and blaming someone else. Neither is it one to be left to a few hundred leaders. Rather, it presents us with one of those rare situations in which each individual everywhere has an opportunity to make a special contribution to his country as well as his community."

In summary, Project SOAR in 1971 is only a start. Pollution is not going to end in 1972. What boys learn to do in 1971 they must apply in future years and pass on to future generations of Cubs, Scouts, and Explorers and their parents and friends.

We can plant millions of trees, protect millions of tons of topsoil, pick up thousands of tons of trash, and do many more things but still not achieve our purpose.

If boys do not learn the fundamentals of ecology,* and the basic causes of the present ecological crisis, and do not develop a sense of personal responsibility for the future, then Project SOAR will be a failure.

WHAT BOYS SHOULD LEARN

To understand the problems, boys should know the ecological facts of life. Dr. Commoner, director of the Center for Biology of Natural Systems at Washington University, St. Louis, says:

"The ecological facts of life are grim. The survival of all living things, including man, depends on the integrity of the complex web of biological processes which comprise the earth's ecosystem.

"What man is now doing on earth violates this fundamental requisite of human existence. For modern technologies act on the ecosystem which supports us in ways that threaten its stability; with tragic perversity, we have linked much of our productive economy to those features of technology which are ecologically destructive. These powerful, deeply entrenched relationships have locked us into a self-destructive course.

"If we are to break out of this suicidal track, we must begin by learning the ecological facts of life. . . . We must discover how to mold the technology to the necessities of nature and learn how these constraints must temper the economic and social demands on technology. This is the momentous task that confronts mankind."

In terms that boys can understand, let's for example, take a carton of milk and look at the web of interrelationships that produce it.

We know that milk comes from cows, and cows eat grass. Grass and other plants are basic sources of food, for green plants do something that animals cannot. They have the ability to make simple foods from the basic elements of carbon, hydrogen, and oxygen.

A green plant is a sort of factory. It gets its power from the sun and its raw materials from the air, water, and soil.

So a carton of milk is truly the product of all our natural resources. Without any one of them, there would be no grass and consequently no milk. It is the natural resources working together that produce, the food for man and animals.

For the complete story of this process, read Conservation—Your Choice, No. 7172, 35 cents, and Project SOAR (formerly 1971 Conservation Good Turn), No. 7171, 35 cents, available from BSA Supply Division, North Brunswick, N.J. 08902.

An effective way to get this story across to boys is to have them make three-dimensional models of the illustrations below and give examples of interrelationships that exist among the various elements involved. Point out with specific examples what might happen when one or more elements are destroyed or seriously damaged. For example, air pollution may damage alfalfa that produces oxygen and also food for cows. Help boys think of other ways that air pollution, water, pollution, soil erosion, or wildlife habitat destruction disrupt the processes that make life possible.

Our life-supporting processes are complex, and boys must have a rudimentary understanding of them to know the effects of pollution on the environment. For only with understanding comes the motivation for action.

LAUNCHING PROJECT SOAR

It has been shown many times that boys learn more quickly in the environment they know best—their own community, whether it be inner-city, outer city, suburbia, small town, or open country. For that reason, your Scout council has organized a special Project SOAR advisory committee. It has been working for several months developing ideas and suggested learning experiences and projects for the consideration of packs and troops. This committee has also been working with council and district Exploring committees.

At a fall roundtable, leaders will learn of the plans and suggestions developed by the conservation advisory committee. The procedure should then be:

CUB SCOUTING

November 1970—Pack committee discusses the Good Turn and its objectives; agrees to participate and makes plans for Boy Scout Week kickoff in the pack.

December 1970—Dens review possible projects proposed by the council Project SOAR committee, selects one or more suited to its capabilities.

January 1971—Dens make specific plans for Boy Scout Week kickoff and preliminary plans for community-conservation activities.

February 1971—Kickoff in den and pack meetings.

March 1971—Launch outdoor phase of the Good Turn.

April–June 1971—Continue with community activities.

Summer 1971—Monthly activity related to conservation.

Fall 1971—Conclude event with recognition.

---

*Ecology—EC from the Greek *ekos*, meaning house or household: *OLOGY* meaning branch of knowledge or science. Ecology means science of the household. We think of it as the relationships of organisms (plants and animals) to each other and their environment (household), including man and his influences.

BOY SCOUTING

November 1970—Patrol leaders council discusses the Good Turn, its objectives and methods; agrees to participate and begins plans for Boy Scout Week kickoff in troop.

December 1970—Troop leader, Order of the Arrow member, or invited guest presents list of possible Good Turn projects and how Scouts may carry them out. By patrols, the boys will discuss the projects, select one or more to do during spring 1971. Patrol leader's council then develops troop Good Turn program.

January 1971—Complete detailed plans for Boy Scout Week kickoff in the troop and make preliminary plans for the outdoor phase starting in March.

February 1971—Kickoff in the troop.

March 1971—Launch the community-conservation activities.

April-June 1971—Continue the activities.

Summer 1971—Special emphasis on conservation in camp and carry out the monthly activity in community.

Spring and Fall 1971—Participate in council or district show or camporee with conservation emphasis.

October 1971—Conclude in the troop with recognitions.

By following this plan, valuable learning experiences develop and boys will learn of environmental needs in the community. They will discuss these needs in their patrol meetings where they can make decisions on what they want to do. They also will get some understanding of the total picture. Don't shortcut this part of the plan.

SOME UNIT KICKOFF SUGGESTIONS

If your council does not have a Project SOAR committee, use the following suggestions:

Emphasize the Outdoor Code in den and troop meetings by explaining each point and being sure it is understood: Outdoor Code pocket cards, No. 3428, 80 cents per 100 or $6 per 1,000, may be purchased in your council or form the Supply Divison. Ask each boy to sign his card and carry it with him.

Hold a special parents' night on the environment and invite members of the sponsoring institution. Have a speaker on environmental problems or show a movie or filmstrip on the subject. In an impressive ceremony present everyone with a pocket card and ask him to sign it and carry it with him. At this meeting announce the unit's conservation plans.

Buy Outdoor Code posters, No. 3694, 20 cents each. Have Scouts place them in store windows or other appropriate spots.

Ask each den or patrol to build three-dimensional models of the illustration on page 43. Label and display with other exhibits in schools.

Build other conservation exhibits for display in windows or on bulletin boards. See your fall 1970 issues of Boys' Life for ideas.

Encourage Scouts to earn the Conservation of Natural Resources and Soil and Water Conservation merit badges. Get local conservationists to conduct merit badge clinics.

WATER POLLUTION

What man has done to water

Man has harmed his water supply in many ways. He has changed its color, dumped tons of dirt into it, and has made it foam with detergents. The phosphates in the detergents cause the algae and other plants to grow so fast that they shrink the lakes to swamps and add bad tastes and odors to the water. Through waste chemicals and oil spillage he has polluted the waters, making them hiding places for cans and other trash, as well as destroying wildlife and spoiling the beaches.

At one time the relatively clean rivers could take the household wastes, and through natural processes the water would wash itself clean. But as more men come together and cities grow larger, the rivers and oceans can no longer do the job without additional city waste-treatment plants.

At home, man uses more and more water. Automatic dish and clothes washers gulp ever-increasing amounts of water, making it dirtier with the detergents that have replaced the soaps.

As man has multiplied, so have his needs. He uses more steel, iron, paper, food, and nearly everything else. With the birth of the synthetic age in which we live came new industries with new technological processes that required more water. Many of the processes resulted in new chemical wastes that pour into our lakes and streams. Many of the wastes are deadly and persistent.

Industries producing electric power need lots of water for cooling purposes. When the hot water is poured into the stream, the stream's capacity for holding oxygen is reduced and aquatic environment is greatly altered. Fish and other aquatic life are reduced, and organisms that break down wastes in water may die because of lack of oxygen.

Farmers, seeking to feed the increased millions of people in the world, have developed new methods for growing more food. This increased the demand for water. Farmers use more and newer pesticides and fertilizers, and much of them are being washed into streams where they produce taste and order problems and become toxic to aquatic life.

Things to do

Visit water works or water-treatment plants and learn how water is made fit to drink. Learn where your drinking water comes from (wells, reservoir, rivers).

Learn about erosion and how you can prevent it by planting grass or shrubs or riprapping a streambank. With help, find out if there are places in the community where you can help in erosion prevention.

Encourage Scouts to discuss with their streets, and sidewalks free of trash.

Encourage Scouts to discuss with their mothers the proper use of detergents in the home. Read the instructions on the box and proper amounts to use.

Organize activities for removal of trash from streams and streambanks.

Encourage Scouts to discuss with their parents the proper use of insecticides. Stress the importance of following the instructions on the labels.

Check the laws governing your community related to water-quality standards and pollution abatement and discuss with other boys and parents.

Learn what pollution damage is affecting fish, other wildlife, human health, recreational facilities, and industry in your community.

Avoid putting Scouts in the position of becoming "pollution policemen."

Write for other ideas to the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, Washington, D.C. 20242. Ask for the *Boy Scout Leaders' Guide to Water Pollution Control.*

AIR POLLUTION

What is air pollution?

Air pollution is defined as: *Contamination of the air by waste products resulting from the activities of man.*

Your community's air is polluted when the contamination is strong enough to affect you, *to interfere with your comfort, safety, or health, or to prevent you from using and enjoying your property and your community.*

Most wastes get into the air from burning—man's basic method of producing power. This burning may be in the furnaces of industry, the engines of modern transportation, or even in your community's home furnaces and incinerators.

What they spew into the air mixes with wastes and gases from many other sources. Some are acted upon by sunlight. Some interact with one another to form different polluting compounds.

These contaminants are sometimes washed away by rain or snow or blown away by wind. But too often, the whole mess stays in the air—for you to breathe.

How long does it stay? How much harm does it do?

It all depends on what the pollutants are. What the community is like. Its climate. Its physical characteristics. A valley city surrounded by hills, for example, may have more trouble than a city on the open plain. Hills trap the impure air and keep it from blowing away.

Polluted air may also be trapped by weather. On a windless day, a heavy mass of air can hang around your city, just soaking up wastes. Above, where it's usually cool, there may be a layer of warm air—warmer than the air close to the earth. Then the cooler air can't rise. So the warm high air sits on the cooler ground air like a lid. It boxes in the unclean mass right where it stands. This condition is called an "inversion." The weather provides us with many such days—especially in the fall.

What harm does air pollution do?

