

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, too often the bad guys get the headlines and the good guys seem to be nonexistent. This is particularly true insofar as our young people are concerned. And so it is a real joy to call to the attention of my colleagues the speech of Stephen Flynn, the winner of the Voice of Democracy contest in Alabama.

It is reassuring to know that there are young men like Stephen Flynn in our high schools preparing themselves to handle the great problems of this Nation. He is a genuine credit to the First District of Alabama.

Stephen will now compete with contest winners from other States for one of five scholarship prizes to be awarded to the national winners. The Veterans' of Foreign Wars, who sponsor this contest, are to be congratulated for their efforts to seek out and reward those fine young Americans who still seek to preserve rather than destroy our heritage of freedom and liberty for all.

I highly commend to all my colleagues this fine essay entitled "Freedom's Challenge":

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

(By Stephen Flynn)

Sable Island lies in the Northern Atlantic some 100 miles off the shore of Nova Scotia. In the winter months this area is the brunt of fierce Nor'easters, storms which raise the sea into waves as high as 30 feet and have the capability of breaking a destroyer in half. Fishing boats must pass near the island to reach harbor. The waters are treacherous in fair weather. During the constant storms of winter navigating is nearly impossible. More than 5,000 people lost their lives to Sable's shores before the installation of the Sable lighthouse and radio beacon. With the lighthouse, the death toll has greatly decreased. The lighthouse must have a keeper who is deposited on the island at the close of the calm summer and must remain, in solitude, until the end of the turbulent winter. Such a man, on whom so many depend for their lives, must be exceptionally stable mentally and physically.

The United States is a beacon in which the flame of freedom burns bright. The rays of light which beam forth from this flame guide billions of people through the constantly raging storm of slavery, tyranny, and despotism. We, the citizens of the United States, are the guardians of this freedom. It is our privilege, our responsibility, our duty to keep it brightly enkindled.

Freedom issues us a challenge; that challenge being the very existence of freedom. If we are to fulfill our responsibility this challenge must be met. There are two basic tasks which must be achieved before freedom's flame is completely safe. First, freedom must be assured for all. Secondly, liberty must not degenerate into license.

Lord Acton tells us that, "The most certain test by which we judge whether a country is really free is the amount of security enjoyed by minorities." The United States has

come far in assuring the liberties of its minority groups. Yet there are those who would mentally shackle others to one opinion through terror and violence. Others continue to discriminate against humans of a different skin color, a factor over which none of us have control. How can the beacon of freedom burn bright if the qualities of freedom of speech and the right to pursue happiness are not enjoyed by all? Voltaire said, "Prejudice is the reason of fools." Let us never fall into this pit of ignorance. Let us enlighten those who have. In this way freedom will be assured for all, and the first part of our battle will be won.

The second segment of this battle to ascertain freedom's existence is the fact that liberty must not degenerate into license. Each man's liberty extends to the point of hindering the freedom of others. Once beyond that point, one man's freedom impedes the freedom of his fellowman, and liberty becomes tyranny or anarchy, which is the tyranny of the strong. Every American is endowed with the right to peaceful assembly and the right to express dissent. These rights do not represent, and cannot be construed to represent a license to destroy and threaten the lives and property of others. This destroys the freedom of others to pursue happiness. Mme. Roland states, "O Liberty! What crimes have been committed in thy name!" It is criminal to abuse our freedoms, thus destroying the freedom of others. It is criminal to attempt to justify this abuse of liberty with the Constitution of the United States. We must convince those who do so of the criminality of their actions. If mere words are too weak, then the law must be called upon to protect the freedom of all and prevent liberty from degenerating into license.

This, then, is the very essence of freedom. These two principles, the assuring of freedom for all and the prevention of liberty's degeneration into license, are weapons for the answering of freedom's challenge; the existence of freedom itself. If not carried out, they are weapons for freedom's demise.

Tonight a solitary watchman will brave the cannon roar of a North Atlantic storm in order to protect the lives entrusted to him. He will remain faithful to his task. Will we, the citizens of the United States, remain faithful to ours? We have been given two means by which we can assure the existence of freedom. Will we use them? Will we be faithful to the task?

HUNTING HOT SPOTS IN UTAH

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, Although large scale atmospheric testing stopped in 1963, the occasional megaton tests by the Chinese and French have continued to place strontium, cesium, and other fission products into the stratosphere from whence they slowly settle back to earth. A variety of factors operating synergistically in Utah have caused radioactive hot spots to form in certain areas. These spots are known and are under surveillance by competent groups.

A new research project has been launched to search for new hot spots and to determine what effect, if any, this

radioactive fallout will have on people, livestock, and wildlife. The Atomic Energy Commission is funding this study on a 3-year basis. Nuclear News in an article in the February 1970 issue, "Hunting Hot Spots in Utah," states this study "may develop into the most detailed and thorough radiation-ecology investigation in the world."

I would like to lay to rest a rumor before it gets started:

The cesium raining down on Utah is not from any nuclear power reactor nor is it from any recent U.S. weapons or Plowshare nuclear test.

Mr. President, I ask that a copy of this article I referred to be included in the Extensions of Remarks at this point.

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

HUNTING "HOT SPOTS" IN UTAH: THREE-WAY RESEARCH PROJECT IS DESIGNED TO PINPOINT FALLOUT; UNIVERSITY OF UTAH RESEARCHER FINDS THAT SOME AREAS HAVE BECOME "HOTTER" IN SPITE OF TEST-BAN TREATY

A comprehensive new research project has been launched in Utah to detect radioactive fallout in the environment and to determine its potential effects on people, livestock, and wildlife. The University of Utah, the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, and the University of California's Lawrence Radiation Laboratory have joined forces in the new, unprecedented study, which some scientists believe may develop into the most detailed and thorough radiation-ecology investigation in the world.

Principal investigator and director of the project is Robert C. Pendleton, associate professor of biology at the University of Utah and director of radiological health on that Salt Lake City campus. Dr. Pendleton is also a long-time researcher on the accumulation of radioactivity on dairy farms and in the high mountains of Utah.

"By combining the competence of all three agencies, a far more complete study can be made," says Pendleton, who for years has been pushing for an open exchange of fallout data among scientists. "I believe the whole future of scientific investigation in radiation ecology throughout the world lies in such cooperation among groups of scientists in various disciplines."

FUNDED BY AEC

Under the three-way research in Utah, the AEC is providing the funds—\$107,000 the first year and \$75,000 to \$80,000 for two successive years—and the University of Utah and Lawrence Radiation Lab are setting up a network of 16 air-monitoring stations throughout Utah, stretching from the Idaho border on the north to the city of St. George on the south. The AEC will also provide some instrumentation for the study and technical assistance in weather forecasting.

Most of the stations are located on dairy farms that have already been studied in previous University research on radioactive buildup in the state's milk supplies. This will give the researchers background information on the known radiation ecology of the various areas.

The stations are placed to give a broad base of coverage in the event of a release of fallout from testing in Nevada or elsewhere around the world. They allow scientists to measure fallout on both the lee and windward sides of mountains and to take into consideration the weather effects on fallout

trajectories. The stations include three types of air samplers, two for continuous and one for sequential sampling. The stations are being maintained by persons living on or near the dairy farms, in close cooperation with Pendleton and his staff.

The network is designed to give useful information about fallout clouds from nuclear blasts around the world, especially about the way radioactive particles travel, disperse, and accumulate in the environment. Such information, says Pendleton, will be useful in setting federal standards and assessing potential hazards to people who breathe the particles.

"Under the new monitoring system, any particular radiation problem that might develop can be pinpointed in a matter of minutes," Pendleton added. "Corrective measures can be started in time to greatly reduce hazards to people if levels of radioactive particles threaten via food chains or inhalation."

Data will be provided, too, that will help scientists understand the cumulative effects of nuclear testing around the world and relate them to progressive increases in radioactivity, which Pendleton has observed in Utah soils.

The aerosol monitoring system is actually only part of the research. Pendleton's staff has already started collecting water, soil, plant, and animal samples from the areas surrounding each station. Results of this sampling will eventually provide a background or base level for assessing the nuclear testing and provide a realistic base for determining hazards to living organisms at sites distant from the detonation.

Researchers working with Pendleton in Salt Lake City have perfected a method of measuring radioactive cesium in streams flowing from the high mountains down to the lower valleys. They have traced this isotope and others from watersheds to dairy farms, some of which are showing high accumulations in soils. The method utilizes a small, portable "water treatment plant" that allows the scientists to remove the radioactive particles from samples in the field without the necessity of carrying heavy casks back to their laboratories. The method combines flocculants, filters, and ion exchange columns. The filters, water cask liner, and ion exchange tubes can be carried back in a light plastic bag for accurate counting.

#### "HOT SPOTS" GETTING "HOTTER"

Because of peculiar drainage, soils, and terrain, the "hot spot farms," as they are called, seem to trap and hold radioactive materials. And the cesium level in the milk from cows that graze on these farms is higher because of the animal uptake of the isotopes through the plant food chain.

Pendleton says these "hot spot farms" have been getting "hotter" over the years, in spite of the atmospheric Test-Ban Treaty, which has been in effect since 1963. For example, one farm east of Salt Lake City had a field with readings for cesium-137 of 32 millicuries per square mile. The same field today yields 12 times that amount, or 374 millicuries per square mile. Pendleton says levels in the soils of Utah now average between five and seven times higher than the samples taken in 1962.

He emphasizes that current levels of radiation in foods from these farms are not high and should not cause alarm, but, on the other hand, he points out that soils in the higher altitudes, which have heavy precipitation, are getting quite hot. Some "hot spots" in the headwaters of certain streams in the High Uinta Mountains, for example, are at least 20 times hotter than they were eight years ago.

Erosion on the top four centimeters of soil is causing the radiation to be washed down to the lower, populated valleys, where it is accumulating in the "hot spots" on irrigated

farms and in reservoirs. Bodies of water with inflowing streams act like huge sinks to collect radioactivity, Pendleton says.

The researchers are also studying "secondary aerosols"—that is, the dusts that are carried by winds and deposited in other areas. These radioactive particles can also be taken into animals' bodies through plants and can be breathed by both animals and people.

#### LOCATION OF STATIONS

Stations now in operation under the comprehensive research program are located in or near the following Utah cities and towns: Cornish, Mendon, Grouse Creek, Wendover, Draper, Magna, Snyderville, Bridgeland, Bluebell (near Altamont), Ephraim, Wellington, Monroe, Delta, Milford, Cedar City, and St. George.

University scientists are taking samples of pasture grasses, hay bales, animal lungs, flesh, bones, and other animal organs in these areas to add to the baseline levels already taken at the 16 stations. The air monitoring apparatus is on an around-the-clock operation.

"If we do get fallout," Pendleton adds, "we will now be able to pinpoint it, quantify it, define the gamma emitters in it, and give the data to those agencies responsible for taking corrective measures if necessary."

### FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

#### HON. MARK ANDREWS

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, North Dakota's winner in the Voice of Democracy contest this year is Steven J. Frank, 1840 15th Avenue South, Fargo, N. Dak., in the First Congressional District which I have the privilege to represent.

Over 400,000 school students participated in the annual contest this year which is conducted by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its ladies' auxiliary. I insert Mr. Frank's winning speech on "Freedom's Challenge" in the Record:

#### FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

(By Steven Frank)

Theodore Roosevelt once wrote: "Far better is it to dare mighty things, to win glorious triumphs, even though checkered by failure, than to take rank with those poor spirits who neither enjoy much, nor suffer much, because they live in the gray twilight that knows not victory nor defeat." That dare to do mighty things rings on today as freedom's challenge.

Nearly two hundred years ago, a group of men representing the British Colonies in the New World met in Philadelphia. What they created in one daring step has grown to the United States of America that we know today. Without that step, that first action, we might still be living in gray twilight. These men, however, took three basic steps to meet their challenge, steps that are applicable to Americans entering the seventies: to be concerned, to be informed, and to be involved. Each step leads to the next.

How can I meet these steps? First I develop a concern for my fellow man and the elements of my environment. I think beyond my own everyday needs to those of others and the tasks they must face. After I have developed this basic concern and appreciation of the situation elsewhere I must move to informed concern. I read, I study, and I hypothesize about the problems, actions, and circumstances within the local, national, and

world communities. Being aware not only includes reading and studying, but also being cognizant of the ideas of others. If I can take the time to analyze what others say and how those same people react to yet another group of people, I can take a big step towards awareness. If I can take those two preliminary steps, concern and awareness, I can move on to involvement, which in actuality meets that dare to do mighty things. Involvement can also be multifaceted. I can take action through membership in church, community, and school organizations. Membership in an organization is little, however, until it is coupled with active participation.

Through organizations I may make some progress toward the achievement of my goals, but more important is the contact I make with people who obviously also want to take a stand through involvement. With this contact my challenge really begins to work. As a concerned and informed citizen I am able to influence others of my convictions. This is vital because convictions really have very little meaning until they have been exposed and tried. Through open expression of opinions and convictions that have been backed by concern and information I can find added information and conflicting views. Through head-on confrontations with conflicting viewpoints my stance is strengthened and I am bettered because I am motivated to recall my primary concern and information that led me to my involvement. Without any motivation to renewed recollection I could find my desire to meet my challenge stagnating. I must be willing to speak out if the opinions of others conflict from my own, for again convictions have little meaning if they aren't backed up.

If I can be concerned, informed, and involved I can help keep America out of gray twilight, I can dare mighty things, do mighty things, and meet freedom's challenge.

### THE INTERSTATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

#### HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1968 required under section 23(c) the submission to the Congress of certain reports regarding the Interstate System in the District of Columbia.

The two reports submitted to the Congress this week, one from the District of Columbia government and one from the Secretary of Transportation have presented a confusing set of recommendations.

The intent of the 1968 Highway Act was to clarify the confusion which had reigned for so many years in the District of Columbia regarding the Interstate Highway System. The act directed that certain projects be completed and that others be studied further to enable the District to adjust the projects to whatever changing conditions had occurred during the long period of controversy.

The two reports submitted to the Congress are for the greater part in disagreement with each other, despite stories to the contrary in the press. In addition both contain wide variances from what is contained in the 1968 High-

way Act. In other words the two have confused the picture to the same, if not worse, extent as that which existed when the 1968 Highway Act was passed.

While these positions have been developing, the District of Columbia highway program has again showed signs of bogging down and for the same old reasons.

The east leg which was to be under construction above Barney Circle has yet to see the award of a contract. The portion of this project which was directed to be under design between Benning Road and Bladensburg Road has yet to be started.

The Congress cannot sit idly by and allow millions of dollars of taxpayers' money to be wasted in an unending series of studies the results of which there seems to be no intention of implementing or in which there is apparently no hope of agreement among the public bodies involved. Nor can they permit projects to proceed which have only had superficial examinations, and little, if any, factual basis.

Even the rapid transit system which required such painstaking effort on the part of so many to get underway is subject to delays by the various recommendations.

As reluctant as we are to inject ourselves into the local picture, it is imperative that the Congress act to insure the Nation's Capital a proper transportation system.

THE SDS AND THE HIGH SCHOOLS

HON. RICHARD H. ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the membership of the House, and in order that it might be even more widely available, I am inserting in the RECORD a copy of an article written by the able and distinguished FBI Director, Mr. John Edgar Hoover, analyzing activities of the Students for a Democratic Society—SDS—directed at America's high schools. The article, which appeared in two parts in the January and February 1970 issues of the PTA magazine captioned "The SDS and the High Schools," is a thoughtful review by Mr. Hoover of student extremism. The article vividly portrays the tactics used by the SDS to reach high school students and to build a disruptive force within schools. Mr. Hoover recommends several very well-considered prescriptions to remedy a deeply disturbing situation.

The article depicts two teenagers and a juvenile officer from Columbus, Ohio, who, it is noted, testified before the House Committee on Internal Security "about attempts by SDS members to incite students to disruptive action, including burning local schools, and a draft center." Appearing before the committee in October 1969, these witnesses told also of SDS members urging them to kill police, burn a department store, and rob suburban homes. They testified to an intolerable set of circumstances. No na-

tion can be regarded as a guarantor of liberty for all its citizens if such a tawdry few can find fertile conditions for unlimited license. In a special report on "SDS Plans for America's High Schools" released by the House Committee on Internal Security in December 1969, I cautioned that those who rally to the support of SDS can be under no illusions; the issues are clear. Long ago the protest methods of SDS exceeded the bounds of legitimate and orderly dissent.

SDS now appears to be on the decline on the college campuses throughout the Nation and it is my personal opinion that SDS no longer has the capacity to foment the great number of disturbances it has brought about in the past. My assessment is based upon the following developments in 1969: First, SDS is seriously split into three factions; second, school administrators have learned to more effectively deal with SDS challenges; third, the true nature of SDS is now widely known and the nonradical student is less likely to join SDS on the issues around which it seeks to rally students, and fourth, the treatment of SDS by the news media has materially changed. However, the potential of SDS for causing trouble still exists and there is some evidence to indicate that SDS may prove more successful in its planned penetration of high schools than originally thought possible. In any event, we can count on other organizations, if not SDS, to utilize the same tactics in causing unrest and disturbances; therefore, I highly recommend Mr. Hoover's article to the attention of my colleagues.

THE SDS AND THE HIGH SCHOOLS: A STUDY IN STUDENT EXTREMISM

(By John Edgar Hoover)

PART I

Three shocking incidents happened recently in different cities of the United States. The episodes, though separate in themselves, are part of a national pattern.

Incident number 1.

Jake, a high school student, age eighteen, knocks on the door of a small house. Another student, David, age seventeen, answers.

"I've come for the class," Jake says.

"Yes, come right in," says David.

David escorts Jake into the front room. Some fifteen to twenty young people are present. They have started the class. Jake takes a seat.

What is the class?

David, as leader, defines the purpose: to discuss how high school students can disrupt their schools, organize trouble, harass the administrative staff, and even, as David emphasizes, "take over the school" if the opportunity should present itself.

It is a group of student extremists from various local schools learning the techniques of disruption!

Incident number 2.

Three young men stand on the sidewalk at the entrance of the grounds of a high school. It is morning and pupils are arriving.

Who are these young men?

They are members of the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), a militant New Left group.

The young men offer the approaching students a leaflet. Some accept; others don't.

What does the SDS leaflet state?

In essence, that the high school is a prison and the students are being exploited.

It asserts that there are a "lack of student power," "rudeness from teachers," "ridicu-

lous dress codes," "no say in course content," "too many irrelevant tests," "unfair grades," "no opportunity to evaluate teachers."

Do students want to do something about "these deplorable conditions"? If so, the leaflet urges them to come to a certain center sponsored by a local college SDS chapter. There they can have discussions, read books, view films, and receive help in mimeographing papers and leaflets.

You, the student, are welcome to attend! Incident number 3.

A student walks into his high school library. There on the table he finds an odd-looking paper with a provocative or unusual name such as *The Rat*, *The Radish*, *The Spark*, *The Free Press*.

He's never seen a paper like this before. It's poorly printed. The editing is sloppy. Obscene words and cartoons are frequent. There are articles attacking the high school, the government, the military.

Schools, he reads in one article, are a "twelve-year course in how to be slaves." There is an announcement of some student workshops: "Classroom 'Guerrilla Tactics'—how students can effectively teach in the classroom"; Radical Teachers and Radical Students—how they can work together." Another item talks about student actions: "Others tore up bathrooms and desks and broke windows to tell them how we see the schools." In still another article, he sees, the cartoon of a guerrilla fighter and these words:

"In the final analysis, Revolutionary Culture is only a step towards R-E-V-O-L-U-T-I-O-N!!! It analyzes, seeks, and deals with the enemy. It points to the enemy as not being only an obviously discernible person, but possibly YOUR OWN MOTHER!! AND REVOLUTIONARY CULTURE TEACHES YOU TO DEAL WITH THE ENEMY!!"

What is this publication? It is a high school "free press," or "underground," paper, one of many in the nation.

How did it get into the school library?

It was smuggled in by a sympathetic student or faculty member and left there purposely.

A class in how to foment disruption in high schools, the leafleting of a high school by a radical group for the purpose of encouraging student discontent, the smuggling into high schools of obscene, filthy papers advocating revolution—a few years ago these episodes would have been unthinkable.

But no longer.

High schools are today being specifically targeted for New Left attack, the downward thrust from the college level of student turbulence.

Not that high schools are currently being disrupted like colleges. But every indication points to increased student extremism on the secondary school level in 1970.

What is at stake here could well be nothing less than the integrity of our whole educational process as well as the institutions and values of our society.

For that reason, let's take a closer look at SDS's strategy toward high schools.

What is SDS? Why is it trying to disrupt high schools? What is it trying to inculcate into youthful minds? And most important, what can we, as parents and teachers and responsible citizens, do about the problem?

(Let's remember, when we talk about student extremism, that it exists in many forms. In addition to SDS extremism, we have black extremism—a growing problem—as well as extremism from Old Left groups. Perhaps never before have our schools on all levels been so subjected to extremist pressures of all types, white and black, left and right.)

SDS AND ITS MENTALITY OF EXTREMISM

Just a short time ago SDS was virtually unknown to Americans. Today it is almost a household expression, meaning revolutionary and extremist students bent on destruction and riots both on and off campus.

The key emphasis of SDS is extremism, violence, and revolution.

Founded in 1962 by a small group of students at Port Huron, Michigan, what we call SDS moved quickly from a rather mild protest group into a grotesque, destructive genie that last October staged a violent "bust" in Chicago, proudly hailed by its own press as a "war" against the nation:

"Five hundred of us moved through the richest sections of Chicago, with VC flags in front, smashing luxury apartment windows and store fronts, ripping apart the Loop, and injuring scores of pigs [extremist term for police]. It was war—we knew it and the pigs knew it."

Though small in numbers (a claimed membership of some 40,000 in 200 to 250 chapters) and beset by factionalism, SDS has been a key instigator in numerous campus riots. With the group increasingly under Marxist influence, SDS hatred is directed against all facets of our society (called the Establishment). It seeks not reform but blind destruction, with little if any thought of what is to take the place of the system that is to be destroyed.

In carrying out its aims, SDS has developed the activist tactics of the guerrilla fighter. Who are SDS's heroes? Fidel Castro, Mao Tse-tung, Che Guevara, Ho Chi Minh. Why? Because in SDS eyes these men are rebels, guerrilla fighters who have attacked the Establishment in their own countries.

This is what SDS leaders believe they are doing: attacking a society whose democratic principles, morality, and values they not only detest but seek to eradicate. They possess, in their minds, a duty, an impelling destiny or mission to destroy the society in which they live—not tomorrow or next year, but now.

#### THE COLLEGE SDS AND HIGH SCHOOLS

This guerrilla approach of SDS is directed against high schools. In SDS eyes, they are part of the hated Establishment. In SDS's opinion, the entire educational system (college, secondary, and elementary) is a vast factory and prison where students are molded into robots to staff, operate, and perpetuate the Establishment.

"This function of the schools under capitalism," says one SDS document, "is the preparation of an ideological army for imperialism."

Therefore, SDS-ers feel that it is their job as "guerrillas" to subvert the high schools. Here are thousands of young people, impressionable and at a point in life where they are making critical judgments about the values of life and society. ("Activity in the high schools is probably the most significant new tactic on the left today," writes one New Leftist.) These students should be influenced, or, to use, a favorite SDS term, "liberated." Still another SDS term is "jailbreak."

"Jailbreak," says an SDS paper. "We move on the high schools of Chicago. The schools are prisons and the prisoners must be liberated." In some isolated instances, SDS-ers have physically stormed high schools.)

Now let's examine just how SDS, primarily a college group and small in numbers, is able to reach into high schools.

Experience shows that SDS attacks are largely (though not exclusively) instigated by college SDS members (or chapters), especially if the school is near an institution of higher learning where SDS is active.

Actually only in rare instances has SDS been able to organize a chapter inside a high school. The very nature of high schools, with their scheduling of classes, absence of dormitories, close supervision, makes the establishment of a chapter most difficult. SDS, therefore, operates in high schools primarily by creating a nucleus of a few SDS-motivated students (usually not members but sympathizers) to work inside the school as catalysts for radical action. If a student's older

brother or sister is a college SDS member, or a faculty member is sympathetic, the infiltration process is accelerated.

Just how do college SDS-ers reach high school students and attract their interest?

1. *By leafleting high schools.* This is a fairly common occurrence, with college SDS-ers standing near a high school and handing out literature about the SDS or inviting students to support them in some project.

2. *By holding seminars, conferences, and workshops.* In an eastern state, high school students participated in SDS-sponsored anti-Establishment classes during the summer. In a western city, some eighty high school students attended an SDS conference, where the SDS line on imperialism, capitalism, and the "power structure" was set forth. SDS and communist literature (writings of Marx, Lenin, and Che Guevara) was available.

3. *By assisting in the publication of an underground paper.* College SDS-ers can aid in the publication of a high school underground paper (which may be in the form of a leaflet or brochure) by furnishing editorial direction, printing equipment, and money. Often these high school papers are so obscene, vitriolic, and intellectually shallow that they soon disappear. If there is no high school underground paper, the college SDS may invite high school students to write an article for the SDS college underground paper.

4. *By encouraging high school students to observe and/or participate in college SDS-sponsored demonstrations.* The key objective here is not so much the physical presence of these students to support an SDS project (though this can help), but their exposure to the rough-and-tumble tactics of on-the-street confrontations. In one instance, some fifty high school students participated with SDS students in seizing a college building.

5. *By trying to secure speaking invitations in high schools.* In one instance, an SDS-er spoke to a school assembly at the invitation of an international relations club; in another case, under the auspices of the student government. Nothing pleases SDS better than to have official (or unofficial) invitations to address students.

6. *By working through faculty members who previously were either members of or sympathizers with SDS (usually as students in college).*

#### SDS AGITATION INSIDE THE HIGH SCHOOL

The college SDS has attracted and developed some student sympathizers in high school. How is agitation carried on in these schools?

SDS's approach here is to stir up as much dissatisfaction as possible in the student body on *within-the-school* issues. SDS, though a revolution Marxist group, realizes that these young people are not yet proper revolutionary material. The vast majority couldn't care less for slogans about fighting "imperialism" and "warmongers." Many, it is true, are concerned about national issues such as the war in Vietnam and the draft, but in reality it is the immediate, at-hand student issues inside the school that, as one young lady told me, "turn the kids on"—issues such as dress regulations (how short a skirt a girl is allowed to wear or how long a boy's hair should be), cafeteria service and/or food, disciplinary rules.

These are the issues that SDS seeks to exploit.

If a student is suspended, let's say, for wearing his hair too long or using drugs or abusing a teacher, how is this handled by SDS?

It simply shows, says SDS, that *you*, the student, really mean nothing in this high school. The school is part of a wicked, corrupt Establishment that is trying to turn you into a robot. You have no freedom, no rights, no opportunity for creative expression. These rules are simply designed to make you part of the "system."

"Both student and teacher are tool and product of administrative totalitarianism."

The school administrator (usually the principal) is what might be called, in SDS eyes, *the resident dictator*. That is, he is the on-the-spot symbol of the hated Establishment:

"The administrator, whose real function is nothing more than the maintenance of the campus (a task which could be easily performed by a simple-minded computer), has become the lord and master of our schools, commanding unbounded fealty."

Before an incident is staged, SDS (in its printed literature) makes clear that careful advance preparation must be made:

1. Is this the best possible issue on which to harass the administration?

2. Gain support by talking about the issue with other students.

3. Contact minority groups in the school to solicit their support.

4. Consider the possibility of an underground paper.

5. Try to secure as much nonstudent support as possible: teachers, parents, religious groups, unions. This includes PTA's.

#### THE SDS AND THE HIGH SCHOOLS

##### PART 2

1. *Is this the best possible issue on which to harass the administration?* Unless a highly volatile issue is chosen, about which many students are concerned, the incident can backfire.

2. *Gain support by talking about the issue with other students.* "Show the students that we are on their side and have many of the same concerns they do." A good time to talk about these issues, says an SDS pamphlet on high schools, is during physical education classes.

3. *Contact minority groups in the school to solicit their support.*

4. *Consider the possibility of an underground paper.* When the first issue is printed, mail a copy to as many student cliques as possible ("so that the paper is *in*"). Why mail it? "Mailing is emphasized because any attempt to distribute such a paper on campus would result in those responsible for it being crushed by the administration."

5. *Try to secure as much nonstudent support as possible: teachers, parents, religious groups, unions.* This includes PTA's. "We should get our parents active in PTA and make a concerted effort to get PTA support. In all our dealings with these groups, our position should be polite but firm. We are asking them for support because we feel that in many areas our interests are mutual, but [we impress on them] that this is a student movement and we have no intention whatsoever of giving up any of our power to adults."

The SDS has no illusions about its ability, even with careful preparation, to carry off permanently effective protests. But it cites what can be done:

At one school, thirty students destroyed their student activity cards and "sat in" for the first ten minutes of the fifth period in protest against an assembly's being called off for the third time.

At another school there was "a storm of protest over the suspension of a student for wearing his hair too long. . . ."

Actually, SDS says, "even such seemingly destructive actions as starting trash can fires and pulling fire alarms are forms of protest directed at the school as it is now constituted."

#### SDS GOALS

SDS goals in high school agitation are both immediate and long range.

The immediate goal, of course, is to foment student unrest and turbulence for the specific purpose of harassment. The SDS is an activist group more interested in confrontation and conflict than in study and ideology.

The long-range goals are several: To radicalize, as much as possible selected students who might upon entering college, be recruited into SDS and extremist activism. SDS realizes that only a small minority will either agree or be sympathetic. "The job of radicals is not to lead the youth," says one New Left writer. "It is to find young leaders and help make them radical."

To build, if possible, a radical consciousness among the students as a whole; that is, to inculcate in even unsympathetic students a feeling that there is an "evil" Establishment, that their education is "irrelevant," and that society is corrupt; to undermine respect for the law; to try to tear down our national heroes and look for everything bad in our country; to urge students to be cynical about our values; and to discourage genuine cooperation between adults and young people.

To develop a link with the future working class. Many high school students will not go to college but will obtain jobs instead. If, while in high school, they can be radicalized to a certain extent, they may be catalysts of future radical action; for instance, in labor unions. "If they can be socialized into a new ideology, the making of a radical industrial working class is both theoretically and practically possible."

The ultimate long-range goal, of course, is "liberation" or "jailbreak"—that is, the complete disruption of the educational process.

WHAT OF THE FUTURE?

SDS is badly split, and its organizational future is uncertain. The present factions are *Weatherman* (the most militant group, so called from the words of Bob Dylan, "You don't need a weatherman to know which way the wind blows"); *Revolutionary Youth Movement II* (which recently declared itself a separate "anti-imperialist" youth group); and the *Worker-Student Alliance* (controlled by the Old Left pro-Red Chinese Progressive Labor Party).

But regardless of what happened to SDS as an organization, the extremist mentality remains. In America today we have a minority of young people, many of them well trained academically, who have become disaffected from the fundamental values of the nation. These radicals, regardless of how they may quarrel among themselves, agree in their critical analysis of our society; that it is rotten and should not be reformed but destroyed. Speaking more and more in Marxist terms, this minority works for a revolution.

WHAT CAN WE DO?

1. Be appreciative of the majority of our current generation of poised and intelligent young people. The extremist minority, though influential, represents only a numerical few of our young people. Let's not condemn a whole generation for the extremist tactics of a few.

2. Recognize that student dissent is not necessarily identified with extremism. Legitimate dissent is part of our tradition. We want young people to think for themselves; this is the very heart of our educational process. On our campuses we have students with a vast variety of viewpoints—sincere idealists, with deep and honest convictions of protest, as well as extremists. We must be careful of our facts. Let's not sweepingly categorize all dissent under the label of extremism.

3. Distinguish between peaceful change through democratic processes on the one hand and destructive violence on the other. Our system is based on the inevitability and desirability of change. But this change must be within the law, not carried out by violence.

4. Remember that any educational or school decision made under the threat or actuality of violence, blackmail, and coercion sets a dangerous precedent.

The growing infatuation with violence is one of our nation's most pressing problems. Education can function only in an atmos-

phere of mutual trust, a desire to search for the truth, and a willingness both to speak and to listen. Schools simply cannot function under the fury of the mob, the shadow of the barricade, or the fist of the disrupter.

5. As adults we need continuous and sincere communication with our young people. All too often adults "tune out" the young. Yet many of them have important messages. Let's talk to them—and maybe they in turn will listen to us. I'm sure the most effective school administrators, teachers, and parents are those who communicate with young people, are responsive to their legitimate needs and aspirations, and provide meaningful counsel.

6. Adults, especially teachers and parents, should set good personal examples for young people. Here is one of youth's major complaints—that adults talk in one way and act in another. The power of personal example, reinforced by personal conviction and courage, can be contagious for the good.

Let's admit that we have weaknesses in our society. Let's also assert that our society is working through legitimate processes of government to correct those weaknesses. We want young people to know what good will, hard work, and commitment to the positive can accomplish in a democratic society.

7. Keep faith with America. This means that in our pluralistic society we may have disagreements and conflicts, separate groups and interests, but that we all work for the best interests of our country. America needs a reaffirmation by its people of the heritage of freedom which gave it birth.

The very presence of an extremist minority of young people—as in SDS, which rejects our democratic values—should give all Americans concern. I know that you, as readers of *The PTA Magazine*, will do your share in meeting this challenge.

MADRIGAL SINGERS OF FREED-HARDEMAN COLLEGE PRESENT EXCELLENT RELIGIOUS AND PATRIOTIC CONCERT

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on January 18, I had the pleasure of a unique experience. The meeting house of the Lemalsamac Church of Christ, located between Yorkville and Newbern, Tenn., was the scene of an excellent religious and patriotic concert which Mrs. Jones and I attended.

The program was presented by the Madrigal Singers of Freed-Hardeman College, Henderson, Tenn. This group, under the direction of John Bob Hall, was organized in 1966. Concerts are presented each school year in many communities throughout the United States. The January 18 concert included such great hymns as "When I Survey the Wondrous Cross" and "Prince of Peace." A number of spirituals were given, including "Ninety and Nine," as well as the patriotic "My Country 'Tis of Thee." An excellent audience was present in spite of the inclement weather which featured West Tennessee snow, ice, rain, and sleet.

Lemalsamac is a rural church in Dyer County with a long and useful history dating back to 1847. This was the year that Neill S. Brown defeated Aaron V. Brown for the governorship of Tennessee. James K. Polk was President of the

United States, the Mexican War was in progress, and the Mormons were making their historic trek to Utah. It was the era of "manifest destiny" in the United States of America.

The nine charter members of the Lemalsamac Church were: Jehiel and Elizabeth McCorkle, R. A. H. and Tirzah Scott McCorkle and their daughter, Mrs. Algea, J. T. Algea, Jane Maxwell McCorkle, Margaret Dickey, and Lemuel Scott.

The first building was erected in 1857 with all the lumber being dressed by hand. After moving into this building—from a nearby schoolhouse where services had been conducted—the name Lemalsamac was coined by R. A. H. McCorkle. The names of the charter members were used in the following manner: Lem—from Lemuel Scott, Al—from J. T. Algea, Sa—from Sarah McCorkle, Mac—from McCorkle.

The original building was torn down in 1917 and replaced by the present structure. At that time a Bible, along with the names of the officers of the church, was placed under the cornerstone. New oak pews were installed in 1951, air conditioning was added in 1963, and five classrooms, and a baptistry were built in 1964. The building is maintained in an excellent state of repair; the present attendance is in the eighties with a contribution each Sunday of nearly \$200.

Norman Hogan, professor of Bible and History at Freed-Hardeman College, is currently preaching for the Lemalsamac Church. Each of the five presidents of Freed-Hardeman—N. B. Hardeman, A. G. Freed, W. Claude Hall, H. A. Dixon, and E. Claude Gardner—has preached at Lemalsamac or in nearby communities. C. P. Roland, the first dean of Freed-Hardeman as well as many faculty members through the years have preached at Lemalsamac.