Polluted air rots and soils clothes. Discolors bright house paint. Rusts metals. Mars monuments and public buildings. Cuts down visibility—it can ground planes and make car driving dangerous.

It can stunt growing vegetables, shrubs, and flowers. It has damaged fruit trees, sickened cattle, and ruined crops.

It also menaces human health.

Harm air pollution does to you

Polluted air can make your eyes water and burn. It can blur your vision. But even worse, it can upset your breathing. You may have to make an effort to breathe. And you may not get all the oxygen your body needs to stay healthy.

Air pollution has been known to kill, to sicken, and to destroy. It is particularly hard on people with serious chest conditions—chronic lung or heart disease. Such people have to work harder to breathe the impure air.

Things to do

Check to see if air pollution is a problem in your area and what its effects are. Show Scouts how to wrap a bumper sticker, sticky side out, around a post. Leave it there for several days and examine it closely. Are there signs of air pollution? If bumper stickers are not available, place a flat pan of water on a rooftop or in the backyard and examine it after several days. Or use a piece of paper with Vaseline rubbed on it.

Have Scouts find out how air pollution damages plant life, human health, buildings, and clothing.

Encourage Scouts to discuss with their parents the importance of keeping the car motor and home heating plant in proper running order. This cuts down on pollution and reduces fuel costs.

Show boys the importance of keeping driveways, sidewalks, and streets clean to avoid soil and dust in the air. Encourage them to plant grass on bare soil in their yards.

Check local and state air quality standards and air pollution prevention laws. Discuss with Scouts, or, if practical, have them check on the laws.

Emphasize the importance of not burning leaves and trash. Show how to build compost piles of leaves and how to properly dispose of trash in your community.

Arrange trips to local industries to see how air pollution is prevented.

Help control ragweed, the pollen of which is an important pollutant. Show Scouts how to recognize the weed and how to cut it off at ground level. Do not pull up by the roots. Start this project in summer and continue until the first frost.

Show boys how they are polluters; use this formula with information from their parents.

LITTER PREVENTION

Scouting Keep America Beautiful Day

To focus the attention of the American public on one universal conservation problem—litter—a national Scout antilitter day will take place Saturday, June 5, 1971. Mobilizing all Boypower-Manpower resources of the Boy Scouts of America plus other concerned community resources behind this 1-day, massive antilitter project will have a forceful impact on our American environment.

Trash along streets, highways, and roads or in waterways, parks, and recreation areas is more than unsightly—it is a health and safety hazard. It may contribute to air and water pollution; it may be a fire hazard; and it is expensive. Some of the litter, aluminum cans or paper, for example, can be reclaimed and recycled.

Have the boys compute the amount of pollution caused by their home furnaces and family cars by this formula:

1. Find the *tons of coal* or *thousands of gallons of fuel oil* or *millions of cubic feet of natural gas consumed* in a year; also the *thousands of gallons of gasoline* burned by the car.

2. Multiply the above amounts by the pounds of each kind of pollutant listed in the table below to find the total pounds of pollutants emitted in a year.

	Pounds per ton of coal	Pounds per million cubic foot natural gas	Pounds per 1,000 gallons fuel oil	Pounds per 1,000 gallons gasoline
Carbon monoxide	50	0.4	2	2,910
Hydrocarbons	10	(1)	2	524
Oxides of nitrogen	8	116.0	72	113
Oxides of sulfur	100	.4	400	9
Particulates	20	19.0	12	11

[1] Negligible.

Source: Table derived from compilation prepared by Martin Mayer, Cincinnati Public Health Service, May 1965.

A 1-day antilitter effort has many public relations values beyond focusing attention on a single major problem. It can be highly visible locally and nationally and enhance the image of Scouting as a service organization. There will be national public relations support for this project. Details will be announced later this fall. You will also receive specific help from your council Project SOAR committee.

OTHER ANTILITTER ACTIVITIES

During World War II, Scouts did a tremendous job in collecting wastepaper and certain metals for reuse. Such a project will be possible again in some cities in 1971 through the cooperation of the Reynolds Metals Company of Richmond, Va.

Where aluminum cans are used in large numbers, Scouts may collect and turn them in for recycling (cans are shredded, remelted, and made into more cans or other products). The fact that boys can earn ½ cent per can is a small part of the project. There are more important conservation concepts involved—cans that are reused will not litter the landscape, and the salvage of a vital mineral resource is conservation in itself.

Details on this aluminum collection project will be sent separately to councils where they may be applied at a later date.

In some places newsprint has a higher salvage value because it can be de-inked and reused with little loss. A ton of reused newsprint saves trees. Collecting newspaper and selling it as scrap is a practical conservation project.

MISCELLANEOUS PROJECTS

For Cub Scouts and Webelos Scouts

1. Plant shrubs that provide food or cover for wildlife.

2. Plant grass seed on bare ground in park, yard, school or church yard to prevent erosion.

3. Plant tree seedlings for shade, landscaping, or ground cover.

4. Make window boxes and plant flowers or plant tubs with trees or shrubs.

5. Plant and maintain small flower garden in front of home.

6. Plant and maintain small flower garden in park.

7. Make litter bags for family's and neighbors' cars or boats.

8. Make Outdoor Code posters, put up in school, and explain the code to other boys and girls.

9. Write a set of rules for pack, den, or family to follow when visiting parks or picnic areas.

10. Adopt a vacant lot or open area, clean it up, and keep it clean.

11. Help distribute fire-prevention (or other conservation subject) posters in community.

For Boy Scouts

1. Plant shrubs to provide food and cover for wildlife.

2. Build and set out bird and squirrel nesting boxes.

3. Plant soil banks and similar areas to prevent erosion and help heal "scars on the landscape."

4. Adopt a vacant lot or open area, clean it up, and keep it clean.

5. Plant shrubs, vines, and grasses to help heal gullies.

6. Plant schoolyard, public park, individual backyard or lawn with grasses and legumes to provide ground cover and prevent erosion.

7. Set up a forest fire-fighting instruction session with a forester and learn what to do if a forest fire is discovered.

8. Take part in a forest-fire prevention campaign locally with help of a forester.

9. Take part in a tree insect and disease control project locally with help of a forester.

10. Give a demonstration before school or adult group on good outdoor manners—using public recreation areas such as National or State parks and forests and when hunting or fishing on private land.

11. Volunteer service to superintendent of a public recreation area to help on weekends or during the summer.

12. Make an exhibit for a store window or give a demonstration at a public site showing proper use and misuse of public recreation areas, fishing streams, and parks.

13. Help conservation agent or park superintendent put up posters urging the public to have proper respect for outdoor areas.

14. Develop a nature trail in park, camp, or community forest.

SUMMER CONSERVATION ACTIVITIES

For Cub Scout and Webelos Scouts

Summer is the ideal time to carry out learning experiences in conservation and have fun at the same time. Participation in any one of the activities (listed below) will help a Cub Scout understand the vital importance of natural resources to himself and his country and will show him his interdependence with his environment and his responsibility, as a citizen, to contribute to the development of a better environment.

1. Participate in Willing Water Week—1 week in August each year. This program is sponsored by the American Water Works Association for reminding the public of the important and varied role that water plays in their lives and how public water supply systems provide a good, safe, adequate supply at low cost.

2. In the spring, packs may contact their community water works for the free booklet *The Story of Water Supply*. Ask the water officials how the pack can participate in ways other than the tour listed below. (If there is no local water works, contact Mr. Eric Johnson, American Water Works Association, 2 Park Ave., New York, N.Y. 10016.)

3. Hold an all-day picnic or outing including some of these ingredients for a day of water fun and learning for Cub Scouts:

Water contests. Hold them earlier in the year with judging and the awarding of prizes to dens and individuals. The prizes along with clean water posters, window display materials, and clean water jingles, etc., may be exhibited at the picnic outing.

Water games. See *Cub Scout Water Fun*, No. 3220, pages 35–38.

Tours of water-related facilities (arranged ahead of time) to one or more of the following: municipal water treatment plant, sewage disposal plant, city watershed area, intensive stream improvement area, dam-reservoir-hydroelectric project, an industry that uses great amounts of water and properly treats the waste water.

Water-related service project. Distribute free water information brochures within the den or pack neighborhood. A supply of *What You Can Do About Pollution* may be secured from the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, Office of Public Affairs Information, Crystal Mall, 1921 Jefferson Davis Hwy., Arlington, Va. 22202. From the Humble Oil and Refining Co., Public Relations Dept., Room 4190, P.O. Box 2180, Houston, Tex. 77001, you may secure *You Can Help Keep Air and Water Clean.*

For Boy Scouts

Camps will have special educational programs and activities in conservation. A major effort should be made to get as many boys as possible into camp in 1971.

But there are many before or after camp projects for those who cannot get to camp.

1. Conduct stream improvement projects such as planting on banks to prevent erosion, building small dams and cover devices.

2. Show wildlife-management motion picture at troop, chartered institution, and PTA meetings, school assembly, service club, civic club, or other community get-together.

3. Make posters to exhibit in fishing tackle or sporting goods stores urging sportsmen to observe good conservation practices.

4. Distribute posters or other educational materials put out by state fish and game agencies.

5. Prepare simple soil erosion demonstrations to show at school assembly, troop meeting, and garden club, civic club, or service club meetings.

6. Make an exhibit for store window, theater lobby, or other public place emphasizing importance of soil as source of all food, most clothing, and many other necessities of life; show how not wasting food and clothing helps save soil.

7. Visit community watershed, water pumping station, or water supply station and find out where water comes from; what measures are necessary to make water usable; what water conservation problems are.

8. Find out if your community has a sewage-treatment plant; if not, how does it dispose of its sewage? Visit these facilities.

9. Visit one or two industrial plants that use large quantities of water and learn what their problems are; how water supply limits their production; amount of water used to manufacture paper, cloth, etc.; what their water conservation problems are. Do these

industries have waste disposal problems and how do they cope with them?

10. Help thin and prune woodlands at a campsite, public land, or nearby farm to improve tree growth.

11. Visit a wood-using industry—lumberyard, paper mill, rayon plant, furniture plant, turpentine distillery, etc. Find out what wood is used, where it comes from, and how it is processed.

12. Visit a lumberyard and find out what wood is used locally for construction and other purposes and where it comes from.

13. Make an exhibit showing how forest fires in other sections of the country affect the local community.

14. Make an exhibit showing how forests are important to water supply, wildlife, and recreation, as well as being the source of wood products.

15. Conduct a rat-control project under guidance of local health department, conservation agent, or other experts to help in a nationwide effort to exterminate rats that destroy or contaminate millions of dollars worth of food products and are health hazards to humans.