The Lemalsamac Church has been active in the proclamation of the Gospel, support for children's homes and homes for the elderly, radio evangelism, and personal support for missionaries for over a century.

The January 18, 1970, concert of the Madrigal Singers was another in a long line of events which has led to a close relationship between Lemalsamac and Freed-Hardeman College since the founding of the college in 1908.

HON. HAMMOND FOWLER, TENNESSEE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSIONER, DELIVERS EXCELLENT SPEECH ON CURRENT PROBLEMS IN OUR NATION

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Hammond Fowler, Tennessee public service commissioner, recently delivered a timely address before the John Sevier Chapter of the Tennessee Society of the Sons of the American Revolution in Chattanooga, Tenn., in

which he pinpointed some of the problems of our Nation today and recalled the great heritage of our country.

Commissioner Fowler is an able, eloquent, dynamic speaker, and his remarks were most appropriate and included a discussion of the problems of crime and violence continuing in this Nation.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in the problems of our Nation, I herewith place Commissioner Fowler's remarks in the RECORD.

The speech follows:

Tonight we would not be here in the heartland of prosperous, powerful, freedom-loving America to commemorate the 238th birthday of a great Virginian except for the courage, the wisdom and the dedication of George Washington. His military genius in the face of heart-breaking long odds attained our national independence by the fearful arbitrament of armed conflict. His statesmanship, first as presiding officer of the Constitutional Convention which gave the newly-liberated colonies a viable national government in lieu of the ambiguous and impractical Articles of Confederation, and thereafter as the first president of our Republic in the critical days of its infancy preserved and implemented the national existence which his generalship had won for the Thirteen Colonies on the battlefield.

The life and accomplishments of George Washington in war and in peace constitute the cornerstone upon which our nation was built and are a priceless heritage held in common by all Americans—whether their ancestors came, as some of mine did, to the shores of Britain's North American Colonies a third of a thousand years ago in search of religious freedom and economic opportunity, or whether they themselves are newly-arrived fugitives from some police state tyranny of the fascist right or the communist left, drawn hither by the same "Western Star" which lured the Pilgrims to New England and the Cavaliers to Virginia three centuries ago.

But in a very special sense of the word we compatriots of the Society of the Sons of the American Revolution—direct descendants of men who risked—and some of whom lost—their lives in combat under the supreme command of General Washington, are entitled to claim such an honorable heritage. And it is today by no means a merely ceremonial, insignificant or empty honor. May I illustrate by telling you that on the reverse side of a gold medal awarded to my late, great mother for academic excellence on the occasion of her graduation from the University of Tennessee in 1898 are engraved the words "honor adds obligation".

So we Sons of the American Revolution, as inheritors from our forebears of the honor of their services have the obligation, by every means within our ability, to preserve, to strengthen and to upbuild the nation which their gallantry and their sacrifices brought into being.

It would be a pleasant and relatively easy way to carry out my assignment this evening if I should here launch forth into a detailed and documented review of the life and times of George Washington and thereupon conclude with some fine rhetoric about how our nation as it enters the decade of the 'seventies justifies the hopes and is worthy of the sufferings of our ancestors.

Candor and realism impel me to say instead that never since the Liberty Bell proclaimed the signing of the Declaration of Independence on a July day in 1776 has our United States of America stood in greater peril, nor have the wisdom, courage, dedication and unselfishness exemplified by George Washington been so urgently needed as they are on this the 238th anniversary of his birth.

Moral decay and a weakening and abandonment of long-accepted standards of personal conduct and business and professional ethics are all too evident on every hand. One can scarcely pick up a book or magazine today without encountering disgustingly filthy language of a type rarely heard even in the back room of a second-rate saloon not so many years ago. "Dirt for dirt's sake" seems to have replaced the now apparently outmoded slogan of "art for art's sake".

On the stage, crudely indecent conduct together with obscenely indecent speech which within the recent memory of the youngest of us would have brought the police van to the theater and assured the producer a jail sentence now bring favorable reviews from the dramatic critics and guarantee a long run and a lucrative box office.

Our radio and television programs are increasingly devoted to a glorification of vice, crime, violence and perversion. The television screen offers to young Americans a "do it yourself" home study course in rape, robbery, murder, seduction and all manner of lesser offenses against the criminal laws of our state and the precepts of religion.

Our newspapers, filled though they necessarily are with news stories about crime and delinquency and immorality and featuring interviews with celebrities advocating such things as drug addiction, illegitimacy, infidelity and in some instances conduct which is little, if any, short of treason against the United States, are about the only form of current literature today not constantly employing short, ugly and explicit words to connote human sewage, sexual activity and various manifestations of human depravity and perversion.

The alarming increase of crime in our nation threatens our individual liberties and our material possessions far more than did the arbitrary and oppressive policies of the British crown which brought about the American Revolution. This fast-spreading cancer encompasses a whole repulsive spectrum from the petty purse-snatchers and car thieves operating on their own to the far-flung well organized syndicates which by bribery, extortion, and outright murder have amassed billions of untaxed dollars, infiltrated their slimy way into labor organizations and legitimate business enterprises, corrupted or intimidated public officials and in some instances have gone so far as to attain a measure of control over state and local governments—not, thank God, in Tennessee, I am proud to add.

Contempt for law and order, for the police officers who enforce our laws and the courts which administer such laws is growing at a frightening pace. The recently concluded trial of the so-called "Chicago seven" for conspiracy to incite riot and for incitement to riot—of which latter offense five were found guilty and have been sentenced—is a typical and terrifying example of such a tendency. As a lawyer I am aware that it is not generally advisable to pass judgment on a criminal case without the benefit of the entire record but from what I have read it is my opinion that the presiding judge in the Chicago case acted with ample justification and in the best interest of justice and good order when he imposed long sentences for contempt of court upon the defendants and their attorneys who had sought to make a propaganda show out of the trial and a mockery of the orderly administration of justice.

Closely associated with the growth of crime and the prevalence of disrespect for law is the so-called "youth revolt" which poses a deadly threat to our continued life as a nation. Too many of our young men and women today, it would seem, do not go to college to obtain an education, but to participate in riots, to seize and occupy college buildings, kidnap college deans and presidents and resort to all manner of vio-

lent and lawless tactics calculated to terrorize and intimidate the administration and the board of trustees into granting such "demands" as they see fit to make. Two or three years ago, any of you might think to himself—"That may be happening in New York and California but it can't happen here." But it has happened here! Fortunately lacking the destructive violence manifested in those distant states, we have experienced so-called "student demonstrations" at my alma mater, the University of Tennessee at Knoxville and on a small scale here at the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga, within recent months.

The use of narcotic and hallucinatory drugs by our college and even high school-age young people has grown to the point where it is a major problem and a major threat. Spurred on by some disreputable rock and roll entertainers who glorify and promote drug addiction—and who incidentally should be driven from the entertainment field for this disservice they do to our nation by corrupting our youth—and supplied by the crime syndicates who are growing rich out of human degradation and who ought to be in the penitentiary, too many of our youth are experimenting with "pot" or "acid", with deadly peril to themselves and to their nation.

I am sure you have read of the recent tragic death of the daughter of that radio and television personality, Art Linkletter, who jumped from a window while under the influence of drugs, and of the arrest of the teen-age son of the Governor of New Jersey in a narcotics raid.

It will doubtless shock and dismay you, as it did me, to learn that the February issue of the Tennessee Press, the official publication of the newspaper profession in Tennessee, carried a news story which quoted the County Judge of Monroe County, a typical rural East Tennessee county populated by fine, Anglo-Saxon citizens, to the effect that juvenile delinquency in that county during 1969 was three hundred percent greater than for any prior year in the century and a half of its existence.

To an audience such as the one which I am honored to address tonight I need not present detailed documentation of the fact that patriotism has undergone a shocking decline. Reverence for our flag and the things it represents is a laughingstock in too many quarters and on the part of too many citizens. People who love their country and want to serve it in war or peace are far too widely regarded as "squares", anachronisms and hopelessly old-fashioned. Efforts—far too successful—are being made to abolish, downgrade or de-emphasize the Reserve Officer Training Corps program in our colleges and high schools. Cynical jokes are being circulated about our sister organization, the Daughters of the American Revolution, and if we were as well known and as numerous as the DAR's, the SAR's would doubtless be the target of similar abuse.

Let me make it plain that I am not here tonight to bring you a jeremiad of defeatism, despair and surrender but to point out that the perils, the problems and the difficulties which we face as a nation entering upon the seventh decade of the twentieth century present not merely a threat but an opportunity—an opportunity to display the same high order of courage, dedication and devotion as Washington and our Revolutionary ancestors displayed during the seventh decade of the eighteenth century, and to achieve the same success in our day and generation as they did in theirs. I can assure you that it will not be quick, easy or pleasant but I verily believe that the goal can be achieved and that with faith in God and ourselves and each other it will be achieved.

It would be highly presumptuous on my part to undertake to hand you a complete blueprint of how to go about the building

of a better America or to furnish you with a battle plan, with all appendices and supporting data attached, for a successful campaign against those forces which would destroy America, but may I briefly give you some of my own thoughts as to how we may best accomplish the mission to which the obligation inherent in the honor of our heritage has assigned us.

First, we cannot, we must not adopt an attitude of negativism as we face the complex and complicated problems of the fast-changing, jet-atomic space-navigational age in which we live. To be against change for the mere sake of avoiding change is as unrealistic and self-defeating as to embrace any and all change for the mere sake of discarding all existing ideals, principles and institutions in favor of others which are new, untried and without demonstrable merit. Solutions to the urgent problems of today are not to be found in blind adherence to the oversimplified dogmas of the "radical right". As the sons of rebels, we should guard against any course of action which might lead us down the sunset trail of reaction to a dead end of frustration and stagnation.

To my mind, social justice and economic justice under progressive legislation designed to serve the interest of the majority while respecting the rights of the minority constitute the one and only alternative to the rise of leftist marxism, Russian style communism and outright anarchy in our beloved country. Police, and if necessary armed soldiers, should put down rioting and disorders in the slum areas of our cities, but at the same time our affluent nation should and in my opinion must bring the healing sunshine of better schools, more decent and adequate housing, sufficient medical care and employment opportunities into these breeding grounds of crime, delinquency, ignorance and idleness.

One essential for every Son of the American Revolution who would discharge the obligation incident to the honor of his Revolutionary heritage through the building of a better America is to rededicate himself, seven days a week, twenty-four hours a day to being the very best American of which he is capable. Let us each ask ourselves, as we enter into every business, professional or social activity, not "What's there in it for me?" but "What is best for my country?"

Christ, as he walked beside the Sea of Galilee in what is now the gallant, war-torn little Republic of Israel, admonished His disciples to "let your light so shine among men that they may see your good works and glorify your Father who is in Heaven". So may we, by virtue of our heritage, let our Americanism so shine that the cynics, the scoffers and the indifferent Americans of the turbulent seventies, may see our sincerity, our dedication, our patriotism and along with us glorify, cleanse, strengthen and rebuild our common country.

One of the causes advanced for the so-called "generation gap" and the "youth revolt" is the alleged hypocrisy of the senior generation and the injustices in our society—the failure of the "establishment" to live up in practice to the principles which it professes. More sincerity, more dedication, more letting the light of genuine patriotism shine, will help to close this gap and to bring the strength and vigor of more young people to our side as we labor to cure the ills and correct the evils which beset the America for which our ancestors fought.

On the occasion of the signing of the Declaration of Independence on July 4th, 1776, wise and witty old Benjamin Franklin, dean of the Pennsylvania delegation, noting that the signatories had made each signer a traitor to the British crown and liable to be hanged for treason to the crown if the Revolution failed, remarked: "Gentlemen, we must all hang together or we will all hang separately".

So as Americans, especially as Americans possessed of the particular heritage mentioned earlier, we must seek out other Americans of all ages and both sexes, of all races and creeds and of all political persuasions other than the brainwashed puppets of Moscow, Havana, Hanoi, and Peking, and work together with them for the greatness, the good and the glory of America, or we will all fail separately. Success in such an endeavor will heal our sick society, solve our social, racial and economic problems, and build from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from our unfortified border with Canada to the banks of the Rio Grande, from the frozen tundra of Alaska to the orchid-clad islands of Hawaii a veritable "Washington Monument" more durable, more impressive and more meaningful than the lofty structure of stone which stands upon the banks of the Potomac at our national capital.

A MEETING OF FRIENDS

HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, that the United States and Great Britain are old and trusted friends is pointed out in a recent Seattle, Wash., Post-Intelligencer editorial.

The editorial describes the meeting between Prime Minister Wilson and President Nixon which produced "nonnews in a globe full of tension, friction, and great danger." It discusses the bonds between these two nations and makes the point that "England remains our firmest link with the rest of West Europe."

As a participant in a recent Ditchley Foundation Conference in England of American and British legislators and businessmen, I was personally once again reminded of the close ties we share with England.

The editorial follows:

A MEETING OF FRIENDS

Because no major headlines were produced, the two days of talks in Washington last week between President Nixon and British Prime Minister Wilson received scant attention from commentators. The general atmosphere of non-news was further strengthened by omission of the usual final joint communiqué on what had been decided.

There can be only one reason why no tempest of speculation was stirred up by the summit meeting. It is simply that everybody assumed the parties had no basic differences to resolve in the first place. Here, we think, is an almost classical case of no news being good news.

Despite the absence of headlines, it is enormously heartening that traditional Anglo-American ties of understanding and cooperation remain so demonstrably close. Permitting Mr. Wilson to attend a session of our National Security Council was an extraordinary demonstration of that mutual trust and good will.

There are those, of course, who think the "special relationship" defined by Winston Churchill in 1946 is no longer of real importance. Since World War II, they emphasize, Great Britain has surrendered much of its greatness; from a world superpower it has shrunk to an island whose future primarily is dependent on relations with its European neighbors.

This is true enough. But what truly needs emphasis is that Britain still is the world's

second most important monetary power; that the moral, intellectual and political prestige it exercises with the U.S. in the non-communist world is indispensable, and that England remains our firmest link with the rest of West Europe.

Our old friend is having to make many adjustments in a changing world. No longer a giant, some of its economic and political interests inevitably are diverging from our own. But, as the Nixon-Wilson talks showed, our general course continues in the same general direction.

We are fortunate that top-level talks with such an ally produce non-news in a globe full of tension, friction and great danger.

EMERGENCY LABOR DISPUTES

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend President Nixon on taking the initiative in the area of emergency labor disputes by proposing the Emergency Public Interest Protection Act of 1970. In his message to Congress last Friday, February 27, the President described the inadequacy of existing laws to protect the public interest when work stoppages occur in the transportation industry. The President has therefore asked for new authority and new options under the Taft-Hartley Act, as it applies to the transportation industry. Under this plan, the President would have three additional options at the end of the 80-day cooling-off period if no settlement has been reached.

First, the President would have the option of extending the cooling-off period for an additional 30 days. His second option would be to require partial operation of the troubled industry for up to 6 months in order to minimize dangers to the national health and safety. The precise level of partial operation would be determined by an impartial three-man board appointed by the President.

Finally, the President would have the option of invoking the procedure of "final offer selection." Under this procedure, both labor and management would submit one or two final offers to the Secretary of Labor, and the parties would be given another 5 days to bargain over these final proposals for settlement. Should no agreement be reached in that time, a neutral selector group would choose one of the final offers as the final and binding settlement.

This third option is likely to be the most controversial, but as Secretary of Labor Shultz has pointed out, it would not constitute compulsory arbitration.

It would, however, provide a new incentive for the parties to reach an agreement at an earlier stage. Such an incentive does not exist under current procedures. In the President's words:

Rather than pulling apart, the disputants would be encouraged to come together. Neither could afford to remain in an intransigent or extreme position. In short, while the present prospect of Government arbitration tends to widen the gap between bargaining positions and thus invites intervention, the possibility of final offer selection would

work to narrow the gap and make the need for intervention less likely.

Mr. Speaker, the need for labor law reform geared to deal with emergency situations is something which has been talked about for many years. But in the past there has been little or no Executive leadership or guidance along these lines for obvious reasons: Reform is not something which will go down well with either labor or management no matter how apparent the need. President Nixon has done a courageous thing in bringing this proposal to us. It is now up to us in the Congress to bear our fair share of leadership responsibility and explore the full ramifications of this legislation and hopefully reach some consensus on a reform package designed to protect the national health and safety while promoting collective bargaining as free as possible from Government interference. Let us recognize that nearly everyone is dissatisfied with existing procedures and is now looking to the Congress for leadership in the area of labor law reform. We cannot shrink from this responsibility.

#### AGRICULTURE HAS BIG STAKE IN CRACKDOWN ON PESTICIDES

### HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal written and said recently about the use of pesticides and the effect these chemicals might have on our environment. Many good arguments could be made both for and against the use of these pesticides.

As one who comes from a predominantly rural district, many of my people are concerned about efforts to ban the use of these chemicals. The February issue of *Progressive Farmer* contains a thought-provoking editorial on this important matter. I would like to share this editorial with my colleagues by inserting it in the RECORD at this point:

#### AGRICULTURE HAS BIG STAKE IN CRACKDOWN ON PESTICIDES

All over the nation there is mounting concern over the pollution of our environment. Farm people share this concern. They recognize environmental pollution as an undisputed fact. That it stems primarily from the agricultural use of pesticides and plant nutrients, they deny with great vigor—and they have the facts to back their contention.

Farm people have a great deal at stake in the Federal Government's recent crackdown on DDT and its promised ban on other persistent pesticides such as aldrin, dieldrin, endrin, chlordane, heptachlor, toxaphene, benzene hexachloride, and lindane. They recognize the attack on DDT as the opening skirmish in a war against many other pesticides, and they fear what it will lead to.

In the United States, there are 10,000 species of insects, 600 species of weeds, and 1,500 plant diseases. If we suddenly stopped the use of pesticides in agriculture, U.S. production of crops and livestock would drop 30% or more.

After spending many hours reading a big pile of printed material dealing both pro and con with the subject, we believe DDT and its chemically related pesticides are being

condemned on very flimsy circumstantial evidence. Here are some reasons for this conclusion:

1. American Medical Association says there is no evidence to date that humans are appreciably affected by the continued ingestion of minute traces of pesticides in raw and processed foods.

2. Present levels of pesticide residues in food and environment pose no adverse effect on man's health, according to National Academy of Sciences National Research Council (June 1969).

3. "To my knowledge, not one death (excluding accidental deaths) or serious illness has been caused among people exposed to the insecticide (DDT) in connection with the control of insects."—E. F. Knipping, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

4. "During years of investigation, it has been impossible to confirm the allegation that insecticides, when properly used, are the cause of any disease of man or animals."—Dr. Wayland Hayes, Jr., U.S. Public Health Service.

5. While conservationists call for a ban on DDT, the medical profession is studying it as a deterrent to cancer. Researchers at Johns Hopkins are studying workers at Montrose, Calif., because the incidence of cancer among men who have been exposed to a high level of DDT for over 20 years is far below normal.

6. Present controls are providing adequate protection of our food supply. Available evidence does not indicate that present levels of pesticide residues in man's food and environment are producing an adverse effect on his health.

7. Stories of fish kills due to pesticides should be taken with a grain of salt. A few years ago, major fish kills in the Mississippi River were attributed to water runoff from fields in which endrin had been used. Later a team of scientists presented convincing evidence that these fish kills were not related to pesticides used on agricultural lands.

8. Southern cultivated fields where DDT has been used for 10 years seldom show residue equal to one year's application.

It is indeed ironic that DDT, of all pesticides, should be singled out for attack. It is one of the most useful chemicals ever discovered. We know that DDT and other persistent pesticides build up in some forms of animal life such as fish and fish-eating birds. But it has not been established that the risk of environmental pollution outweighs their value in the production of food and fiber. Through its reduction of insect-borne diseases throughout the world, malaria in particular, DDT has perhaps saved as many human lives as all other drugs combined. Millions of people now living in good health would be dead or anemic cripples if it were not for DDT. In 1948, Dr. Paul Muller won a Nobel Prize as a result of his discovery of DDT's powers as an insect killer.

While the U.S. production and use of DDT is less than half what it was five or six years ago, it is still of great value to American farmers and consumers in controlling insects, especially on cotton, fruits, and vegetables. Three-fourths of U.S. production is now exported, in large measure for malaria control.

Aldrin, which is used on 40% of the corn acreage treated for soil insects, is another insecticide threatened by the recent USDA promise to move against persistent insecticides. Yet, in the judgment of most scientists, its contribution to environmental pollution is very small.

Still other pesticides under fire are 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T. To the ranch people of the Southwest, 2,4,5-T is of vital importance. It is their standby in fighting mesquite and other brushy plants that have taken over 8 million acres of ranch and pasture lands in Texas since World War II. According to John A. Matthews, chairman, Texas Brush Control & Range Improvement Committee,

the banning of 2,4,5-T "would cost us 50,000 marketable head of beef a year in only five years' time in Texas alone." Also, 2,4,5-T is widely used for weed control in the rice areas of Texas, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Mississippi.

The decision to restrict the use of 2,4,5-T apparently was made after a test indicated a higher than normal degree of deformities in the offspring of rats and mice which were given relatively heavy doses of 2,4,5-T orally during early pregnancy. "It's hard to see how anyone can expect the material will have the same effect on livestock or people," said Matthews, "when we have 20 years' actual experience to the contrary."

DDT and other chemically related hydrocarbon insecticides are being outlawed because they are persistent. Farmers need insecticides of some persistence because many insects are persistent. The more persistent an insecticide, the less often it must be applied and, other things being equal, the less expensive its use. Many of the less persistent insecticides are more dangerous to apply and are more costly.

The time may come when new methods of biological control (including the so-called bug-fight-bug technique) will make the use of insecticides much less urgent. But the time is not ripe for it yet. We have already spent \$100 million to find new methods of non-chemical pest control, but we are still years away from their widespread use.

No one of good will wishes to continue the use of a pesticide that is actually dangerous to human or animal life, or that gives reasonable promise that it is likely to become so. The decision for or against a pesticide should be made on the principle of its benefit in producing food and fiber needs versus its risk of environmental pollution. Apparently decisions are being made to outlaw pesticides that are of vital importance to the production of food and fiber on unsubstantial evidence that they are significant factors in environmental pollution.

In recent months, USDA seems more inclined to accept the judgment of those who would place a slight potential risk of environmental pollution ahead of the very present benefit of pesticides to U.S. agriculture. In registering pesticides, decisions by USDA on their effect on human health are to be based on conclusions reached by HEW (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare). This could be dangerous to agriculture. Secretary Hardin should make HEW prove its case with substantial evidence. He should be a real fighting friend of U.S. agriculture and not allow HEW to influence the outlawing of pesticides on flimsy evidence such as that given in the case of 2,4,5-T. *What we need is the regulation of the use of chemicals both by USDA and proper state authorities. In any case, regulation should be based on the separate consideration of each individual pesticide and on each use to which it is put. Widespread banning of pesticides can be disastrous to U.S. agriculture. It shouldn't be accepted without a fight by farmer representatives and their friends.*

#### THE SILENT MAJORITY SPEAKS OUT

### HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies' Auxiliary conducts a Voice of Democracy contest. This year over 400,000 school students



participated in the contest, competing for five scholarships which are awarded as the top prizes. This year's theme is "Freedom's Challenge." The winning contestant from each State is brought to Washington, D.C., for the final judgment as guests of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. Speaker, it was with a great deal of pleasure that I received the news that one of my constituents was judged as the winner in the State of California. Mr. Randy E. Thomas, of the Amos Alonzo Stagg Senior High School in Stockton, Calif., will compete here in Washington next week. Meantime, I believe it would be in order to share with you and my colleagues the contents of this young man's speech:

#### FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

President Richard Nixon often refers to the silent majority. It is that silence which challenges our freedoms. One of the basic principles of American democracy is a right of the minority to be heard. Indeed, that minority is being heard, that minority is creating a loud tremor throughout the United States.

The tremor varies from protest of the Vietnam war, to mere protest of the American establishment. With the minority so vocal and so devoted to their beliefs, the American image is often that of the minority. A minority may often become the ruling agent in a society when the majority becomes silent. To commend that silent majority is to only allow it to remain silent.

In order to reduce the impact that the minority carries, it is necessary for the majority to protest, to become visible, to create a contrast. The word "protest" carries a great impact these days, an impact that carries with it ideas of degradation of moral and society oriented principles. A vision of long haired students, an anti-American sign comes to mind. That image must be destroyed and be re-created into one of voice in favor of American goals, in favor of American foreign policy, and pro-American establishment.

This nation was born by protest and our guarantee of success depends on our nature of improvement. Aristotle, Plato, Washington all recognized that a society must improve in order to maintain the constituent freedoms. In the element of achieving improvement, protest does become necessary. There are, however, certain criteria that are necessary before those improvements can be achieved, by peaceful protest and peaceful demonstration.

The criticisms must be constructive. They must be valid. The challenge to freedom becomes apparent when a minority can destroy the creditability of future American foreign policy. A prime example is the effect that minority dissent has had in the case of the Vietnam war. Hanoi will not seriously negotiate any peace terms in Paris or anywhere else when the American position is so successfully protested by the minority. That it may possibly force a change in American foreign position.

President Nixon has attempted to put Hanoi in a dilemma by giving them two choices, to maintain current objectives and the United States troops will continue to prevent further aggression or to decrease objectives and the United States troops will be gradually withdrawn.

Why should Hanoi declare its position when American position is so insecure because of minority protest? The point is that we should not halt protest but that the majority should try to maintain some stability behind American foreign policy by creating a contrast. To give American for-

eign policy a chance. To give our President a chance. The silent majority must be heard.

If American creditability and freedom are to be maintained, the challenges to be heard must be met. If we are to solve the Vietnamese conflict with honor, peace and still maintain stability in South Vietnam, it is necessary for the American majority to support American foreign goals, to support our President, to give him a chance. The challenge to freedom needs decisive action. The silent majority must be heard.

#### WHY DON'T THEY STOP INFLATION?

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, one of my most distinguished constituents, the Honorable Roger A. Freeman, formerly with the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace at Stanford University, and now a special assistant to President Nixon, recently delivered an address before the Eastern Regional Conference of the Associated Credit Bureaus in New York City. I believe Mr. Freeman's remarks are worthy of being brought to the attention of my colleagues, and I am therefore submitting them for inclusion in the RECORD.

#### WHY DON'T THEY STOP INFLATION?

(Remarks by Roger A. Freeman)

If we conducted an opinion poll among a representative cross section of the American people, asking what their leading grievance is in the domestic policy area, we would today in most places get the answer: soaring prices.

In letters to editors, in radio and TV interviews and on many other occasions, people keep asking, "Why don't they stop inflation?" "They" of course meaning the government. In a rare display of consensus, members of Congress of both political parties have been condemning inflation in vivid tones and demanding that it be ended forthwith. With everybody seemingly opposed to it, we may well wonder "Why don't they stop inflation?" Is there a sinister and clandestine lobby at work which keeps frustrating the will of the people?

It reminds me somewhat of the psychiatrist who when examining his patient inquired: "Are you troubled by improper thoughts?" to which the patient cheerfully replied: "No, I am not. Frankly speaking doctor, I rather enjoy them."

The fact is that most people enjoy their share of inflation, that is their individual slice of the expanded money supply in the form of an income, whether from wages or from independent activity, that grows faster than their productivity. What they don't like is the consequences of inflation, which is higher prices. It is not the overeating or drinking that we dislike—it is the hangover, the indigestion, the obesity we fear, but too often fear not enough to abstain from drinking or overeating. This looks like a case of being able to resist everything save temptation.

It is a natural and understandable tendency for people to try to offset the impact of higher prices by boosting their income and, albeit grudgingly, spending more money instead of reducing their demands. It is as if at a football game we were not seeing well enough over the heads of the people in front of us and decided to stand up. We'll see

better—temporarily. When the other people also stand up, as most likely they will, we and everybody else will see no better than we did before. More likely, we'll see less. If we then sit down, we'll see nothing. But how do we persuade the other people to sit down, too, so that we all can see at least something, in comfort? As so often it is much easier to get into trouble, then to get out of it, because few are eager to make the sacrifice of being the first to give in. How can we, in a free society, get concerted action by having all sit down at the same time? In this case Ben Franklin's famous observation holds true:

"We must all hang together or, most decidedly, we shall all hang separately."

Opinions differ on what causes inflation and how it can best be cured. Keynesians and Neo-Keynesians who believe that fiscal policy is the key to stable economic growth and a firm lever for steering between the Scylla of inflation and the Charybdis of recession, had it largely to themselves for most of the time since World War II. Though they still count the majority of economists among their disciples, they have been losing ground in recent years to the monetarists who believe that the quantity of money is the only thing that matters. There are different shades of monetarists—from Friedmanites to Friedmansques—but they all hold more or less that changes in money supply control the course of inflation.

When neither of these two factions were as successful as they promised to be if given a free hand, another view gained adherents. Noneconomists—or, as economists would regard them, less sophisticated persons—find the amorphous abstractions of fiscal and monetary policy hard to comprehend or absorb. They prefer to think in antropomorphic terms—a crime must have a villain and a victim. The victim of inflation is, of course, always the person speaking and the economic group to which he belongs. The villain, depending on which side of the fence the speaker happens to be on, is either a union leader raising extravagant wage demands or a corporate manager or business tycoon boosting prices to reap exorbitant profits.

Is arguing over the relative roles in generating inflation like arguing which is the most important leg of a three-legged stool? Not quite. All three are important, but the shaping of anti-inflationary policy depends on where we want to place our main emphasis.

#### FISCAL POLICY

That a succession of huge budgetary deficits in the 1960s bears a major responsibility for the inflationary trend of recent years is now widely, if not universally, recognized. The imposition of a 10 percent income surtax in the summer of 1968 was expected to help end the budgetary deficits, which it did. Many economists feared that the changeover from a \$25 billion deficit in FY-1968 to a \$3 billion surplus in FY-1969 amounted to an overkill and might lead to a depression.

As happened in other instances, overkill was only in the mind of the beholder. Prices kept rising at an undiminished pace right through FY-1969 and into FY-1970. Does this mean that a tight fiscal policy is not anti-inflationary? Of course not. But why do we expect a \$3 billion surplus to be followed, hopefully, by \$1 to \$2 billion surpluses in the two succeeding fiscal years to end an inflationary trend caused by a \$57 billion deficit in the preceding 8 years? In those 8 years an inflationary psychology ingrained itself deeply on the minds of producers and consumers alike and cannot be easily eradicated by a couple of slim surpluses, particularly when the firmness of congressional determination to end inflation has not yet been convincingly demonstrated.

The Committee for Economic Development recommended in its recent statement "A Stabilizing Fiscal and Monetary Policy for 1970" that the target for the current and successive fiscal years should be a \$6 to \$9 billion surplus until inflationary tendencies are well under control.

Why did the President not recommend a surplus of that magnitude in his budget? You may remember how much difficulty the President encountered in persuading Congress to extend the 10 percent surtax through the second half of 1969 and even greater resistance to obtaining, at the last moment, a 5 percent extension for the first half of 1970. No greater tax increase could have passed Congress at that time.

To be sure, the overall tax burden of the American people has become too heavy and needs to be lightened. But should this be done at the cost of adding to inflation?

There is, of course, another way of producing a greater budgetary surplus: tighter expenditure control. But, strange as it seems, it was the same forces in Congress that pushed for tax cuts which also drove the hardest for larger expenditures than the President had recommended. If the President had not vetoed a major appropriation bill—as he had long warned Congress he would—the planned surplus would have disappeared, proving to those who doubt the determination or ability of the U.S. government to end inflation that they were correct right along. Pressures for enlarged spending on and in Congress continue undiminished and that battle has been particularly fierce in the past few days.

No doubt, you have heard the claim that the budgetary situation is tight only because defense spending has tremendously increased and swallows the major part of our tax payments. If defense were cut substantially, it is said, below the amounts recommended by the President, there would be ample money available to lower tax rates, augment funds for education and other social purposes and still wind up with a healthy surplus.

Now for the current 3-year period, between FY-1968 and FY-1971, as proposed by the President, as you may know, defense spending was cut 10 percent, outlays for Human Resources (education, health, social security, labor, etc.) raised by 41 percent, for all other purposes increased by 14 percent.

While this shows a dramatic shift of federal funds from military to social purposes, our critics contend, that such comparisons should be made over a longer period than 3 years. The big boost in defense came before that time. This is a valid point. So, let me give you the changes in the rates of expenditures in the two preceding 8-year periods:

*Increase or decrease in Federal spending<sup>1</sup>*

|  | Percent |
|--|---------|
| Defense:   |         |
| Between 1952 and 1960.....   | -2      |
| Between 1960 and 1968.....   | +75     |
| Between 1968 and 1971.....   | -10     |
| Human resources (education, health, social security, labor, etc.): |         |
| Between 1952 and 1960.....   | +227    |
| Between 1960 and 1968.....   | +165    |
| Between 1968 and 1971.....   | +41     |
| All other purposes:  |         |
| Between 1952 and 1960.....   | +49     |
| Between 1960 and 1968.....   | +78     |
| Between 1968 and 1971.....   | +14     |

These figures indicate trends which differ decisively from widely believed myths. But those are the facts.

Now let us look at the expenditure in-

<sup>1</sup> Data for 1952, 1960 and 1968 are for calendar years. For the 1968-71 comparison only fiscal year data are available. Figures shown for fiscal year 1971 are based on the President's budget recommendations.

creases over the entire period from 1952 to 1971:

|   | Percent |
|---|---------|
| Defense (increase).....   | 57      |
| Human resources (education, health, social security, etc.)..... | 1,170   |
| All other (increase).....                                       | 147     |

Defense accounted for 66% of the Budget in 1952 (=13.5% of GNP).

Defense accounted for 49% of the Budget in 1960 (=9.1% in GNP).

Defense accounted for 44% of the Budget in 1968 (=9.3% of GNP).

Defense accounted for 37% of the Budget in 1971 (=7.1% of GNP (estimate)).

I cannot discuss with you in this context the grave implications for our national security of cutting defense funds below the amounts which the President recommended. But there is a good chance that unless the international situation deteriorates in the next few years—which nobody can predict at this time nor rule out as a possibility—defense may well account for a smaller percentage of the budget and of GNP a few years hence than it does now.

Tighter control may, however, well be applied to other outlays as a result of studies in depth that are being or will be undertaken.

In some public programs the benefits of increased spending are evident. We find, for example, that the fatality rate is less than half as high on interstate highways (freeways) as on other rural roads. This is not a minor matter as long as more than 55,000 persons are being killed in traffic accidents each year. The potential reduction in loss of life and human suffering, aside from lowered economic losses as a result of modernized roads, is truly tremendous.

Protection, conservation and development of natural resources and of our environment generally have been greatly advanced by well planned public programs and will demand increased attention in years to come. Social insurance programs enable American families to look with greater confidence toward their old age and are helping many millions against other vicissitudes of life.

Public assistance programs, on the other hand, have proven to be counterproductive and need to be replaced by an approach that aims to preserve human dignity and make as many dependent persons as possible wholly or partially self-supporting. The results of urban renewal programs also have been spotty and need re-evaluation.

It is a matter of pride that outlays for education have multiplied more rapidly than for almost any other purpose so that we in the United States now spend almost as much for education as all the other countries of the world combined. The results are in many respects excellent—but in other respects less than persuasive. Certain major programs activated within the past 10 years have failed to deliver what their sponsors promised and will need to be studied closely before the amounts are substantially increased. To be sure: funds for education will have to keep increasing at a rapid pace. But the methods of their application will need to be more thoroughly considered and funds concentrated on programs which demonstrably can and do produce tangible educational improvements.