16. Develop a nature trail in park, camp, or community forest with approval of authorities.

17. Help control ragweed.

Be sure that boys know about national and council conservation training camps and have the opportunity to attend if they wish.

PSORIASIS

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 23, 1970

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, many people, no doubt have at one time or other heard the word "psoriasis." But few actually know the disease—what it is, the misery and suffering it causes million of Americans, and the shocking lack of funds devoted to finding a cure.

Just 2 years ago, in Portland, Oreg., a National Psoriasis Foundation was chartered through the desire of one victim to communicate with others who understood the torment of the disease.

The director of the foundation is Mrs. Beverly W. Foster of Portland. Mrs. Foster's husband placed a small advertisement in the personal column of a local newspaper asking other sufferers of psoriasis to get in touch with his wife and share their experience. The response was overwhelming, and from this desire to communicate stems the foundation aimed at educating the public and working for additional funds for research on the disease. The foundation publishes a bimonthly newsletter and is also actively engaged in setting up local chapters in all 50 States.

About 8 million persons are afflicted with psoriasis in our Nation, and an estimated 150,000 cases are diagnosed annually. Of the total number, approximately 10 percent have, or will have, proriatic arthropathy, an extremely painful and destructive form of arthritis. Psoriasis is a lifelong, hereditary disease representing ostracism and economic disaster to many of its victims. No completely safe and effective treatment has been developed up to this time, and the annual outlay for research has been a minuscule $200,000 annually of the medical research budget.

The foundation was organized to take action against the ignorance surrounding the disease. It received its corporate charter from the State of Oregon in October 1968, and Federal exempt status December 2, 1968. When funds become available, the foundation will proceed to organize at the State level using a pyramid structure for organizational responsibility. Although the foundation has received only limited public exposure to date, the mailing list has grown to 6,000 names in every State and actually representing a much larger number of persons as some families list up to eight afflicted members.

This, briefly, are the goals and aims of the foundation. I wanted to bring this to the attention of my colleagues and urge their fullest support of efforts to expand the program throughout the United States. With public attention focused on this disease, we can hope that more adequate funds can be provided to work toward a cure of psoriasis.

CONGRESSMAN CLAY ANSWERS GOV. LESTER MADDOX

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 23, 1970

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, the following is my reply to Governor Maddox's letter on welfare reform, which I thought would be of interest to my colleagues:

DEAR GOVERNOR MADDOX: Your letter to me dated November 16, 1970 expressing opposition to the proposed Family Assistance Plan leaves me with mixed emotions. My first reaction was to file it with all the other junk mail received from idiots. But on second thought, persons in high positions of responsibility cannot be permitted to spew racial hatred and venom on the American public unchallenged, even if they are idiots. Therefore, I am replying to your letter and sharply disagreeing with the reasoning advanced for opposition to the Family Assistance Plan.

You state that the FAP would "spread socialism and communism, and ultimately destroy private enterprise and what we know and love as Americanism, thus ending our nation as a great and free republic." Mr. Maddox, let me advise you that America started its decline from greatness when you seized an "ax-handle" and defied the laws of the land. It continued on that decline when you were permitted to go unprosecuted and unpunished for that violation. And the complete destruction of American greatness culminated with your election to represent the State of Georgia.

Americanism is the love and zealous support of our country, its ideals and laws. We are not born patriots—just citizens with the opportunity for patriotism. The mandate for patriots is to protect the principles which brought this Nation into being. If we are to exist in an open society, patriots must fight against policies which flow from men like you who have closed minds.

You further stated in your letter that "the guaranteed annual wage proposal before Congress, if implemented, would reward mediocrity and shiftlessness, and penalize excellence and hard work; destroy the initiative and kill the desire to work of millions of Americans." Let me hasten to point out that the American government already has a "guaranteed annual income" but it is not for the poor. It's strange that you have not seen fit to attack the guaranteed income of rich farmers in the State of Georgia who are being paid at this very moment by the federal government for not growing crops.

Last year, our government spent over $3 billion in tax money to subsidize rich farmers. Four thousand farmers collected more than $100,000 each for not planting their fields. This summer, our government paid one farmer in California $4 million for not working his fields. Would you consider this a guaranteed annual income, Mr. Governor, and would you conclude that those recipients are "mediocre and shiftless"? You also stated that passage of the FAP would "result in the federal government stealing billions of tax dollars from the hard-working producers and achievers in this country, and giving it to those who otherwise could, but would not, make their own way". Are you suggesting that those non-producers now receiving government subsidy for not producing are stealing billions of tax dollars?

Documentary evidence clearly demonstrates that you will be well advised to devote your time and talents to facing the many perplexing problems in the State of Georgia. National policies should be left to those who have the expertise and the capabilities of formulating them. The record reveals that the State of Georgia registered the second highest increase in cases of infectious syphilis in the nation during the past year. It also shows that the State of Georgia ranks 38th in the nation in per capita income ($2,781 for 1968). And Georgia's commitment to the poor is non-existent. Your State only pays those on old age assistance $80 a month, a family of four on aid to dependent children $125 a month. The Governor of Georgia cannot afford the luxury of articulating national policy when his own State is so neglected.

For the majority of the poor, changes in their economic destiny is beyond their control. Poverty is not theirs by choice but by design of federal policies. Most people are poor because affluence is beyond their reach. Most persons who are poor are still working but due to lack of education, opportunity or physical handicaps are unable to earn a living wage. You have focused your attacks on the minority of the poor and you conclude that Americans are poor because they are lazy. Our government must throw its full weight behind a campaign to eliminate poverty in this country and elevate the standard of living for all. Yes, Mr. Governor, you have arrived at the right conclusion but for all the wrong reasons.

TODAY'S INTERNATIONAL PROBLEMS: WARTIME HOPES AND CURRENT REALITIES

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 23, 1970

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, last June 16 the Economic Club of Pittsburgh sponsored the first Walker Foundation lecture, supported by a grant from the Alex C. Walker Educational and Charitable Foundation. The speaker was Lionel Lord Robbins, publisher of the London Financial Times.

Lord Robbins' talk was titled "Today's International Problems—Wartime Hopes and Current Realities." Lord Robbins was one of the principal British delegates at the Bretton Woods Conference, and one of the designers of the international agreements developed at that time.

In brief, his present view is that these instruments failed, partly, at least, because they were designed to cope with worldwide deflation. It was the generosity of the American taxpayer that put Europe back on its feet.

For the information of my colleagues I would like to introduce this speech into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

TODAY'S INTERNATIONAL PROBLEMS: WARTIME HOPES AND CURRENT REALITIES

It is a great honour for me this evening to be invited to deliver this first lecture for this distinguished Foundation, and when I received your invitation I confess I was somewhat perplexed. I wondered what I could find to say which would be of interest to you. The United Kingdom, whence I come, is no longer an absorbing focus of interest in the rest of the world; what could I contribute, therefore, to repay your hospitality? Well, eventually, as Professor Perlman has related to you, I hit on a solution in terms of my personal history. My first visit to the United States was in 1943. That was not in connection with money, but with food. I came to the United States as a United Kingdom delegate to the famous Food Conference at Hot Springs. But from that time onwards through the War it was my great good fortune to participate, in co-operation with officials in the State Department and the United States Treasury, in the discussion and foundation of some of the economic institutions which were projected and founded at that time. I can claim with Dean Acheson that I too, although in a much humbler capacity, was in at the beginning. And so I felt that perhaps there might be some interest if I passed in review, in a very brief and desultory way, the hopes and fears which we entertained at that time and then considered them in the light of contemporary developments. And that, ladies and gentlemen, is what I propose to do this evening; to consider the ideas and the institutions conceived in the second World War and to review them in the light of today's economic problems.

Now to begin with ideas. The first thing to emphasize is that the historian of the future will get it all wrong unless he realizes that deflation was the great bogey of those times. Those of us who were charged with planning the post-War institutions were working under the shadow of the Great Depression of the 'thirties and all of us (or nearly all of us) were affected. Many made estimates—projections—of what was to happen after the War; and most of the projections predicted that after a very short boom there would supervene a chronic shortage of investment which needed in various ways to be sustained and increased if the world were not to continue in its state of chronic stagnation. There were very few exceptions to this frame of mind. There was indeed one: I don't know to what extent the name of R. G. Hawtrey rings a bell among economists of your generation; but in the first fifty years of this century, certainly so far as my country is concerned, his name deserves to be coupled with that of Dennis Robertson and Maynard Keynes as one of the leaders of monetary thought. Hawtrey was a Treasury official but being also an extremely learned man, his interests were not always focused on practical administration and he did not therefore, perhaps, always take a very large part in the day-to-day business of wartime negotiation and planning. Thus, he did not accompany us to Bretton Woods and, indeed, it was not until we had got to our destination that Hawtrey's comments on the financial plans came into our hands. One morning I came down to breakfast and found a pile of papers which Keynes had sent along to me. Among the papers was a document by Hawtrey sent from London—sent from his room at the Treasury where he had been meditating upon the White plan and the Keynes plan; and the burden of his reflections was, "What's all this talk about deflation after the war? *Inflation is going to be the main problem*". And at the top of the memorandum Keynes had written, "Dear Lionel: thought you would like to see what the old lunatic is saying in his cell.

After all, he may be right"! [1] Well, the point I am trying to make is that, with the exception of a few visionaries like Hawtrey, most of us were imbued with the belief that our main task was so to shape the institutions of the future that world deflation should be avoided; and the institutions we created were indeed so effected.

The second point to which I should like to draw your attention is that it was conceived that these menaces were to be remedied by international co-operation and a network of international institutions. And it was in that way that there came into being the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank, and there was projected the ill-fated International Trade Authority, and so on and so forth. Now, ladies and gentlemen, I shall be saying some things this evening which will be critical of some at least of those institutions. But at the outset I would not like there to be any doubt at all of the admiration I have for the major progenitors of those schemes. I'm proud to have been part, to have played a part—a humble part, let me emphasize—in that movement of thought. The United States officials and the United Kingdom officials operated in those days as a band of brothers; and the leadership of thought, I think—the leadership of men who still happen to be with us, like Dr. Bernstein—displayed a resource and ingenuity almost without precedent in human history. There was an over-emphasis, I fancy, in our thinking in those days on the economic factor and I shall have more to say about that later on. But this is one of the episodes in recent human history which one can contemplate with a certain degree of admiration and satisfaction.