While there is no doubt that federal expenditures will continue to go up as our population and economy expand, there is an urgent need to keep the increase at lower rates than those which prevailed in the past. Only in this way can the tendency of taxes to grow faster than national or personnel income be reversed.

Until inflationary trends are well under control and have subsided, a tight fiscal policy must continue with its main emphasis on the expenditure side of the budget.

Fiscal policy has not failed—but time and circumstances have so far not permitted a budgetary surplus of the size which to all appearances would have been necessary to reverse the inflationary tide that has engulfed us for the past four to five years. Congress will have to convince the American people as well as foreign observers that it means business in its aim to end inflation by taking firm action. Last year Congress adopted an expenditure ceiling but then disregarded it when authorizing larger appropriations and mandating certain outlays. Such a performance is not apt to inspire confidence among the public that the lawmakers will resist the pleas of special interest lobbies and exercise the discipline necessary to overcome inflationary pressures.

#### MONETARY POLICY

Monetary policy fluctuated during the 1960s, tightened temporarily in 1966, but on the whole was not effective in stemming inflationary trends. It has been only about one year since the Federal Reserve Board embarked on a truly restrictive policy. Money supply increased a mere 2½ percent between December 1968 and December 1969, and has remained almost static since the spring of 1969. This has had a distinct effect in reducing inflationary pressures, as most economic indicators have shown for several months. To be sure, prices kept going up—but there is little doubt that if money were kept as tight for an extended period, the price curve would eventually yield. The question is: are the American people willing to pay the price for such a policy?

To cut off the money supply completely is like tying up an artery to stop the flow of blood from a wound: it may be necessary to keep the patient from bleeding to death. But if the blood is cut off for too long, gangrene may set in and the limb may be lost. Money is the economy's life blood. The potentially serious impact of a complete freezing of the money supply for a period that will soon exceed a year makes it likely that a slight easing of the restraints could be forthcoming before too long.

I said "slight" lest anybody gets up his hopes too high.

The Federal Reserve Board's dilemma and its extreme caution before acting is not hard to understand. If the Board lowers reserve requirements and purchases federal securities in the open market and prices continue to soar, it is certain to be blamed. But if it continues money as tight as it has been and a recession develops, the Board will be regarded as the main culprit. This is not an enviable position to be in—but the Board will, I trust, resolve it judiciously.

It has been widely asserted that high interest rates are a cause of inflation and the demand has been raised that the rates should be lowered, by government edict or otherwise. Now, let us think about that and look what has been happening.

Over the past five years personal income increased 42 percent, personal savings only 32 percent. Personal installment loans meanwhile grew 47 percent, all consumer credit 35 percent. The flow of funds into commercial banks, mutual savings banks, savings and loan associations and insurance companies dwindled from \$50 billion in 1967 to a mere \$5.5 billion in 1969.

Obviously, money is a commodity that is high in demand, short in supply. What would happen if government forced lower interest rates in such a situation? Probably the same thing that would happen if the price of any other commodity with inadequate supply were reduced. Lower interest rates would cause savers and investors at home and abroad to channel their funds elsewhere while additional borrowers who were deterred by high rates would be attracted.

Where would the added money to meet the demand come from, if savers and investors do not supply it? From the government? What impact would the creation of large amounts of new money have on the rate of inflation?

If interest rates were artificially lowered, a rationing of all credits would probably become inevitable, a step which this Administration wants to avoid. Experience in many countries has shown that political pressures being what they are, government does not allocate funds as efficiently as the market does through the pricing system. That does not mean that the market cannot occasionally be nudged into some types of particularly needed investment. But the long-range implications for economic growth of comprehensive credit controls are grave and must be carefully considered before such a step is taken.

The bond market has begun to show unmistakable signs of strength in the last few weeks and some of the interest rates on new bond issues have been coming down. This may, but does not necessarily, mean that we have reached the long-awaited reversal of the uptrend.

An interest rate of 8½ percent or 9 percent may appear high in historical terms. But if prices rise between 5 percent and 6 percent per annum, as they did in 1969, this equals a net return of only 3 percent to 3.5 percent to the investor. It also means that the borrower will repay the principal in cheaper dollars and, therefore, does not truly bear a 8½ percent or 9 percent burden. I, therefore, doubt that interest rates will come down substantially until the rate of price increases has materially slowed.

It has been an interesting phenomenon that the dollar has gained remarkable strength in international markets in the past two years and is now again the leading international reserve currency—at a time when our merchandise export balance has all but vanished and the balance of payments recorded its greatest deficit ever (on a liquidity basis). One of the reasons for the dollar's improved stature, despite our poor trade performance, is the willingness of banks to pay 10 percent to 12 percent for Eurodollars. I wonder what the impact would be on the status of the dollar if interest rates were artificially lowered by government edict?

To sum this up: lower interest rates and an easier money policy are of course highly desirable—if they come in conjunction with developments in the market and with an appropriate fiscal policy. To clamor for easy money at lower rates, for enlarged public spending and lower taxes while complaining about runaway prices may to some seem politically profitable. But I believe that the American people are too intelligent and too well educated to fall for such self-contradictory appeals.

WAGE, PRICE AND PROFITS POLICY

Balanced fiscal and monetary policies have now been in effect for at least a year and, to some extent, well over a year. Most economic indicators disclose a general slowdown throughout the economy, as was expected. But prices keep going up and many people are becoming impatient and dissatisfied with the results of fiscal-monetary policies. They feel that we may be faced with cost-push rather than demand-pull inflation and that only direct action will stop it within a reasonable time.

Some have suggested the issuance of guidelines on wage and price changes. Such guidelines worked not too badly in the early 1960s when inflationary pressures were very low. But when pressures started to mount in the mid-1960s, guidelines did not prove strong enough a weapon and were finally

discarded. This does not necessarily prove that under certain circumstances they could not be of some help in conjunction with appropriate noninflationary fiscal and monetary policies.

One problem: What do you use for a guideline when the productivity increase is down to zero or close to zero?

Some want the President to do more "jawboning." I am not certain whether jawboning means moving one's jawbone—in other words trying to persuade business and labor to refrain from demanding or imposing disproportionate increases—or whether it refers to the kind of jawboning that Samson did when he fought the Philistines. There is nothing wrong with jawboning of the former type and the President has, in fact, been exerting leadership along that line, admonishing major economic groups not to press selfish claims that would work to the disadvantage of all. Jawboning of the latter type, however, occasionally used by some Presidents in years past, actually amounts to an attempt at governmental control, with haphazard or even capricious enforcement.

Some have gone a step farther and suggested the imposition of general wage and price controls, usually in the form of a general freeze.

Would a wage and price freeze accomplish what fiscal and monetary policy have so far not been able to bring about? During World War II, price control succeeded in slowing down the price movement. But there were then tight restrictions on materials and production, many items were rationed, a 77 percent excess profits tax and a 91 percent maximum income tax were in effect. Moreover, the patriotic spirit helped to make restrictions acceptable as a necessary sacrifice for winning the war.

Even so, price and wage control was only a delaying action with many leakages, as those of you who were then active in business may well remember. I was a shoe buyer for the Macy concern in those years and recall that manufacturers and retailers, as well as unions, used numerous subterfuges as a means of getting around the price and wage freeze.

Even if an enormous enforcement apparatus were created to control and supervise the over 10 million single proprietorships and partnerships and 1.5 million corporations, it might be no more effective than the XVIII Amendment was—and it could generate many ills including black markets. A freeze at any particular time would be unfair to those who have not had recent adjustments. It could be circumvented by slight changes, sufficient to justify a new price in millions of items, by fake overtime and promotions. It would generally favor the corrupt over the conscientious. There are circumstances under which controls may have to be considered—but they do not exist today nor are they likely to occur in the discernible future, barring a major international emergency.

Can other action be taken to end the wage-price spiral? Two months ago Walter Reuther objected to the term wage-price spiral. It should be called a price-wage spiral, he said, because prices are raised to maximize profits and this in turn causes workers to demand higher wages. It is correct that in several instances prices went up in advance of rising unit labor costs, though not necessarily in advance of wage rates. Prices start rising while demand is high, when facilities and manpower are fully employed and when labor productivity is increasing. But as the cycle continues, productivity declines, wages and unit costs rise faster and prices aim even higher.

What has actually happened in the past four years? Have higher prices lead to higher profits or have they resulted in labor getting a bigger slice of the pie?

Let us see:

Changes in income shares between 1965 and 1969—IV quarter (seasonal adjustment)

[Increase or decrease in percentage points]

|  |      |
|--|------|
| Shares of National Income:   |      |
| Employee compensation increased from 69.8% to 73.6%-----                   | +3.8 |
| Pre-tax profits declined from 13.8% to 11.6%-----                          | -2.2 |
| After-tax profits declined from 8.2% to 6.4%-----                          | -1.8 |
| Shares of Personal Income:   |      |
| Labor income increased from 70.1% to 72.0%-----                            | +1.9 |
| Dividends, business & professional income declined from 11.5% to 9.8%----- | -1.7 |
| Shares of Corporate Income: <sup>1</sup>                                   |      |
| Employee compensation increased from 77.6% to 80.3%-----                   | +2.7 |
| Pre-tax profits declined from 21.0% to 20.2%-----                          | -0.8 |
| After-tax profits declined from 11.9% to 10.4%-----                        | -1.5 |

<sup>1</sup> From 1965 to 1969—III Quarter seasonal adjustment.

Regardless of the chicken v. egg question of who started it, the crucial point is: how can the spiral be stopped?

This is an important question because contracts negotiated in 1969 provide on the average a first-year hourly wage increase of 8.2 percent, compared with 7.2 percent for the full year of 1968. With productivity increases virtually absent, the implications for future price movements are obvious.

In the construction industry, first-year wage increases negotiated in 1969 averaged 14.0 percent which seems to offer a gloomy outlook for housing.<sup>1</sup>

Bargaining negotiations are scheduled in 1970 for about 5 million workers (teamsters, autoworkers, rubberworkers, etc.), compared with 2½ million in 1969, with union demands for wage boosts certain not to be lower than they were last year. Nor is management likely to be more compliant, in view of the current profit squeeze that seems to be tightening.

Does this suggest government intervention in wage negotiations to thwart labor's aims? Not at all. To put pressure on labor union leaders might serve little purpose. If workers are dissatisfied, they will veto bargaining agreements between union and management representatives and may replace union officials who settle for less than the rank and file are willing to settle for.

Business response to the severe profit squeeze and sharply rising labor costs is predictable: cost paring. In many industries, attempts are under way at cost savings by reducing payrolls and will unquestionably continue. Coming at a time when cutbacks in the defense procurement programs and in the size of the Armed Forces and supporting personnel will affect well over a million Americans within the next 18 months, we are likely to experience an increase in unemployment. By how much the unemployment rate which stood at 3.9 percent of the civilian labor force in January 1970 will rise is impossible to tell. Should it go up too steeply, appropriate government action will be taken to alleviate the situation.

<sup>1</sup> Actually, more housing units were completed in 1969 than in any year on record, with the possible exception of 1950. Conventional housing starts were down—not surprising when we consider that residential construction costs increased 34 percent in the past 5 years while the Consumers Price Index grew only 20 percent. But about 400,000 factory produced so-called mobile homes were turned out—about twice as many as in 1966, over four times as many as in 1961.

But a few facts on the composition of the unemployed group may help toward a better understanding of the nature of the problem we are facing:

More than one-half of the 2.6 million persons unemployed in December 1969 had been jobless for less than 5 weeks, with most of them on the lookout and between jobs. Only one person in every 228 persons in the civilian labor force had been unemployed for 15 or more weeks.

Fewer than one-half of all unemployed had actually lost their last job. A larger number than were dismissed had never before been employed or had just reentered the labor force; 14 percent quit their last job.

The unemployment rate among men living with their families was only 1.7 percent—or one in sixty. It was much higher among single men and among women.

This does not aim to detract from the seriousness of employment as such nor from the necessity of being ready to cope with a substantial increase, should it occur. It aims to put the situation in the right perspective.

Even the mere discussion of a pending wage and price freeze would cause labor unions and companies to hasten to get their adjustment in before controls are imposed. It would, therefore, accelerate and intensify the pressure of the upward movement.

In summary: Wage and price controls offer no feasible solution to the problem of rising prices. Nor can jawboning serve as a substitute for proper economic directions. There simply is no reasonable alternative to a continued and judicious pursuit of sound fiscal and monetary policies, by planning for sizable budgetary surpluses, by keeping public expenditures from expanding too rapidly, by encouraging saving over consumption, by keeping money tight with only a gradual easing as the condition of the economy and inflationary pressures permit or demand, and by letting interest rates find their own level which, more likely than not, will follow the movement of prices.

Any other course is likely to be more costly in the long run and lead to greater dissatisfaction and internal conflict.

#### BAN DDT AND SIMILAR INSECTICIDES

**HON. EDWARD I. KOCH**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture is considering regulations restricting the use of DDT. Eight years have gone by since Rachel Carson's "Silent Spring" appeared in 1962 warning us against the use of DDT. The experts, bureaucrats, and technocrats of the commercial companies and the U.S. Government all viciously attacked her and sought to label her as an alarmist.

We now know that she was accurate in her predictions and that it was the "experts" who were in error. Let us now attempt to undo as much as we can of the damage that has been wrought through the use of DDT and surely preclude by law through the banning of DDT further damage from that insecticide. In support of the most restrictive regulations to effect such a ban, I have sent the letter which follows to the U.S. Department of Agriculture. I have also requested of that Department that it con-

sider regulating in the most stringent way not only DDT but all other insecticides similar to DDT which adversely affect the ecology.

The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., February 20, 1970.

HARRY W. HAYS,  
Director, Pesticides Regulation Division, Agricultural Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. HAYS: I wish to register my support for the regulation filed by the Department of Agriculture regarding proposed cancellation of all uses of DDT (F.R. Doc. 69-14024; Filed Nov. 24, 1969). I stand in strong opposition to continuation of present permitted uses of DDT. The implications of DDT for human health and environmental safety necessitate a complete ban on its use with the well-defined exception that in potential catastrophic insect infestation that would pose an imminent threat of human health disaster, widespread destruction of agricultural areas or extensive damage to a natural resource DDT could be used for short periods of time in the event that no other less persistent insecticide was available in sufficient quantities. In stating this exception I do not mean regularized usage, but a potential outbreak of an insect-carried disease or some phenomenon such as a locust plague. I would hope that the use of DDT in such imminent disasters would be at most a few days.

The hazards posed by DDT are well documented and require immediate action. Overwhelming scientific evidence clearly shows that DDT is a menace to the environment and wildlife, and current data indicate a definite danger to man.

Available scientific findings have established that DDT is a potential cancer-producing agent. Some of these findings include the following:

1. As far back as 1947 the Food and Drug Administration found increased incidences of liver tumors in rats which were fed DDT.
2. On May 1, 1969, the National Cancer Institute reported that DDT added to the diet of mice quadrupled the frequency of tumors of the liver, lungs, and lymphoid organs.
3. Hungarian scientists reported similar findings concerning the relationship of DDT and the development of tumors and leukemia. A recent University of Miami Medical School study revealed that the bodies of persons who died of cancer contained more than twice the DDT concentration as persons who died of accidental causes.
4. We know that the DDT concentration in mothers' milk has been found to be more than twice as great as the concentration permitted in cow's milk sold for public consumption.

DDT has polluted our waterways, contaminating fish which are later consumed as food. Persistent chemicals have been carried down rivers and streams into the lakes and oceans of the world. DDT has even been found in the fatty tissues of birds and fish in the Arctic and Antarctic. The cost of DDT use has been deathly high for various animal species. It has had a disastrous effect on the fertility of some bird species, indeed among them has been our national symbol, the bald eagle. The direct threat of extinction to certain species of birds and wildlife should serve as a warning to us, a bellwether of potential biological havoc wrought by the continued use of DDT.

I have been very impressed by recent studies which have shown that with an increased use of DDT and other insecticides crop production yields in several parts of the world have actually decreased, in addition

to having a detrimental effect on human welfare. This would indicate that the exclusive reliance on chemicals alone to increase food production in our already underfed world is unwise, as well as ecologically unsound.

Effective and economical alternatives for pest control have been developed. The U.S.D.A. presently lists effective alternatives for DDT for virtually every crop of which this most persistent pesticide is presently used. In addition, a host of nonchemical means of pest control have been applied with great success in many parts of the country, including the development of crop varieties that resist insect attack, the introduction of natural enemies into the pest's environment, insect sterilization, and integrated procedures which combine chemical and biological control measures. It is reasonable to surmise that a ban on DDT may well act as a stimulus for the development of more sophisticated biological and integrated control mechanisms for dealing with pests.

The proposed regulations, to my knowledge, pertain to DDT usage alone. There are other insecticides chemically similar to DDT—such as Dieldrin, Endrin, and other chlorinated hydrocarbons—which have similar ecological and physical effects. I would like to take this opportunity to urge the Department to closely consider these substances and subject them to equally stringent regulations.

We must not postpone action to prevent further abuse to our environment and human life brought about by DDT use. The existing degradation of our environment as well as foreseeable damage to ecology and man dictate an immediate suspension of the use of this man-made menace in our environment.

Sincerely,

EDWARD I. KOCH.

#### SCOUTS ALERT COMMUNITY TO DANGERS OF POLLUTION

**HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, in a recent statement, I applauded the increasing concern of this Nation's youth about the dangers of environmental pollution. I am pleased to note that two Boy Scouts representing troop 8 in Hamden, Conn., have exemplified this concern in a manner highly beneficial to their community.

As part of an Eagle Scout project, these two dedicated young men have started a campaign "to get the citizens of our community actively interested in the serious problems of pollution." They have urged citizens to write their elected officials about the need for antipollution measures and have distributed a flyer which graphically illustrates the need for prompt action in the community, State, and Nation. They have asked me and other officials what they can do, as Boy Scouts and citizens, to contribute to the antipollution effort.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to acknowledge the resourcefulness, dedication, and idealism of these two young men, and I am confident that the citizens of Hamden will heed their call to action. I hope

that their initiative will serve as an example to other concerned citizens throughout the country.

I wish to insert at this point in the RECORD the text of the flyer which is being distributed by these scouts:

**POLLUTION IS CAUSED BY PEOPLE. IT MUST BE CURED BY PEOPLE—POLLUTION? YES IT IS BAD, BUT IT DOES NOT AFFECT ME IN THE COMMUNITY OF HAMDEN—NO? READ THIS—POLLUTION IN OUR COMMUNITY**

Many of us have remained unaware of the urgency of the pollution problem facing us today. According to Time magazine, "Every year, Americans junk 7 million cars, 100 million tires, 20 million tons of paper, 48 billion cans, and 28 billion bottles. Garbage collection annually costs \$2.8 billion. Every year, U.S. plants discard 165 million tons of solid waste and gush 172 millions of tons of smoke and fumes into the air."

A local member of the Connecticut Commission on Air Pollution, Mr. Herbert H. Etter, says, "There is now 17 times more of a problem with the incidence of Emphysema than we had 10 short years ago." Air pollution causes the equivalent of \$65 worth of damage per person in the U.S. today, for a total of over \$12 billion a year.

In short, the problem is great!

As our population continues to increase by incredible numbers, so continues the pollution of lakes, rivers and oceans. People use vast amounts of water every day in the U.S. and if it's not taken care of—We're going to run out of it!

Concerning how much each individual in the U.S. uses today as compared to 1900, we now use four times as much water. Industries in the U.S. now use thirteen times as much and farmers use seven times as much water as they did in 1900. This amounts to 387 billion gallons of water being used in some way by the industrialist, the farmer and the common people of America every day.

As water is continually being used more and more each day, we should try to keep it cleaner instead of allowing it to become polluted. Since 1900, water pollution has gone up six times and unless you act now will stay on this ever-rising scale.

The experts all say the cost of combatting this threat to our very survival will run into the billions. Yet it is clear that the cost of not fighting pollution is a price that we cannot afford to pay: the extermination of the human race.

"But there is no clear danger to me here in Hamden," you may say. Look around you at the polluted streams, the air pollution hanging in the valley that makes you choke. We're polluting ourselves out of existence and drowning in our own filth. The time for action is now! Unless you act now your children will not blame you for your failure—they may not even be alive.

Please, for their sakes, write to the people listed below, and do it today:

President Richard M. Nixon, Washington, D.C.;  
 Senator Abraham Ribicoff, Washington, D.C.;  
 Senator Thomas J. Dodd, Washington, D.C.;  
 Congressman Robert N. Giaimo, Washington, D.C.;  
 State Senator Patrick Barbato, Hartford, Connecticut;  
 State Representative Milton Caplan, Hartford, Connecticut;  
 State Representative John Chagnon, Hartford, Connecticut;  
 Mayor William M. Adams, Hamden, Connecticut.

Thank you.

Your children's lives are in danger! Act!  
 An Eagle project by S.S. and P.K.—Troop 8—Hamden, Connecticut.

**THE SOCIAL JUSTICE OF A CAROLINA TOWN**

**HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the following letter from the Barnwell, S.C., branch of the NAACP speaks for itself. It indicates the deplorable extent to which racial abuse is still accepted as the official way of life in parts of this country. The letter details the policies of outright injustice, humiliation, and neglect practiced by the local government of Barnwell toward the black citizens of that town. That the black population of Barnwell makes up more than one-third of the town citizenry amplifies the disgracefulness and illegality of such conditions. I urge all my colleagues, those who are trying to end racism in this country and those who are trying to deny it exists, to take careful note of the contents of this letter. It follows:

FEBRUARY 10, 1970.

To: The Mayor, City Councilmen, The County Delegation, Chamber of Commerce, County Commissioners, and other Concerned Persons and Organizations.

From: Barnwell Branch, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Mrs. O'Bertha Barfield, President, 2337 Calhoun Street, Barnwell, South Carolina 29812.

Subject: Proposals for Favorable Action to Improve Barnwell, South Carolina.

October, 1969 marked two years of patient waiting for a reply to proposals made to the Mayor of the City of Barnwell by some Black citizens representing the Barnwell Branch, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. This was followed by a copy of the proposals sent to Mayor Mazurska and members of the City Council for action and a reply. Until this date, February 10, 1970, we have not been granted the common courtesy of an acknowledgment of ever receiving the Special Delivery Letter. You will readily agree that numerous unanswered questions have penetrated our minds since that time.

Is this a routine of your office procedure for handling requests from registered, tax-paying citizens of Barnwell, South Carolina?

Because we received no communication, neither have we observed any solution to problems that confronted us then; we are forced to make these proposals now, this Tenth Day of February in the year of Our Lord, Nineteen Hundred and Seventy (1970).

**PROPOSALS**

1. That all persons on Welfare receive the full amount due them as any other person or family under similar conditions.
2. That free Food Stamps be issued to all needy persons.
3. That immediate steps be taken to improve housing, and provide sewage facilities in Black Communities.
4. Employ Black workers in Welfare Offices.
5. Influence Banks to train Black Tellers and other workers.
6. Employ Black persons in FHA office, Employment office, Post Office, and all other Federal establishments within the vicinity of Barnwell, South Carolina including Business Office at the Hospital.
7. Hire Blacks as Cashiers, Secretaries,

Clerks, etc., in Every business and office in City Hall and Courthouse where Black people spend money.

8. Employ Black Workgang (Chaingang) Guard.

9. Influence and support the appointment of six Black Deputy Registrars for Barnwell County. Williston—2, Blackville—2, and Barnwell—2.

10. Remove "Colored" and "White" signs from Courthouse downstairs. "White" is still over the drinking fountain in 1970.

11. Pave streets, build sidewalks, and properly light all Black communities.

12. Employ at least three full-time Black Policemen.

13. Encourage use of courtesy titles preceding names of Black Adult citizens.

14. Provide recreational facilities for all citizens.

15. Influence Doctors to eliminate double waiting rooms.

16. Chairs and seating places at Barnwell Hospital should be moved from room formerly labeled "Colored Entrance".

17. Employ Teachers of Barnwell for positions before Teachers are brought in from beyond the borders of Barnwell County.

18. Employ a Black Deputy Sheriff.

19. Influence Plant Managers to promote Black workers to positions of "Supervisor".

20. Move Voter Registration Office from back of building near Magistrate's office to front of building using proper title, VOTER REGISTRATION OFFICE, and open office on Saturdays all day instead of being closed.

21. Execute Compulsory School Attendance Law beginning with the 1970-71 school session.

22. Employ a Black Game Warden.

23. Express desire to organize a Human Relations Council that would be affiliated with the South Carolina Council on Human Relations.

24. Appoint at least two (2) Black persons to School Board of Education.

25. Appoint at least two (2) Black persons to City Council.

26. Appoint at least three (3) Black persons to the County Commission.

27. Employ a Black Clerk in the Voter Registration Office.

28. Post "Children Playing" signs to protect children on streets where Black citizens reside.

We are expecting a reply on, or before March 4, 1970.

O'BERTHA J. BARFIELD,  
 President, Barnwell Branch, NAACP.

**COURT DECISION ON FOOD-AID PROGRAMS**

**HON. PAUL FINDLEY**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, subsequent to my request of the Department of Agriculture on January 28, 1970, to withdraw its opposition to a court order requiring that Federal food-aid programs for poor families be established in 88 Texas counties, the U.S. district court denied the Government's motion for a stay of the order, meaning that food-aid programs soon will be made available in these Texas counties.

It was reported at the recent National Agriculture Outlook Conference, I am pleased to say, the Department of Agri-

culture has adopted a goal of getting food-aid programs underway in all counties of the Nation by June 30, 1970. Currently there are 258 counties in the Nation which do not offer food programs to the poor which will hopefully soon be providing these poor families with the benefits of this program.

The Department of Agriculture deserves applause for its goal and I sincerely hope it can complete even sooner the task of bringing these needed programs to the counties currently without them.

Although the court order was in regard to the 88 Texas counties not at that time sponsoring a food-aid program, many counties outside the State of Texas were so classified. The fact that 258 counties were reported at the Agriculture Outlook Conference as not having food-aid programs is shameful. Here is a list of the counties by State which were reported to not have food-aid programs underway:

Colorado: Douglas, Jackson, Pitkin.

Florida: Charlotte, Citrus, Flagler, Indian River, Marion, Martin, Nassau, Osceola, Putnam, St. Johns.

Kansas: Barber, Brown, Butler, Chase, Cheyenne, Clay, Cloud, Coffey, Comanche, Doniphan, Edwards, Ellis, Finney, Geary, Gove, Gray, Greeley, Harvey, Haskell, Jewell, Kiowa, Lane, Logan, Marion, Marshall, Mitchell, Morton, Nemaha, Ness, Norton, Osage, Osborne, Ottawa, Pawnee, Pottawatomie, Pratt, Rawlins, Republic, Rice, Riley, Rooks, Rush, Russell, Scott, Seward, Sheridan, Smith, Stafford, Stanton, Stevens, Sumner, Thomas, Trego, Wabaunsee, Wallace, Washington, Wichita.

Louisiana: Bossier, Plaquemines, Terrebonne.

Massachusetts: Barnstable, Dukes, Nantucket.

Minnesota: Clay, Dodge, Fillmore, Martin, Olmsted, Watonwan, Wilkin, Winona.

Missouri: Andrew, Atchison, Audrain, Barton, Bates, Boone, Callaway, Camden, Carroll, Cass, Cedar, Chariton, Cole, Cooper, Crawford, Franklin, Gasconade, Henry, Holt, Howard, Jasper, Johnson, Laclede, Lafayette, Macon, Miller, Monticau, Morgan, Pettis, Phelps, Platte, Pulaski, Ray.

Montana: Carbon, Golden Valley, Madison, Stillwater.

Nebraska: Grant, Red Willow, Saline, Kimball, Polk, Sioux.

Nevada: Esmeralda, Storey.

North Carolina: Randolph.

North Dakota: Bowman, Renville, Slope.

Ohio: Fairfield, Hancock, Putnam.

Oklahoma: Beaver, Harmon, Major, Woods.

Texas: Andrews, Aransas, Archer, Armstrong, Bailey, Bandera, Baylor, Bell, Blanco, Borden, Bosque, Bowie, Briscoe, Castro, Clay, Coleman, Collin, Collingsworth, Colorado, Concho, Coryell, Crane, Crockett, Deaf Smith, Denton, Donley, Ector, Edwards, Ellis, Erath, Fort Bend, Garza, Gillespie, Glasscock, Gray, Gregg, Hall, Hansford, Harrison, Hartley, Hood, Hopkins, Jack, Johnson, Kaufman, Kendall, Kenedy, Kerr, Lamar, Lampasas, Llano, Loving, McCulloch, McMullen, Mason, Menard, Mills, Navarro, Ochiltree, Oldham, Palo Pinto, Farmer, Presidio, Randall, Reagan, Reeves, Refugio, Roberts, Rockwell, Runnels, Rusk, San Saba, Shackelford, Sherman, Somervell, Stephens, Sterling, Sutton, Throckmorton, Uvalde, Van Zandt, Wheeler, Winkler, Wise, Wood, Yoakum, Young.

Virginia: Alleghany, Augusta, Bedford, Botetourt, Campbell, Chesterfield, Clarke, Culpepper, Fauquier, Frederick, Hanover, Henrico, James City, King George, King William, Lancaster, Loudoun, Mathews, New

Kent, Orange, Prince George, Pulaski, Rockingham, Shenandoah, Spotsylvania, Stafford, Wisconsin: Green Lake, Jefferson, Walworth.

Below is my correspondence with the Department of Agriculture in which I suggested that it withdraw its opposition to the court order and the subsequent reply by the Department of Agriculture:

JANUARY 27, 1970.

HON. CLIFFORD M. HARDIN,  
Secretary of Agriculture,  
Department of Agriculture,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On December 30, 1969, the District Court for the Northern District of Texas in Dallas added its weight to the growing concern of those who would, to use President Nixon's phrase, "put an end to hunger in America for all time."

The court ordered that the Commodity Distribution Program should "immediately" be put into effect, "in the shortest time feasible and at Federal expense" in 88 Texas counties which have no federal food-aid program. The court further stated that "as an outside limit, the Federal defendants, in every Texas area that has no Food Stamp Program, must put into effect the Commodity Distribution Program within sixty (60) days from January 5, 1970."

The Department of Agriculture has requested the Justice Department to ask the court for a stay in executing its order. The justification given has been the laudable desire by the Department of Agriculture to place federal food-aid programs in cooperating counties willing to administer and finance the programs locally. This emphasis on the preservation of federalism is important, but in this case I suggest it be set aside in the interest of the hungry and malnourished people in the 88 counties.

My suggestion has urgency because this Friday, January 30, a hearing has been scheduled in Texas on the motion to postpone the court order.

In my view, local officials in Texas, like others elsewhere, have richly deserved pressures aimed at persuading them at long last to recognize minimal basic necessities for people in their jurisdictions by implementing federal food-aid programs for poor families.

Even before the Federal Court order, the Department had adequate justification to bring every possible pressure against these county governments. I am gratified by reports showing that during the past year your Department has actively been encouraging the missing counties to participate. It is to your credit that in fiscal 1969, for the first time in over a decade, every penny of the section 32 funds available for implementing surplus distribution programs has been spent by the Department of Agriculture, and none was returned to the treasury. As recently as 1968, well over \$200 million available for this food-aid program was unspent by Washington.

After a year's renewed effort, however, 88 Texas counties still have neither the food stamp nor the surplus distribution program. From this I would conclude that the cooperative spirit of the new federalism so admirably displayed by President Nixon and by the Department you head has been frustrated and bankrupted by local county officials, not by officials in Washington.

Accordingly, I strongly urge that you withdraw opposition to the court order. In making this recommendation, I am aware that this will enable the county governments to escape the cost of administration. Conceivably, causing the court to withdraw the order might mean that one or more of these counties will voluntarily initiate food-aid programs and thus pay the cost of administration.

This probability must be evaluated in light of the long-standing, callous indifference of these officials to local poverty. They have resisted all pressures up to now, and are unlikely to acquire a social sensitivity in the next few months. Meanwhile, hunger and malnutrition continue. A few months may be but a speck of time for government budget-makers, but it can seem like an eternity for those without enough food on the table.

I make this suggestion for another reason too.

You are of course aware that some aspects of the farm programs are in wide disrepute in the public mind and on Capitol Hill. Resentment against programs which permit large payments to individual farmers has grown over the years. This resentment is intensified by disclosure of payments totaling millions of dollars in the very counties which refuse to feed the hungry through participation in a federal food-aid program. Congressmen, urban and rural alike, find it difficult to justify large payments to wealthy farmers for not growing food while many of their constituents go hungry.

Attached to this letter is a list of the 88 Texas counties which still refuse to institute a food-aid program, together with data on the level of local poverty, as well as payments to farmers. These statistics show convincingly the need for a realignment of priorities and justify the concern and resentment of Congressmen dissatisfied with farm programs inherited from previous administrations.

When I placed similar information in the Congressional Record in May of 1969—now almost one year ago—98 Texas counties were without any type of food-aid program, yet wealthy farmers in those counties were receiving huge farm payments. Lynn County, Texas, had the dubious distinction of having no program to feed 2,282 hard-core poor—about 25 percent of the county's population—while at the same time another 25 percent of the population constituted families which received \$8,903,000 in federal farm payments.

The next morning after I revealed these facts, "The Dallas Morning News" headlined the story "Texas Food-Aid Situation Deteriorated." Today, I am very glad to report Lynn County has a federal food-aid program. Thanks to the publicity and the persistent efforts of USDA since last May, Lynn County and nine other Texas counties have initiated food-aid programs.

Some progress has been made, but not enough. There are still many "Lynn Counties" in Texas. In the case of Hartley County, which still has no food-aid program, if annual payments to individual farmers in excess of \$5,000 were divided equally among the hard-core poor, each man, woman, and child would receive over \$18,000. In two other counties, Armstrong and Sherman, each poor individual would receive over \$14,000.

It has been 35 years since Congress first enacted a program to help feed the hungry in this country. It has been almost a year since the specific counties without food-aid programs received widespread publicity. Despite the passage of a third-century, and despite all the publicity, many counties obstinately refuse to help feed their poor, hungry, and malnourished citizens. Federal policies which permit hunger to exist alongside big federal payments to keep wealthy farmers from growing food are bound to create resentment.

Therefore, I urge you to reconsider the Department's position requesting a stay of execution of the court order so that the Department can move immediately to begin implementing federal food-aid programs in each Texas county which presently does not have one. I applaud you for your goal to lodge at the local level primary responsibility for financing and control of the food-aid program,

but involved here are die-hard political combines which obviously are sensitive neither to embarrassing publicity nor to the hunger of their needy constituents. The hungry should not have to wait for the resolution of differences between local, state, and federal officials. They have waited long enough, as the Commodity Distribution Program has been universally available since 1935.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL FINDLEY,  
Representative in Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
OFFICE OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY,  
Washington, D.C., February 12, 1970.

HON. PAUL FINDLEY,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. FINDLEY: Secretary Hardin has asked me to reply to your recent letter regarding the bringing of a Food Program to all of the counties in Texas.

By this time you are aware of the fact that on January 30 U.S. District Court Judge W. H. Taylor, Jr., after argument, denied the Government's motion for a stay of his order of December 30, 1969.

The Department of Agriculture is making every effort to comply with the order, working closely with State officials. We are happy to note progress. We are informed that 10 additional counties have just recently agreed to operate a Food Program in their area and indications are that additional counties will be coming in shortly.

Our program for having all counties with a program by June 30, 1970 still remains as our attainable goal.

We appreciate your interest and solicit your help.

Sincerely,

RICHARD LYNG,  
Assistant Secretary.

THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT SURE  
MISSED A "NATURAL"

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, my good friend, JOHN SAYLOR, the distinguished Congressman from Pennsylvania does not mind a little ribbing from his Democratic colleagues from time to time and today I think I have found the perfect vehicle.