The third leading thought dominating hopes and fears in those days was the idea which was expressed by Mr. Wendell Wilkie in the slogan "One World". We were all dominated by the ideology of complete internationalism. This took various forms. In the first place, it took the form of the belief that nothing should be done without all-round consultation at gigantic conferences. I won't say that that was the only thought. In practice, of course, very much was done on the side. Most of what was achieved at Bretton Woods had been talked out beforehand by small bodies of officials, chiefly U.S., U.K. and Canadian—indeed, apart from drafting detail, all that was really left over was the highly controversial question of the quotas. But, there was a certain inhibition on any admission that such consultations took place. Everything was to be above board; everything was to be conducted on the basis of a general repudiation of special alliances or special anxieties. In the world of the future, as it was conceived in those days in Washington and affiliated centers, the Nazis of course had to be eliminated, but they were regarded as a special evil, the last of their kind in human history. For the rest, it was assumed that general harmony would prevail. There might be small dangers—the President of the United States in those days, it is credibly reported, assumed that Mr. Winston Churchill was probably likely to be a greater menace to world peace than Stalin! But if all the institutions didn't all go so far as to give one vote to each state (El Salvador on the same footing as the USSR and the United States) as in the Assembly at U.N., the various modifications of that principle which took place in the Fund and in the Bank and in the Security Council were regarded as being a concession to base reality. The ideal of the universal equality of states was held to be unimpeachable.

And hence, there was a tendency in our minds, I am sure, to a certain playing down of the political factor. The idea that the world of the future would have to be kept in order by force was something that was very repugnant, something which, if mentioned at all, was mentioned rather shamefacedly. Economics was to be the key. The root of evils in the past was held to be economic. I don't wish to denigrate completely this attitude. Much subtle thought had gone to build it up and no doubt much truth inhered in much of the analysis. But certainly there was an over-emphasis. I think, for instance, of this first conference which I had the privilege to attend. Some of the leaders of thought actually believed (I really have no doubt at all that Mr. Henry Wallace, for instance, profoundly believed) that if only you could bring it about that the members of the human race all ate enough, you would solve at once not only the problems of consumption and production of food but that all the rest would follow quite naturally. Perhaps that was rather a comic turn. But, in a sense it does symbolize the frame of mind which was very prevalent in those days. Well, as we all know, things haven't worked out that way. There have been some successes, not inconspicuous successes, on the basis of the institutions thus devised. But there have also been great disappointments, great surprises. Certainly the problems that we are confronted with today are problems that we confront with radically different anticipation than those which inspired the framers of the institutions immediately post-War. And, in dealing with these problems, we find ourselves equipped with a set of institutions which in fact were devised with expectations radically different from the way in which the world has turned out since.

Now, what I want to do this evening, ladies and gentlemen, is to comment on these developments. I want to talk for a moment or two about the more or less immediate surprises and disillusionments which supervened within two or three years after the conclusion of the War; then I want to go on and devote the greater part of my talk to the problems of the present day and present institutions. Don't be dismayed. I don't propose to be exhaustive!

Let me start with immediate disillusionments, both economic and political. On the economic front it was not long before there was revealed a total inadequacy of our plans to deal with the general post-War situation. Perhaps the plans for relief (the famous UNRA arrangements) were well conceived. But so far as rehabilitation was concerned, the restoration to more or less normal working conditions of the economies of the Western world, there was a gigantic vacuum. Trade was disorganized, production was at very low levels, the balance of payments of the European powers were hopelessly out of equilibrium. There was, in short, a complete and spectacular vindication of the famous remark made by Jack Viner at one of Harry White's conferences when, after the preliminary shape of the White plan had been outlined to a scratch conference of diplomats returning from Hot Springs, he was asked what he thought and he said, "After the War, I shall need a bombproof shelter and you are offering me an umbrella".

[1] I ought perhaps to explain that the frivolous allusion was a mark of fraternal affection. Keynes had a profound respect for Hawtrey and his contributions.

It was certainly not long after the War before it became clear that neither the International Monetary Fund nor the International Bank had the capacity to deal with the problems with which we were then confronted. And, very wisely, the authorities of those two institutions opted out to a very large extent of what had to be done in order to put things right. Then, of course, there was the great Anglo-United States loan which ran out so disastrously quickly. That was certainly partly our fault. One mustn't disguise the unfortunate influence on the rate of exhaustion of that fund of the ultra-cheap money policy practised by the United Kingdom government in the years immediately after the War; nor would I wish to disguise what the Germans would call the step-motherly handling of the problems which the existence of the abnormal sterling balances contributed to the rapid exhaustion of the loan which was then raised. But, there were other inadequacies, I think, in those arrangements. There were inadequate conceptions of the volume of assistance which was necessary to put the United Kingdom and Europe on their feet again; and there were inadequate conceptions of the speed with which it was prudent to attempt to achieve complete convertibility of European currencies. In any event, as you all know, it was not long before the U.K. loan was exhausted and the countries of continental Europe were on the point of collapse. They would have collapsed in fact if the United States had not stepped in with the Marshall Aid, one of the most imaginative, one of the most generous gestures in history. I've often noticed that when this is said to inhabitants of this continent, they tend to repudiate the adjectives and argue that after all it was a gesture that was in their interest. Yes, I think it was in the U.S. interest. But, very seldom in human history has there been such a spacious conception of what the long-term interest of a great power really is.

In the sphere of politics, expectations proved equally illusory. Firing had hardly ceased before President Stalin—so much less dangerous than Winston Churchill!—went back on everything. The co-operation which had been expected to restore the harmony of the world added up to less than zero. You had the episodes of the Berlin airlift, the refusal of Marshall Aid on behalf of the so-called Iron Curtain countries, trouble in Greece, and so on and so forth. I was at an American university institution the other day and I read, pinned up on the wall, a statement by some foolish boy that it was "American stupidity" that was largely responsible for what he called "the mythical cold war". As I read it I couldn't help thinking of a story of the Duke of Wellington. You may remember that the Duke, standing outside the Houses of Parliament or somewhere like that, was accosted by a man in the street with outstretched hand who said, "Mr. Smith, I believe"; and the Duke replied, "If you believe that, you'll believe anything." As I read this legend, I couldn't help wishing that the youngster who wrote it could have seen the Berlin Wall, the obscene symbol of the division of the world, with its pathetic memorials at intervals to the unfortunates, brutally shot escaping from totalitarian tyranny.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, in the crisis which was caused by the disaffection of the Soviets, again it was your imagination and your initiative which produced a new solution. It is my firm conviction that, whatever the delusions of the wartime planning, it was the vision and insight of Messrs. Truman and Acheson which saved the Western world from the spiritual and moral death which supervenes wherever you have Communist domination. And I also think that, in creating the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, they created the nucleus of an institution which, more imaginatively developed by the Europeans, could have consolidated peace in our time and reduced most world problems to manageable proportions. But more about that later on. So much for the short-period disillusionment.

I now come to the perspectives of the present day; and, again, I will deal with them in the same order—economics first, and politics later. Now first of all let us all admit that this has been a period of astonishing growth and prosperity. In the Western world, even the slowest economy, even the United Kingdom, has enjoyed a rise in income per head at a rate almost unparalleled in earlier history. I know that this has not been equalled in the so-called underdeveloped parts of the world. Not surprisingly, I think, if you remember the fearful, the frightening, population explosion which has taken place *pari passu* with all the dedicated efforts to raise the standards of life in those countries.

But I don't wish to divagate to discuss that problem; the Western world is the focus of my remarks this evening. It has been a period of growth, I would say, but also a period of inflation. It has been a period in which the decline in the value of money in peacetime, as distinct from wartime inflation, has only been paralleled with what took place in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries with the discovery of new sources of precious metals in the New World. Now I suppose we should ask, "Has the growth been due to the inflation?", for we must not disguise from ourselves the fact that there is some intellectual support for this point of view. Not, perhaps, much for galloping inflation, although I have heard excuses for that, but rather for a mild rate (say 2½ to 5 per cent per annum)—I fancy that in certain quarters of application there is quite a considerable body of support which is not always surreptitious. I remember a letter to *The Times* from one of the most distinguished younger economists in the English speaking world, reproaching, very forcefully, those who poured cold water on the movement which in his opinion was doing so much to release the springs of energy and productivity. But I personally, ladies and gentlemen, must confess that I think that attitude is dangerous. I don't deny for a moment that the absence of deflation has been highly beneficial; and the extent to which international co-operation has brought it about that there has been no deflation is certainly an important gain which must be chalked up to some extent to the credit of the international organizations. But, beyond that I am certainly not prepared to go. I wouldn't deny for a moment that inflation *may* contribute to growth. We all know how, for a time, the forced saving which inflation brings about may involve a volume of real investment greater than otherwise would have been the case. But the extent to which that can go on for any period of time is surely limited. It has to be unperceived in order that it may continue to be effective. *People find out*—I would have thought it was unanswerable today that the high rates of interest in recent years are a standing proof of the fact that you can fool some of the people some of the time but you can't fool all of the people all of the time. So that if the stimulus of inflation is to continue year in year out, it has to be quicker and quicker. This is surely bad in itself, eventually upsetting even productive efficiency and in the meantime having very bad effects indeed on distributive justice and on public morals. In the end I doubt if responsible people would support a high rate of inflation. The trouble is that small rates tend to build up big ones.

Now, to deal with this problem, the existing international institutions are quite inadequate. As I was saying earlier, the Fund and the bank were designed expressly to avoid deflation, deflation spreading from the embarrassment of some centres of economic activity in trouble with their balances of payments and for that reason practicing restrictionist policies which tend—or might tend—to spread. But neither the Fund, nor the Bank, was provided with instruments for restraining excess demand. It is perfectly true that Fund officials may tell particular governments in difficulty not to inflate. But in doing that they are dealing with a problem which is essentially *relative*. Balance of payments difficulties are not a phenomenon of general world inflation; they are a byproduct of inflation in one centre which has got out of step with the inflation elsewhere. All that you can say of the international institutions in this respect—that is to say, of their capacity to avoid general inflation—all that you can say is that they don't encourage it. I think perhaps that it ought to be said, in the interest of historical truth, that the probability is that the International Monetary Fund, founded on the White plan, encourages inflation considerably less than the rival plan, which we in the United Kingdom pushed as hard as we could until we realized that it hadn't got a chance, the extremely ingenious and intellectually stimulating Keynes plan for a Clearing Union, which, with its virtually unlimited liability for the creditors, would probably in the circumstances which supervened after the War have been distinctly more inflationary in its effect.