I want to bring to our colleagues' attention an article by Edith Kermit Roosevelt which mentions Congressman SAYLOR in glowing terms. The subject of the article is Secretary Hickel's incredible decision regarding grazing fees on our public lands and how Congressman SAYLOR justifiably read the riot act to the Secretary. Just to make my own position clear, I wholeheartedly agree with the Roosevelt and Saylor statements on the Secretary's decision.

But that is not the end of the story. Above and beyond the fact of the article is another vignette which points up an interesting lesson about Republicans and government or more specifically, Republicans and the Department of Interior.

On relatively good authority, I have learned that Miss Roosevelt sought a position with the Nixon administration in

the Department of the Interior. To think that the lifelong registered Republican granddaughter of President Theodore Roosevelt could not get a job with a Republican administration is almost too hard to believe. Considering that Miss Roosevelt could not get a job with a Republican—her article proves that—but has an impressive professional and technical background in conservation and environmental matters that is the envy of conservationists everywhere, it is laughable that such a talent was refused a position in the Department that the Secretary claims will lead the fight to clean up the Nation's environment. I guess we can say that the administration's loss is the public's gain for her incisive comments on conservation matters are now read by thousands through her syndicated column.

Since I am sure the public will tire of its flirtation with the "conservationists" in this administration, I want to express to Miss Roosevelt my pledge to do everything in my power to assure her of a responsible position in the Interior Department after the 1972 elections. One has to admit that she has the perfect name for the next Democratic administration.

I know my friend from Pennsylvania will not mind this dig at his party's new-found conservation concern. I know from a long and fruitful association with him that he has been years ahead of his party on matters affecting the natural environment, and as a member of the majority party, I can only add that I am glad he has been.

Miss Roosevelt's article from the Shreveport Journal follows:

ANTIPUBLIC DECISION—GRAZING FEES  
(By Edith Kermit Roosevelt)

WASHINGTON.—If the President's goal of improving the environment is to be more than a slogan, policy must serve the long-range needs of all our people. Decisions must not cater to special economic interests for their own short-range benefits.

This is especially the case in dealing with the public lands of the West which can serve multiple recreation, conservation and development uses. These scenic and scientifically valuable millions of acres in Arizona, Utah, Idaho, or any Western state are no less a natural resource than the Everglades, Yellowstone, the Redwoods or any other truly national responsibility.

The Western public lands are the habitat of three-fourths of our major big-game animals and most of the cold water species of fish. They provide more than 112,000,000 visitor days of outdoor recreation annually and the volume of recreation use is increasing yearly. In addition, these federally owned lands have a clearly recognized potential for watershed production and soil conservation as well as for renewable resources, such as timber.

Under Democratic and Republican Administrations alike, the Western lands in the public domain have been shamefully neglected and exploited because government decisions concerning them have served mining, grazing and other special economic interests instead of the public as a whole. We have created a regulatory and policy-making monstrosity where the fox guards the chicken coop.

As an example, we have the recent decision by the Department of the Interior not to raise grazing fees this year in the national

forests in the 11 Western states and on the public domain lands that it administers. Under a 10-year schedule announced in January of 1969, grazing fees were to be increased from 44 cents a month per animal to 55 cents. A Department of Agriculture study shows this was justified. As is well known, the income received by our public agencies from the grazing resources on the nation's public lands is far short of the revenue received by state and private owners of similar lands.

Had the moratorium on grazing fees for 1970 not been put into effect, existing policy would have enabled the Interior Department to return one-third of the 13 cents per animal increase in grazing fees to the public lands for conservation. This would have served not only to protect and develop these acres but also provided for more grazing.

Who stands to gain from the Interior Department's anti-public decision?

According to Sen. Clinton P. Anderson (D-N. Mex.), a member of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, just a little over 3 per cent of those using Bureau of Land Management grazing permits will receive about 45 per cent or nearly half of the benefits in savings arising from Interior Secretary Walter J. Hickel's decision to abandon the scheduled increase in grazers' fees. On Feb. 3 of this month, Anderson flatly declared on the Senate floor:

"Only a handful of the richest rangers will benefit from this decision."

Rep. John P. Saylor, the conservationist minded Republican from Pennsylvania, charged in a strongly worded telegram to Hickel that the Administration had broken its pledge to the American people and surrendered to profit and political pressures. He went on to say:

"These public lands are not the private domain of the grazers but belong to all the American people. Your decision is unworthy of the Interior Department's responsibility to the people."

Saylor's indignation is understandable in view of the fact that the federal government stands to lose \$1,476,000 in fiscal 1971 on account of Hickel's decision. This means that the U.S. Treasury will be that much poorer at a time when we are being told that every dollar counts and that the government must make every effort to have its income equal or exceed its outgo.

There are specific losses to the already eroded Western range land. As a result of failure to increase the grazing fees, the Range Improvement Fund will lose \$877,000 in 1971, according to data furnished by the Interior Department. Therefore, ranchers will be denied a chance to put an additional 41,414 head of livestock on reseeded acreage on the public range.

Ranchers and those concerned with watershed conservation and wildlife programs have long supported programs of range improvement. In this case, conservation is best for the ranchers who rent the public land as well as every family downstream. They recognize that a well-managed rangeland with a good cover of grass is a basic investment in controlling erosion and water pollution.

Figures furnished by the Department of the Interior on rangeland conditions reveal the consequences of the lack of a progressive land-use and management policy. A total of 49,600,000 acres or 31 per cent of acres of public range, is in poor or bad condition while 22,400,000 acres, or 14 per cent, is still declining. As Representative Saylor has pointed out:

"Declarations, plans, program and other bureaucratic mumbo-jumbo about protecting the environment are cheap. However, actions such as the grazing fee for moratorium decision is immediately chargeable against the public's account."

## A BASIS FOR DRAFT REFORM

## HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the report of the President's Commission on an All-Volunteer Armed Force issued recently is required reading as Congress prepares to debate reform of the military draft system. In my judgment, the Commission proposes several sound recommendations that should be incorporated in draft reform legislation:

First. The draft should be ended, and reliance for national defense in peacetime be placed on an all-volunteer Armed Forces.

Second. A standby draft system should be established, but only activated by consent of the Congress.

Third. Improvement in military service condition and recruiting efforts should be implemented to increase the attraction of the Armed Forces to volunteers.

Many of the Commission's recommendations are embodied in legislation I have proposed to the Congress in H.R. 14529.

The Commission, ably chaired by former Defense Secretary Thomas S. Gates, Jr., has marshaled an impressive array of arguments and statistical material to support its recommendations.

At the outset of its report, the Commission states its working philosophy:

The United States has relied throughout its history on a voluntary armed force except during major wars and since 1948. A return to an all-volunteer force will strengthen our freedoms, remove an inequity now imposed on the expression of the patriotism that has never been lacking among our youth, promote the efficiency of the armed forces, and enhance their dignity. It is the system for maintaining standing forces that minimizes government interference with the freedom of the individual to determine his own life in accord with his values.

The Commission bases its judgments on long-range considerations of what method of recruiting manpower will strengthen our society's foundations. The Commission's members have reached agreement on their recommendations only as the result of prolonged study and searching debate, and in spite of initial division. We are, of course, fully aware of the current and frequently emotional public debate on national priorities, foreign policy, and the military, but are agreed that such issues stand apart from the question of when and how to end conscription.

One of the Commission's most important findings is that to maintain an all-volunteer armed force of 2.5 million men—about the size before the Vietnam war began—would require inducing an additional 75,000 men each year to enlist in the military service. This expansion would supplement the 250,000 volunteers now joining annually.

Reasonable improvements in pay and benefits for the early years of service should expand the enlistment ranks by this number without difficulty. As the Commission observes, such improvements are called for in any case on grounds of equity alone. Pay for officers and men in the early years of service is disproportionately low and the gap between their

pay and comparable civilian salaries is inordinately wide.

In a particularly commendable chapter of the report, the commission tackles the job of answering most of the arguments raised by opponents of an all-volunteer armed force, and succeeds admirably. I offer this important section of the report for my colleagues' consideration:

## THE DEBATE

"We have lived with the draft so long," President Nixon has pointed out, "that too many of us accept it as normal and necessary." Over the past generation, social, political, and economic arrangements have grown up around conscription that touch our lives in a great many ways. The elimination of the draft will inevitably disrupt these arrangements and may be disturbing to some. But beyond these narrow, often overlooked interests lie broader considerations which have prompted defenders of conscription to argue that an all-volunteer armed force will have a variety of undesirable political, social, and military effects.

In our meetings we have discussed the opposing arguments extensively. As our recommendations disclose, we have unanimously concluded that the arguments for an all-volunteer force are much the stronger. Yet, there can be no question of the sincerity and earnest conviction of those who hold the views we have rejected. In fairness to them, and to acquaint the Nation with both sides of the issues, this chapter summarizes the main arguments raised against the volunteer force and offers answers to them. In succeeding chapters (noted in parentheses) these arguments are taken up in detail.

A general point should be made here. The elimination of conscription admittedly is a major social change, but it will not produce a major change in the personnel of our armed forces. The majority of men serving today are volunteers. And many who are now conscripted would volunteer once improvements were made in pay and other conditions of service. Therefore, the difference between an all-volunteer force and a mixed force of conscripts and volunteers is limited to that minority who would not serve unless conscripted and who would not volunteer in the absence of conscription. An all-volunteer force will attract men who are not now conscripted and who do not now volunteer but who will do so when military service imposes less of a financial penalty than it currently does.

Contrary to much dramatic argument, the reality is that an all-volunteer force will be manned largely by the same kind of individuals as today's armed forces. The men who serve will be quite similar in patriotism, political attitudes, effectiveness, and susceptibility to civilian control. The draft does not guarantee the quality of our armed forces, and neither will voluntarism. There are no simple solutions or shortcuts in dealing with the complex problems that must always concern us as a free people.

Arguments against an all-volunteer force fall into fairly distinct, though sometimes overlapping categories, one of which is feasibility. Summarized below are some of the main objections under this heading.

Objection 1: An all-volunteer force will be very costly—so costly the Nation cannot afford it.

Answer: The question of how much the armed forces cost is confused with the question of who bears those costs. It is true that the budget for a voluntary force will generally be higher than for an equally effective force of conscripts and volunteers; but the cost of the voluntary force will be less than the cost of the mixed force. This apparent paradox arises because some of the costs of a mixed force are hidden and never appear in the budget.

Under the present system, first-term servicemen must bear a disproportionately large share of the defense burden. Draftees and draft-induced volunteers are paid less than they would require to volunteer. The loss they suffer is a tax-in-kind which for budget purposes is never recorded as a receipt or an expenditure. We estimate that for draftees and draft-induced volunteers the total tax amounts to \$2 billion per year; an average of \$3,600 per man. If Government accounts reflected as income this financial penalty imposed on first-term servicemen, it would become clear that a voluntary force costs less than a mixed force. One example of real cost savings that will accrue is the reduction in training costs as a result of the lower personnel turnover of a voluntary force.

Conscription also imposes social and human costs by distorting the personal life and career plans of the young and by forcing society to deal with such difficult problems as conscientious objection (chapter 3).

Objection 2: The all-volunteer force will lack the flexibility to expand rapidly in times of sudden crises.

Answer: Military preparedness depends on forces in being, not on the ability to draft untrained men. Reserve forces provide immediate support to active forces, while the draft provides only inexperienced civilians who must be organized, trained, and equipped before they can become effective soldiers and sailors—a process which takes many months. The Commission has recommended a standby draft which can be put into effect promptly if circumstances require mobilization of large numbers of men. History shows that Congress has quickly granted the authority to draft when needed (chapter 10).

Others contend that an all-volunteer force will have undesirable political and social effects. Some of these objections are given below.

Objection 3: An all-volunteer force will undermine patriotism by weakening the traditional belief that each citizen has a moral responsibility to serve his country.

Answer: Compelling service through a draft undermines respect for government by forcing an individual to serve when and in the manner the government decides, regardless of his own values and talents. Clearly, not all persons are equally suited for military service—some are simply not qualified. When not all our citizens can serve, and only a small minority are needed, a voluntary decision to serve is the best answer, morally and practically, to the question of who should serve (chapters 3 and 12).

Objection 4: The presence of draftees in a mixed force guards against the growth of a separate military ethos, which could pose a threat to civilian authority, our freedom, and our democratic institutions.

Answer: Historically, voluntary service and freedom have gone hand in hand. In the United States and England, where voluntarism has been used most consistently, there is also the strongest tradition of civilian control of the military. There are responsibilities to be met in maintaining civilian control, but they must be exercised from above rather than at the lowest level of the enlisted ranks. They reside in the Halls of Congress, and in the White House as well as in the military hierarchy.

In either a mixed or volunteer force, the attitudes of the officer corps are the preponderant factor in the psychology of the military; and with or without the draft, professional officers are recruited voluntarily from a variety of regional and socioeconomic backgrounds. It is hard to believe that substituting a true volunteer for a draftee or a draft-induced volunteer in one of every six positions will so alter the military as to threaten the tradition of civilian control, which is embodied in the Constitution and deeply felt by the public. It is even less credible when one considers that



this substitution will occur at the lowest level of the military ladder, among first-term enlisted men and officers, and that turnover of these first-term personnel in an all-volunteer force will be approximately three-fourths of that in a comparable mixed force.

The truth is, we already have a large professional armed force amounting to over 2 million men. The existing loyalties and political influence of that force cannot be materially changed by eliminating conscription in the lowest ranks (chapter 12).

Objection 5: The higher pay required for a voluntary force will be especially appealing to blacks who have relatively poorer civilian opportunities. This, combined with higher reenlistment rates for blacks, will mean that a disproportionate number of blacks will be in military service. White enlistments and re-enlistments might decline, thus leading to an all-black enlisted force. Racial tensions would grow because of white apprehension at this development and black resentment at bearing an undue share of the burden of defense. At the same time, some of the most qualified young blacks would be in the military—not in the community where their talents are needed.

Answer: The frequently heard claim that a volunteer force will be all black or all that, simply has no basis in fact. Our research indicates that the composition of the armed forces will not be fundamentally changed by ending conscription. Negroes presently make up 10.6 percent of the armed forces, slightly less than the proportion of blacks in the Nation. Our best projections for the future are that blacks will be about 14 percent of the enlisted men in a conscripted force totalling 2.5 million officers and men, and 15 percent in an all-volunteer force of equal capability. For the Army, we estimate that the proportion of blacks will be 17 percent for the mixed force and 18 percent for the voluntary force as compared to 12.8 percent in the Army today. To be sure, these are estimates, but even extreme assumptions would not change the figures drastically.

If higher pay does make opportunities in an all-volunteer force more attractive to some particular group than those in civilian life, then the appropriate course is to correct the discriminations in civilian life—not introduce additional discriminations against such a group.

The argument that blacks would bear an unfair share of the burden of an all-volunteer force confounds service by free choice with compulsory service. With conscription, some blacks are compelled to serve at earnings below what they would earn in the civilian economy. Blacks who join a voluntary force presumably have decided for themselves that military service is preferable to the other alternatives available to them. They regard military service as a more rewarding opportunity, not as a burden. Denial of this opportunity would reflect either bias or a paternalistic belief that blacks are not capable of making the "right" decisions concerning their lives (chapter 12).

Objection 6: Those joining an all-volunteer force will be men from the lowest economic classes, motivated primarily by monetary rewards rather than patriotism. An all-volunteer force will be manned, in effect, by mercenaries.

Answer: Again, our research indicates that an all-volunteer force will not differ significantly from the current force of conscripts and volunteers. Maintenance of current mental, physical, and moral standards for enlistment will ensure that a better paid, volunteer force will not recruit an undue proportion of youths, from disadvantaged socioeconomic backgrounds. A disproportionate fraction of the 30 percent presently unable to meet these standards come from such backgrounds, and these men would also be

ineligible for service in an all-volunteer force. Increasing military pay in the first term of service will increase the attractiveness of military service more to those who have higher civilian earnings potential than to those who have lower civilian potential. Military pay is already relatively attractive to those who have very poor civilian alternatives. If eligible, such individuals are now free to enlist and, moreover, are free to remain beyond their first term of service when military pay is even more attractive.

Finally, how will "mercenaries" suddenly emerge in the armed forces as a result of better pay and other conditions of service? The term "mercenary" applies to men who enlist for pay alone, usually in the service of a foreign power, and precludes all other motives for serving. Those who volunteer to serve in the armed forces do so for a variety of reasons, including a sense of duty. Eliminating the financial penalty first-term servicemen presently suffer, and improving other conditions of service, will not suddenly change the motives and basic attitudes of new recruits. Also, can we regard as mercenaries the career commissioned and non-commissioned officers now serving beyond their first term? (chapter 12).

Objection 7: An all-volunteer force would stimulate foreign military adventures, foster an irresponsible foreign policy, and lessen civilian concern about the use of military forces.

Answer: Decisions by a government to use force or to threaten the use of force during crises are extremely difficult. The high cost of military resources, the moral burden of risking human lives, political costs at home and overseas, and the overshadowing risk of nuclear confrontation—these and other factors enter into such decisions. It is absurd to argue that issues of such importance would be ignored and the decision for war made on the basis of whether our forces were entirely voluntary or mixed.

To the extent that there is pressure to seek military solutions to foreign policy problems, such pressure already exists and will not be affected by ending conscription. The volunteer force will have the same professional leadership as the present mixed force. Changes in the lower ranks will not alter the character of this leadership or the degree of civilian control.

A decision to use the all-volunteer force will be made according to the same criteria as the decision to use a mixed force of conscripts and volunteers because the size and readiness of the two forces will be quite similar. These military factors are key determinants in any decision to commit forces. Beyond initial commitment, the policy choice between expanding our forces by conscription or by voluntary enlistment is the same for both the all-volunteer force and a mixed force of conscripts and volunteers. The important difference between the two forces lies in the necessity for political debate before returning to conscription. With the all-volunteer force, the President can seek authorization to activate the standby draft, but Congress must give its consent. With the mixed system, draft calls can be increased by the President. The difference between the two alternatives is crucial. The former will generate public discussion of the use of the draft to fight a war; the latter can be done without such public discussion. If the need for conscription is not clear, such discussion will clarify the issue, and the draft will be used only if public support is widespread (chapter 12).

Other critics of an all-volunteer force argue that it will gradually erode the military's effectiveness. Some of their main concerns are listed below.

Objection 8: A voluntary force will be less effective because not enough highly qualified youths will be likely to enlist and pursue military careers. As the quality of serv-

icemen declines, the prestige and dignity of the services will also decline and further intensify recruiting problems.

Answer: The Commission has been impressed by the number and quality of the individuals who, despite conscription, now choose a career in the military. The fact that we must resort in part to coercion to man the armed services must be a serious deterrent to potential volunteers. A force made up of men freely choosing to serve should enhance the dignity and prestige of the military. Every man in uniform will be serving as a matter of choice rather than coercion.

The Commission recognizes the importance of recruiting and retaining qualified individuals. It has recommended improved basic compensation and conditions of service, proficiency pay and accelerated promotions for the highly skilled to make military career opportunities more attractive. These improvements, combined with an intensive recruiting effort, should enable the military not only to maintain a high quality force but also to have one that is more experienced, better motivated, and has higher morale (chapters 4, 5, 7, and 12).

Objection 9: The defense budget will not be increased to provide for an all-volunteer force, and the Department of Defense will have to cut back expenditures in other areas. Even if additional funds are provided initially, competing demands will, over the long term, force the Department of Defense to absorb the added budgetary expense of an all-volunteer force. The result could be a potentially serious deterioration of the nation's overall military posture.

Answer: Ultimately, the size of the military budget and the strength of our armed forces depend upon public attitudes toward national defense. Since World War II, our peacetime armed forces have been consistently supported at high levels. The public has supported large forces because it has felt them essential to national security. The change from a mixed force of volunteers and conscripts to an all-volunteer force cannot significantly change that feeling.

The contention that an all-volunteer force is undesirable because it would result in smaller defense forces raises a serious issue regarding the conduct of government in a democracy. Conscription obscures a part of the cost of providing manpower for defense. When that cost is made explicit, taxpayers may decide they prefer a smaller defense force. If so, the issue has been resolved openly, in accord with the Constitution, and in the best tradition of the democratic process. Those who then argue that too little is being devoted to national defense are saying that they are unwilling to trust the open democratic process; that, if necessary, a hidden tax should be imposed to support the forces they believe are necessary (chapters 3 and 12).

Finally, Mr. Speaker, there is the matter of ending the draft and providing for future emergencies. My bill calls for a 3-year phaseout of the draft by the end of 1972 and provides that Congress, not the executive, must control the mechanism for activating a standby draft system if required in time of national emergency or war.

The Commission's plan for a standby draft and its arguments for congressional reactivation of the system closely parallel mine. In my judgment, this section of the report is another that deserves to be especially highlighted and I herewith submit it for insertion in the Record:

Heeding its directive, the Commission has considered "what standby machinery for the draft will be required in the event of a national emergency." The Commission recom-

March 2, 1970

mends that legislation be enacted to provide, once an all-volunteer force is in effect:

1. A register of all males who might be conscripted when essential for national security.
2. A system for selection of inductees.
3. Specific procedures for the notification, examination and induction of those to be conscripted.
4. An organization to maintain the register and administer the procedures for induction.
5. That a standby draft system can be invoked only by resolution of Congress at the request of the President.

Because there have been several recent studies of the operation of the Selective Service System, we have not undertaken a re-examination of that subject. Instead, we have formulated our recommendations for standby draft machinery in fairly general terms, which would be consistent with a wide range of specific systems.

Clearly the task of creating and maintaining a state of military preparedness capable of dealing with threats to the nation's security is a vital one. The nation's military readiness is both actual and potential: active duty personnel are prepared to act instantaneously; able-bodied but untrained and unorganized civilian males are potential servicemen. This spectrum of manpower can be divided into three groups in descending order of their state of readiness: (1) active duty personnel, (2) reserves, and (3) civilians. In planning standby draft machinery, it is important to recognize that conscription is relevant only to the civilian population.

The rationale for providing a standby draft is the possible urgent need for the nation to act quickly. It is clear, however, that a standby draft will not supply effective military forces in being. All it can provide is a basis for acquiring eligible manpower who must be trained, organized and equipped. Effective forces can be available only to the extent that men are organized, trained and equipped prior to an emergency. Under current military policy, should a crisis arise, it is the function of the Reserves to provide the first stage in the expansion of effective forces. They are organized and at least partly trained and equipped; hence they can be operationally ready in a shorter time than new forces. The function of a standby draft is to provide manpower resources for the second stage of expansion in effective forces.

Much thought lies behind the recommendation that Congressional approval be required to invoke conscription. An important issue of national policy is obviously involved. The alternative is to endow the Office of the President with the independent power to call for activation of the standby machinery. This has been rejected for several reasons.

Conscription should be used only when the size of forces required for the security of the nation cannot be supplied by the existing system. If Congressional approval is made a prerequisite to the use of conscription, the necessity for legislative action will guarantee public discussion of the propriety of whatever action is under consideration. If discussion yields a reasonable consensus, the nation's resolve will be clearly demonstrated and made less vulnerable to subsequent erosion. If a consensus sufficient to induce Congress to activate the draft cannot be mustered, the President would see the depth of national division *before*, rather than after, committing U.S. military power.

A standby system which authorizes the President to invoke the draft at his discretion would capture the worst of two worlds. On the one hand, it would make it possible for the President to become involved in military actions with a minimum of public debate and popular support. On the other

hand, once the nation was involved, especially in a prolonged limited conflict, the inequities of the draft would provide a convenient rallying point for opposition to the policy being pursued.

It is important to emphasize that Congress has not been reluctant to enact a draft when the President has requested it. In the first World War, the United States declared war on April 1, 1917, the draft law was requested by President Wilson on April 7, and it was signed into law on May 18. Prior to World War II a draft bill was introduced into Congress on June 20, 1940, endorsed by the President on August 2, passed on September 14, and signed into law September 16. When the Korean War broke out on June 24, 1950, debate on extension of the selective service law had been underway for some months. Congress promptly discontinued debate and extended the law for one year on July 9.

Because of the loss of personal freedom and the inequities inherent in conscription, the draft should be resorted to only in extreme situations. If the Office of the President has the power to use the draft, there will be pressures to do so when circumstances do not warrant it. The viability of an all-volunteer force ultimately depends upon the willingness of Congress, the President, the Department of Defense and the military services to maintain (1) competitive levels of military compensation, (2) reasonable qualification standards, and (3) attractive conditions of military service. Under foreseeable circumstances, such as serious budget constraints, there is a danger that inaction by one or another of these parties might force the President to resort to conscription when it is not really necessary. If Congressional approval is made a prerequisite to use of the draft, the danger of using it unnecessarily or by default will be much reduced.

One of the fundamental principles embodied in the Constitution is that taxes are to be levied only by Congress. Since conscription is a form of taxation, the power to conscript is the power to tax. Therefore, it is in keeping with the intent of the Constitution to require Congressional approval for the activation of the standby draft.

Finally, requiring Congressional approval for activation of a standby draft will have little or no effect on the time required for the nation to bring effective military power to bear when needed. To repeat: conscription does not provide the nation with military forces in being. Effective flexibility in response to crisis can be achieved only to the extent that forces are already partly or wholly organized, trained and equipped. The draft is a vehicle for supplying men for gradual expansion, not for meeting sudden challenges. This has been true, for example, in Vietnam. Under our standby proposal, the delay introduced in expanding the forces with conscripts cannot exceed the time it takes for Congress to act. In practice the time lost will be even less: preparations for organizing, training and equipping recruits can proceed simultaneously with Congressional action.

#### MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

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

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,400 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

#### DOING WHAT IS POSSIBLE AS WHITE MEN

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Richard Hamilton of Evansville, Ind., is old fashioned. He still believes Christ meant what Christ said.

He even still believes what "America the Beautiful" says, "To crown our good with brotherhood."

Shelley wrote:

The great secret of morals is love. A man to be greatly good must imagine deeply and comprehensively, he must put himself in the place of another—of many others. The pleasures and pains of his specie must become his own.

The following sermon delivered by Rev. Richard E. Hamilton makes clear his knowledge of the great secret of morals:

#### DOING WHAT IS POSSIBLE AS WHITE MEN

(Sermon delivered at the Methodist Temple, Feb. 8, 1970, by Richard E. Hamilton)

"I appeal to you, my brothers. . . . bring a living offering to God. Put yourself wholly in his service. . . . Do not allow yourself to be governed by the norms of the world, but let yourself be transformed by God your mind and heart be fundamentally changed by him." (Romans 12)

The world has many ways of testing our faith. There is little question but that the middle decades of the 20th century have been and are presenting to the American churches a clear test of faith in the matter of racial change.

I am well aware that many of us are tired of being reminded that this is so. As a matter of fact both blacks and whites are tired of such talk. The black man is tired in the sense of impatient. He is saying, Get on with the action, or get out of the way. The time for talk has passed. The white man is often tired in the sense of fed-up, saying, We have heard too much about race. Let's drop it a while. Give us all a rest.

Who cannot understand that feeling? I can understand it. It is no easier to speak about the racial testing of our faith than it is to listen to it, and I have been speaking about it for 15 years. I have also been listening. I read the symptoms of fatigue of the conscience in many of us white men.

But to those who feel this way I can offer no solace and no respite. The testing of the church is not imaginary, not temporary, not superficial. It is real, it is deep, it cuts close to the heart of our commitment and it will remain a part of our Christian experience in the foreseeable future. It is a part of the duty and the burden of the church in our time. For the white Christian to say that he does not wish to hear more about it, is for the surgeon to say he is tired while the patient is still on the table, the policeman to punch out at the station time clock while the riot is still on, the athlete to relax in the third quarter or the mother to say, I'm tired, in the midst of childbirth.

Of course people are tired. Of course it is painful to continue. But some things cannot be suspended. Racial change is one such thing in our day. There is a dangerous mood in America and in the church today. It says, Let's let up; let's slow down. It is very attractive, very beguiling, and it is malignant. To ask to be excused is to deny our faith. We must say it kindly but we must say it firmly.

Many of you join me, I know, in the conviction that our responsibility in the name of Christ is great here. If we did not learn that from the New Testament, perhaps we have learned it from the newspaper. Together the two have convinced us.

But conviction and effective contribution are two different things. And the best intentioned persons are often frustrated or confused today. The disillusioned white man of good will who shakes his head at the last fifteen years of racial movement and says, Things were a lot more peaceful before all this started is right in his description if by peace you mean a situation without open conflict and in which everyone knows the rules. The problem is that now the rules have changed. But the reluctant white being dragged into the new world by his heels and the sympathetic white, wanting to help, are confused. Both sense that the rules have changed, but no one seems to have the new handbook.

As a result even those who want to help, sometimes do not know what is possible.

Perhaps we need to begin by reminding ourselves of what is not possible for us white men anymore.

It is not possible for us to decide unilaterally where and when and how changes in the racial patterns of our society will come about. For a long time we have done that. That all began to change on a hot day in 1956 in Montgomery when one tired black woman decided she would decide from then on where to sit on the bus. Ten years ago as Essie Lincoln writes this week in a religious sociologist viewpoint, the number of blacks who had ever voted in Mississippi could have been seated in a good sized camp meeting with nobody on the ground. Today nearly 100 blacks hold public office in Mississippi. So in a dozen different ways the black man is less and less ready to allow the white man to call the shots.

Second, it is no longer possible for the white man to relate to his black neighbor as benevolent uncle or kind boss man. The black will no longer tolerate that, nor will he allow us to fool ourselves about such relationships in the past. Dick Gregory, the black comedian and rebel, said several years ago that he thought the racial troubles in this country would soon be over because, he said, every white man he met said that some of his best friends were Negroes. There are still whites who do not hear the bitter irony in those words. Any white who understands at all what has happened in the past ten years will avoid referring to the "colored people" and will never again say, Some of my best friends are. . . Few ever had the right to say that. I grew up in the South. Mary was in our home often. She sometimes walked to the river with me to feed the ducks. She washed our clothes, cooked some of our food, soothed our skinned knees. She loved us and we loved her. But if I ever did, I could not now say with a clear conscience, Mary was my friend. A friend is a person you invite to sit in on your bridge club, one whose children are often in your home, one you go on a family camping trip with, one you drop in on unannounced.

Today's black is often saying, at least for the time being, Keep your friendship until we can meet as equals.

Nor can the white man assume any longer that the black man wants to be like him. The arrogance of that assumption is monumental.

The black man wants many of the things I want; he shares the elemental human concerns I have for food and security. But the black man knows today that he does not have to be white to be a man. As a white man I have to accept that.

But if we have to begin by knowing there are some things which are not possible for the white man today, we have to continue by searching for the things that are possible. There are many. I mention six quickly.

1. We can acknowledge our guilt. Why is this so difficult? Why do we hedge so? Next to the Bible which talks about lack of brotherhood as sin, I suppose the Kerner Report is the least favorite reading of white Christians. This high-level citizens report says that our two societies are the direct result of white racism. No one likes to feel guilty. But guilt acknowledged is the first step for the white man in doing what is possible. We are after all, responsible. This is our society. We made it what it is. If it is divided, we sowed the seeds. If it is violent, we failed to be makers of peace. If it is sick, we allowed wounds to fester. Christians ought to know that it is possible to do something about guilt. We might begin there, with confession.

Next, we can take risks in personal relationships. Let's acknowledge that we do not have "best friends," at least few of us do. But we can try to build a few bonds of real acquaintance and respect. This road is hazardous today. One may easily meet rebuke. But it can be done. Of course it will be a bit artificial at first, a bit forced. What new friendship isn't? Don't you remember your first blind date, or first meeting with the new business associate, or golfing partner at the club tournament? But personal relationships on real basis of equality of respect are crucial, and they are possible—not the condescending forms of being good to the unfortunates but genuine meeting of person to person, for the benefit of both.

Third, we as individuals, or groups of Christians, can continue to press for change where we are. The word is not wish for, but press for. You sell used cars? Is there a black salesman on your team? Your bank handles trust properties. Couldn't you do a bit more about housing integration? You're looking for an investment with social benefits? The University needs scholarship funds, particularly for blacks. You are a teacher, a PTA officer, a legislator, a service club member, a listener at the beauty shop. No, you cannot do it all. But you could do something.

It is not enough to wish the Negro well. He still needs the muscle and resources and commitment of white men who will stand with him. The Christian white man is called to press for change with all skill, with all understanding, but with full energy and muscle. If this is not so then I do not understand the New Testament. When my children read the history of the 1960s and 1970s in America and ask, Dad, what did you do back when the black Americans were struggling upward, I do not want to have to answer, I stood on the sideline and wished them well.

Fourth, it is possible for the white man to work to understand and to support the movement toward black identity and power. It surely goes without saying that not every voice from the black community is mature, not every voice is responsible. Was it Carl Stokes the black mayor of Cleveland or Richard Hatcher of Gary who said, "We must be given the right to make our own mistakes"? Blacks are no more consistent or unified or constantly tempered and wise than whites. But the dread and very deep stream of black self-consciousness are elemental human currents.

In fall of 1969, 14 black members of I.U. football team quit in mid season. Four returned after one week; ten left permanently.

Newspaper article quoting many of them contained these words from one of the starters, ". . . all we want is for people to respect us for what we are doing. No one seems to understand . . . even some of the white players don't understand. We were born black. We were not born football players. We can stop being football players, but we'll always be black."

"There comes a time when you have to ask yourself: Am I a man?! Black pride is more than a figure of speech.

"Sure, this whole thing turned out to be more than we thought it would be. And we've found out this 'Hoosier Hospitality' stuff doesn't last after you're through playing football. As long as you're performing for them, you're okay. But they're through with you when you leave the field.

"Some people have been real nasty about it. I feel sorry for them."

They can be listened to. It is probably true that no white man can really know what it is like to be black, but we can listen. We can stop alibing for the harsh statistics, which in spite of some gains, are appalling, a devastating indictment of all of us, at the point of death rate, disease rate, unemployment rate, salary scales even for equal education and all the rest.

Fifth, the concerned white man can make his own peace with the fact that the required change for the black man will probably cost him something. This is the fallacy of many persons of good will and genuine desire to help. A little more education, a little more time, a little more good will and everyone will be happy and no one will be hurt. The history of social change is not reassuring here. What we want in racial change may not come without some suffering on our part. That should not surprise the Christian. He ought to remember that truth and life and love and the brotherhood of man as he understands them now became clear only at very high cost.

The county of my birth has been much in the news recently. Down in Daytona Beach there is a difficult process going on. Today's schoolchildren are being asked to pay some cost in inconvenience and perhaps in quality of education because of the sins of those of us who have lived in Volusia County for all the past decades. It's a painful thing. Why should children have to bear the burden? I remember something in the Bible about the sins of the fathers coming to fruit in their children.

It is astonishing how quickly we dismiss any suggestion of responsibility on our part, excuse ourselves, if there is a price tag attached. Yes, there might have been in the past; there might be today, temporary drops in housing values (it would be caused of course by white psychology, not black money) if housing were really open. Yes, school curricula might have to be adjusted for the children of illiterates. Yes, there may be some extra spoilage on the production line when men who are third generation garbage haulers try to read micrometers; yes, job loyalty might be a problem with people who have felt little stake in productivity or in society as a whole. But we are the ones who determine real estate prices; we are the ones who allowed illiteracy to continue; we are the ones who closed the doors to personnel offices or union ranks for so long, so long. Why should it surprise us if now we have to pay part of the price of catching up? It is no secret as to who has borne the cost so long.

The white man can come to terms with his own past, not with view to any delight in feeling guilty, but in accepting responsibility, and with the realities of today, and with the judgments of his own faith and know that it is his burden and perhaps, in the deepest religious sense, his high privilege to live in a time when he must bear some of the suffering of those around him. Such a

March 2, 1970

white man will know instinctively that he will have to go a little more than half way, bear a little more than half the load. Whenever I hear someone complain about having to hire men not quite qualified, and all honor to the business world where this is being done, or admit students not quite bright enough, or meet demands not quite fair with an outraged conscience and a holy appeal to equality and justice, I winch a little. We who have winked at equality so long can scarcely make it serve us now.

It's as if we had been at the three-quarter point, we pause and, looking back from our 400 yard (or 400 year advantage) we say, All right, take off the leg irons. From here on we run as equals. Ready, Set, Go.

Whatever those rules might be, they would not be justice, nor equality.

So it is. The white man lives today in a time requiring patience and pressure. Patience to listen and to bear a bit more of the load than he would like. And pressure, pressure to keep the momentum moving in a direction that is surely to the best in our national heritage. But beyond this the white Christian cannot forget that he is under a mandate not option for extra credit as a Christian, a mandate not of grudging acceptance of what must be taken from him to serve another; nor of reluctant acquiescence to the bare bones of justice. But he is under a mandate of generous, sacrificial love.

The white man who remembers this today cannot do everything. But he can do something. And what he can do he must do.

In 1963 a United States Commission came to Indianapolis to inquire as to progress in civil rights. At one point in the hearings a member asked, What are the churches here doing? There was an awkward laughter in the room.

That was not entirely fair. But there will be echoes of that laughter, bitter laughter, until we do what is possible.

#### THE UGLY 4 PERCENT

### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a very fascinating and objective commentary on the subject of anonymous and explosive calls to publications appeared in the February 18 edition of the Suburbanite Economist of Chicago, Ill.

In noting the article, I must observe that many Members have undoubtedly had the same basic reaction to similar letters and calls which we often receive and know how frustrating it can be not to have an opportunity to provide clarifying information to an irate individual. The article follows:

#### THE UGLY 4 PERCENT

Every time a controversial article appears in the paper (and almost anything is controversial to somebody) people call the editor.

Ninety-nine percent are polite and reasonable and their viewpoints are welcome, although those viewpoints would reach more people if put in writing to appear in the Public Forum.

Every now and then, though, a real live large-mouth get on the horn. Some nasty trait in him cuts loose, and he gets a real charge out of cussing out an editor.

This type always knows everything. Never mind the facts—he knows better. He "knows who planted that story," or he "knows who paid money to get that printed."

Sometimes he also "knows" that the editor is (1) Jewish, (2) Catholic, (3) atheist or (4) a Bible-thumper. He "knows" other things about the editor's ancestry, too, and expresses these in gutter terms.

This type never gives his name. Oh no. He's only brave when he's anonymous. Generally, he starts his abuse with the switchboard operator and continues as long as anybody will listen to him. Nobody can talk to him; he didn't call to listen, he called to holler and he does.

Sooner or later, depending on the individual's tolerance, somebody hangs up on him. Then his day is made. This confirms it; he was right; the newspaper had no answer.

Well, here's your answer, Bub. You're wrong, wronger, wrongest. Nobody is going to listen to your profanity, so next time save your dime. You're going to need it for bail money some day.

Now, if you want to respond to this, do it in writing. If you can write. The people on this newspaper's staff don't have to put up with abuse from the likes of you on the telephone.

#### DECLARATION OF SUPPORT OF PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

### HON. W. S. (BILL) STUCKEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, on January 29 of this year there were 227 Members of the House of Representatives, both Republicans and Democrats, who joined the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER in signing his declaration in support of peace in the Middle East. Due to an oversight on the part of a member of my staff my name was not transmitted to Mr. CELLER's office in time to be included as a supporter of this declaration. I would like to take this opportunity to join in expressing my support for Mr. CELLER's declaration, the text of which follows:

#### DECLARATION IN SUPPORT OF PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

We, the undersigned Members of the United States Congress, declare: A just and lasting peace in the Middle East is essential to world peace.

The parties to the conflict must be parties to the peace achieved by means of direct, unhampered negotiations. We emphasize these significant points of policy to reaffirm our support for the democratic State of Israel which has unremittably appealed for peace for the past 21 years. Our declaration of friendship for the State of Israel is consistent with the uninterrupted support given by every American President and the Congress of the United States since the establishment of the State of Israel.

It is not in the interest of the United States or in the service of world peace to create the impression that Israel will be left defenseless in face of continuing flow of sophisticated offensive armaments to the Arab nations supplied by the Soviet Union and other sources. We thus adhere to the principle that the deterrent strength of Israel must not be impaired. This is essential to prevent full-scale war in the Middle East.

All the people of the Middle East have a common goal in striving to wipe out the scourges of disease, poverty, illiteracy and to meet together in good faith to achieve peace and turn their swords into ploughshares.

#### CENTENNIAL MEDAL TO EDNA KELLY

### HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, we are always delighted when word reaches us that something nice has happened to one of our former colleagues and "one of the family," so to speak. This is particularly true when an honor is bestowed upon that former colleague by an institution of which they have been a part and for service rendered while a part of this great body.

I was particularly pleased to learn of the high honor recently given to the Honorable Edna F. Kelly by her alma mater, Hunter College—the President's Centennial Award.

Those Members who worked with Edna Kelly during her 19 years in the House, and particularly on the Foreign Affairs Committee, were deeply impressed with her keen intellect, her quick mind and tremendous capacity and store of knowledge. Perhaps few who have been Members of this body have had the intimate, detailed knowledge of the various treaties entered into by our Government over the years and their effect upon our dealings with other nations of the world. The Members who are aware of her tremendous capabilities would agree that this wealth of information and know-how should not go untapped in these days when expertise in these areas is so desperately needed.

During her 19 years as a Member of this House of Representatives, she represented the first, 10th, and 12th Congressional Districts in Brooklyn. In 1963, she was appointed to the U.S. delegation to the United Nations by the late President John F. Kennedy. As stated before, while in the Congress, she served on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and was chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe. In addition, she was a ranking member of the Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Foreign Operations. Her dedication to service was an inspiration to all of us who served with her.

At the ceremony on Friday, February 13, 1970, the citation to her was as follows:

Because you have established significantly the role of Women in law making, because you have sought to introduce through methods of international cooperation the peaceful diminution of world tensions, because you have moved the economically disadvantaged people of this country toward a significantly better life, Hunter College bestows upon you, its highest honor, the Centennial Medal.

I know you will want to join with me in congratulating Hunter College for having recognized the talents and contributions of one of its alumni, and to extend to Edna our warm regards and the wish that her latent talents in so many fields will be utilized in this decade of the seventies.

Along with Edna F. Kelly, several other alumni were given this honor, including the well-known Sylvia Porter.

ATOMIC ENERGY AND THE ENVIRONMENT

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I wish to continue placing in the RECORD statements received at a hearing on atomic energy and the environment which my colleague from New York (Mr. REID) and I held in New York.

Today I am including statements from Jacqueline Binnian, of the Action for the Preservation and Conservation of the North Shore of Long Island, and Per Moberg, a distinguished constituent of mine who spoke on behalf of the Sierra Club.

The statements follow:

ATOMIC ENERGY PLANTS AND THEIR EFFECTS ON THE ENVIRONMENT

At the past hearings in New York State on atomic energy the utility companies have been asked why they continue to commit all their efforts in attempting to build atomic power installations to supply additional electric power to the consumer. Their answer is that they feel this is the best and cheapest way to supply the demand! We are sure your committee is aware of other methods, i.e. fossil fuel and hydro electric power which should be considered in an unbiased effort to meet the projected future needs.

ACTION takes the position that a master plan for electric power generation and distribution for the whole U.S.A. must be in effect and until additional information has been developed with regard to the overall effects of nuclear power plants on their environments, no large scale construction programs should be permitted.

ACTION is concerned with future studies of: (1) The long range results of large amounts of heat which must be dissipated either in the atmosphere or in the surrounding waters. (2) Possible radioactive pollution due either to long-term buildup in minute increments, or by accident. (3) Preservation of natural resources through location of atomic plants in areas which might be improved thereby, rather than sites dictated by the utility companies' preference for economic factors.

ACTION strongly endorses the position taken in the Electric Power Plant Siting Act of 1968 as presented to Congress by Senator Edward Kennedy and Representative Richard Ottinger. Governmental agencies should control sites based upon a master plan for nuclear power plant installations throughout the country, and with full consideration of local conditions. ACTION feels it is essential that any committee established on siting of power plants should include members representing environmental understanding and know-how.

Respectively submitted: William S. Smoot, President.

Presented by: Jacqueline C. Binnian.

ATOMIC ENERGY PLANTS ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT

(Statement of Per Moberg on behalf of Sierra Club Atlantic Chapter and Adirondack Mountain Club L. I. Chapter)

Congressmen Addabbo, Reid and Wolff: My name is Per Moberg, a resident of Port Washington, Nassau County, Long Island. I have been asked to appear on behalf of the Sierra Club and the Adirondack Mountain Club members who reside in the Long Island Sound region.

We are not nuclear physicists or ecologists. We are not speaking with scientific knowledge or producing unquestionable evidence one way or the other. As a matter of fact, the very absence of reliable data is the reason why we are here today.

We cannot accept the fact that atomic energy plants are to be built along the shores of Long Island Sound without the guarantee that such installations would not alter either us or our environment.

It does not take scientific "know-how" to be aware of the pollution in Long Island Sound and its Bays. The prohibition of shell fishing, the closing of the beaches for swimming are not the result of nature, but caused by man-made activities from a society that has refused to look ahead and consider the long range effect of its "doings." We are now at the point where hundreds of millions, perhaps billions, of dollars will have to be spent in the Long Island Sound region alone to restore and prevent what a thoughtless society with a runaway technology has created.

Are we to permit continued experimentation with our lives and our environment by an industry which cannot tell us if they are going to create a tropical paradise or an active cesspool?

Now is the time to stop and think, to make sure that we know what we are doing. Let's give ourselves a chance to restore the Sound and the Bays to the beautiful waters they once were. This is not the time to embark on ventures out in the unknown with captive passengers. At this time, we need a moratorium on all activities of questionable nature. We are not opposed to progress—only to blind progress.

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, this year over 400,000 students participated in the Voice of Democracy contest which is annually sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies' auxiliary. The VFW is certainly to be commended for this encouragement to good citizenship and Americanism, the theme of which this year was "Freedom's Challenge."

I was indeed happy to learn that the winning speech for the State of Ohio was delivered by Miss Katherine Elizabeth Euga, a resident of Pleasant City in the 17th District, and a student at Meadowbrook High School at Byesville, Ohio. Very wisely, Miss Euga stressed the vital importance of individual responsibility and personal involvement in perpetuating our freedoms, virtues which she has evidently practiced in her school activities. As president of both the Thespian Club and the Mixed Chorus, along with serving as class secretary and secretary of the student body, Miss Euga personified the interest and concern which she recommends to all citizens of our Nation. In addition, her achievements include the National Honor Society in 1969, Girl's State in 1969, and the All Ohio Youth Choir in 1968.

In an age of easy generalizations when some shirk the burdens of individual responsibility by excoriating the "Estab-

lishment" or the "System" for ills both real and imagined, it is refreshing to see emphasized that individual initiative and responsibility which propelled this Nation forward to its present position among the governments of mankind.

I wish to commend Miss Katherine Marie Euga for her timely message and include the text of her speech in the RECORD at this point:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

(By Katharine Elizabeth Euga)

Have you ever observed the activity around and within an anthill? If you have, you will have found that each ant, regardless of whether it is a worker, an egg tender, or the queen, must carry out its distinct role in order to maintain the stability and strength of the colony. If just one of the ants falls to do so, the colony in some way will suffer a loss. You will observe also that when a stick is suddenly thrust into the hill, it becomes quite obvious that every ant is willing to rush to the defense of the structure.

Try to compare for a moment the anthill to the United States of America, a country composed of millions of people each having his distinct role in our society. Regardless of whether a person is a doctor, a lawyer, a mechanic, a minister, or the President, his role is a vital one to our society. Does the responsibility of maintaining the strength of our anthill rest with a few queen ants at the head of our government, or does it ultimately belong to every person in the country? To expand our analogy, wouldn't the country in a sense suffer a loss if a few people were to misuse or not use their freedom? Finally, should a stick be thrust into our anthill, the United States, would only the leaders of our nation be responsible for maintaining our freedom? No, every person should be more than willing to come to the defense of his or her homeland should it be threatened by some destructive outside force or corrosive inside force.

This, I feel is the heart of freedom's challenge to every citizen of the United States, the challenge of using (not neglecting or misusing) yes, not abusing the right to have a say in our government affairs and to live life as an individual with unique ideals and opinions. At these times when pleasure is plentiful and material wealth is abundant, people tend to form a lax attitude and not concern themselves with the pressure of deciding what is right or wrong in our society. In this world with its electric appliances, one or two automobiles per family, self-cleaning ranges, and automatic dishwashers, it's very easy to shrink from making these decisions and retreat to our Ivory Towers. In my opinion, freedom, like a door hinge, becomes rusty and loses its shine with lack of use. With abuse, it becomes bent out of proportion and no longer serves its purpose.

In order for each citizen to play a healthy, active part in our democracy, he must first keep in mind and exercise his rights guaranteed him by the United States Constitution. These rights are: freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of worship, the right to assemble, and the right to file a petition. Let me bring this down to a personal level—how I as a high school student may partake of these freedoms. I may attend any church service of my choice without fear of persecution. If I so wish, I can speak out for or against an issue such as the failure to lower the voting age to nineteen. My local newspaper welcomes any articles concerning such issues. Only recently, two students from my high school expressed their feelings about lowering the voting age by means of a letter to the editor. This was printed with no fear of punishment. If I am against a certain policy in my school, I

may call an assembly of my schoolmates after school hours and draw up a petition protesting the policy and signed by the students. You see, in everyday life, any person who is fulfilling his role as a citizen should surely use his freedoms and not hasten their death through lack of use.

Secondly, should not each person be prepared to defend the system which guarantees these basic rights if the time should come when it will be endangered? If man expects to have a voice in the structure that governs him, he should be willing to defend it with every ounce of strength in him. How else is it to withstand the forces which would tear it apart both from the outside and from within?

Yes, I feel that the real challenge of freedom faces each citizen in his daily living. Will he keep liberty alive by using and nurturing it, or hasten its death from dormancy? Will he take the first opportunity to help defeat any threat to our democratic system, even if it requires his life, or will he quiver in his shoes and submit to the opposition? I've made my choice and am preparing myself to take a stand as a conscientious citizen of our great nation. Which choice have you made?

#### ESTONIA AND THE OTHER BALTIC COUNTRIES ARE NOT FORGOTTEN

##### HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, among the great principles to which we in the United States adhere to, believe in, and are willing to fight for is the right of the self-determination of nations. This was clearly enunciated by President Woodrow Wilson in 1917, and has been reaffirmed by us many times.

Fifty-two years ago, Estonia declared its independence, thus manifesting the aspirations of the brave Estonian people for freedom from alien domination. Unfortunately, however, its independence was of short duration because of a curious secret agreement of August 1939 entered into by Nazi Germany and Communist Soviet Russia. As a result, the forces of the U.S.S.R. invaded and occupied Estonia and on August 6, 1940, Estonia was forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union.

It is needless, I am sure, to again recount the great tragedy, the stark terror, the needless slaughter of thousands of innocent people, and the suffering and misery caused by the Russians. This sad story has been told and retold numerous times here in this historic Chamber. To say that we commiserate with the Estonian and other Baltic peoples, is an understatement. To them we emphatically say "You are not forgotten."

Our late President Kennedy stated:

We must never . . . at any summit, in any treaty declaration, in our words, or even in our minds . . . recognize Soviet domination of Eastern Europe.

It was during the 89th Congress, after extensive hearings, we adopted unanimously House Concurrent Resolution 416, where it is stated:

The Baltic peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been forcibly deprived

of the right to self-determination by the Government of the Soviet Union—

And urged the President of the United States—

(a) to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the people of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and

(b) to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples.

Here is undisputable proof that the Estonians and other people of the Baltic countries are, indeed, not forgotten by us. To note the anniversary of the Estonian declaration of independence is to serve notice to the world that we, in the United States, give our full moral support to the rightful aspirations of the brave Estonian people to again achieve freedom and independence in the not too distant future.

#### AMERICA IN 1980: 15 MILLION HOMES SHORT?

##### HON. WALTER FLOWERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, some experts are saying that the economy is in a "period of technical adjustment." Others are saying that we are now bordering on a "mild recession." All these high sounding phrases aside, there is only one way to describe the situation now facing America's homebuilding industry—it is in a state of absolute depression.

This is tragic for during the decade of the 1970's, we will need to build an additional 30 million homes in order to stay even with demand. At the present rate of construction, only 15 million homes will be built by 1980 and the problems which will be created by substandard and inadequate housing will blight the quality of life throughout America. This crisis is not only hurting those families needing housing now, but it is seriously affecting those who depend on the building trades for their livelihood and income. The bricklayers, carpenters, glaziers, and others, are caught in the very middle of this "crunch," while homebuilders are being forced out of business at an alarming rate.

There are several factors which have contributed to this depression—increased cost of materials, labor, and so forth—but the principal underlying cause is the all-time high interest rate being charged on home mortgages.

A specific example can be found by considering a young couple who began married life 8 years ago in an apartment. Since then, three children have been born and they have moved twice from one rental to another to get extra room. During this time, the husband established a good credit rating and managed to save \$6,000 for what he thought would be a nice downpayment on their own home. The couple recently selected just the

home they wanted for \$25,000—it would have cost approximately \$22,500 2 years ago. Local financial institutions informed them that even with a prime loan, their payments would run approximately \$147 per month, considerably more than they had anticipated and their budget will allow. Two years ago—because interest rates were lower and before inflation ran the price up—they could have bought substantially the same house with a similar amount down and payments of approximately \$112 per month. Over a 25-year period, this amounts to about \$10,500 more for the same home, the increase being attributable to inflation and higher interest.

The real responsibility for this rests with the Federal Reserve Board controlling the "supply" of money available in our economy to banks and other financial institutions. Money supply is just like any other commodity. For instance, when there is plenty of coffee available, the price goes down and the same is true with the "price" of money as reflected in interest rates.

We are living in a time of inflation making it necessary for us as a nation to collectively "tighten our belts." Last year, Congress tightened the Federal Government's belt by insisting on a balanced budget. I feel certain that this same responsible course will be followed during this session. This is the best way to fight inflation—making certain that the Federal Government "lives within its means." The Federal Reserve Board is an independent agency not subject to the dictates of Congress or the President. If the legislative branch of Government continued deficit spending as was prevalent throughout the 1960's, then there would be some justification for the Federal Reserve to keep a firm hand on the money supply. However, this is not the case and it is my judgment that the Federal Reserve Board should reexamine its policies with a view toward easing the supply of money so that interest rates can return to a normal level.

#### REPUBLIC OF ESTONIA

##### HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, last week, Americans of Estonian descent celebrated the 52d anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Estonia. It is heartening, in this sometimes grey world, to see their spirit so bold and unflagging as they look forward to the day when Estonia once again will take her place among the proud, free nations of the world.

It is a sad thing to see such enthusiasm dampened by the awful truth that the Soviet Union has visited upon this gallant people. Since the end of World War II, the Soviet Union has occupied Estonia and done violence to its national needs and aspirations in the most brutal and insensitive of ways. The occupation

and forced rule has not only resulted in fortunes lost, families broken, and progress stifled, but it has also been a heart-breaking experience for those of Estonian descent who must witness this infamy to their homeland. It is my fervent hope that the day will come when the celebration of the Estonian Declaration of Independence can take place, in all its glorification of freedom and hope, in Estonia itself. And until that time and until the time the Soviet Union quits this reign of terror, we shall raise our voices again and again against this infamous reign.

THE CHICAGO BOARD OF TRADE  
LOOKS AT STOCK FUTURES

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Board of Trade is currently engaged in a series of new dimensions for vitalizing its activities.

I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues three articles which appeared recently to show the new vigor that is taking hold at the Chicago Board of Trade, the world's largest commodities future exchange.

The articles follow:

[From Newsweek, Mar. 3, 1969]

STOCK FUTURES

Despite its power and influence as the world's largest commodity exchange, the Chicago Board of Trade lumbered along for years like a creaky old threshing machine. It was content to do whatever business happened to come its way. Its management was old and tired—attuned to the glories of the past when it was legal to do such things as corner the wheat market. Above all, the board was an insular institution, and its voice was seldom heard outside the grain industry. "The only time we ever crawled out from under our rock," a veteran official once admitted, "was when someone poked a stick at us."

But during the last two years, the venerable board has begun taking on a new vitality. Much of it has been due to necessity: the grain market dropped from its record level of \$81.4 billion in 1966 to \$36 billion last year. But the biggest reason has been Henry Hall Wilson, 46, a lanky (6 feet 5) North Carolinian and former White House aide to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, who became the board's \$100,000-a-year president twenty months ago. Together with William Mallers, at 40 the board's youngest chairman, Wilson has moved to tighten trading rules, reorganize operating methods, increase the number of paid staff members and give the 120-year-old board a better national image than ever.

Last week, Wilson made his biggest move to date. He announced that the board was thinking about taking a major plunge into the securities business. Although registered with the government to trade in securities since 1934, the board has never done so on a widespread basis, and its last trade was in 1953. Yet to many veteran observers, trading in securities has been just what the board has needed all along to break away from total dependence on agriculture and increase its muscle in top financial circles.

What Wilson proposed to do was set up a national exchange in the so-called option

market—or puts and calls. A call gives a buyer the right to purchase stock at a set price within a specified time—usually six months. Call buyers expect that the stock will go up. A put is just the opposite; it allows the buyer to sell stock within a time limit. Put buyers hope stocks will go down. In either case, the option holder's profit is the difference between the price of the option (5 to 20 per cent of the stock's price) and the rise or fall of the security within the time limit. If the stock doesn't perform as desired, the option holder's only loss is the price of the option. In general, if an investor is bullish about the market, he will buy calls. If he is bearish, he will buy puts. In 1968, options were written on about 30 million shares, up from 23 million in 1967. The bulk of the business was handled by only a score of securities dealers in much the manner of over-the-counter dealings—lots of people doing lots of screaming on lots of telephones. There is no central market, such as the New York Stock Exchange, for options.

LOGIC

In seeking to establish such a market, Wilson thinks the Board of Trade is extending its time-honored grain-futures concept to the securities field. Before coming up with the option-market idea, in fact, the board had considered the far-out plan of establishing a futures market in the stocks that make up the Dow Jones industrial average, as well as other individual stocks. That line of reasoning led to puts and calls, which involve betting on the future as surely as trading on next year's wheat crop.

Wilson believes that such a market would be important to the financial community in general. He told NEWSWEEK's Don Holt: "The major feature of the Board of Trade is the hedging activity we provide for the big grain holders. In stocks you have the same kind of inventory holders in the great funds. They don't use puts and calls now because the market is so small. But I think they might if we had a well-organized market."

A functioning option market is, Wilson concedes, a year or more away. But on the board's floor there is unbridled enthusiasm for the plan—complete with wild tales that option dealings could double the value of a seat (now \$21,000) in two years. In any case, it is likely that the old board will never be quite the same again. As chairman Bill Mallers put it: "The lines are drawn. People here want to go forward."

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 19, 1969]

CHICAGO BOARD OF TRADE PLANS TO SET UP  
MARKET IN PUT AND CALL STOCK OPTIONS

(By Jonathan R. Laing)

CHICAGO.—The Board of Trade, the world's largest commodity futures market, is considering a bold diversification move into the securities field. At the exchange's annual membership meeting, Henry H. Wilson, president, said in a speech that the board is studying the possibility of starting an exchange market in stock put and call options.

According to Mr. Wilson, officials of the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Federal Reserve Board have been advised of the board's proposal. The Board of Trade enjoys the advantage over other commodity exchanges of already having been certified by the SEC as a registered stock exchange. It was certified in 1934, just after the Securities Exchange Act was passed. But little stock trading occurred thereafter.

SEC officials confirmed that officials of the Board of Trade had contacted the SEC about plans for an organized market for put and call options. The officials declined to say whether they favored such an operation, but one noted that "we've indicated to them that we have some questions we want to ex-

plore further with them." The official declined to elaborate.

Observers of the board weren't surprised at the exchange's renewed interest in securities trading to augment its commodity markets. Over the years, trading interest in the board's primary commodities, wheat, corn, soybeans, and soybean oil and meal has been brisk. But in 1968, volume, for the second year in a row, sagged to 4.7 million contracts, valued at \$36 billion, from the record 1966 total of 7.6 million contracts, valued at \$81 billion. Since 1967 large grain surpluses have driven cash grain prices down to near Government support levels, with the result that hedging and speculation have languished in the absence of wide price swings.

SEEN A YEAR AWAY

Board officials declined to estimate when the new market might open but observers say it's at least a year away.

The exact specifications of a put and call option market at the Board of Trade have yet to be worked out but, as presently envisioned, the contract unit would be 100 shares of stock of a given issuer. A minimum of 13 contracts, or option months, would be open for trading at all times.

Currently, puts and calls are sold by some 20 securities concerns such as Thomas, Haab & Botts and Filer & Schmidt who deal exclusively in options. Also, such New York Stock Exchange members as Walston & Co., Goodbody & Co., and H. Hentz & Co., have options departments.

A call option, the most common type, gives its holder the right to buy 100 shares of a specified stock at a specified "striking price" (usually at, or near, the market price at the time of the option purchase) during a specific time period. A put option gives its holder the right to sell 100 shares of a stock at a specified price during a specific period. For these rights, option buyers pay a price, or "premium," which can vary from 5% to 20% of the value of the underlying stock, depending on the length of the option period and the volatility of the stock.

INCENTIVE EXPLAINED

Of course, the holder of a call hopes that the price of the stock underlying his option will rise to a higher level than the premium during the term of the option so that he can recover the option purchase price and still profit.

Correspondingly, the holder of a put hopes the price of the shares underlying his option will fall more than the premium he initially paid. A significant percentage of puts and calls are never exercised because the price of the stock involved doesn't move enough to allow the option holder to recover his premium.

The sellers or "writers" of options own the stock upon which the options are contracted. Their incentive in selling options is the net return through premiums on the value of their stock. Such returns can run as high as 40% annually if a number of unexercised options are written successively on the same shares.

The board's proposed market has particular appeal among many professional stock portfolio managers who make scant use of the current options market because of its small size, and inflexibility. Writing options on stocks held in portfolios is just one more way for today's performance-conscious managers of pension funds, foundations, endowments, mutual funds, and insurance company investment portfolios to wring better gains from stock investments.

The current puts and calls market's annual volume has averaged slightly more than 1% of the New York Stock Exchange's annual volume over the past two years. In 1968, puts and calls were written on more than 30

million shares, up from options on 23 million shares in 1967, according to the Put and Call Association, the option dealers' trade groups. However, the bulk of options trading is in small volume units, clearly unsuitable for the institutional investor.

#### ADVANTAGES CITED

Board officials believe that their proposed options market would correct several weaknesses of the present options market. First, Mr. Wilson said in the speech, the board's options market "could generate enough liquidity in the marketplace to sustain large volume transactions." Secondly, according to Mr. Wilson, option holders in the new market wouldn't be required to directly, or indirectly, take or confer ownership of the underlying stock in order to realize a gain.

The new market would permit them to liquidate their positions on the exchange floor. (This eliminates stock commission costs.) Also, option writers or sellers, who presently have no way to terminate their obligations during the life of an option, would be able to liquidate their position and withdraw from the market at any time.

Most institutional investors surveyed on the board's proposed market favored the creation of a centralized put and call market because of the present option market's lack of a secondary market and its inability to accommodate large transactions.

Paul Haake, chief of investments for the trust department of the Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. commented: "This market the board is proposing is an intriguing proposition and has substantial potential for us in writing options on stocks in pension funds we manage."

#### INVESTOR INTEREST GROWS

Officials of other banks, and a portfolio manager of a large Midwestern casualty insurance company professed to be quite interested in the proposal. Said one bank official who declined to be identified: "We would use the board's options market for our trust department stocks portfolios during bear markets when we normally switch funds into fixed-income debt securities."

Since early 1968, investor interests in put and call options has grown because the Federal Reserve extended its stock-margin rules to previously unregulated lenders and established new margin rules for dealings in convertible bonds. The result is that options offer the only stock-investment avenue for investors who want to purchase stocks on a small cash outlay.

Also, a recently released market study by Princeton University economists Burton Malkiel and Richard Quandt has spurred interest in the securities-options market among investors and professional money managers.

In the study, the professors contend that an investment strategy involving option writing is the optimal course 53% of the time, while option buying optimizes return 39% of the time.

Among the present transaction costs the board's options market would reduce, or eliminate, are dealer spreads between premiums paid option writers and premiums option buyers pay, written contracts, and stock-certificate transfer work.

In December 1967, the New York Produce Exchange, where such commodities as soybeans, soybean oil, and fishmeal are traded, announced plans to inaugurate futures trading in common stock. The plan was presented to the SEC for consideration but no action has been taken on it.

Several put and call dealers rate the Board of Trade's chances of success in setting up an options market as quite good. They warn, however, that current SEC regulations appear to require that all options traded on an exchange first be registered as securities.

This requirement would have to be changed before a workable central market in security options could be established, they contend.

[From the Journal of Commerce, July 7, 1969]

#### CHICAGO BOARD OF TRADE LOOKING TO NEW IMAGE

(By Donald E. L. Johnson)

CHICAGO, July 6.—The Chicago Board of Trade, the world's largest commodities futures exchange, appears to be moving toward a new image and new prosperity.

CBOT President Henry H. Wilson said in an interview with The Journal of Commerce that as a result of a two-year reorganization program, the 121-year-old exchange is set to become more than a grain exchange in the eyes of the general and investing public.

Although the corn market seems to be benefiting from the uncertainties of good demand and a weather market, wheat and soybeans, long the market's volume leaders, are not likely to generate much trading interest without unexpected incentives.

#### BROILER CONTRACT

But interest in the 10-month-old broiler contract has mounted so quickly in the last few weeks that Mr. Wilson is confident that it can become as active as the Chicago Mercantile Exchange's pork bellies (frozen, un-sliced bacon) and live cattle futures markets.

All three markets, he noted, have three things in common: no government price support or controls, rising prices and good commercial hedging.

The absence of government price supports allows prices to move freely. Rising prices almost always attract more speculative interest than declining prices, although prices tend to fall faster than they rise. And hedging by growers and processors seeking price protection provides market liquidity for speculators.

The problem with wheat and beans is that government price supports tend to put floors under prices, while heavy supplies prevent price advances. The result: steady prices and inactive futures markets.

Thus, Mr. Wilson, noting that last week was the best in the broiler market's short history, with an open interest of nearly 2,000 contracts, predicted that the advent of the broiler market as a major trading medium could result in increased identification of the CBOT as a meat exchange. This could help the exchange in its efforts to woo speculators away from the Chicago Merc's hugely successful live cattle market.

#### LIVE CATTLE REVISIONS

Proposed revisions in the CBOT's live cattle market, which went on the boards about two years after the Merc's unprecedented success with its live cattle market, will be submitted to the exchange's board of directors on July 15, he said. The board will be asked to approve multiple delivery points, which are already offered by the Merc's cattle contract. If approved multiple delivery points, which are already offered by the Merc's cattle contract. If approved by the board, the proposal will be voted on by the exchange membership.

Mr. Wilson, who joined the exchange on June 1, 1967, after serving six years as a White House legislative aide to President Kennedy and Johnson, said his most important accomplishment in the last two years has involved hiring a talented staff.

This spring he hired two new vice presidents.

E. William Severson, 40, was named vice president in charge of futures market surveillance, and data processing, and Frank S. Johnson, 38, became vice president of public relations.

At the same time, Joseph W. Sullivan, who joined the exchange as assistant to Mr. Wil-

son, was made the head of the new department of market development.

The next step, Mr. Wilson, said, is to find an agricultural economist for the exchange.

Staff building, of course, costs money. For example, Mr. Severson's office of investigations and audits had a \$143,670 budget in 1968 and has a \$191,303 budget this year. As he builds his own staff, Mr. Severson's budget will increase, Mr. Wilson predicted.

#### BETTER JOB THAN CEA

The exchange has always maintained that it can do a better job of regulating and policing its markets than the Commodity Exchange Authority, which also has been strengthened by Congress in the last two years. Mr. Wilson proudly noted that the CEA recently excepted the CBOT from newly-issued regulations related to member firm finances, "because ours were tougher than theirs."

CBOT members will vote Monday on a proposal that would raise the maximum fines that can be levied by the board of directors from only \$5 per infraction to between \$1,000 and \$10,000. A majority vote of the directors will be required for a \$1,000 fine and a two-thirds vote for a \$10,000 fine. Now, the only alternatives to a \$5 fine are suspension of trading privileges or expulsion from the exchange.

Another area that can stand improvement is exchange public relations, Mr. Wilson said. Although a prominent public relations firm has been working for the CBOT for almost three years, the exchange has not had a professional PR man to direct its efforts.

Mr. Johnson wants not only to improve the exchange's rapport with the grain, cattle and poultry industries, but also to show commission houses and their account executives that they can make money handling commodities accounts.

At the same time, Mr. Johnson will ask the board to "radically" increase its advertising budget, which is set at only \$30,000 for 1969, up a bit from last year. The smaller Merc, which would like to overtake the CBOT in trading volume, has a 1969 advertising budget of over \$300,000, up from only \$16,000 a few years ago. Merc members feel they are getting their money's worth.

#### AN 88 PERCENT RISE IN VOLUME

Last week the Merc reported an 88 percent increase in first half volume to a record 1.7 million contracts, while the Board of Trade this week will report a 7.6 improvement to 2.2 million contracts for the first half and a 13 percent improvement for the second quarter. The Merc also reported a seat sale at a record \$70,000, up from \$32,250 a year ago. A CBOT membership sold for \$22,000 on June 20, up from \$18,000 a year ago. There are 500 seats on the Merc and 1,402 on the CBOT.

Much of the recent success of the Merc can be attributed to market development, especially in live cattle and pork bellies.

Therefore, it is not surprising that Mr. Wilson appears most enthusiastic about the Board of Trade's new planning and development department. It will be primarily responsible for finding commodities that can be successfully traded on a regulated commodities futures exchange, he said.

Three new markets have already been announced, but they appear to be months away from actual trading.

Most radical is the exchange's proposal to start futures trading in put and call options on corporate securities. Announced last February, the put and call market needs another six to 12 months of work, Mr. Wilson said.

The Securities and Exchange Commission still has a lot of questions about the project. And the exchange itself must decide where to put the market (probably in a small hall now



used as a television and refreshment center just off the main trading floor) and whether to create new memberships for those trading the securities options, informed sources said.

#### PRICE VOLATILITY

A more conventional futures market in plywood is scheduled to open this summer. While price volatility has been dramatic for more than a year in this commodity, Mr. Wilson said, the exchange has found that commercial interests in the Pacific Northwest are not familiar with futures markets or used to the idea of having their products traded on a futures market. The Merc is scheduled to open a lumber market Oct. 1.

Most controversial of the proposed markets, so far as the exchange members are concerned, is the silver futures market.

Mr. Wilson said that some members feel that the CBOT is better equipped to handle the volume generated by the silver futures market than the Commodity Exchange, Inc. in New York and that such a market could be "better conducted" on the Chicago exchange.

Opponents, he said, include "certain commission houses" that think a silver futures market would over extend the resources of the CBOT.

They contend that, "time needed by members for learning a new market could be more fruitfully applied to learning about those commodities not now traded," he said.

In any case, Mr. Wilson expressed confidence that the Board of Trade will do better in 1969 than in 1968.

Last year volume declined another 19 percent to 4.7 million contracts worth \$35.9 billion from 5.8 million contracts worth \$50 billion in 1967.