But now, ladies and gentlemen, so far there has been no world crisis due to general inflation. Our troubles in the sphere of international economic finance have been the troubles of the *relationships* of currencies rather than their *absolute level*. And the trouble here clearly ultimately arises from the fact that, with the political division of the world, there are different independent centres of money supplies. There is no one supranational monetary authority; there is no general regulator, no Federal Reserve System for the Western world as a whole. Of course, it's a mistake to argue (I should be very sorry indeed if you thought I was arguing), that all balance of payments difficulties in the last twenty-five years have been due to *positive* local inflation, that is to say, that they have necessarily arisen originally from monetary influences. Clearly, balance of payments difficulties can arise on the "real" side as well as on the monetary side. They can arise from adverse changes in the terms of trade, from changes in the direction of foreign or local investment and expenditure, and so on. But it is true that, *if there are different centres of money supply and the various authorities don't act as if they were part of a unitary system*, then balance of payments difficulties will emerge. In a unitary system you can have shifts in the direction of internal supply and demand. You can have local unemployment and depression in one area; you can have local inflation in another. But, by definition, you do not have difficulties of money changing, which you do have when you have more than one centre of money supply. That is ultimately simply a reflection of the fact that money supply is one of the prerogatives of sovereignty which the political states of the Western world have hitherto not been willing to surrender.

Now, in dealing with these problems, I think it must be said that the International Monetary Fund has had a certain degree of success. Looking back with hindsight, I personally regret the form of the constitution, the vast multiplicity of membership, the terrific and largely meaningless conferences, the top-heavy apparatus of consultation which creates difficulties of possible leakage and means in the end that most major changes are negotiated on the side rather than in open council. I personally feel, again speaking with hindsight, that it would have been better if John Williams' plan had been adopted and the old Tripartite Agreement

had been resuscitated with suitable enlargement so that the big centres of money supply, sufficiently small in number to be able to keep things pretty secret, were not only *de facto* but also *de jure* in control of the thing. And I think that you are now gradually moving towards a situation when it is becoming more and more recognized that the emergence of the Group of Ten is at once a symptom of the difficulties in the constitution of the IMF to which I have been drawing attention, and perhaps a *de facto* solution of the problem. But, having said that, having expressed this mild regret concerning the form which this institution took, I don't doubt for a moment that the disciplines involved in the rules and regulations of the Fund, the disciplines involved in the grant of drawing facilities, have meant an international state of affairs vastly superior to that prevailing in the inter-War period and vastly superior to anything that could be expected to prevail in the absence of some such body of rules and conditions. And, let me hasten to say that, although I am not very much in sympathy with the point of view of people who say that there has been a marked lack of liquidity in the world at large hitherto (if there had been a marked lack of liquidity, you would not have had the world inflation), I do welcome the forward looking statesmanship of those connected with the Fund which has created greater elbow room for their operations in the institution of the apparatus of Special Drawing Rights. I think it is absurd to say that, so far, there has been a lack of liquidity. But I do think that it is wise to guard against prospective difficulties in that respect in the future.

Now, perhaps, ladies and gentlemen, you will permit me to deal with one or two criticisms and suggestions which are made nowadays with regard to those aspects of Fund policy which deal directly with rates of exchange. It has become a fashion recently to argue as if the IMF stood for a system of rigidly fixed rates of exchange, to argue as if the IMF were simply a perpetuation of the old gold standard system. That is a grave mistake. The statutes of the Fund specifically made provision for alterations of rates if and when a particular centre found itself in fundamental disequilibrium. And that, I am quite sure, was a right and a wise thing to do. If, by reason of faulty policy, a centre has got itself into a position in which balance of payments equilibrium can only be restored by drastic deflation of income, it is far better to alter the rate of exchange than to inflict on the economy the additional evil of deflation super-added to the inflation which had preceded it. But the critics of the Fund go beyond that and argue that the present system of adjustable rates is inadequate. Now, on that I think some of the criticism goes too far. I don't contend for a moment that the present rules are perfect. It may be that the rules ought to include provision permitting experimental periods of float as occurred recently in the German case and is alleged to be occuring at the present time in Canada. I certainly don't believe that in this respect human ingenuity is exhausted and I certainly wouldn't like to be standing here suggesting to you that the limits of human ingenuity were reached at Bretton Woods. I would like to say also that I see no insurmountable difficulty in allowing particular currencies to float for some time, provided that the rest of the world system is on a more or less stable basis. I think that experience shows that the damage which is done by one currency floating up and down for a bit is not very great; it may be that in certain circumstances it is the lesser of the evils available. My reservation relates to the "whole hogging" point of view which suggests that floating rates all round would be a superior system. That, I submit, would be in fact an incredible addition to the uncertainties of trade and investment. And I think it would be also a probable additional condition favourable to the persistence of inflation.

My own experience of politicians leads me to think that very often, if they were confronted with balance of payments disequilibrium in a regime of floating rates they would say, "Oh well, we'll let the rate take care of that"; and they wouldn't pay even as much attention as they do now to maintaining the internal value of money. But, be that as it may, my fundamental attitude to the "whole hogging" propositions of this sort is more practical: I just don't think the thing is "on." Suppose that there were some international conference which was persuaded by ingenious argument that floating rates all round should be the order of the day and that this recommendation were put into practice. What would happen? I suggest that, within 24 hours, most of the weaker currencies would have linked up to the stronger currencies again. And within 24 months—probably a much shorter period of time than that—the proprietors of the leading currencies would be meeting, perhaps secretly, to see if they couldn't devise methods of eliminating this cause of uncertainty in international finance. One saw this sort of thing happening in the thirties when the main rates were actually free to fluctuate; and in my opinion, it would be bound to happen again. So I don't believe that floating all round is a practical proposition for the Western world as it is at present constituted. I can indeed conceive that in some far distant future, if Europe were unified on a financial, economic and political basis and if Europe, including the United Kingdom, had a common currency, then no very great harm would be done to the economies of the Western world if the rate between the European bloc and the dollar bloc were rather more adjustable than it has been in the recent past. It might not be necessary. But I can conceive that in those circumstances, arrangements of that sort wouldn't do much harm. But after all, that is living very far in a future which may not come about.

Now, coming back to more immediate problems, at the moment, in currency matters, we are enjoying a certain lull. The pound has been de-valued. The disequilibrium in the sterling balance of payments has been remedied. The mark has been revalued. Alarms and excursions regarding the price of gold are at an end for the time being. The world is virtually on a dollar standard—on a depreciating dollar standard, I am sorry to say. Yet I can't believe, ladies and gentlemen, that we are sensible to be deceived by this lull into thinking that all the problems are at an end. It could last a long time if you in the United States were to right your balance of payments disequilibrium pretty quickly. Well, may be that will happen. Let us hope that it does—the immense fundamental strength of your economy certainly would be a justification for hopes that that may be so. But if it doesn't come about, I myself don't believe that the rest of the world will be prepared indefinitely to accumulate depreciating dollars; and if that were so, then some of the alarms and excursions of recent years would recommence. What form they would take is frightfully difficult to anticipate. I suppose that, from your point of view, the most advantageous change would take place if there were some upward revaluation all around on the part of the currencies which were strong. Some people may hope that the Canadian action is an anticipation of something which may become more general. But, appreciation of the currency is not particularly popular politically, however much sense it may make on a purely technical level. I just don't see widespread revaluations of the other main currencies coming quickly, even if in the end that proves to be the only way out. On the other hand, devaluation of the dollar is an extremely difficult thing. It is much more difficult for you to get off the dollar standard than it is for other people. I've heard it suggested in some quarters that the ultimate solution (which certainly isn't round the corner) would be the creation of some Western International unit with an international money—Special Drawing Rights enlarged and consolidated perhaps—linked to gold and all the other currencies *including the dollar*, free to adjust in terms of that unit of account. That may happen. But it is surely some time ahead. And again one wonders whether there is enough political unity in the world for such a thing to be practicable within the lifetime of most professional economists now living.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, time is going on and I won't detain you discussing the fate of the ambitious plans for an International Trade Authority which were projected during the War in discussions in which I had spent many pleasant hours in company with friends at the State Department. You all know that these plans foundered, partly on the opposition of special interests in different countries, partly on the fact that they were, I now think, eventually top-heavy and overladen with reserves and excessive regulation. The one good thing that came out of all that talk was the successive rounds of semi-multilateral negotiations with regard to tariff levels of which the recent so-called Kennedy-round is the most conspicuous example. The widespread clearance of trade and integration of world economies which at one time was hoped for hasn't taken place, although many harmful barriers have been removed. The only area in which visionary plans of that sort seem likely to be fulfilled, of course, is within the Common Market—the philosophy of which, for good or for bad, is certainly radically different from the philosophy which inspired the plans for the International Trade Authority.

But now, before I cease plaguing you—I've talked too long already—I must say a word or two about the last of my contrasts between wartime hopes and post-war realities: the realities of the present international political situation. I surely don't need to expatiate long on the profound disappointment which all thinking people must entertain with regard to the working of the United Nations. It was founded—certainly on the United States' side—in sincere and exalted idealism. But it was also founded, so far as the Assembly was concerned, on, I am sure, the quite untenable doctrine of the fundamental equality of states. I do not think that the equality assumed in that doctrine between San Salvador and the United States of America has any basis whatever in genuine democratic theory; quite the contrary indeed, it is extremely unfair to each individual inhabitant of the larger democracies whose proportionate representation is so much smaller. And of course the Security Council (the concession to reality), which was to put all that right, has been virtually sterilized by the utter unwillingness of the Communist powers to co-operate. There are no inhibitions in that quarter in exercising a veto whenever any forward-looking initiative arises. So far—let us face it—contrary to wartime expectations, the peace of the world has been very largely maintained by Russian fear of American power. No wonder the young people are anxious and disillusioned.

After the War, as I've said already, there was a very great danger indeed of total disintegration of the Western world and possession of the half of it on the other side of the Atlantic by the Russians occupying, either directly or indirectly, right up to the Western seaboard. That was stopped by American vision and initiative and the North Atlantic Alliance. But the North

Atlantic Alliance, although it saved our world, suffered surely and still suffers from manifold imperfections. First of all, it is an alliance only of the Atlantic powers, whereas in my judgment it would be far better if it were an alliance of like-minded powers, whether bordering on the Atlantic or elsewhere. Secondly, it concerns only the interests in the Atlantic area of the high contracting parties, whereas, in my opinion, it would be fully effective only if it concerned the worldwide interests of the Atlantic powers whether in the Atlantic or in the Middle East or elsewhere. And thirdly, for this reason partly and partly because of lack of further developments, it certainly has lacked throughout any reality of complete political planning. There has been abundant military planning—some of it extremely resourceful and ingenious—but there is no political organization for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization which is comparable in any way to the organizations which prepare military or even economic plans. That, I think, puts the high contracting parties at a fundamental disadvantage *vis-a-vis* the monolithic unity of the Iron Curtain countries in this respect. I blame, to some extent, the United Kingdom for not pushing this particular point further. I don't think the United Kingdom has been backward in contributing support to the Alliance. But certainly here was a great chance of consolidating and enlarging it which I can't help thinking that lack of vision on the part of the United Kingdom statesmen missed.