The exchange had its best year in 1966, when 7.6 million contracts valued at \$81 billion changed hands.

#### IN MEMORY OF CONGRESSMAN JAMES B. UTT

#### HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, there is a certain blend of courage, integrity, character, and principle. Our colleague, Congressman JAMES B. UTT, possessed that rare blend.

As a citrus grower in southern California, Congressman UTT added to the development of that important industry. As a practicing attorney in Santa Ana, he contributed to the growth of that community.

Congressman UTT's death comes as a particular blow to the people in his district whom he served as an assemblyman and as a nine-term Representative in the U.S. Congress.

In life, Congressman UTT was a patriot of the first order. In death, he bequeaths to his countrymen a legacy of outstanding civic achievement.

Apart from his distinguished political career, JIMMY UTT was my longtime personal friend.

Mr. Speaker, coming so soon after the passing of Glen Lipscomb, the death of Congressman UTT is a double loss to the California delegation.

My heartfelt condolences go out to his wife, Charlena, and to his family.

#### ESEA TITLE I—EDUCATION OF THE DISADVANTAGED—PRO- GRAM GUIDE NO. 57

#### HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the education of America's disadvantaged young people must continue to be a high priority in the years ahead if the United States is to avoid a serious division in its midst. For years, many of my colleagues and I have stressed that effective education of the disadvantaged can come about only through sound educational administration and a firm commitment to equality of opportunity for all of our young people. For too long, we have seen more than a billion dollars a year scattered through the compensatory education programs of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act without sufficient safeguards to assure that the children who most need quality education will, in fact, achieve it.

That is why my colleagues and I were pleased with the initiative shown by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Finch and Commissioner of Education Allen last November when they set up a special task force to study and to effectuate prudent changes in the administration of title I, the Nation's single largest educational program. This task force, long overdue, has worked diligently with all of the interests concerned and has, we believe, come forth with program recommendations which are fully consistent with the 1965 act and the congressional intentions in enacting it. More important, these recommendations which are embodied in a memorandum from Commissioner Allen to the chief State school officers give great promise of assuring that scarce Federal funds will not be scattered frivolously but will be concentrated so as to deliver effective educational programs to our most disadvantaged youngsters.

It is this type of sound educational administration—a partnership between the Federal Government and the States—which can alone assure that the taxpayers' money makes a difference in the lives of children. We are delighted with this first step and we look forward to working with the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the States on other administrative or, if necessary, legislative changes which might be necessary to erase any trace of educational deprivation from our land.

I submit ESEA title I program guide No. 57, which was issued February 26, 1970, for printing at this point in the RECORD:

#### ESEA TITLE I PROGRAM GUIDE NO. 57

Memorandum to Chief State School Officers:

The Office of Education continues to receive a number of questions about the comparability requirements outlined in ESEA Title I Program Guides 44, 45, and 45A, especially the opening paragraph of Section 7.1 in Program Guide 44:

"The Title I program and the regular school program have been planned and budgeted to assure that Federal funds will supplement

and not supplant State or local funds and that State and local funds will be used to provide services in the project areas that are comparable to the services provided in non-project areas."

In his letter of July 31, 1969, Associate Commissioner Lessinger made clear what is expected of the States with respect to assuring comparability of services provided from State and local funds in Title I schools and in non-Title I schools.

Despite these statements, reports of lack of comparability continue to come to our attention. It is necessary, therefore, to clarify further the requirements for assurance of comparability. This communication revises previous program guides, and will serve as the basis for evaluating all Title I applications for the 1970-71 school year.

#### WHAT COMPARABILITY MEANS

Title I funds must not be used to supplant State and local funds which are already being expended in the project areas or which would be expended in those areas if the services in those areas were comparable to those for non-project areas. Within a district instructional and auxiliary services and current pupil instructional expenditures provided with State and local funds<sup>1</sup> for children in project areas must be comparable to those services and expenditures provided for children in non-project areas. These services and expenditures must be provided to all attendance areas and to all children without discrimination. Services that are already available or that will be made available to children in the non-project areas must be provided on at least an equal basis in the project areas with State and local funds rather than with Title I funds.

#### ASSURANCES OF COMPARABILITY

The State educational agency shall require each local educational agency either (a) affirmatively to demonstrate to the State educational agency in the project application that a comparability of services and expenditures provided with State and local funds currently exists in the school district between project and non-project areas, or (b) to submit a plan to achieve such comparability by the opening of school in the Fall of 1970. This responsibility includes the preparation and submission by the local educational agency (with the project application or before the project is approved) of factual information that fully supports assurances of current or forthcoming comparability in the application or in the plan.

#### CRITERIA FOR DEMONSTRATING COMPARABILITY

The State educational agency shall prescribe criteria by which local educational agencies are to demonstrate their adherence to the requirements of comparability, and shall submit these criteria to the Commissioner for approval by April 1, 1970. Where the data submitted by the local educational agency suggests a lack of comparability the State educational agency must require the local educational agency to submit a plan to overcome inequities in the basic programs provided in Title I schools and determine whether the plan submitted by an applicant is adequate to achieve comparability.

As noted above, the State educational agency is to decide upon whatever criteria it deems necessary to insure adherence to the requirements of comparability. However, the criteria so prescribed by the State educational agency shall, as a minimum, include Criterion A below, and either Criterion B or Criterion C below:

Criterion A (Includes two indicators): As part of its criterion, the State educational agency shall require the submission by the local educational agency of information con-

<sup>1</sup> For the purpose of this policy statement, funds provided under P.L. 874 will be considered the same as State and local funds in determining local expenditure.

cerning both groups of comparability indicators outlined below:

1. Comparability of distribution of staff: Each School Included in Project Application:

- (a) Public/Teacher Ratio.
  - (b) Pupil/Non-Teaching Professional Staff Ratio.
  - (c) Pupil/Instructional Non-Professional Staff Ratio.
- Average Non-Project Area Schools:
- (a) Public/Teacher Ratio.
  - (b) Pupil/Non-Teaching Professional Staff Ratio.
  - (c) Pupil/Instructional Non-Professional Staff Ratio.

In computing pupil/teacher, pupil/non-teaching professional staff and pupil/instructional non-professional staff ratios, the full-time equivalent of part-time personnel or personnel whose time is divided among at least two of the three ratio areas shall be entered in each respective area. In computing pupil/teacher, pupil/non-teaching professional staff and pupil/instructional non-professional staff ratios, if a person is paid in part with Federal funds and in part with State and local funds, only the full-time equivalent of the proportion of his time paid for with State and local funds shall be entered in each respective area.

For the purposes of this criterion, a "teacher" is a professional person employed to instruct pupils or students in a situation where the teacher and the pupils or students are in the presence of each other. Teachers who are assigned administrative and other non-teaching duties are not to be counted in computing the pupil/teacher ratio. Principals, librarians, guidance counselors, psychologists, social workers, etc., are to be considered as non-teaching professionals.

2. Comparability of specific service prior to addition of title I funds:

For services to be provided through a title I project grant, the local educational agency shall certify that the specific title I funded service does not simply match services already being provided in non-project schools. In so doing the local educational agency shall describe the services (of the type applied for) already provided by State and local funds in project and non-project schools. For example, if a local educational agency requests title I funds to finance a food service program in a project area school, it shall provide comparative data on the provision of food services to that school and to non-project area schools before the addition of title I funds to the project area school.

Criterion B (Includes one indicator): The average per pupil instructional expenditure in each project area school is equal to or greater than the average per pupil instructional expenditure in non-project area schools.

"Average per pupil instructional expenditure" is defined as the aggregate of "current pupil instructional expenditures" (in turn defined as expenditures from State and local funds for salaries of principals, teachers, consultants or supervisors, other instructional staff, secretarial and clerical assistants; other salaries for instruction; expenditures for textbooks, materials and teaching supplies, school libraries, and audio-visual equipment, all as set forth in the 200 Series of Expenditure Accounts in *Financial Accounting for Local and State School System*—OE22017) divided by the aggregate number of children in average daily membership in each school.

Criterion C (Includes one indicator): Comparability of total instructional personnel expenditure per pupil:

- Each School Included in Project Application:
  - Total Instructional Personnel Expenditure Per Pupil.
- Average Non-Project Area Schools:
  - Total Instructional Personnel Expenditure Per Pupil.

The local educational agency shall provide data comparing the total instructional personnel expenditure per pupil in project area and non-project area schools. This figure should include the salary expenditures for teachers and non-teaching professionals; and should include non-professional staff serving in an instructional capacity. The salaries of part-time employees shall be included on the basis of their full-time equivalent and the State and local portion of salaries paid to persons who are paid in part with Federal funds and in part with State and local funds shall be included on the basis of their full-time equivalent.

POINTS OF CLARIFICATION AND DEFINITION FOR CRITERION A, CRITERION B AND CRITERION C

1. "Project Area Schools" is defined as those schools within the school district participating in a Title I project. "Non-Project Area Schools" is defined as those schools within the district not eligible for Title I assistance.

2. Data submitted by the local educational agency to the State educational agency shall be based on information derived from the most recent school year for which complete data is available.

3. The State educational agency shall request the local educational agency to specify the standard accounting procedures employed.

4. Data shall reflect expenditures and services during the academic year (excluding summer session) and should be presented on the basis of schools servicing similar grade levels. Schools with 12-month Title I programs should be able to demonstrate equivalence to comparability for the regular school year.

5. The State educational agency may wish to consider in its criteria the differences between small and large schools within a district. In particular, the information requested under Criterion B or Criterion C may vary significantly from schools of 200 to schools of 500 to schools of 1000 students; if this is the case in a district, the State's criteria might reflect these differences.

6. To be eligible for Title I funding of summer sessions, the local educational agency must demonstrate that its project area schools were comparable to those in non-project areas during the previous school year.

7. The cost of determining comparability may be allowed as part of Title I administrative costs.

8. For the purposes of examination, the State agency shall require local educational agencies to submit comparability information on separate sheets attached to the main body of the application.

This memorandum constitutes basic criteria, issued pursuant to Section 105(a) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (20 U.S.C. 241e). It supersedes Section 7.1 of Program Guide No. 44 (March 18, 1969), all of Program Guide No. 45 (June 14, 1968), and that portion of Program Guide No. 45A (July 31, 1969) which refers to comparability.

The Office is prepared to provide technical assistance to you in developing the criteria for your State. Please let me know if you have any questions.

JAMES E. ALLEN, JR.,  
Assistant Secretary for Education and  
U.S. Commissioner of Education.

R.I.P., CALIFORNIA ZEPHYR

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the California Zephyr was a

great train and I enjoyed riding it. I hate to think that it must now go the way of most passenger trains and be abandoned. The Washington Post editorial quoted below is sound and I think we should all heed it.

We do need passenger trains in this country.

The editorial follows:

R.I.P., CALIFORNIA ZEPHYR

Now that the California Zephyr is about to become a fond memory, perhaps the administration and Congress will get down to work on the problem of what to do about passenger trains. There is not much life left in long-distance passenger service and perhaps that service ought to die on the ground it is no longer needed and is an uneconomic use of resources. But it ought not to be allowed to die by default; there should be a national policy—one way or the other, a policy either of abolishing non-commuter passenger trains except in one or two heavily populated corridors or of saving this means of transportation as one of the alternatives to the automobile.

The death warrant for the California Zephyr, signed last week by the Interstate Commerce Commission, is symbolic of what has happened to the passenger trains. The Zephyr went on the rails in 1949 to compete with the City of San Francisco for traffic between Chicago and San Francisco. The Zephyr had the scenic route, the City of San Francisco, which had gone into service in 1936 and switched from a three day a week to a daily schedule in 1947, had the faster route. They were joined in 1954 on the long run to the Coast by the Santa Fe's Chief. Now, the Zephyr has been killed west of Salt Lake City and cut to three days a week west of Denver. The City of San Francisco is going back to a three-day-a-week schedule west of Salt Lake City and the Santa Fe hopes to abolish the Chief soon.

The direct cause of the deaths of these trains, and dozens of others around the nation, is economic; they lost money heavily. The indirect causes are, perhaps in this order: automobiles, airplanes, bad management, and outdated labor rules. Unless the federal government acts, those causes are going to lead to the end of non-commuter passenger service, except in the East Coast corridor and perhaps in a similar Midwestern corridor, within a few years. We think that this should not be allowed to happen until after a substantial effort has been made to save the trains; it makes no sense for the country to be discarding a basic means of transportation because of its current love of automobiles and airplanes at a time when substantial overcrowding of both highways and skyways is easily foreseeable.

What is needed are revolutionary changes in the railroad passenger business—changes that provide a mechanism through which new equipment, better schedules, new management, new labor contracts, and new reservation systems can be injected into one of the most old-fashioned businesses in existence. The Ralpax plan put forward by the Department of Transportation has run into heavy criticism at the ICC largely because it isn't revolutionary enough. If inter-city passenger trains are to survive, more will be required than just \$100 million of federal money and a device that lets current railroad management largely determine the fate of the trains.

Maybe this administration and this Congress aren't bold enough to take the drastic steps that are needed. Or maybe they think these steps will cost more than saving the passenger trains will be worth. Nevertheless, the railroads and the public are entitled to know what national policy is going to be. The death of each crack train, like the California Zephyr, speeds the day when the next one will die and before long there will be

nothing to save. We were saddened to see the Zephyr go under, although we cannot blame the railroads for asking that it be discontinued or the ICC for granting their requests. But we do hope that its death will spur the kind of action that the deaths of other great trains leading up to it—the Twentieth Century Limited and the Royal Blue, for example—never did.

THE EQUALITARIAN THEORISTS—  
UNITED STATES AS OTHERS SEE  
US

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, when advocates of some form of conduct which cannot be justified by any form of logic present their arguments for its adoption, the false and emotional issue of a so-called world opinion is flaunted.

Opinion is the cheapest commodity on earth. The more ignorant of the facts, the quicker and less inhibited the opinion. The more wisdom, the less sweeping and cocksure the opinion.

It was said so long ago that the word "halter" was known by everyone to refer to the hangman's noose, that:

No man e'er felt the halter draw,  
With good opinion of the law.

Our domestic racial problems, which are merely symptoms of a more significant underlying problem, have evoked opinions by the score on the subject, both within and without the Nation. One of the more important opinions was that manufactured by the left for the signature of Swedish Gunnar Myrdal—an instant expert on racial matters although he comes from a nation not noted for its Negro population. Until the advent of American deserters, whoever heard of a black Swede?

As our artificially created racial crisis comes to a head with warmer weather, more suitable to the incitement to riot and loot, it is the responsibility of all Members to honestly try to understand the real causes of the problem, so that we can then exercise our responsibility to make possible its solution.

For this purpose, the paper delivered by an eminent Australian before a seminar of the Canadian League of Rights, reflecting a careful and thorough study of the American race problem, as seen by a disinterested foreign observer, is essential reading, and I include it in my remarks:

[From the Canadian Intelligence Service,  
January 1969]

THE CREATION AND EXPLOITATION OF RACE  
MYTHS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—As a special service to our readers, we are publishing this paper delivered by Eric D. Butler, the Australian Authority on Marxism, at the Canadian League of Rights Toronto Seminar on Race and Revolution, last August 10.)

Benjamin Disraeli, the British Prime Minister who used his novels to divulge deep insight into many matters, wrote in *Endymion*:

"No one must lightly dismiss the question of Race. It is the key to World History and it is precisely for this reason that written history so often lacks clarity. It is written by people who do not understand the race question and what belongs to it."

But if Disraeli were alive today and expressed these views on race and history, he would be violently denounced as a "racist."

The term "racist" is today one of the most deadly of the many smear words used by the totalitarians of all types. The term is never defined so that the victim of the charge of "racism" may disagree and defend himself. It presumes automatic condemnation without any argument or trial. The comparatively successful use of the term is a tribute to the effectiveness of a form of psychological warfare which discourages a realistic examination of one of the central dogmas of Communism; that not only all individuals, but also all races are inherently equal. There are large numbers of people who term themselves anti-Communists but who on this subject, as with many others, unconsciously accept the Communist view. To these people the African, for example, is the same as a European—except that he has stayed out in the sun a little longer. All that is necessary is to provide the African with a Cambridge University education, dress him the same, and he will be exactly the same as a European. It is simply a matter of adjusting environment to produce the same type of human being who can be readily fitted into the centrally planned state, and ultimately, into the one centrally planned world.

The equalitarian dogma is the very essence of Communism. If we accept Communist propaganda, they visualize a perfect society in which, by controlling environment and the educational system, all individuals, being basically the same, will have such perfectly adjusted personalities that they will live in everlasting peace and harmony. The equalitarian dogma insists that any differences between men are primarily the result of environment, not the result of heredity.

If the Communist view of man were true, then, of course, it would be immoral and irrational to oppose it. But although, as we shall see, it is not true, the collectivists have so successfully presented propaganda on this subject under the guise of science, that those who oppose the equalitarian dogma are termed immoral. Those who stress the vital importance of hereditary factors, governing, for example, intelligence, are smeared as fanatics allegedly advocating that human beings be bred like stud cattle.

But in reality it is the collectivists who downgrade the human being by claiming that by centralized control of his environment, he can be turned out in a common mould like peas from a pod. It is only in a genuinely free society of responsible individuals that excellence and quality are possible. Equality really means no quality.

The free society is also necessary for the preservation of the elite of a civilization, without which civilization cannot be maintained. But to the collectivist, those who have succeeded under freedom are "oppressors," while men, races or nations which have not succeeded are allegedly "underprivileged." The logical consequence of a philosophy which denies any natural superiority to those who have succeeded under freedom, is central government control to change the social and economic system so that there is no quality, only equality. Without the dogma of equalitarianism, the Communists and other collectivists would stand openly condemned of being blatant conspirators determined to punish all excellence and to prevent mankind from developing its highest potential. It is much easier to sell slogans about the "equality" and "brotherhood" of man.

In *The Great Deceit*, by Zygmund Dobbs, the following appears:

"The bending and twisting of academic subjects to fit socialist purposes is the prime purpose of all convinced socialists. This has been the case particularly in Social Anthropology, History, Economics, Jurisprudence and Sociology. The socialist dogma requires that all scholastic categories be made to serve socialism and not the cause of scientific truth."

This paper is primarily concerned with the twisting which has been done in the field of Anthropology.

Back in 1922, the eminent American sociologist, Lothrop Stoddard, observed in his great classic, *Revolt Against Civilization*, that "The ideal of Natural Equality is one of the most pernicious delusions that has ever afflicted mankind. It is a figment of the human imagination. Nature knows no equality. The most cursory examination of natural phenomena reveals the presence of a Law of Inequality as universal and inflexible as the Law of Gravitation."

Stoddard was speaking as an objective scientist, not as a political propagandist. But in recent years political propagandists, masquerading as objective scientists, have sought to further their political objectives by perverting science. This is a serious accusation, but it is supported by an enormous amount of irrefutable evidence. Nathaniel Weyl and Stefan Possony made the accusation as follows in their work, *The Geography of Intellect*:

"American psychologists and sociologists have accepted the dogma of equality and proclaimed, not merely that members of different races should all have the same 'rights' (an entirely separate question), but that they are innately equal in all forms of mental capacity as well. Having placed themselves in the vanguard of an ideological movement proclaiming absolute equality, a very large group of American psychologists and sociologists chose to sacrifice scientific objectivity to their political and propagandist purposes."

FRANZ BOAS' RED BACKGROUND

The story of the perversion of the sciences concerning race, starts late last century, primarily with one Franz Boas, mentioned briefly in my *Fabian Socialist Contribution to the Communist Advance* (p. 27). Born of Jewish parents, Boas was a product of the influential German Socialist movement of that period. His parents were Socialists and strong supporters of the Communist rebels of the German revolution in 1848. One of his aunts married Dr. Abraham Jacobi, a member of Karl Marx's Communist League. After serving a sentence in gaol for armed revolutionary violence, Jacobi, a medical doctor, migrated to the U.S.A. and lost no time in actively promoting Marxism.

Karl Marx himself had personally prepared the way for Jacobi in the U.S. with letters to his American agent, Joseph Wedmeyer. Marx used Jacobi to test the loyalty of German migrants to Socialism and their ability as revolutionaries. Boas therefore had many contacts in the U.S. to assist him carry on the family Socialist tradition. His career was a remarkable one. He arrived in New York in 1877, and the next year was installed as Doctor of Anthropology at Clarke University. It was Boas who issued the first Ph.D. in Anthropology in the U.S.A., in spite of the fact that there was no evidence whatever that from a formal academic point of view Boas was entitled to describe himself as an anthropologist.

Boas started to make his big impact in the U.S. when in 1899 he was appointed to the chair of Anthropology at Columbia University, New York, a position he held until 1936. At Columbia, he immediately joined forces with the Socialist sociologist, Franklin

Giddings, a man termed as a sociologist, anthropologist and political scientist. Columbia was a hot-bed of Socialism. Boas' biographer, Melville Herskovits (1953) wrote of him as follows: "The tenure of his professorship at Columbia gave a continuity to his teaching that permitted him to develop students who made up the significant core of American anthropologists, and who came to man and direct most of the major departments an anthropology in the United States." From his base at Columbia University, Boas not only perverted the science of anthropology to serve his Marxist objectives like the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

#### "FRONT" ORGANIZATION TECHNIQUE

Many people believe that the "front" organization technique originated with Lenin, but in fact it was an old Marxist technique. The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People was created by a number of Socialists in 1909. Two of the most prominent of these Socialists were Mary White Ovington and William English Walling. Franz Boas readily agreed to assist the NAACP by providing anthropological support, the line being taken by this Socialist-inspired organization. Boas was not without his difficulties in attempting to prove his teaching that cultural environment is the dominating factor in developing mankind. He was forced to admit that "the anthropologist recognizes that the Negro and the white represent the two most divergent types of mankind." He also had to admit that "It is true that the average size of the Negro brain is slightly smaller than the average size of the brain of the white child." However, Boas insisted that these differences could be overcome by race-mixing.

As the Boas strategy developed, a series of Socialist fronts were established for the purpose of fostering the concept of environment being basically responsible for any differences between races. One example of this type of activity was a Greenwich House Committee on social investigation which sponsored a book by the Socialist Mary White Ovington of the NAACP with a foreword by Boas. There were the Du Bois Clubs, formed to offset the work of the great Negro leader, Booker T. Washington, who attempted to show his fellow Negroes that instead of permitting themselves to be led by political agitators into blaming the whites for their lot, they should set about developing themselves in accordance with their own innate abilities and characteristics.

During the early days of the Great Depression, the Boas cult had developed to the stage where it was becoming dominant in many American Universities and Schools. No doubt influenced by the thought that the "capitalist" system was on the point of collapse, the Socialists and Communists in the Boas movement openly revealed their real purpose: the use of social anthropology to create the coming Socialist State. An example of this is to be found in V. F. Calverton's popular anthology, *The Making of Man*, published in 1931, subsequently widely read throughout the English-speaking world.

Calverton said that "anthropology for anthropology's sake is even more absurd than art for art's sake." It is a familiar tactic of the Communists to describe science that opposes their purposes as "capitalist science." As a good Marxist, Calverton attacked physical anthropology—which insists that there are inherent mental and psychological differences, as well as physical differences, between races—with being a prop for "nationalism," "imperialism," "private property" and the "monogamous family." Calverton candidly admitted that he and his fellow Socialists used certain anthropological data "because they fitted in so well with their own doctrine of social evolution . . . and lent themselves so excellently to the Marxian in-

terpretation of culture as an economic unit. They supplied a historic illustration of the Marxian dialectic."

Franz Boas and the Communist, Bernhard J. Stern, helped to put the Calverton anthropology together. It became widely used as a text book in the Schools and Universities, and was popularized by the Socialist movements throughout the world.

Perhaps we should observe, in passing, that while the equalitarian cult has resulted in a disparagement of the importance of heredity in human beings, supporters of horse racing still feel it important to study the pedigrees of their favorites!

The tactics of Boas and his supporters were so successful that under the auspices of so-called science they were able to spread Socialist influence throughout the U.S.A., and eventually throughout the world. The publications of the United Nations Cultural and Educational Organization (UNESCO) further the Boas line on race and, of course, naturally meet with the enthusiastic support of the Communists. Like all Socialists, supporters of Boas' teachings have used typical totalitarian methods to destroy and to silence those scientists who insist that there are basic differences between races and that these should be studied in a genuine scientific spirit.

#### ANTI-EQUALITARIAN SCIENTISTS TYRANNIZED

The eminent American Publisher, Mr. Carleton Putnam, records in his book, *Race and Reason*, how, after thoroughly investigating the manner in which the Socialists had twisted anthropology to serve their equalitarian dogma, he had approached a number of professional scientists. Putnam records that he found plenty of these scientists who agreed with him. "And I discovered something else. One prize-winning northern scientist whom I visited at his home in a northern city asked me, after I had been seated a few minutes in his living room, whether I was sure I had not been followed. Another disclosed in the privacy of his study he had evidence he was being checked by mulattoes at his lectures. All, when first approached, were hesitant, withdrawn and fearful, and the reason was not far to seek. Their employers, on whom their livelihood depended—the universities, the museums, the foundations—were either controlled by equalitarians or were intimidated by the race taboo. The scientists whom these institutions employed, if they ever were to hint at the truth, must do so deviously, under wraps over wraps, half seeming to say the opposite. But as they grew to know me they gave me facts without varnish. In long conversations and letters they provided the confirmation I needed. Many were internationally known. Some had received the highest prizes."

One prominent American psychiatrist wrote to Putnam as follows: "Where in the U.S. could a psychologist, sociologist, or anthropologist, find employment if he openly and unreservedly espoused the theory of the racial inequality of man?" A Professor of Anthropology from the American South wrote: "It can be documented ad infinitum that the social and biological sciences in Anglo-American countries, for the past half century or so, especially since the 'twenties, have strenuously and studiously avoided any research that could have thrown light on genetic differences between races and ethnic groups. That this avoidance and suppression, this discouragement of graduate students who might have been curious and interested in such research, was done in the names of egalitarian ideology, in full knowledge that it was unscientific conduct, has been admitted, in print, among themselves, by some of our most prominent social scientists."

Communists and Socialists were openly delighted when the American Supreme Court

made its historic decision in 1954 that the American public school system must be desegregated. And so were all the dupes of the Boas equalitarian doctrine on race. The Supreme Court decision was both incredible and explosive. Incredible because it accepted uncritically the work *An American Dilemma*, by the well-known Swedish Socialist, Gunnar Myrdal, as the main foundation for its decision, and explosive because it set in motion moves resulting in American troops being used in America in an attempt to force the desegregation of schools and universities, and provided the Communist-backed Civil Rights movement with the basis from which to launch a series of revolutionary activities; the major battle cry being that as the Supreme Court has ruled that all races are equal, it was only "white discrimination" against the black which was preventing the American Negro from enjoying what was rightfully his.

Nineteen-Fifty-Four was a great watershed in American history, and the disastrous results flowing from the Supreme Court decision are still convulsing America internally and influencing its policies abroad.

*An American Dilemma* was nothing more than a propaganda work for the Boas thesis concerning race. But no authorities were called to provide evidence to test the validity of the so-called scientific claims. It was not until nine years later, in a Trial Court action in Savannah, Georgia, that the Boas hoax in a Court of Law was exposed by the evidence of scientific witnesses. The legal representative for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) collapses in face of the scientific evidence presented and relied upon a successful appeal to a Court of Appeals and, if necessary, to the Supreme Court itself. The Trial Court found that "All the evidence before the Court was to the effect that the difference in test results between the white and negro students is attributable in large part to hereditary factors, predictably resulting from a difference in the races . . . no evidence whatsoever was offered to this Court to show that racial integration of the schools could reduce these differences."

The Court observed that integration in the classroom between two groups of children of different backgrounds "and varying abilities would lead to conflict impairing the educational process. It is essential for an individual to identify himself with a reference group for healthy personality development." The following gave evidence in the case: Dr. W. C. George, Professor of Histology and Embryology, School of Medicine, University of North Carolina, and a member of the American Association of Anatomists, Zoologists and Human Genetics; Dr. R. T. Osborne, Professor of Psychology and Director of the Student Guidance Centre at the University of Georgia; Dr. Clarette Armstrong, Professional Chief Psychologist at Bellevue Hospital, New York City, who testified that in various truancy tests in New York schools, she had found that one-third of the Negro truants said they ran away from school because they could not maintain the standard in integrated classes; Dr. Ernest van den Haag, Professor of Social Philosophy at New York University, an expert on race relations; and Dr. Henry E. Garrett, former President of the American Psychological Association, former member of the National Research Council, and for 16 years head of the Department of Psychology at the University of Columbia. Dr. Garrett had the opportunity to study the work of Boas personally while at Columbia University, and has said in a note to Carleton Putnam (P. 41, *Race and Reality*, 1967):

"I was also able to observe the increasing degree of control exercised by the (Boas) cult over students and younger professors until fear of loss of jobs or status became

common in the field of anthropology unless conformity to the racial equality dogmas was maintained. . . . I can testify from repeated personal observation to the intimidation and to the pall of suppression which has fallen upon the academic world in the area in which I speak. It encompasses not only anthropology but certain related sciences."

Unlike the massive publicity given to the Supreme Court decision of 1954, the Savannah Court judgment was given practically no national publicity whatever in the U.S.; and outside of the U.S. this important case never took place, providing further evidence that the mass media of today serves the cause of the collectivists and equalitarians.

On June 9, 1964, in Atlanta, the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals reversed the decision of the County Court. The evidence was completely ignored, and the dictatorship of the Supreme Court asserted with the statement that "...no inferior federal court may refrain from acting as required by that decision (1954 decision) even if such a court should conclude that the Supreme Court erred either as to its facts or as to the law." The final act in this exercise came with a petition to the Supreme Court against the ruling of the Appeals Court. The vital question was what would the Supreme Court do in the face of the mass of scientific evidence presented, evidence the Court did not have before it when the 1954 decision was made.

Before the Supreme Court issued its decision, another Trial Court, in the Evers case, had, after considering even more scientific evidence than that presented in the case referred to above, concluded that "the facts in this case point up a most serious situation, and indeed, 'cry out' for a re-appraisal and complete reconsideration of the findings and conclusions of the United States Supreme Court. . . . Accordingly, this Court respectfully urges a complete reconsideration of the decision. . . ." But then came the news from the Supreme Court: There would be no further hearings, no further proceedings. No explanations were offered. Having endorsed the Boas racial equalitarian dogma as truth, the Supreme Court was not prepared to permit any discussion of scientific evidence refuting this dogma. Silence was the answer to those seeking the truth. No wonder it has been said that the ghost of Boas sits on the American Supreme Court!

#### "AN AMERICAN DILEMMA"

The capture of the American Supreme Court by the Boas devotees was the culmination of a long and careful campaign. For years there had been a steady barrage of articles in law journals and sociological reviews. The legal department of the NAACP played a major role in the campaign through the law journals. The Boas equalitarian dogma was consistently presented with charges that those who insisted that the facts showed fundamental differences between races were "racists," "fascists" with sympathy for Nazi Germany's master-race theories. But it was Gunnar Myrdal's book, *An American Dilemma*, which was regarded as the bible of the Boas campaigners, and which was obviously accepted as such by the American Supreme Court. It is therefore essential to grasp the tremendous significance of how *An American Dilemma* was produced.

Myrdal was not responsible for the conclusions put forward in his book; these had all been put forward by a Socialist-Communist group operating under the Boas banner. As an economist from Sweden, which has no racial problems, he had no special qualifications for investigating racial questions in the United States. Obviously, he was chosen to give prestige to the project. The American leaders of the Boas school of social anthropology in the Thirties were all known for their Socialist and pro-Communist views. But Myrdal came from a country of "moderate" Socialism which Americans need not

fear. He was selected to do an ambitious public relations job, and his own statements leave no doubt that he knew what he was about and what was required of him. He is on record as having agreed that no study should be made concerning possible inborn trait differences between Negroes and Europeans. He agreed completely in advance with the racial equality dogma of Boas. And in his book he attacks the physical scientists as supporters of "conservative . . . reactionary ideologies."

It was in 1937 that Frederick P. Keppel, head of the Carnegie Foundation, invited Myrdal "to become the director of a comprehensive study of the Negro in the United States. . . ." Keppel had a long Socialist background, going back to the First World War when he shared living quarters with the notorious Fabian Socialist, Felix Frankfurter, who later sent many Socialists from the Harvard Law School into key positions at Washington. One of the most notorious of his pupils was the top Communist agent, Alger Hiss.

It seems most appropriate that Mr. Justice Frankfurter should be a member of the Supreme Court which in 1954 endorsed Franz Boas' contribution to Socialist strategy. With Frankfurter's influence, Keppel was in 1918 made Third Assistant Secretary of War, a special Act of Congress being passed to make this post for him. In 1923 he became President of the Carnegie Foundation in New York. It was mainly from the organization known as the Social Science Research Council that Keppel recruited the staff which did the actual organizing of the Myrdal project.

The tremendous power and influence of the Social Science Research Council was dealt with in the Congressional investigation of American Foundations, "Report of the Special Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations and Comparable Organizations," House Report, No. 2681, 1954. This Report stated that the Social Science Research Council was financed by the Carnegie, Rockefeller, Ford, Russell Sage and thirty other foundations, that it "is now probably the greatest power in the social science research field," and that this power "seems to be used to effect control in the field of social sciences." The Social Science Research Council was brought into existence by Socialists and Communists in the academic institutions as a type of strategic body to direct and influence all social thinking in the U.S. Control resides in a board comprised of self-appointed and self-perpetuating directors.

Keppel also enlisted the assistance of Mr. Donald R. Young, President of the Russell Sage Foundation, to assist with the Myrdal project. Young was also the secretary for grants and fellowships of the Social Research Council and later became the Council's Research Secretary, and he actually wrote the broad outlines of the Myrdal study. An examination of the assistants listed by Myrdal in the preface to *An American Dilemma*, shows 57 with extensive records in Communist and Socialist front organizations. Needless to say, the NAACP helped Myrdal with his project. Carnegie Foundation funds were paid to James E. Jackson, Jr., later President of the Communist Party, and Dixie Wilkerson, a member of the National Committee of the Party, to make their contribution.

Listed amongst those social anthropologists who sought to stamp the imprimatur of academic approval upon Myrdal's work were: Franz Boas, Ruth Benedict, Otto Klineberg, Melville J. Herskovits, M. F. Ashley-Montagu and Gene Weltfish. These were some of the prominent hard-core members of the Boas cult. It is instructive to look briefly at their political affiliations.

Ruth Benedict, authoress of the best-seller, *Patterns of Culture*, a work used widely as a

textbook. Still a housewife at 34, she got a remarkable start as an "authority" on anthropology under Boas. She began her studies at the new school for Social Research, an extremely radical Socialist institution.

Margaret Mead, another writer whose works have been popularized; also was a member of the Boas school and wrote the preface to *Patterns of Culture*.

Gene Weltfish, co-authored with Ruth Benedict *Races of Mankind*. This book was used for American troops in World War II in spite of Weltfish's Communist background, but was subsequently banned as Red propaganda. The Communist *Daily Worker* on March 15, 1961, listed her as a sponsor of the subversive American Peace Crusade. Other Red connections could be listed. Her scientific integrity may be judged by the fact that she had evidence that the Americans had used germ warfare in Korea!

An examination of Mr. Ashley-Montagu's background also brings out some significant facts. For some unexplained reason he felt it necessary to change his name from Israel Ehrenberg to Montague Francis Ashley-Montagu when he came to the U.S. in 1927, and to abbreviate his mother's name from Mary Plotnick to Mary Plot for his *Who's Who* biography. He taught at the New School for Social Research in 1931, and in 1942 was teaching at the Communist School for Democracy, later known as the Jefferson School for Democracy. He is listed as having been associated with a number of other Communist organizations.

Melville J. Herskovits became interested in social anthropology while studying at the New School for Social Research. In his book, *The Myth of the Negro Past*, Herskovits suggests that if it could be shown that the Negro has had a reputable past, and that this idea were taken over "into the canons of general thought . . . Would this not, as a practical measure, tend to undermine the assumptions that bolster racial prejudice?" What ever may be said about this suggestion, it hardly encourages confidence in the author's scientific objectiveness.

Otto Klineberg was a student under Boas. Klineberg provided a typical example of the blatant dishonesty of the devotees of the equalitarian dogma when, during World War I, he attempted to support the Boas school of social anthropology by comparing tests given to soldiers from the four Southern States where White averages were lower with those given in the four Northern States where the Negro averages were the highest.

And so with the endorsement of the above "authorities," Myrdal's work, produced by Socialists and Communists, became the basis of the Supreme Court's fateful decision of 1954. The long and carefully prepared campaign in the race equalizations had achieved a major breakthrough. Not one of the many eminent scientists like Dr. Carleton S. Coon, Past-President of the American Association of Physical Anthropologists, author of the great classic, *The Origin of Races* (1962), and internationally recognized as an outstanding expert, was invited to present evidence. Apart from the composite Communist-Socialist project bearing Gunnar Myrdal's name, the Supreme Court judges turned to other "authorities" like Theodore Brameld, a driving force behind "progressive education." There was no concern that Brameld had been cited as having been associated with at least 10 Communist-front organizations. Still another "authority" quoted by the Court was E. Franklin Frazier, described as a sociologist. He had 18 Red-front citations to his credit.

Ever since President Franklin Roosevelt started packing the U.S. Supreme Court to ensure that his Socialist "New Deal" legislation was not declared unconstitutional, the Court has lost its traditional character and started to make decisions of growing concern to responsible Americans. Bodies like The

American Bar Association have publicly criticized decisions which give aid and comfort to the Communist conspiracy and to the criminal.

Eminent constitutional lawyers have drawn attention to the alarming manner in which the Supreme Court judges have started to make sociological pronouncements and to invade the sphere of the Legislative. The 1954 decision on segregation in schools was such an example, because it was in effect an order to the Federal Government that it had to use its power to ensure that integration of the school system took place. This led to the horror of Little Rock and Mississippi.

Incredible though it must appear to many, the truth is that a Supreme Court presided over by Justice Warren, a man without any real judicial experience, who only became Chief Justice by insisting that President Eisenhower honour a promise made to him in exchange for his political support as Governor of California, endorsed a scientific hoax planned by a Communist-Socialist group when it made its 1954 decision on schools. It is generally believed that Justices Felix Frankfurter and William Douglas, both long-time political leftists, played a prominent role in obtaining a unanimous decision. Mr. Justice Douglas' reliability may be judged by the fact that he has helped further the myth that Lincoln would have supported integration because he believed in racial equality. Even history is perverted by the equalitarians in an attempt to bolster their dogma. In a number of statements Lincoln completely rejected what is attributed to him. When Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation, he said: "I can conceive of no greater calamity than the assimilation of the Negro into our social and political life as our equal. . . ."

But Lincoln was sincerely concerned about the future of the Negroes and worked hard to foster the idea of Negro colonization, either back in Africa from which they originally came, or in other areas more suited to their racial make-up. Lincoln believed in separate development. It should be noted that Karl Marx was a violent critic of Lincoln.

Every attempt to force integration in the United States has produced increasing friction and worsened race relations. This suits the revolutionaries, but it is against the best interests of both the Negro and the European. It is criminal dishonesty to continue any further with the myth that there is such a thing as racial equality. History and genuine science show that it is not going to help the Negro, or any other race, by destroying the identity of the European through the type of race-mixing advocated by the equalitarians.

#### WHAT ABOUT CHRISTIANITY?

All of what has been said here, of course, will be most annoying to two main groups: the Communists and Socialists, who have for so long been comparatively successful in advancing their strategy under the guise of science; and those Christians who emotionally reject any suggestion that all men and all races are not equal. It is difficult to argue with Socialist totalitarians who believe that man can be successfully planned, but it should be possible to point out to Christians that the basic Christian teaching stresses the uniqueness of each separate individual.

However, it is much more difficult to discuss the separate development of races, because immediately the effects of mind-conditioning display themselves with references to the "anti-Christian apartheid policy of South Africa." Or, Rhodesia is mentioned. It is taken for granted that "all Christians are opposed to South Africa's racial policies." This is not so. Large numbers of Christian clergy of all denominations in South Africa support the general policy, even though they may criticize some aspects of its administration. Roman Catholic Archbishop Whelan

has been very clear on this in a statement he issued on February 18, 1964.

Archbishop Whelan said that it was essential to distinguish clearly between any policy like apartheid and the actual laws and regulations which might be used to implement this policy. "The question to be asked is whether or not injustice is *inherently* involved in the policy of separate development as it is being currently pursued. The Archbishop answered this question by observing that "there is no teaching of the Church in opposition to the idea of a state composed of a number of national or racial groups maintained in their separate and distinct identity by the state of which they form a part."

Replying to the question of whether a denial of the "one-man one-vote" principle is also a denial of Christianity, Archbishop Whelan first pointed out that Pope John had said that "in determining the structure and operation of government which a state is to have, great weight has to be given to the historical background and circumstances of given political communities, circumstances which will vary at different times and in different places."

The Archbishop continued: "We know, for instance, how restricted the electorate was in ancient Athens, the home of democracy; an even today it is not considered a grave injustice that the women in Switzerland have no vote. In recent times we have seen too many cases of the "one-man one-vote" slogan being used as a pretext by demagogues to seize power which they exploit for their own ends. A democracy based on a wide electorate seems to secure the common good only in highly developed and homogeneous societies."

The lessons of history teach that stable political systems are only possible in homogeneous communities with a dominant philosophical background. Irrespective of whether we believe that God created separate races, or that these races evolved from three major stocks or species—Black, White and Yellow—and irrespective of whether we believe that these three major stocks evolved from common ancestors or were created as separate groups—the truth is that diversity, not uniformity, has been a major feature of the development of mankind. What is anti-Christian about accepting the total truth concerning God's world? We do not serve any moral purpose by falsely claiming that all races are equal, even if we attempt to smother the falsehood under the slogan that "all men are brothers," a cliché so often used by Christians. The great Dr. Albert Schweitzer, who served the African for most of his life, exposed the misleading inference of this slogan with his reply that while, as a Christian, he certainly accepted the African as his brother, he also believed him to be his very junior brother by thousands of years. In his private correspondence, Dr. Schweitzer spoke kindly but objectively about the African. He did not believe that either truth, or the African, was served by pretending that the African had qualities and capacities he did not in fact possess.

True progress is endangered by the equalitarian dogma and the modern collectivists. True progress is only possible through differentiation between both races and individuals. The flowering of human personality requires the opportunity for self-development through genuine *freedom of choice*. It also requires stimulus provided by the excellence of others.

But also essential is social stability, which requires, amongst other factors, race stability. It is natural for every human being to have a sense of belonging to a racial group through which he can develop himself. The *race* might be regarded as a wider concept of *family*; and, generally, well-adjusted people only become so within the confines of their own family and people. Integration be-

tween basically different races inevitably produces tensions of varying types. Policies of attempted forced integration are, therefore, a type of cosmic lie which, if persisted with, can only assist the eroding of the very foundations of Civilization. Proper pride in one's own race is no more immortal than proper pride in one's self.

The history of Civilization is of a comparatively small elite pioneering, instructing and leading by example. Civilization is a complex thing, and can only be sustained by conscious effort from generation to generation. It requires *quality* far more than quantity. The Golden Age of Greece was produced by a mere handful. These few lacked the social experience which Boas and his followers claim is one of the major essentials for the Negro to demonstrate that he is the equal of the European, but they did produce Plato, Socrates, Aristotle, Archimedes, and many others.

Rome, Venice, Spain, Holland and England all set the fashion in Civilization with small populations compared to others. There have been enormous environmental changes, and modern man is heir to a wealth of social experience, but where is that greater flowering of genius and creativity which, according to the environmentalists, we should be seeing? No Shakespeares, Bacon or Newtons seem to be flooding out of our modern, highly centralized schools and large universities.

The collectivist and equalitarian philosophy strikes at the very heart and mainspring of Civilization. Buttressed by collectivist financial and economic policies, it produces a levelling-down in society, and encourages the envy of those who lack the ability of others. The concept of preserving one's own race and traditions is derided as "unscientific" and "wicked discrimination." Both at home and abroad I have heard Australia's restrictive immigration policy, designed to preserve a homogeneous European population, attacked as being "anti-Christian." Those who support the policy are asked if they have not heard of the great Christian commandment to love one another. But the statement of this or any other similar law, or teaching, does not tell us how to apply the law to all conditions, which can vary enormously. Just as every family has the natural right to protect itself, so does a nation have the right to protect its identity. Many non-European nations exercise this right much more strictly than does Australia. But who, for example, has ever heard of Liberia in West Africa (which, in spite of over 120 years of independence, has made no real progress towards Civilization) being criticized because of its anti-European citizenship laws?

Australia's immigration policy has kept Australia free of the racial friction bedeviling the U.S. and now the United Kingdom. We have no developing Black Power movements similar to that now starting to develop in Canada. And this is why the Communists and their spiritual allies, the equalitarians of all types, attack the Australian immigration policy. In the meantime, they attempt to exploit in various ways the primitive aboriginals, extolling the qualities of "aboriginal leader" Mr. Charles Perkins, who received some education with the Civil Rights movement in the U.S., and who is publicized as the first Australian aboriginal to take a university degree. Here is another example of the dishonesty of the equalitarians. At the most, Mr. Perkins is only 50 percent aboriginal, and much of his undoubted ability must be attributed to his part-European background. And in the U.S. many, like Dr. Ralph Bunche, have been described dishonestly as "Negro leaders." Large numbers of American "Negroes" today are in fact part European.

Australians can best apply the Christian law of love towards Asians and Africans, not by bringing them into the country to eventually swamp the European, but by providing

them with educational and other assistance in their own countries. Only those who are true to themselves, as Shakespeare said, can assist others. By importing race problems, Australia would find her foreign policies inhibited in the same way that American foreign policy has been influenced by its race problem. American politicians have been quoted as saying that their attitude towards South Africa has been governed, not by truth and the importance of South Africa to the West in the struggle against International Communism, but by Negro votes at home.

Racial tensions are not confined to Europeans and non-Europeans, but exist also between the non-European peoples. In Ceylon the Tamil-speaking Hindus have conflicted with the rest of the community; the Africans dislike the Indians intensely; Indian and Negro have been at loggerheads in former British Gulana, with both assisting to eliminate the native Carib Indians; the Chinese are distrusted and disliked by the Malays, this being one of the major reasons why Singapore with its large Chinese population broke from the Malaysian Federation in 1965; the Japanese dislike the Koreans; tribal conflict is a feature of "liberated" Africa; and the indigenous people in Fiji bitterly resent the rapidly expanding Indian population.

Giving evidence before the international Court of Justice at The Hague on June 23, 1965, Professor Ernest van den Haag of New York University, a recognized expert on race relations, stressed that one of the inevitable results of unregulated contact between different ethnic groups is an increased rate of delinquency and a higher rate of suicide. He said that studies in the U.S.A. had shown that delinquency reaches its maximum when a community is half White and half Negro.

Professor C. D. Darlington observes in his book, *Genetics and Man* (1964) that "it is absurd to pretend that water and vinegar are equal. Water is better for some purposes, vinegar for others. Vinegar is harder to get but easier to do without. So it is with people. For 200 generations the advance of mankind has depended on those genetically diverse groups (races) which have been able to practise mutual help and show mutual respect. The future of mankind will depend on the continuance of such abilities and habits; a happy aim which cannot be assisted in the long run by make-believe, certainly not by a make-believe of equality in the physical, intellectual and cultural capacity of such groups."

Despite the elaborate technology with which modern man has surrounded himself, he ignores at his peril the truth about the evolution of man through racial diversity. One of the really great authorities—a true scientist—on race, Sir Arthur Keith, has warned that continued development depends upon the races remaining separate. He has warned that mixing them will eliminate those more highly specialized traits and differences, not only physical but mental and psychological, which have not only been the products of past evolution but necessary stepping-stones for further progress. Genetic realities must be faced and acted upon.

True unity, order and progress in the world will not come by pretending that all men are equal and can be mixed together to produce the World Citizen for the World State. Every step to impose more uniformity, more centralization, will produce more friction, leading towards what has been termed "the drab equality of chars."

It is time for the European peoples, particularly the English-speaking, to rid themselves of the guilt complex concerning other races, injected into them through the propaganda of the equalitarians. With all their faults, the English-speaking nations of the world have an excellent record in the maintenance

of free, stable societies. They should be thankful for the genetic and cultural heritage which has made this possible. And they can manifest a genuine humanitarian attitude towards primitive peoples and under-developed countries without becoming victims of the propaganda of the equalitarians. By rejecting the dogma that all races are inherently equal, they strike a massive blow against International Communism—depriving the Red conspiracy of one of its main ideological weapons.

**GRIFFIN BILL WOULD INCREASE THE NUMBER OF FAMILY DOCTORS**

**HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN**

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, available health care to Americans has reached crisis proportions. Hospital costs have soared and the number of available hospital beds has not kept pace with population growth.

The trend toward specialized medicine has created another problem which we must meet. The practice of family medicine has suffered a decline. In 1931, three-fourths of all physicians in private practice in this country were general practitioners. As a result of the trend in the medical profession toward specialization and public need for certain specialized medical services, today only one-fifth of all physicians are general practitioners. Between 1963 and 1967 alone, general practitioners decreased by 7.3 percent while the increase in the number of specialists was almost 20 percent.

In February 1969, the American Medical Association approved an American Board of Family Practice, with powers to conduct examinations and grant certification to family physicians. Few medical schools are now offering or planning courses leading to certification in this field.

To encourage expansion of the field of family medicine, I have introduced H.R. 16209, which would provide grants to medical schools and hospitals to assist them in establishing special departments and programs in the field of family practice and to otherwise encourage and promote the training of medical and paramedical personnel in the field of family medicine. The bill would authorize the appropriation of \$50 million for fiscal year 1971, \$75 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and \$100 million for each of the following 3 fiscal years.

As a part of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include an editorial which appeared in the Jackson, Miss., Clarion Ledger, February 26, 1970, endorsing the objectives of my bill. I commend it to the attention of the House:

**MORE FAMILY DOCTORS NEEDED**

Congress and various state legislators reportedly seek to help medical schools and hospitals educate larger numbers of doctors to practice family medicine. Surveys indicate there is a big need in this field.

Forty years ago, three-fourths of all this nation's practicing physicians were general

practitioners, according to quoteworthy analysis of this situation in the Congressional Record.

Today, only one in five—just 20 per cent—are general practitioners. The rest are specialists in surgery, pathology, radiology, internal medicine, psychiatry, pediatrics and so on.

Today's sophisticated and rapidly growing field of medicine does require a wide variety of specialists. Even so, this need is not greater than the need for family doctors—physicians who can provide general medical care for the entire family, from childhood to old age.

The family doctor needs to be trained in particular in preventive medicine. A second important function is to advise families on whom to consult when it is apparent that the trouble requires the attention of a specialist. The average family does not understand the medical specialist fully and needs the advice of a close friend, the family doctor.

It is true some medical schools are beginning to recognize the importance of training more family doctors, but the supply is only a drop in the bucket as compared with ever-growing needs.

State and federal efforts are needed to encourage more doctors to enter the field of family medicine.

**PRODUCTS FROM POLLUTANTS**

**HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON**

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, because of the great interest in environmental problems these days, I believe the enclosed editorial from the February 23 issue of the Provo, Utah, Daily Herald will be of interest to my colleagues who are also concerned about these problems:

**PRODUCTS FROM POLLUTANTS**

A lot of people are talking about pollution and the preservation of environment these days—and many are beginning to do something about these problems. For example:

Waste from the processing of citrus fruits (peel, rag and seeds) comprises 45 to 66 per cent of the total fruit. Food Engineering magazine reports that a new conversion process is turning this waste into cattle feed selling for \$18 or more a ton.

Researchers at General Electric's Research and Development Center in Schenectady are experimenting with special strains of bacteria which hold the promise of converting trash into a new animal food source.

The bacteria can digest cellulose which, in various forms, accounts for up to two-thirds of the solid wastes deposited in municipal refuse dumps.

Engineers at the Franklin Institute Research Laboratories in Philadelphia are developing a solid waste separator that will make possible other reuse of household discards. Shredded trash is fed into the device and a series of vibrating screens, baffles, paddle wheels and gravity separators sort it by classes—paper, soft plastics, glass, metal and hard plastics.

Also in the field of solid wastes, International Patents & Development Corp. in Kings Point, N.Y., has developed a garbage compactor already in use in a number of Manhattan apartment buildings.

The fully automated unit, which ejects 80-pound chunks of compacted trash, eliminates

fire hazards and air pollution and lowers time and labor costs involved in handling of waste material.

As for liquid waste, an advanced wastewater treatment process is in the final stages of testing at the University of Michigan. It can consistently remove 95 to 97 per cent of organic waste matter, compared with 80-90 per cent by conventional sewage treatment.

Most significant, the process removes most of the phosphate and much of the nitrogen in waste water. These contaminants, little affected by conventional methods, are largely responsible for excessive algae growth and the consequent rapid decay and aging of lakes.

Everybody is jumping on the pollution control bandwagon, so much so that it is being called the newest "glamor industry."

According to a survey of 248 companies by the National Industrial Conference Board, expenditures for pollution control equipment rose 23 per cent in 1969 to a total of \$256 million. The petroleum industry claims that it alone spent more than \$1 billion between 1966 and 1969 on air and water pollution control efforts.

It's one thing to trap pollutants, but this in turn can cause a problem. Take the tons of fly ash—unburned carbon—being collected daily in factory smoke stacks.

One company in Springfield, Ore., does take it, by the truckload, and converts it into charcoal briquets. What was once a nuisance and a literal eyesore is transformed into a marketable product.

Yes, many are talking about pollution, and because they are, the country is being motivated to action.

#### THE 18-YEAR-OLD VOTE

### HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to note the support of WABC-TV, in New York City, for legislation to lower the voting age to 18. As the sponsor of this legislation, House Joint Resolution 18, I agree with their stand on this issue, and would like to call their editorial on the subject to the attention of my colleagues, as follows:

#### 18 YEAR OLDS MUST BE ALLOWED TO VOTE

We are glad to see so much support growing for our long-standing position that 18 year olds should be allowed to vote. At no time in history have people of this age been so well educated and trained. Never before have they been so involved in such constructive work. We don't take our stand on the old slogan . . . if they're old enough to fight, they're old enough to vote. Young people know what's going on in the world today. In fact most of them are better informed about politics than their parents. Don't form an opinion of young people by what you see happening in wild demonstrations. Think of all the quiet protests that never get into the news. Remember that the one or two per cent of young people who cause violent disruptions do not represent all young adults. On January first of this year . . . 18 became the legal age in England, and the Government has not been toppled. However, the voters did not decide this issue . . . Parliament made the change. Channel Seven would like to see Congress do the same thing here.

#### THE FARM BILL

### HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, Many of us know that the House Committee on Agriculture is working hard to bring forth a farm bill.

I know of no more difficult task in this Congress than getting a farm bill in 1970. However, the committee has shown a determination that we will get a bill and pass it in plenty of time for the President to sign it before June 30 of this year. The chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE) has worked on this with the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BELCHER) the ranking Republican. From my observations of the committee, there has been very little politics. The committee on both sides of the aisle is desperately trying to come up with a bill in the public interest that can pass the Congress and be signed by the President.

David R. Francis, business and financial correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, has written an article on the uphill fight which the farm forces face in getting a bill. This article by Mr. Francis is in the Friday, February 27, issue of the Christian Science Monitor. I append it herewith so that all others in the House who are interested in the farm bill may read it:

#### FARM BLOC FACES UPHILL FIGHT: BILL EMERGES IN CONGRESS

(By David R. Francis)

WASHINGTON.—Rep. W. R. Poage, chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, candidly confesses his committee's relative weakness.

"The only farm bill that can possibly pass is that which we work out between the committee and the administration, the Republicans and Democrats. There isn't one group alone that can pass a farm bill today," the Texas Democrat says.

That wasn't the case a few years back. What the congressional agricultural committees proposed, Congress accepted. The farm bloc was powerful.

It will be a different story this spring when the House and Senate vote on new farm legislation. Important amendments from the floor are certain to be made. They may well pass. Urban congressmen are in revolt over the farm program, and they have the voting muscle needed to make changes.

#### COMPROMISE SOUGHT

In recent days, Mr. Poage and his fellow conservatives on the Agriculture Committee have been negotiating with top officials of the Department of Agriculture to work out a compromise farm bill. They hope such legislation will have a better chance of coming out of Congress relatively unscathed.

"We are still trying to get together," says Mr. Poage, who likes to wear fancy cowboy boots with his business suit.

Earlier this month, the Department of Agriculture sent a proposed farm bill to Mr. Poage. It was termed a "consensus bill," a phrase that causes Mr. Poage to chuckle.

The draft bill was supposed to be the product of numerous weekly meetings between Mr. Poage's group and Agriculture Department officials. The White House has refused to stamp the proposed legislation as an administration bill.

#### FURTHER CHANGES SEEN

"I am not condemning their bill," says Mr. Poage. "But that bill they brought up has not been agreed to by the members of the committee. It has a lot in it that resulted from our discussions. However, it is going to be modified considerably further."

Comments Don C. Paarlberg, top economist at the Department of Agriculture, "The signs are good for some reconciliation of differences."

Mr. Poage has represented his Texas constituency for 33 years. Since he won't be opposed for the Democratic nomination, he is expected to be reelected next fall. In 1968 he encountered no Republican opposition and was sent back to Washington with more than 95 percent of the vote against an independent candidate.

With a replacement or extension of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 necessary this year, Mr. Poage is glad to have his time free from campaigning to work out a farm bill.

#### NEW PROGRAM NOTED

What his committee is expected to report to the House floor will likely not be too different from the old farm bill.

One probable change will be the partial adoption of the so-called "set aside" program offered in the Department of Agriculture bill.

"It doesn't appeal to me at all," states Mr. Poage bluntly. "It is rather foolish. You are using a shotgun where you ought to use a rifle. It is not a very accurate way of achieving supply management."

"But it is something we can live with. This administration has got to put its brand on a new program. They cuss Freeman just as we cussed Benson," he added, referring to former Secretaries of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman and Ezra Taft Benson.

Farmers, as in present farm legislation, would divert a portion of their land from crop production because of the superproductivity of American farmers. This would match supply more closely to demand for farm products.

However, the farmer would have slightly more freedom to plant whatever crop he wished on the remaining land.

Details of the Department of Agriculture proposal are likely to be altered. As offered, the "set aside" would be unfair to farmers in some states because of varying historical changes in what is called the "conservation base." So this base may be adjusted.

#### PARITY-FLOOR BATTLE SHAPES

In addition, Mr. Poage says it will be harder to apply "set aside" to cotton than to feed grains or wheat. Cotton is of major importance to the Texas congressman's constituents. Cotton growers get a major hunk of government-subsidy money—perhaps \$900 million this year.

The Department of Agriculture bill also would remove the current floors on loans and purchase prices. These floors are set in terms of parity—a comparison of prices farmers receive for their products with the prices they pay for their supplies and based on the years 1910-14. Most economists view it as a nonsensical concept. But it is still regarded highly by farmers.

Removal of the floor, the Agriculture Department argues, would facilitate exports of farm products. Prices could be lowered to world levels.

But the House committee wants a floor. As a compromise Department of Agriculture officials have been talking of a transitional arrangement for 1971, after which the parity-price floors would disappear.

Another feature of the Department of Agriculture bill is a limit on government subsidies to individual farmers.



Because the subsidy system is based largely on commodity production, the biggest farmers who need help least get the great bulk of government payments. The small farmers get little subsidy money.

Speaking of the Department of Agriculture's proposed limit, Rep. Silvio O. Conte (R) of Massachusetts termed it "ridiculously high." The proposal is a scaled one that would allow payments up to \$110,000 to a single producer for each crop, or as much as \$330,000 for all three programs.

Mr. Conte said he was convinced that the House "will not countenance such a transparently feeble attempt to give the appearance of reform without the substance."

The Pittsfield, Mass., representative proposes a \$5,000 limit per crop on government subsidies to a single farmer. This limitation, he maintains, could trim as much as \$500 million from the cost of the farm program. Another source estimated \$400 million.

SAVINGS COMPARED

The Agriculture Department limitation, officials reckon, would save only \$20 million to \$50 million, depending on how it is administered. That compares with government farm subsidies totaling \$3.7 billion last year.

Mr. Poage doubts that a farm bill will pass without some limitation on payments. What it will be, though, is an unknown factor at this stage of the legislative process.

Another feature of the Department of Agriculture bill is an effort to tighten budgetary control.

This is unlikely to come out of the agricultural committees. Most farm groups oppose it.

"We will fight that agricultural-appropriation thing right down to the last ditch," warns Robert Frederick, legislative representative for the National Grange and the spokesman for a coalition of 27 farm groups.

He argued that farmers would not sign up for the various crop-diversion programs if they could not be guaranteed a level of government payments. At present, the Department of Agriculture and Congress establish a level of payments, and the money is appropriated later.

The proposed system would require the program to be shaped to money appropriated in advance.

If rejected by the committees, Agriculture Department officials expect the budget-control measures to be introduced on the floor of the House and Senate. The system has less prospect of passing than a limit on payments, most observers say.

The Senate Agriculture Committee began hearings on the farm program last week. It is expected to report out a bill within a few weeks and before the House committee. It will be even closer to the old bill than the House version, observers expect. Since all Senators have at least some farmers in their states, they have more reason to please farmers than the vast majority of representatives with their largely urban constituents.

JAMES B. UTT—AMERICAN

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply shocked and saddened by the sudden passing of our friend and colleague, the Honorable JAMES B. UTT, of California. We are all a little poorer with the loss of such a great American.

JAMES UTT was well known for his zeal against the menace of communism. Undaunted by the abuse and scorn of those

who see no real danger in communism and those willing to tolerate it, he carried on his crusade, often alone but never swayed from his determination to preserve America's sovereignty and the liberty that makes the free world free.

For 18 years, he served well and faithfully and has left behind a record of dedicated patriotism, unsullied integrity, unflinching courage, and distinguished statesmanship that can make each of us a little more proud to be a Member of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to pay tribute to this great American and regret that such tribute comes on so sad an occasion. I know I am joined by all my colleagues in extending deepest sympathies to JAMES UTT's widow and family.

PLANE BOMBING CALLED  
OUTRAGE

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, we have been repelled by the continuous acts of terrorism aimed at civilians in transit, at airfields, in travel offices, and in the aircraft as they travel. On many occasions we, who have been members of our delegation to the Interparliamentary Union meetings, have supported resolutions to the effect that this wanton practice cease. But the tragic consequences do not strike with ultimate sorrow until they hit close to home.

Last week, Connecticut residents Dr. and Mrs. Richard Weinerman and Mel Meyerson became victims of one such senseless act of violence when they were riding as innocent passengers aboard a plane which was destroyed by a terrorist bomb over Switzerland.

Our own past experience with the hijacking of American airliners clearly indicates the ease of access to these craft. The liability of an aircraft to be hijacked has caused considerable concern. The liability of such an aircraft to be bombed is a cause of immediate worldwide alarm. If airline bombing is not eliminated now, the threat of repetition of the tragedy in Zurich will haunt air travelers, not just in the Middle East, but throughout the world on a daily basis.

The death of the Weinermans was a great loss to the country for they were productive people as shown by his work at Yale University and their combined efforts as authors in the fields of medicine and hospital care.

The repetition of this tragedy for lack of some form of concerted action to prevent it would be unconscionable. We all hope that the future can record this loss as the last such instance of the mad bombing of aircraft.

A news story which gives an account of this tragedy follows:

STATE RESIDENTS KILLED: PLANE-BOMBING CALLED OUTRAGE

(By John Landry)

The Jewish community of Greater Hartford Sunday expressed sorrow and outrage over

the bomb-sparked crash of a Swissair jetliner Saturday killing 47 persons.

Three Connecticut residents died in the crash including a Yale University professor of medicine and his wife on their way to Israel to complete part of a study commissioned by the World Health Organization and Harvard University Press.

Dr. Edwin Richard Weinerman, M.D. 52, and his wife Shirley, 51, of Hamden had boarded the jetliner on the first leg of a trip taking them to Israel, Japan and New Zealand. They were working together on a study of medical care in those countries to complete a second book on the subject.

They previously had studied medical practices in Poland, Hungary and Czechoslovakia under World Health Organization sponsorship and published "Social Medicine in Eastern Europe," a book stemming from the study in 1968.

Dr. Weinerman was a professor of medicine and medical care at Yale and director of ambulatory services for Yale-New Haven Hospital.

Also among 11 Americans killed in the crash was Melville Meyerson of Stamford.

The jetliner, a four-engine Convair Coronado, screamed to earth and crashed at Wurelingen, about 20 miles north of Kloten Airport, Zurich, shortly after takeoff for Tel-Aviv.

BOMB EXPLODED

The pilot of the airliner had radioed Kloten that a bomb had exploded in the baggage compartment and he was flying back to Kloten when it crashed.

A Jordan-based Arab guerrilla organization claimed "credit" for the crash, its leaders saying the bomb had been planted on the plane.

A similar bomb explosion aboard an Austrian aircraft bound for Israel earlier Saturday caused no personal injuries as that airliner rerouted safely to Frankfurt, Germany.

PUBLIC STATEMENT

The Jewish Community of Greater Hartford issued a public statement Sunday on the tragedy signed by Charles Rubenstein, president of the Hartford Jewish Federation; Jerry Wagner, chairman of the Hartford Jewish Community Relations Council and the Rev. James M. Webb, general secretary of the Connecticut Council of Churches.

STATEMENT

"We believe that all Americans join the Greater Hartford Jewish community in expressing shock and sorrow at the wanton mid-air destruction of a Swissair plane this weekend," read the statement.

"We in the Hartford area felt loss keenly because the victims were the son and daughter-in-law of David Weinerman, a long time community leader."

FRUSTRATION AND OUTRAGE

"Even as we express our condolences to the Weinerman family and to all relatives of the victims we cannot help voicing our frustration and outrage at the brutality and senselessness of this criminal act.

"How can the civilized world permit terrorist groups, obsessed with the desire to destroy Israel to wreak this kind of havoc? How long can Arab governments continue to furnish haven and comfort to perpetrators of such murderous deeds? We call upon the entire international community to denounce the continuing onslaught on air traffic and to demand that Arab states eliminate all terrorist bases within their borders."

A memorial service for Dr. and Mrs. Weinerman will be held Tuesday at 7 p.m. at the Emanuel Synagogue, 160 Mohegan Drive, West Hartford.

Both Dr. and Mrs. Weinerman were Hartford natives, who attended local schools and were "teen-age sweethearts" according to Dr. Weinerman's brother, Robert A. Weinerman of 76 Westerly Terrace.

"My brother was a war victim. That's the only thing I can say about this horrible thing," said Robert Sunday.

"The irony of it all is that he and Shirley were on a mission of help for all people in the world. They were doing a study of medical practices."

Robert Weirnerman is the president of the Southern New England Contracting Co.

Dr. Weirnerman graduated from Hartford Public High School in 1934; his wife, the former Shirley Basch, from Weaver High School in 1935.

Dr. Weirnerman graduated Phi Beta Kappa from Yale in 1938; from Georgetown Medical College in 1942. He had the highest marks in the country when he took his medical board examinations and was cited for the achievement by the federal government.

He was a former director of the Herrick Memorial Hospital clinic and was in private practice at El Cerito, Calif. He joined the Yale University medical school as assistant professor of public health in 1962 when he was also appointed director of ambulatory services at Grace-New Haven Community Hospital.

Dr. Weirnerman also had a masters degree from Harvard School of Public Health.

During World War II, he served as a captain in the Army Medical Corps, then went to the University of California at Berkeley as visiting associate professor of medical economics. While on the West Coast he also served as medical director of the Permanent Health Plan, Oakland, Calif.

Mrs. Weirnerman graduated from Smith College in 1939. She collaborated with her husband in his academic writings and was assisting him on his most recent project.

The Weirnermans have two children, Jeffrey Alan Weirnerman, a teacher who lives in San Francisco and Diane Weirnerman, a senior at Oberlin College.

Dr. Weirnerman's survivors also include his parents, Mr. and Mrs. David T. Weirnerman of 779 Prospect Ave., West Hartford and his brother, Robert.

Mrs. Weirnerman's survivors include her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Charles Basch of 10 Pinecrest Rd., West Hartford, and a sister, Mrs. Clifford Barger of Brookline, Mass.

#### DEAD END STREET

### HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, without the benefit of poverty or other recreational funds, and without the persuasion of any of the numerous "uplift" organizations, a veteran congressional page, Phil Tannenbaum, has provided recreation for some of the children in his neighborhood.

The following brief newspaper item of recent date tells the story:

#### DEAD END STREET

What's the best thing to do with the end of a street? Phil Tannenbaum spent \$11.50, put up a pole, a backboard and a hoop and turned the one in front of his house into a basketball court for neighborhood children who didn't have a nearby place to play.

Phil, only 17 himself, is a page in the House of Representatives and is to graduate from the Capitol Page School in June. He lives with his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Sam Tannenbaum, at 2219 Richland St., Silver Spring.

His father is a lawyer but Phil plans to attend the University of Maryland and major in business administration. He started

as a Senate page when he was in the ninth grade and now has Potomac Fever; he hopes to keep working on the Hill in some capacity while attending college.

#### WE MUST MOVE FORWARD

### HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the rights of millions of black Americans hang in balance as the result of the faltering and backsliding of the present administration. This is a time for ever-increasing effort to provide justice for all Americans. Yet, the actions of the past few months, incredible as it may seem, are slowing and even reversing the forward motion so painfully sought over the years.

Witness the forced resignation of Leon Panetta from the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Witness the renewed fight for segregated schools under the guise of that celebrated misnomer "freedom of choice."

Witness the contradictory statements of administration officials—this southern strategy subterfuge. This is the time for a clear stand and a clean delineation of the issues by the executive department. We cannot at this point in our history afford vacillating appeals to sectional interests.

The record of obstructionism and indifference is striking.

I insert the following articles which testify to this distressing state of affairs:

#### ROBERT KENNEDY'S '67 IDEA RECALLED ON PRESIDENTIAL ACTION FOR EQUALITY

(By Frank Mankiewicz and Tom Braden)

In February of 1970, the racial problem reached a crisis. As in the past, the question was whether to have one society or two, but the immediate issue was whether to abandon the effort to send black and white children to the same schools.

President Nixon stood mute, but statements were issued in his name, so confusing and so vague as to permit both sides to claim his support.

On the night of July 27, 1967, Sen. Robert Kennedy sat in his office talking with friends. President Johnson had just addressed the nation in the aftermath of the Detroit riots. "It's over," said Sen. Kennedy, "he's not going to do anything."

"What would you do, if you were President?" challenged a friend. Kennedy thought for a moment.

"If I were President," he began, "I'd take advantage of the power of the office. I'd call the heads of the three television networks and ask them to be here tomorrow morning."

"I'd tell them it's their duty to their country to produce a two-hour documentary, to be run as soon as possible—in prime time—which would show what it's like to live in a ghetto. Let them show the sound, the feel, the hopelessness, and what it's like to think you'll never get out."

"Show a black teenager, told by some radio jingle to stay in school, looking at his older brother—who stayed in school—and who's out of a job. Show the Mafia pushing narcotics; put a Candid Camera team in a ghetto school and watch what a rotten system of

education it really is. Film a mother staying up all night to keep the rats from her baby."