Well now, today even the Alliance, imperfect though it be, is in danger; this for two reasons. On the one side there is the failure of a Europe which has been restored to prosperity (and I include the United Kingdom), a failure to assume a due share of the burden; on the other side, there is a danger arising from a growing and understandable disinclination on your part to perpetuate the present degree of involvement. The main idea has, to some extent, lost its appeal. There is a falling apart; and in consequence the whole of Western solidarity is in danger. What is going to happen? Well, I don't doubt that something is going to happen in Europe—in continental Europe. Whether the United Kingdom is going to go in or not is, I think, still an open question, although it is a very important question for the United Kingdom and perhaps for the rest of the world. It may be that in time to come, Western Europe, with or without the United Kingdom, may emerge strong enough to sustain its frontiers against the forces of barbarism until these forces—these ideologies—have burned themselves out, as doubtless they will in the next two or three hundred years. And I should hope that in such circumstances, with the emergence of a strong Western Europe, with or without the United Kingdom, in spite of the very considerable amount of quite absurd and contemptible anti-Americanism which is knocking about in some continental European countries—particularly France—there would also be enough good sense in the Western world to prevent friction between the two great branches thereof. But that time is still far off. And in any case, ladies and gentlemen, it is the second best solution.

No indeed, you only have to look at the main sources of danger in the world at the moment—in the Middle East and in Asia—to realize that, whereas there is not one world in Wendell Wilkie's sense, in the sense of a common will to international law and order and peace throughout the world population as a whole, there certainly is one Western world interest in the sense of a deep community of interest, a deep apprehension of danger, a deep necessity to create arrangements to maintain peace and safeguard the common civilization of the West—the only *civilization,* ladies and gentlemen, *hitherto which has promised hope and progress for humanity at large.* Will that be realized? I don't know. In the present state of opinion on both sides of the Atlantic, it is not easy to feel completely optimistic. But if it is not realized, let there be no doubt about it, our children face another dark age of barbarism and unfreedom. So, there is very much responsibility for all of us concerned. For us—Europeans—on the other side of the Atlantic, to avoid parochialism and self-deception and for you—members of this great Republic—not to lose the vision and self-confidence which, so far, in the anxious days since World War II, have been the main source of stability and progress.

Thank you.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Dr. PERLMAN. Mr. Yeo has asked a question about what has been the experience of the United Kingdom with regard to incomes policy, something that seems to be emerging in larger and larger type in American newspapers in the last 72 hours.

Lord ROBBINS. This is not an easy question to answer. The incomes policy which was introduced by the Labour Government in the early days of the economic crisis of '64 to '68 is, of course, no longer in vogue. There is a Prices and Incomes Board still in existence. But any attempt to control, through that body, the rise in wages and salaries has, for the time being, been abandoned; I think it is not likely to be resumed exactly in the old form. How effective the policy was while it lasted is, no doubt, a controversial matter. I seem to remember a speech by Mr. Aubrey Jones, who is Chairman of the Prices and Incomes Board, in which he claimed that the operations of his body had been effective in restraining the inflation by one per cent per annum, which is perhaps not a very extravagant claim. I have also heard it contended by opponents of the policy, that since its abandonment, the upward explosion of wage rates has been greater than would have been the case had the trade unions not felt so suppressed while the policy was in active operation. I've also seen it contended by highly qualified persons—no less a person than Professor Lipsey has taken this line—that it may be that, if you set a certain norm which is to be the guideline of action in carrying out a policy of that sort, that it means that the rate rise is rather greater than might otherwise be the case because some people, so to speak, perk up their ears and say, "Well, if the other chaps are going up to that, we must go there too." My own judgment is that the great inflationary problems of our time are not to be solved, in the final analysis, by devices of this sort. I can conceive that temporary wage freezes or wage ceilings may be necessary in certain emergencies. I shouldn't rush to advocate them. But I can conceive that qualified persons may take that point of view. I find it much harder to conceive that attempts, year in year out, to regulate from the centre the relationship between rates of pay in different occupations are likely to prove permanently viable. Certainly in my country they encountered the strongest resistance from organized labour. Indeed, it was that resistance, which you must realize is not the resistance of the extreme left at all but rather the resistance of the right wing of the Labour Party, which caused the virtual abandonment of this policy a few months ago.

Dr. PERLMAN. This is not an easy question to summarize. I think you all heard it pretty well. I think the essence of it is, "Can you summarize the balance of payments problems of various countries outside of using the United States as the basic international medium?

Lord ROBBINS. I didn't wish to express undue apprehension of what is likely to happen in the next few months because I don't think the difficulties will boil up as soon as that. It may very well be that policy in this country will be successful in reducing the deficits which, after all, arise to some extent from the burdens in the world at large which you have shouldered for political reasons and which might become diminished by changes in policy and changes in the international situation. But, assuming for the moment that deficits continue, then I do submit that, sooner or later, the central banks elsewhere will begin to wonder what limit they should set to the continual accumulation of dollar reserves. That was what I had in mind and I don't think that's an entirely fantastical query. It's a query which you will certainly hear in many central banking circles on our side of the Atlantic. Now, this is a danger which may never occur. But it is a danger to which any reserve currency is subject if that reserve currency is not sustained by a policy which eliminates unwanted balance of payments deficits.

Dr. PERLMAN. This is a question to comment on the growth of the Euro-dollar market from the standpoint of developments in the international balance of payments.

Lord ROBBINS. This is a very esoteric matter. On the whole, I regard the growth of the Euro-dollar market as a sign of health rather than the reverse. It seems to me that it ill becomes people who believe in the international mobility of capital to grumble at the development of an institution which, to some extent, enables people to evade national restrictions and restore a much greater mobility of capital than otherwise would exist.

Dr. PERLMAN. This is an opportunity to comment on the new economic history with its different sense of the new economic history—this is the new left economic history, I suppose.

Lord ROBBINS. I don't know quite what to say. Far be it from me to comment on the history of internal policy in the United States. This is a matter on which I want to learn rather than to pronounce. Speaking as a British citizen, I must say that nothing that has been written in recent years shakes my conviction that the international policy pursued by President Truman was absolutely fundamental in restoring economic political stability to the Western world. Whatever the verdict on President Truman's domestic policy, I feel sure that he will go down in history as having presided over the economic rehabilitation of economies which were on the point of collapse and of having, at the instigations no doubt of expert advisers like Mr. Acheson, created the apparatus which said to the tides of Russian influence which flooded throughout Western Europe, "Thus far shalt thou go and no further." That, in my judgment (I may be wrong) was of inestimable benefit to the Western world as a whole.

Dr. PERLMAN. I don't know if all of you heard Professor Bronfenbrenner's question. He asked simply what Lord Robbins' reaction would be to the United States turning to a much greater reliance upon protectionism, a point of view not unknown in this part of the state.

Lord ROBBINS. Who am I to tell you what you should do? I certainly know that as a citizen of the United Kingdom and, so to speak, of the rest of the world, I should feel that such change of policy was unfortunate for us and since the example of the United States in turning away from high protectionism has had such manifestly beneficial effects on the general volume of world trade, I frankly would be somewhat apprehensive if that movement were to go very far. I don't think I ought to say more than that.

Dr. PERLMAN. The general question relates to the emphasis on future kinds of trade negotiations—multi-lateral negotiations, general trade agreements and the like.

Lord ROBBINS. I think it's difficult to say. I fancy that in the next few years most goings on in that area will be dominated by what is happening in the Common Market. Certainly in the months immediately ahead, the question whether the United Kingdom is going to be absorbed in that area with policies tending towards local freedom of trade within its boundaries, will be a dominating consideration in many adjacent parts of the world. But whether that takes place or not, the Common Market will probably go on and the future policy of the Common Market in regard to its external barriers will, I think, be a major if not a dominating consideration determining international trade policy anywhere. Here you are dealing with a movement which is only just getting under way and which I think has now acquired sufficient momentum to go considerably further. Now, one asks oneself whether in the end the influence of that is going to be beneficial to world trade outside that area or not. I don't know. Something certainly will depend upon the extent to which the authorities of the Common Market succeed in mitigating the influence of their agricultural constituents. I well remember, at a discussion of the official reconstruction committee in Whitehall round about 1943–44, Maynard Keynes turning to the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Agriculture and saying to him with a sweet smile, "All agricultural departments all over the world are a racket, aren't they?"

Dr. PERLMAN. The question is simply this: If Lord Robbins does not think that the United States will be successful in turning around its inflationary problem, and by that I presume what you mean is reducing the rate of inflation to somewhat less than it has been, what should it do?

Lord ROBBINS. I really don't feel competent to answer that question at all. You must ask Professor Friedman or Professor Samuelson, according to your fancy.

Dr. PERLMAN. I am going to call the official questioning period to an end. I would end it, however, with one very small observation. In one of his relatively unknown essays, Lafayette observed that the French Revolution came about, not when conditions had gotten very bad—on the contrary, things were getting better—but the French Revolution came about, he said, when the French governing community—what he called the ruling class—lost confidence in its capacity to govern. I think one of the very attractive elements of this evening's splendid speech has been a review of what the United States has achieved and a sort of reinforcement of the convictions that problems are soluble and that the United States' record is not simply a question of the kind of activities which lead to signs on walls such as "All Yanks go home" and the like. And for that I think we are very much indebted to Lord Robbins; in any case, I personally, feel very much cheered by the speech tonight.

Thank you very much.

MANPOWER BILL AIDS THE ELDERLY

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 23, 1970

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed glad that the manpower bill which the House passed on November 17 will permit the continuance—and hopefully the extension and expansion—of the community service employment program for low-income senior citizens, such as is operated by the Boston Commission on Affairs of the Elderly under contract with the National Council of Senior Citizens and Department of Labor.

This unique program in Boston has for 2 years demonstrated the valuable contribution that the low-income elderly can provide the community. Senior aides improve their own impoverished lives by earning $2.15 per hour for a 20-hour week. The 62 aides enrolled in the Boston project have provided many needed services for the city, with their assignments in the Veterans services departments, the health and hospital department, and the educational services. One of their most notable involvements has been with the Office of Public Service and the neighborhood service centers. In each, specialized cases and problems involving medicaid, medicare, housing, and social services, are sought and serviced with the direct assistance of the aides.

SUPPORT FOR THE TRADE ACT OF 1970

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 23, 1970

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, on November 19, 1970, the House of Representatives passed the Trade Act of 1970, which is designed to provide protection for American industries harmed by imports.

The need for enactment of this legislation is graphically depicted by a letter I received from Mr. Fred Listorti, one of my constituents who is engaged in the manufacture of shirts, pajamas, sportswear, and underwear for boys. I insert this letter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

SAVADA BROS., INC.,
New, York, N.Y., August 26, 1970.

The Honorable GEORGE GOODLING,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GOODLING: I wrote to you about a year ago that the government should do something to check the influx of shirts, pajamas, etc. from our so-called friendly Asiatic nations. Laborers there work for 3¢ to 17¢ per hour, 14 hours per day, and 28 days per month. While it is hard enough to compete with non-union shops and European labor, it is impossible to compete with the Asiatic labor.

Congress means well by helping those nations by trade; but, at what price? Savada Bros., Inc. has been in the boys shirt and pajama business for over sixty years. I have been managing the Glen Rock plant, namely Glenrow, Inc., for the last twenty years. Last Monday evening Mr. Savada called me to inform me that it is impossible for him to continue to stay in business and loose money; therefore, he will phase out the pajama business within the next two to four weeks. Is this the price we must pay?

The government seems to support or subsidize most business. I believe they even help to pay for the cotton sold to Japan. They in turn sell shirts delivered in San Francisco for $12.00 per dozen. Why? We, the taxpayers that support all this giveaway, have to pay 57½¢ a yard for cloth plus freight—2¢ per yard. The cloth alone comes to $11.00 per dozen.

I ask you to have our economic and engineering experts to figure how we can compete and make some profit. Are we all heading for the welfare line?

Why not put a high tarriff on imports and give it back to the workers of those nations so that they can buy what they produce and some of our products.

I'm writing to you as our representative in Washington to please come and explain to these employees why we are forced out of business. Please do not tell us that you will retrain or relocate us. We love it here and want to work here. This is our home.

Sincerely yours,

FRED LISTORTI.

RACIAL "SOLUTIONS" IN ZANZIBAR

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 23, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Communist leadership of Zanzibar has now come up with a revolutionary solution to racial tensions long existing between the black majority and the Arab-Asian minority—to abolish the racial differences through forced mixed marriages.

The initial experimentation in the "pleasures" of race mixing marriages have been reserved to black party officials with four young girls of Persian descent being coerced into the marriages.

Reportedly the Arab parents of the young girls have not yet adapted themselves to the "utopian" solutions of communism and dared object to the forceful marriages of their daughters to the new red-black aristocracy. The objecting fathers were in turn promptly sentenced to jail for a year and given 24 lashes each, for interfering in the power of the state over the marriages. It is uncertain as to what punishment is in store for the mothers who refused to order the daughters to submit in order to consummate the marriages.

The head Communist of Zanzibar, Sheikh Karume, cannot understand why his new integration-by-marriage program should meet with any objection. So bitter is Karume that he has even threatened to ban the Mau Mau newspaper from neighboring Kenya if it does not stop "irresponsible" opposition. Rather, he feels the world should recommend mixed marriages as a way to overcome racial differences. Perhaps even a U.N.-approved method to solve apartheid—with economic sanctions against parents who protest.

It will be interesting indeed, to follow the marriage experiment in Tanzania as a solution to the race differences. Who can say but what the next extremist approach by the civil rights-radical-liberals of our country may be to seek to amend the present civil rights bill so as to outlaw legal marriage between any two people of the same race, creed, religion, or national origin.

I include several related newsclippings in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 8, 1970]

ZANZIBAR TRIES FORCED MARRIAGES

(By Stanley Meisler)

DAR ES SALAAM, TANZANIA.—Zanzibar, the Indian Ocean's exotic spice island of legend and literature, in reality has long festered with racial tensions between its ruling black majority and its Arab and Asian minorities.

Today it is the scene of a state experiment in integration through enforced mixed marriages, bringing shock and outrage to mainland Tanzania, its senior partner in the republic to which it was united in 1964.

Most recently, four young girls of Persian descent—14 to 20 years old—were forced into marriage with African officials, and their fathers and seven other men were jailed for protesting.

That was but the latest embarrassment to the dominant mainland from the island some 20 miles offshore.

It exposed once again the difficulty facing President Julius Nyerere in asserting his authority and influence on the insular portion of his republic.

Late last week, either his authority or the mainland's angry resentment seemed to be having a belated effect. The 11 Persian men were released.

When the "brides" did not show up at home that night, however, the men protested to the government and demanded they be locked up again if the girls were not returned.

Sheik Abeid A. Karume, head of the Zanzibar Revolutionary Council, told a mass rally he was surprised to hear people on the outside shouting about what was going on. He said he would not obey orders from anywhere else, and added that Zanzibar citizens should welcome mixed marriages as a way to end racial differences.

Since the union of Tanganyika and Zanzibar into Tanzania, Nyerere, in theory, has been president of both. But actually Zanzibar does pretty much as it pleases.

Doing as it likes, Zanzibar has become a frightening, bizarre island, ruled by the authoritarian whim of a black revolutionary council that is largely unschooled and obviously resentful over centuries of Arab and Asian domination. Since the Africans overthrew the Arab sultan in 1964, the tables have turned in a cruel and vengeful way.

Last May, Karume proposed marriage in turn to four young girls of the Persian Ithnasheri Moslem sect. When each girl refused, Karume became so enraged that he put their fathers and other male relatives in jail.

But President Nyerere flew to the island and evidently persuaded Karume he had gone too far. The Persian men were released, and for a while, Nyerere's rule of reason prevailed on the matter of mixed marriages.

On Sunday, Sept. 6, however, the four Persian Ithansheri girls were taken forcibly from their homes and married to four African members of the Revolutionary Council, who ranged in age from 48 to 55.

The fathers and other male relatives of the girls tried to stop the ceremonies. They shouted verses from the Koran that a marriage consummated without a girl's consent was rape and that a Moslem marriage was not legal without the consent of the girl.

But a member of the Revolutionary Council, who was acting as a Moslem Kadhi (priest), performed the ceremonies anyway.

According to reports reaching Des es Salaam, the mothers of the girls were told the next day that the girls had refused sexual relations with their husbands. The mothers were told to order the girls to consummate the marriages, but the mothers refused.

A day later, the fathers and other male relatives of the brides were brought to Zanzibar People's Court and sentenced to a year in prison and 24 strokes of a cane each, for trying to stop the marriages. The 11 men included an 80-year-old and a 70-year-old.

[From the London Times, Oct. 23, 1970]

TANZANIA THREAT OF CENSORSHIP ON BRIDE REPORTS

The East African Standard, which has been conducting a campaign against forced marriages in Zanzibar, has been warned that its circulation will be banned in Tanzania if its treatment of the affair does not change.

In a telegram to the Nairobi newspaper yesterday, Mr. Makame, the Tanzanian Minister of Information, said the Government considered the newspaper's treatment of the subject as "mendacious and irresponsible" and contrary to the policy of good neighbourliness.

The telegram, which was broadcast by Dar es Salaam Radio, added that to discuss issues and policies was one thing and to carry on a campaign of personal vilification of leaders was another. If the newspaper persisted in treating the subject in this manner the Government would have no option but to ban it.

On Tuesday the newspaper gave prominence to two young women reported to have been married to Shaikh Abeid Karume, the Zanibar Head of Government and Tanzanian First Vice-President.

MOSS QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 23, 1970

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, during August, I mailed my annual questionnaire to my constituents and approximately 15,000 persons responded. The questionnaire contained 22 questions ranging from consumer protection and foreign affairs to gun control and welfare.

Results show pollution, crime, inflation, the Indochina war, and drug abuse—in that order—as the five issues of greatest concern to the residents of the Sacramento County, Calif., area.

The questionnaires were tabulated by computer which designated the response, sex of the respondent, age group, education level, family income, and political party voting preference in the 1968 general election.

In assessing the national issues, respondents in age groups 18 to 50 were in agreement on the priority problems, but respondents age 51 and over listed crime and inflation as the most vital concerns of our time.

As this point in the RECORD, I am inserting the list of the questions I asked and the results:

MOSS QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

1. As a consumer, do you feel the government should require producers to:

(a) clearly date the packaging of perishable goods (28 percent);

(b) clearly list the price per unit (per oz., etc.) on packaged goods (24 percent);

(c) guarantee prompt repair or replacement of goods covered by warranties (28 percent);

(d) maintain warranties on products for at least one year (19 percent).

2. Given increasing inflation and unemployment, would you favor:

(a) decreasing federal spending (27.8 percent);

(b) raising federal taxes (4.6 percent);

(c) imposing federal price and wage controls (22.8 percent);

(d) negotiate price and wage guidelines with business and labor (25.8 percent);

(e) reinstitute credit controls requiring larger down payments and shorter periods in which to repay (18.9 percent).

3. The congestion in our cities is a serious problem. Do you favor:

(a) providing federal highway funds for mass transit systems (28.1 percent);

(b) direct subsidies to local transit authorities (13.1 percent);

(c) the use of existing railroad rights of way for intercity rapid transit (32.1 percent);

(d) encouragement of population redistribution by planning economic and employment incentives away from city centers (26.6 percent).

4. Do you favor legislation to prohibit all vehicles which cannot meet pollution standards? Indicate by (y) or (n).

Yes, 12 percent;

No, 87 percent.

5. Which do you feel is the best way to solve the crime problem:

(a) federal subsidies to increase the size and quality of local police forces (15.5 percent);

(b) tougher judges and harsher prison sentences (21.4 percent);

(c) federal funds for improving the prison systems to make them more rehabilitative (21 percent);

(d) request more federal funds for community action in designated poverty and high crime areas (19.3 percent);

(e) more courts and judges in order to ensure a speedy trial (23 percent).

6. The present state and federal drug laws appear inadequate. Do you favor:

(a) reducing penalties for users and increasing penalties for sellers (41.2 percent);

(b) reducing penalties for marijuana only (14 percent);

(c) more extensive education about drugs in our schools (45 percent).

7. Given the growing necessity for educational facilities, do you favor increasing federal funds to:

(a) elementary schools (28 percent);

(b) secondary schools (24.4 percent);

(c) vocational schools (20.2 percent);

(d) colleges and universities (9.1 percent);

(e) all the above (18.1 percent).

8. In the interest of our senior citizens, do you favor:

(a) the present social security system with cost of living raises (48 percent);

(b) extended federal services for the aged (housing, transportation, etc.) (31 percent);

(c) federal aid to convalescent hospitals and other health facilities (21 percent).

9. Concerning the workings of Congress:

(a) should Congressional Committee leadership be based on ability rather than seniority (42.8 percent);

(b) should a mandatory retirement age be established for Members of Congress (33.9 percent);

(c) should terms of Congressmen be extended from two to four years (23.2 percent).

10. If "Vietnamization" of the war turns out successfully, would you favor the following U.S. actions:

(a) continued air and artillery support for the South Vietnamese (16.4 percent);

(b) keep advisers and training bases in Vietnam (23.4 percent);

(c) hire soldiers of various nations to fight for the South Vietnamese (6.4 percent);

(d) keep U.S. special forces in the area (10.5 percent);

(e) no further military support (43.1 percent).

11. Should foreign military aid and defense spending be:

(a) decreased (81.8 percent);

(b) increased (5.5 percent);

(c) remain the same (12.6 percent).

12. Do you feel in our relation with Red China we should:

(a) recognize Red China officially as a sovereign nation (34.4 percent);
(b) admit Red China into the United Nations (30 percent);
(c) continue current policy of limited trade of non-strategic goods (20.3 percent);
(d) continue current policy (for past 14 years) of limited recognition through talks at Warsaw (15 percent).

13. Concerning labor problems, which would you favor:
(a) compulsory and binding arbitration (33.2 percent);
(b) national labor negotiations court (32.4 percent);
(c) strengthen and continue the present channels for labor negotiations (34.3 percent).

14. How do you feel about the President's plan to provide a minimum annual income of $1600 for a family of four per year;
(a) the plan is grossly inadequate to meet even the minimum needs of the poor (32 percent);
(b) the plan offers sufficient reform to the present welfare system (13 percent);
(c) the plan is a start but it will have to be expanded (34 percent);
(d) the plan is too expensive and unnecessary (21 percent).

15. Our draft or Selective System should:
(a) continue with the present lottery system (23.5 percent);
(b) be abolished for a volunteer army (45 percent);
(c) be changed to an alternative national service, not necessarily in the military (32 percent).

16. Which of these measures would you favor for family planning:
(a) no governmental intervention (12 percent);
(b) liberalizing abortion laws (27 percent);
(c) tax incentives for limiting size (26 percent);
(d) distribution of contraceptive devices by community agencies (18 percent);
(e) federal assistance for education about birth control (17 percent).

17. Water pollution is an ever growing problem. Do you feel control is best left to:
(a) the states rather than the federal government (15.1 percent);
(b) the industries whose products or production methods are contributing to pollution (5.9 percent);
(c) strict federal control and standards (74.5 percent);
(d) local government (4.4 percent).

18. Concerning gun control legislation do you feel:
(a) strengthening gun control infringes upon the individual's rights (28 percent);
(b) strengthening gun control lessens crime (38 percent);
(c) gun control has no effect on the crime rate (34 percent).

19. Given the deterioration of the railroad passenger service, what do you feel the federal government should do?
(a) create a public corporation to operate the service (43 percent);
(b) leave the solution to private companies (32 percent);
(c) assure some alternate means of credit for the companies such as a federal credit corporation (9.2 percent);
(d) subsidize operation and improvement (16 percent).

20. Concerning the Middle East situation, which would you favor:
(a) selling fighter planes to Israel (17 percent);
(b) insistence on direct talks between Israel and Arab states (29.4 percent);
(c) joint U.S.-Russian peace settlement to ensure a lasting peace (29.5 percent);
(d) stop all sales of arms to the area and demand negotiations (23.9 percent).

21. Regarding non-military foreign aid, would you prefer one of the below:
(a) continue present level of $1.625 billion (6.4 percent);
(b) distribute it through the United Nations (17.2 percent);
(c) concentrate on developing nations which show promise in leadership and economics (30.4 percent);
(d) reduce the program (46 percent).

22. What do you feel the national priorities should be as far as attacking the various problems in our country? Please number 1 through 5.
(a) consumer protection.
(b) crime (2).
(c) drug abuse (5).
(d) family planning (9).
(e) housing shortage (11).
(f) Indochina war (4).
(g) inflation (3).
(h) Middle East situation (10).
(i) pollution and ecology (1).
(j) racial strife (6).
(k) space exploration (12).
(l) student unrest (11).
(m) welfare (7).

SHEPHERD WATCHING OVER HIS FLOCK

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 23, 1970

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, traditionally the role of a pastoral clergyman is compared to that of a shepherd watching over his flock. Occasionally, however, one finds a member of the clergy who, almost in spite of himself, exercises an influence that extends far beyond the limits of his particular congregation. I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to such a man—the Reverend Monsignor Michael Hrebin, V.F., pastor of Ascension Byzantine Church in Clairton, Pa., a third-class city in my 20th Congressional District.

Monsignor Hrebin's sincerity, warmth, friendliness, and love of fellow man has been infectious and has touched not only his parishioners but the entire community, Catholic and non-Catholic alike. He possesses that remarkable trait of quickly turning a new acquaintance into an old friend. Never is he too busy to talk to an individual, whether it be on a personal matter or merely a social chat. Never is he so involved with the affairs of his church that he will not join in a program or project which will improve the lives of the community's residents.

Recently Monsignor Hrebin was honored at a testimonial dinner celebrating his elevation to his new rank in the church. Hundreds of persons attended the affair. High ranking members of the church hierarchy joined the parishioners of Ascension Church and residents of Clairton in an open display of affection and respect for Father Mike.

Father Mike has only been in Clairton a relatively short time, less than 10 years. But in that period he has worked unceasingly with his parish and his community. He has instilled in the people a zeal and zest to help each other. He has replaced lethargy with a driving desire and has brought everyone closer together.

Born in the little town of Swoyersville, Pa., Monsignor Hrebin was graduated from St. Procopius College and attended 4 years of philosophy and theology at St. Procopius Seminary in Lisle, Ill. He attended Catholic University here in Washington, and the School of Music at Duquesne University in Pittsburgh. He was ordained into the priesthood on May 8, 1949, and served many years as professor of chant and choir director at Saints Cyril and Methodius Seminary in Pittsburgh.

His pastoral assignments, prior to coming to Ascension Church, included the Holy Ghost Parish in Cleveland, Ohio; St. Michael's Church in Gary, Ind.; and the Holy Spirit Parish in Pittsburgh. In May of this year he was elevated to the office of Monsignor by Pope Paul VI, and the investiture of Monsignorship was bestowed by Archbishop Stephen J. Kocisko.

Mr. Speaker, Monsignor Hrebin is no ordinary clergyman. I suspect the future holds much for him in his chosen work. How long he will remain with us in Clairton, I do not know. I do know, however, that we have been made better through our contact with this remarkable man we know as Father Mike.

THE 1970 ELECTIONS—NOT DECIDED ON THE ISSUES

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 23, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, commentators and political observers of all kinds throughout the country were looking for a pattern in the November 3 elections, and expecting to find it. On the one hand there was talk of an "emerging Republican majority"; on the other hand, the conviction that economic issues and appeals to minority groups continue to dominate the American political scene.

But a close examination of the election post mortems will show them to be very similar to the pontificating before the election. People see in the results what they want to see; but every point made by one side on the basis of the election winners and losers can be matched by an equally telling point for the opposing faction. The fact is that there was no pattern in the 1970 election, because very few contests were actually decided on the issues.

It may be said with much truth that this is nothing new in American politics, which is another way of saying that we are still indulging ourselves in politics as usual. But the times are hardly usual. Our ability to defend ourselves and others against the advance of communism is declining all over the world. The very day after our elections, a Marxist was sworn in as President of Chile. At home, we face a wave of disorder, disruption, and crime topped by an organized revolutionary terrorism new to American

history. If these are not issues to move the electorate, what will move them?

Yet the November 3 elections were not decided on these issues. They gave no verdict for the hard-line position taken by Vice President AGNEW, though naturally he would like us to think they did, nor for the policy of compromise and understanding so persistently promoted in the news media, as their "pundits" would like to have us think.

For instance, in California the very same voters who reelected Governor Reagan by a substantial margin also elected, by a somewhat larger margin, a superintendent of public instruction diametrically opposed to virtually every thing Governor Reagan has spoken for in the vitally important field of education.

The voters of Boston, Mass., elected to Congress a woman widely known for her uncompromising opposition to the disruption of communities by compulsory busing of schoolchildren out of their neighborhoods—but they also elected to Congress a priest whose statements show that he has accepted virtually the whole liberal doctrine which has led to compulsory busing and similar Government policies.

The voters of Maryland sent Congressman J. Glenn Beall to the Senate, apparently rejecting the incumbent Senator JOSEPH TYDINGS as too liberal—and at the same time they sent three new men to Congress, all of whom appear to be far to the left of those they replaced.

Nationwide, presuming that all candidates now leading in the vote count hold their lead through whatever recounts may be held, the Republican Party has scored a net gain of one seat in the Senate and suffered a net loss of 10 seats in the House, while supporters of a strong national defense and firm action against violence at home have scored a net gain of three seats in the Senate and suffered a net loss of 11 seats in the House. This is according to the best estimate that can now be made, keeping in mind that high public office changes many men, some for the better and some for the worse. The total number of new Congressmen is 55, moving me that many steps up the ladder of seniority.

Where this election was not decided on the issues, it could only be decided on personalities or superficialities: youth versus age, personal appearance and charm or the lack of them by an opponent; successful image-making either by television or by spectacular gimmicks—such as the 1,000-mile walk by the new Senator from Florida—and name recognition. The list of sons and brothers of famous people in Congress is growing longer, running the ideological gamut from Buckley to STEVENSON. Dynastic loyalty reached its peak in Massachusetts, where the voters not only overwhelmingly reelected Senator EDWARD KENNEDY despite the events on Chappaquiddick Island, but threw out of office the district attorney who ordered and conducted the inquest into Mary Jo Kopechne's death.

Such is politics in America, 1970. At this rate, it may not be a luxury we will enjoy much longer.