"The President is the only man who could get them to produce that show. Then I'd ask people to watch it—and experience what it means to live in the most affluent society in history—without hope. Government can't cure all the problems, but the President isn't a prisoner of events—he can act. And he's the only man who can."

"Then," Kennedy continued, "I'd collect data on what this means to every major city. In New York, ghetto children lose between 10 and 20 points on their IQ between the fourth and eighth grades—those statistics should be available for every city."

"Then I'd call meetings one a day, if necessary—of people from every major city. Maybe there are fifty such cities—maybe more. I'd find out who has the real power, and I'd ask them to the White House. The mayor, ministers, bankers, real estate men, contractors, union officials—everybody knows who really has power in a city—not just elected politicians."

"I'd talk to those groups, I'd show them the facts—in their city. And I'd say, 'Gentlemen, this is your problem, and only you can solve it. If you don't solve it, your city will fall apart in a few years, and it will be your fault—and I'd say it was your fault.'

"They could figure out their own solution. If the problem was schools, let them raise the money for schools, or modernize, or bus the kids, or change the zones. I wouldn't care—just do it. If it was unemployment, make new jobs. They could do it by cutting profits, or by tax incentives, or by using government programs. But I'd make it clear that this can only be solved in the community—and that they had no time to spare."

Kennedy sat back. "It's no use my saying these things—when I do, it's a political speech. The President of the United States is the only man who has the pulpit—he is the only leader we all have. If he leads—if he shows that he cares—people will give him time. In a crisis—and this is the worst one since the Civil War—his leadership is all we have."

#### THE WHITTEN AMENDMENT

Yesterday the House reattached the fabled Whitten amendment to the compromise Labor-HEW appropriation bill. The Whitten amendment is the name given to one or more amendments (their form changes slightly from year to year) which Mississippi Congressman Jamie Whitten appends annually to Labor-HEW appropriations bills. There is a vast gulf between the Whitten amendment's noble-sounding language and its actual intent. On its face, the Whitten amendment would merely prohibit the Department of HEW from using its funds in such a way as to force school children to attend schools which are against the choice of their parents or to be bused to schools not of their choice; and it also would prohibit HEW from using its funds to abolish particular schools. The busing part was put in as sort of come-on by Mr. Whitten who knows that "forced busing" is a specter which Northerners profoundly fear, and who also knows that school desegregation in the South often tends to require less busing than does the maintenance of the illegal dual school system.

So the busing proviso is there to gain Northern support—never mind that the federal government is already forbidden by statute to compel busing to overcome de facto segregation. The important part of the Whitten amendment is that which would prevent HEW from carrying out the provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 or following the directives contained in several Supreme Court decisions in relation to the dismantling of the South's dual school system. It would give a reprieve to districts like those Mr. Whitten represents which have been flouting the law for 16 years and which are

now complaining, via their representative in Congress, that the Supreme Court on Oct. 29 acted summarily and in indecent haste. Mr. Whitten's amendment, in short, is designed to maintain the validity of officially imposed school segregation in the South. This fact is one of the worst kept secrets on Capitol Hill—or any place where school desegregation is the subject of even remotely serious discussion.

Mr. Nixon has been aware of the importance of the Whitten amendment for some time, and he has taken a very interesting position on it. In the autumn of 1968, when he was a candidate for President, and when the Whitten amendment was a hot item in the House, Mr. Nixon authorized Melvin Laird to tell House Republicans that he—Mr. Nixon—opposed the Whitten amendment and hoped they would vote against it. That got a nice splash in the press and—rather more important—provided the narrow margin that defeated the Whitten amendment.

In 1969, Mr. Whitten was to come back with his amendment on the new Labor-HEW appropriations bill. That summer, the Attorney General informed the relevant members of the House that the Nixon administration in fact did not oppose the Whitten amendment; so the Whitten amendment was passed by a narrow margin in the House.

Then at the end of summer, Secretary Finch told the Senate that the Nixon administration did oppose the Whitten amendment; things were a bit far gone by then, however, so it took a king-sized battle mounted by Secretary Finch and Minority Leader Scott to keep the thing off the Senate version of the appropriation bill. And Secretary Finch did some very intense lobbying to get the House to accept the Senate's language. As recently as Feb. 6, Mr. Nixon's commissioner of education, James E. Allen Jr., informed a Senate subcommittee of the reasoning behind the administration's continuing opposition to the Whitten maneuver:

"The Department continues to oppose such proposals because they not only conflict with the decisions of the Supreme Court but further would seriously restrict the enforcement efforts under Title VI to eliminate discrimination."

A short while after the commissioner made his statement, Mr. Ziegler, the President's spokesman, let it be known that Commissioner Allen did not speak for the administration. Then, Monday, emerging from the White House, Minority Leader Ford disclosed that the President favored the "thrust" of the Whitten amendment. In thrust, perhaps, but not, as you might say, in drift. Or in substance, but not in form. Or—who knows?—in form but not in substance. By afternoon, Secretary Finch informed the House Rules committee that he opposed the Whitten amendment and believed himself to be speaking for the administration.

There—as of the moment of writing—you have the position on the Whitten amendment that Mr. Nixon has evolved. The good Lord knows it is subject to change before the ink is dry, but we think that, over all, it has certain interesting permanent features. One is that it is highly mobile, and the other is that it is rarely if ever enunciated by Mr. Nixon himself—only by those who speak for him on all sides. It will be interesting to see whether Secretary Finch's word is the last word when the bill goes to the Senate.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 24, 1970]  
OBITUARIES FOR DESEGREGATION WRITTEN BY LEFT, RIGHT, CENTER  
(By David S. Broder)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.—It was a great ecumenical funeral they arranged last week for the 15-year-old policy called school desegregation. They said the kid never accomplished much when he was alive, but he sure drew a crowd for his burial.

The President and Vice President of the United States came, and so did most of the Republicans and Democrats in the House and Senate, and they all threw a handful of dirt into the grave.

The obituaries had been written by the best commentators of the left, the right and the center, the New Republic's Alexander Bickel, the National Review's William Buckley and Newsweek's Stewart Alsop. They agreed it was a darn shame it happened; but the fool kid had been warned time and again to stay off buses and to quit messing around neighborhood schools. He just wouldn't listen.

They listed all the trouble the kid had caused in his short lifetime. He'd made race relations worse, they said, and helped pile up a vote for George Wallace. He'd caused violence in the schools. He'd scared the whites out into the suburbs and made the cities more segregated than before.

Even those who had been the kid's friends and had tried to help him had to admit that the effort was costly when measured against the pitifully little genuine integration that had been achieved since the Supreme Court delivered the unwanted infant on the nation's doorstep that May Monday in 1954.

There was no call for an inquest into the cause of death. Maybe it could have been shown that what really killed integration was the unwillingness of the white majority to stick the cost and inconvenience of desegregating the schools. But everyone knew the cost—in dollars and in disruption of familiar patterns—was bound to go up, and most agreed it was better the kid was dead, with no questions asked.

One of the new "realists" was Sen. Abraham Ribicoff (D-Conn.), who has progressed in only 10 years from being John Kennedy's favorite governor to being John Stennis's favorite senator. He came pretty close to telling the truth at the funeral when he said, "We are talking about a segregated society . . . It is not the kids who are racists; it is the adults who are racists. I do not want to make the children innocent pawns."

But even Ribicoff, the supreme realist, could not quite bring himself to admit what it was that had been killed—or even that a death had occurred. He kept talking about opening the suburbs to Negroes and making big improvements in ghetto schools—trying to comfort the bereaved.

However, the kid's friends know now that desegregation is probably finished, except in those rare communities where local conditions and attitudes are so favorable that the federal courts can enforce their orders with the minimal help likely to be available from federal, state or local authorities. No politicians—and few judges—will work very hard at propping up a corpse.

Most of the country will now revert to the reservation policy, as Sen. Clifford Hansen (R-Wyo.) suggested, when he compared the "mistake" of integration to the "mistake" of sending Indian children off the reservations to school.

It is, of course, a somewhat chancier proposition to adopt a reservation policy for 22,000,000 blacks, whose reservations are the centers of our cities, than it is to impose that policy on 5,000 Indians in Wyoming.

But even if every Negro parent passively accepted reservation status for his children, which will not happen, one would still have to ask how much of the soul of America was in the casket that was buried last week. This was the question Leon Panetta, the ousted administration civil rights official, Sen. Walter F. Mondale (D-Minn.) and a few others tried unavailingly to raise at last week's state funeral.

School desegregation was a last, desperate effort to erase the ugly heritage of slavery. It was an effort to vindicate in the next generation the founders' faith that this could

be one nation of many peoples, a free society based on the equality of all men.

History may judge that vision was foreordained to failure by the tragic fact that slavery preceded independence on our continent.

But that is a judgment only history can make, and the test of statesmanship today surely must be resistance to that fateful admission of failure.

It is tragic that a President who only a month ago spoke of giving this country "the lift of a driving dream" should have acquiesced, with nary a protest, in the death of the American dream.

#### DESEGREGATION: PIERCING A FEW VEILS

It was not just the public that found itself completely baffled by the end of the week as to what was going on in the Senate on the subject of school desegregation. Rarely has there been more confusion—*de jure* and *de facto*, as it were, or deliberate and inadvertent—than that which marked the Senate debate over John Stennis's amendment calling for equal application of desegregation law in the North and South. What, after all, could be wrong with that? Was not the North, in Senator Ribicoff's phrase, guilty of "monumental hypocrisy" in its attitude toward the racial concentration in its own schools?

The answer to the second question is, Yes—but not in a way that has much, if anything, to do with what was going on in the Senate. For in relation to the pitch the Southerners were making, and as the term "monumental" goes, it was to compare Grant's Tomb with the Mausoleum at Halicarnassus. Consider only Senator Talmadge's observation that there has been no officially-imposed racial segregation in the South since the Supreme Court outlawed the practice sixteen years ago. It could get you to wondering on what grounds, then, Attorney General Mitchell, who is not exactly in the vanguard of the civil rights movement, had brought suit against the state of Georgia to desegregate its schools in the fall of 1969.

To untangle some of the mysteries attending this question of equal application of the law, it might be well to consider, first, what Federal law currently is; second, the way in which it already applies to the North; and, third, what the Stennis amendment (passed in the Senate) could or could not do to affect the situation. Elsewhere on this page, an excerpt from the debate, goes to the same points.

First, for the law. It is embodied in several Supreme Court decisions, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and various measures related to Federal aid to education. The court has held that it is unconstitutional for governmental authorities at any level in the public school system to segregate children "solely on the basis of race." To do so, of course, was the publicly stated, official practice of Southern (and some Northern) school systems prior to the Brown decision in 1954. Ten years later, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 incorporated the court's views on the illegality of discrimination of this kind and made compliance with those views a condition of receiving Federally-dispersed money:

"No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance."

The passage of this law preceded by only a short time the passage of the Federal aid to education act and similar Great Society legislation which, for the first time, made significant sums of money theoretically available to (and withdrawable from) state operated schools and other institutions that had continued to defy the court's ruling against racial discrimination. That was when the fuss over the "guidelines" hotly up. Defiant Southern school districts, wanting

their money, attempted to meet the Civil Rights Act standard merely by saying they were desegregated in the sense that they no longer publicly espoused discrimination ("freedom of choice"); HEW, which had the funds to dispense, countered that in numerous districts only the rhetoric had changed; the Supreme Court, in 1968, then took another step in the law: it ruled that so-called "freedom of choice" or desegregation by proclamation, was not in itself sufficient evidence of compliance with the law. It thus gave HEW authority to apply its own measures of good faith or lack of it in the districts under consideration.

How does all or any of this affect the North? It is important to note, first, that where official intent to segregate children in schools "solely on the basis of race" has been established in the North—usually a covert intent, but an intent, nonetheless—those school districts have come under the same pressures and orders as those in operation in the South. Most of the more famous "de facto" cases in the North and the West, in fact, have been prosecuted and resolved on "de jure" grounds. So in that sense the law already is equally applicable; it's just that people have assumed that any ruling against a Northern or Western district must, of its nature, be a "de facto" ruling.

"De facto" itself is a term that is loosely applied to cover any situation in which official intent to discriminate has not been perceived, but where large racial concentrations exist in the schools. Some lower courts have ruled that such concentration in itself is a form of illegal "segregation." Most have ruled otherwise. And more important, the Supreme Court has declined to take any view on the question. The Civil Rights Act, however, does take a view, specifically distinguishing between racial concentration caused by discriminatory state action and racial concentration that is not the apparent result of such official action. It has forbidden the federal government to use its funds merely to establish racial balance where no state discrimination can be found. The Stennis amendment, being merely a kind of policy statement, will thus have little practical effect in bringing about "desegregation" in the North, since the court's silence and the Civil Rights Act's directive render it almost without legal meaning.

What it can provide, however, is yet another weapon for resisting districts in the South. They will be able to attempt a new stalling maneuver on the grounds that they do not have to move any faster than, say, Cleveland. So with adroit legal manipulation (at which they have never been slouches) they may gain a little more time. We should be clear whom we are talking about here. Of some 4,470 school districts in seventeen states where the dual, black and white system had some official standing, only a few hundred (mostly rural) districts are still going through the agonies with the Federal government over their refusal to dismantle their dual school systems. Those are Senator Stennis's clients; they are what the fuss has been all about.

Still, we may all owe the Senator a debt of gratitude. Only this skirmish could have focused national attention on the real problems in the North (and in some cities of the South, which have complied with law but found their schools "resegregated" on a "de facto" or neighborhood basis). So now we can get down to considering the authentic questions—which plans work and which plans don't; how, without proving discriminatory intent, you can move children around on the basis of their skin color and not establish precedents or practices that are as dangerous as they might be well-intended; whether racial concentration, in itself, can be officially stigmatized without creating state doctrine that a given number of black children in a school automatically defines

that school as one that is defective; what the real sources and dimensions of the problem are—and what its practical solution. On account of Senator Stennis's effort this week (though despite his opposition to the idea), there will now for the first time be a select Senate committee charged with making a serious and responsible inquiry into these questions, questions the Congress has done its best to ignore over the years. That was the one really useful thing to come out of the Senate debate.

#### A SCHOOLHOUSE DIVIDED AGAINST ITSELF

(By Leo Rennett)

WASHINGTON.—"I don't know the exact shape of the American school of the future," said Sacramento's former Supt. of Schools F. Melvyn Lawson a few years ago. "But I'm confident it will be an integrated school."

Lawson reached that conclusion after a long period of painful soul-searching. He had seen the beginning of ugly racial conflict in his community and weighed the alternatives—one society or two hostile camps. He came to realize quality education in the second half of the 20th century cannot take place in a setting of racial isolation. Full educational opportunity for all youngsters meant natural daily contacts with children of other races.

As a result of this evolution in his professional thinking, Lawson steered Sacramento schools on the path to integration. While the process has had its disappointments and imperfections, it also has been a major success. Today, there are hundreds of superintendents throughout the country who wish they had exercised as much leadership and initiative a few years ago instead of permitting segregation to become deeply imbedded in their school systems.

#### HAND

But instead of giving them a helping hand, President Richard Nixon has decided to throw the prestige of his office on the side of all those—North and South—who grasp for any excuse to avoid or delay integration.

The neighborhood school, he suggests, should remain a sacred institution. Busing is a dirty word. What counts is "quality" education. Southern segregationists and their Northern counterparts could not be happier with this expression of presidential philosophy. They see no White House endorsement of recent court rulings—only the most grudging agreement to carry out judicial orders.

With Nixon prepared to "balance" the U.S. Supreme Court and to out-Dixie George Wallace, the way has been paved for more obstructionist tactics by anti-integration forces everywhere. After all, if the President criticizes busing and defends the neighborhood school, who would dare challenge the local white supremacists when they propound the same arguments?

Not only has Nixon complicated the task of integration in districts where such an effort still remains to be made. He also has pulled the rug from under conscientious school officials who have stuck their necks out to promote integration, including his own commissioner of education, James E. Allen, Jr.

#### FOCUS

Like Lawson, Allen has approached the problem as an educator, not a politician—by focusing on what constitutes good education and the most practical way of achieving this goal. Both men believe quality education means integrated education. Thus, any method—including some busing—which helps a district reach this objective is perfectly defensible.

Neither Allen nor Lawson sees any overriding virtue in neighborhood schools—or any special evil in busing. If they foster good education, use them. If not, try something else.

Half a century ago, American farmers gave up their neighborhood schools in an attempt to improve the educational opportunities of their children. The one-room schoolhouse was boarded up and youngsters bused to better facilities with better teachers. It was the era of consolidation, of the emergence of union school districts. And the bus was the symbol of progressive change.

In American cities, it took somewhat longer for Lawson and other administrators to discover the liabilities of neighborhood schools. But long before the issue of segregation ever was raised, they found that small-enrollment centers deprived children of many educational advantages. Youngsters often were thrown into two-grade combination classes. Small neighborhood schools could not afford librarians, resource teachers, science equipment and other important ingredients of a modern curriculum. They were expensive to operate and singularly ill-fitted for innovations like team teaching.

#### RECOGNIZE

In recognition of these problems, new suburban systems switched to extensive busing operations so that buildings no longer would dictate curriculum. When special vocational programs or projects for the gifted were set up in one central location, no one protested the purchase of a few more buses.

But unfortunately, these are all considerations the White House chooses to ignore. Nixon has discarded the opportunity of presidential leadership. He instead has embarked on the dangerous course of playing politics with the emotional sidelights of what still remains the nation's biggest domestic problem.

#### SANDBAGGED AIDE IS OUT

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

Leon Panetta, fired this week as civil rights chief of the Health, Education and Welfare Department, was literally hounded out of office by top administration officials, including Vice President Spiro Agnew.

When Panetta moved to desegregate the higher education system of Maryland, former Maryland Gov. Agnew went to HEW Secretary Robert Finch to complain.

Likewise, when Panetta moved against the public school system of Wichita, Kans., where a clear showing of de jure (officially sanctioned) segregation was made, the White House itself bitterly complained to Panetta's bosses at HEW. Panetta went ahead anyway, and cited Wichita for noncompliance.

President Nixon himself has been calling for equal treatment, North and South, in federal school desegregation efforts. But in one of Panetta's first major actions in the North—at Wichita—the White House rebuked him.

The effort to get rid of Panetta almost came to a head last fall, but collapsed when some high officials at HEW let it be known that if Panetta was fired, they might walk out, too.

The leading Panetta-hater then was Attorney General John Mitchell (who derided Panetta behind his back as a "zealot") and his deputy, Richard Kleindienst (who got a venomous earful about Panetta from Robert Mardian, HEW's conservative general counsel, with whom he drove to work every morning).

Most of the back-stabbing was done out of range of Finch and HEW Under Secretary John Veneman. Both of them regarded Panetta as a major asset to the department, who, far from making political trouble, was simply enforcing the law.

Recently, however, White House complaints about Panetta began to come directly to Finch himself. Two weeks ago Panetta, Finch and Veneman decided that these complaints had reached such a peak that Panetta's ability to operate was becoming compromised. Panetta informed his bosses that under those circumstances he probably should resign.

But he never had a chance. When Southern congressional sources leaked a story last Tuesday that Panetta was on the way out, the White House called Finch and demanded the resignation at once. It was announced by the White House before Panetta had had a chance to write it. He was fired for obeying the law.

#### PANETTA RAPS NIXON AIDES ON RACE ISSUE (By James K. Batten)

Leon E. Panetta says President Nixon is surrounded by men who attach a low priority to the cause of racial justice in America.

Panetta, a 31-year-old liberal Republican who quit under pressure this week as the Department of Health, Education and Welfare's civil rights chief, said in an interview yesterday that he believes the President himself is a "fair-minded man."

But he quickly charged that such top White House aides as Bryce Harlow, John D. Ehrlichman and H. R. Haldeman had made little or no attempt to help Nixon understand the gravity of the nation's racial crisis.

Panetta quoted Ehrlichman, now the President's top lieutenant for domestic affairs, as saying to him: "The blacks are not where our votes are."

#### CHARGES PRESSURE

Panetta had said he quit because of congressional pressure on the White House—members of Congress complaining that he was too militant on the issue of school desegregation.

Despite White House pressures for his ouster in the past, Panetta said, his boss, HEW Secretary Robert H. Finch, had urged his young civil rights director to stand fast.

But when he walked into Finch's office last Tuesday, Finch told him: "Well, it looks like it may be it."

Panetta added: "He was very obtuse, but the message was very clear."

In yesterday's interview, Panetta was reluctant to blame Nixon for his firing, or for the administration's increasing coolness toward the cause of racial integration in the schools.

The problem, Panetta suggested, was that no one at the White House has been actively advocating the best interests of black Americans in the tugging and hauling over school integration.

"I kept seeing these memos from Harry Dent to the President, the Vice President and the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, attaching letters from white parents saying what a tragic thing it was that white kids had to be bused across town.

"But I've yet to see a letter from a black parent or a black child."

Panetta, however, said he did not believe that full responsibility for the White House performance should go to Dent, a former aide to Sen. Strom Thurmond, R-S.C., now Nixon's top political aide.

#### AIDES BLAMED

Dent, Panetta said, could not have achieved that by himself. "It takes the Harlows, the Haldemans and the Ehrlichmans—people like that.

"Nixon probably is sincere," Panetta said, "but he hasn't taken the time to understand what a deep problem this is in this country. If there could just be an indication of concern at the national level that efforts have to be made to bring people together . . ."

The brunt of the blame, he said, must be placed upon "those around him (the President) who have got to bring to his attention the whole impact of this thing. And I don't think they've done that."

The result, Panetta said, is "a vacuum in leadership" at a time when the nation is in turmoil about the future of its schools and racial integration."

"In recent weeks, Southern politicians have been crying 'Fire!' in a crowded theater,

but then the administration goes in and yells 'Fire!' even louder. And by God, you don't help by doing that," he declared.

#### DRIFT TO THE RIGHT: SENATE VOTES ON SCHOOL DESEGREGATION SEEN AS REACTION AGAINST BLACKS

(By Joseph Kraft)

The latest Senate votes on school desegregation make it plain that a reactionary tide is running in American politics. But the present move to the right is a curious phenomenon—different from what happened in the 1920s and the 1950s.

This time the reaction is without visible leaders and organization. It is less a swing than a drift—something allowed to happen, which probably means that it will be that much harder to arrest and reverse.

The prime targets of the present reaction are the blacks in this country. They constitute an obvious and unpopular minority, geographically centered in the major cities, and without inner economic balance. They were the chief beneficiaries of the liberal surge under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson.

And at the heart of that liberal surge was the principle, implicit in the famous 1954 Supreme Court decision against school segregation, that fairness required a progressive lowering of the barriers between the races.

Nobody knows the exact meaning of the many amendments voted up and down last week by the Senate. But that is precisely the point. The ambiguity is large enough to mean a field day for the local officials in the South who have so long and so tenaciously resisted the spirit of the 1954 decision.

They will now halt school desegregation dead in its tracks. There will be efforts to stop desegregation of such public accommodations as hospitals and hotels. The real requirement, which is to move forward to break up residential concentration of the races, is distant beyond imagination. For there has been a turnabout in race politics.

But this momentous change-over had about it nothing of the dramatic. There was no moment of truth, no big speeches or policy statements. On the contrary, the transformation was wrought with minimum breakage. The visible signs were a certain fogginess at the White House, and a couple of marginal shifts in Democratic ranks.

The fogginess at the White House was central and calculated. The starting point was the administration's Southern strategy. That strategy would plainly have been compromised if the administration were obliged to enforce court orders on school desegregation over the opposition of Southern politicians like George Wallace. Accordingly, the President had a political interest in letting the segregation issue sink from sight without a big fuss.

The administration played that interest to near perfection. Through various spokesmen, the White House issued a series of statements on school desegregation that added up to any position anybody wanted to take. Inside the administration, this waffling caused one casualty—the resignation of the Special Assistant to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Leon Panetta.

But on the floor of the Senate there was almost complete confusion about the administration's desires. At one point there were two Republican senators—Minority Leader Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania and John Tower of Texas—standing on the floor claiming White House support for opposite views.

On the key vote—the vote on the amendment submitted by Sen. John Stennis of Mississippi—only 11 diehard Republican liberals stayed with Sen. Scott in opposition. Twenty-six Republicans joined Sen. Tower in supporting the Stennis amendment.

On the Democratic side the fuss was not much greater. Sen. Abraham Ribicoff of Connecticut had a personal crisis of confidence about a desegregation policy that was concentrated on the South. His stance made it easy for his colleague from Connecticut, Thomas Dodd, and three liberal Democrats from border states to support the Stennis amendment.

That Ribicoff had even that much clout said something about the weakness of the Democratic leadership effort. Sen. Walter Mondale of Minnesota did see what was brewing and fought it all the way. He emerged with enhanced national standing as a result.

But Sen. Edward Kennedy, who might have made a difference, was in bed with pneumonia and a temperature of 104. And the senior Democrats were not prepared to make a bid deal about the blacks.

What this really means is that the reaction now registered in the Senate is a popular reaction. The majority of the country, not just a few demagogues skilled at whipping up passions, has had it with blacks. And presumably that mood will endure until events and a new set of leaders show that the United States cannot decently turn its back on what we all know to be our main social problem.

#### STENNIS AMENDMENT'S EFFECT ON INTEGRATION UNCLEAR

(By Richard Harwood)

After days of wearisome and baffling debate, Sen. Albert Gore (D-Tenn.) arose in the Senate last week to observe:

"I am in a quandary about the pending resolution, and the quandary is whether it does something or whether it does not, which seems to be entirely problematical."

When it was done and when the Senate on Wednesday at last adopted 56 to 36 the "Stennis Amendment" on school desegregation, the question of whether it did something or not was still being argued.

Ostensibly, it merely required the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to apply its school desegregation guidelines evenly throughout the country—cutting off federal school money to segregated districts in the North as well as to segregated districts in the South.

But much more than that was read into it. Its passage meant, said an anguished columnist, that "the Senate of the United States has now cravenly abandoned the policy of racial integration."

Not so, said the Justice Department. Nothing has changed, said HEW.

"Mercifully," said Sen. Hugh Scott, the Republican leader, "this is mere policy and therefore not binding."

Sen. Jacob Javits (R-N.Y.) disagreed: "One of two things will happen. All efforts to desegregate will stop and it will be impossible to go on; or there will be federal interference (in the schools) of such size, magnitude and depth that the country will be appalled if this measure becomes law."

The mildly worded resolution that produced this confusion was drafted by Sen. John Stennis of Mississippi. It stated:

"It is the policy of the United States that guidelines and criteria established pursuant to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Section 182 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1966 shall be applied uniformly to all regions of the United States in dealing with conditions of segregation by race, whether de jure or de facto, in the schools of the local educational agencies of any state without regard to the origin or cause of such segregation."

If this language was artfully designed, as critics charged, to impede or end desegregation efforts in the South, it came at a very late time in the school integration struggle.

As of last week, according to the Civil

Rights Office of HEW, 93 per cent of the 4,470 Southern school districts were desegregated or were in the process of desegregation under federal court orders.

The remaining 310—principally small-town or rural districts—were in various stages of compliance with or defiance of HEW guidelines; 97 of them had already been declared ineligible for federal school funds.

Furthermore, the administration claimed, whatever the effect of the Stennis Amendment on Title VI enforcement, it had no effect on the Justice Department and would have no effect on the federal courts, which have been taking an increasingly tough line against integration delays in the South.

If, on the other hand, the language was designed—as Stennis insisted—to bring about increased school desegregation in the North, it seemed unlikely to achieve its purpose within any foreseeable period of time.

Officials at HEW said it would be virtually impossible to write guidelines to end de facto school segregation resulting from neighborhood segregation in the North—in Chicago, for example, where roughly half the Negro students attend totally segregated schools.

And if that problem could be overcome, others remained. One was a constitutional problem; the Supreme Court has never ruled that de facto segregation is illegal.

Another problem was the state of Northern public opinion.

"I do not want to ruin the schools of the North," said Stennis last week, "but I want them to find out whether or not they want this massive, immediate integration. I do not believe they do."

Minority Leader Scott seemed to agree.

"Any genuine attempt in good faith to enforce this language," he said, "would require all the police forces in America and a good many of our troops overseas."

However that may be and whatever the ultimate "meaning" of the Stennis Amendment, the Senate's adoption of it last week was a political landmark of sorts.

For the first time in roughly 15 years, the Southern bloc in the Senate prevailed on a civil rights issue that was regarded, rightly or wrongly, as matter of more than passing significance. For the first time in nearly a decade, said Sen. Walter F. Mondale, a leading opponent of the Stennis Amendment, "a fundamental civil rights issue lacked the active support of the Justice Department and the President." For the first time in the memory of most congressmen, the Senate faced up for a few days to what Sen. Abraham Ribicoff (D-Conn.), whose support of the Stennis amendment was crucial to its passage, described as the "hypocrisy" of the North on questions of race. And for the first time since the 1950s, serious questions were raised about the wisdom of using public schools as a principal instrument for achieving racial integration in the United States.

#### EFFECT ON SOUTH

The fear of various civil rights activists is that even if the Stennis Amendment lacks substance, it will encourage segregationist officials in the South to stiffen their resistance to school integration or to delay it through court tests of the amendment's meaning.

The administration's answer is that most of the desegregation job in the south has been done and that, in any case, the Justice Department and the courts are not handcuffed.

On a purely political level, Senate liberals have another fear: that the passage of the Stennis Amendment is symptomatic of a growing conservatism in the United States.

"There is a real question," Mondale said, "whether the liberal coalition that has dominated the Senate is viable any longer. This country may really be turning to the right."

#### PRESIDENT CRITICIZED BY PANETTA

The resigned chief of the government's school desegregation program charged yesterday that President Nixon is abdicating a moral obligation to lead the nation on civil rights and is retreating on many fronts to appease the South.

Leon Panetta made the charges in addressing the Women's National Press Club on his final day in office. He resigned last week as head of the civil rights office of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Two of Panetta's aides said last night they were quitting, too, among signs that others would follow.

Peter Holmes, Panetta's liaison man with Congress, said he would resign. Carl Flaxman, director of civil rights for HEW's Dallas office, said he resigned Feb. 17 under congressional pressure.

Panetta also said Vice President Agnew is aggravating racial friction by catering to racists.

"As long as they think they can get votes, rather than take the tough stand and not divide the country but bring us together, I expect this will continue," Panetta said.

He said Mr. Nixon has allowed phoney issues such as busing and neighborhood schools to supersede the real questions of equality in education.

"Ninety per cent of the schools in the South have used busing in their schools—many times to preserve a dual school system and to avoid a neighborhood school system," he said.

Earlier, in a television interview, Panetta warned that if minority groups continually feel "they don't have any clout" within the system, "it's only a matter of time before they go out of the system . . . resort to the streets . . . they've found in the past that this is the only way they can get satisfaction. And I think that this is what we are headed for."

#### LISETTE SUSAN VINET OF HAWAII WRITES WINNING ESSAY, "FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE," IN VFW CONTEST

#### HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, our young people are deeply concerned over the direction that this Nation is taking as we enter into the 1970's, and a new decade the destiny of which they will profoundly affect.

That our young people are willing and able to carry forward the efforts of our Nation to achieve its finest destiny is nowhere more eloquently attested to than in the essays submitted for judging in the annual Voice of Democracy Contest.

This year, over 400,000 students participated in the Voice of Democracy Contest, sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its ladies' auxiliary. The contest theme was "Freedom's Challenge," and I am particularly proud that an outstanding young lady from Wahiawa is Hawaii's winning contestant this year.

This young lady, Miss Lisette Susan Vinet, daughter of Lt. Col. and Mrs. William C. Vinet, Jr., is a student at Lilehua High School.

I take great pleasure in submitting the speech of the 50th State's VFW Voice of Democracy Contest winner in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

#### FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

It was raining, but it stopped. I felt like the day . . . quiet, gray, serious. It was as if the weather had matched my mood to console me. Nothing better to do so I was just walking. Nowhere in particular, just walking. The people were all gone too. Wonder where people go when it's raining? All the shops were closed. I guess they have nothing to offer on rainy Sundays. There's always the windows to look at. I prefer bookstore windows myself.

Wonder how they manage to cram all that stuff in, but they do. More than just books, mobiles, photos, even posters. There was one poster that stood out in my mind from all the rest. Perhaps because it was hidden in the corner alone, like me.

It read: 1984 by George Orwell . . . Ignorance is strength, freedom is slavery. It was of an old man with shackles on his head and he was smiling but it was that forced sort of smile. Though his lips veiled his feelings, his eyes told of the sufferings of mankind . . . of mental tortures crueler than any physical punishment. He had been told how to act and what to think for so long that he had ceased trying to be a free individual. His freedom had been snuffed out until he hardly knew it existed. Yet it was there. It is a part of us all.

Our first cry as a new born baby is a cry of freedom. We burst with the joy of living but as we grow older, we lose this enthusiasm for life. Unconsciously, we adopt the principles of 1984. Do we believe ignorance is strength?

I think of ignorance and I picture to myself a man without ears, one who won't listen. Am I thinking of you? There are many like him. Their prejudice makes them blind to the needs of others. They band together under one leader to draw in others to their cause. And their power increases as they seek control of our minds and our government. And they succeed partially because we let them. The newspapers are still there and our books haven't been burned yet we complain we don't have the time to keep informed. So we join their cause because it sounds strong and because we don't know the other side. Where is that spark of freedom now?

When we are given the chance to decide who our leaders are to be do we vote or do we assume that somehow it will all work out? Those very assumptions created the world of 1984.

Are we really individuals or do we blindly follow the crowd allowing others to dictate our lives? Oh, why must people be so ready to accept what others tell them instead of making up their own minds? They have opinions I know it because I've heard them. They're out there picketing now for one cause or another. They're crying for peace as they destroy and trample another's rights. And they're locked up for it. For them, freedom is slavery. Is that same freedom we were born with or have we changed it somehow?

The freedom I know is illusive like the wind but just as strong. It motivates me to participate in school activities just for the sake of making something better. It should affect us all. There are a few who have accepted freedom's challenge but they are just a whisper when they should be a roar. Don't be afraid of involvement. Freedom comes with the realization that we have left our mark on the world. That somehow, because of us, the world is a little different.

Each of us faces that challenge. Will we turn toward the darkness of 1984, or will we rekindle the fire of freedom? If we are

to do something, every person must accept the challenge. Because our government is the people it exists to hear our opinions and to act upon them to create a better community. Before it can do this, we must care enough to be concerned. Only then will our demands be answered.

In this mixed up world, freedom is struggling. It is trying hard to survive and it must remain alive if we are ever to exist as free people in the world to come. No, I turn my back on 1984 and I refuse to give up without a fight just as I refuse to believe that others will not join me in my cause. Together, we will make freedom's challenge our own.

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART CALENDAR OF EVENTS—MARCH 1970

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Calendar of Events of the National Gallery of Art for the month of March 1970. Once again, the National Gallery has scheduled outstanding events for this month, and I urge my colleagues and the American people to visit the Gallery in March. It is a worthwhile and enjoyable way to spend an afternoon.

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART, CALENDAR OF EVENTS, MARCH 1970

J. Carter Brown, Director of the National Gallery, has made a special plea for funds to purchase "Civilisation", the extraordinary series of 13 one-hour films in color narrated by Kenneth Clark. The series, which ran at the Gallery from November 2 through January 31, drew nearly 150,000 viewers, and was also shown at the White House. Contributions should be addressed to "Civilisation", National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C. 20565. Checks should be made payable to the National Gallery of Art, and all contributions are deductible for Federal income tax purposes.

The reality of appearance: The trompe l'oeil tradition in American painting. Opening on March 21 and continuing through May 3, this exhibition features the *trompe l'oeil* ("fool-the-eye") still-life paintings especially popular in nineteenth-century America. It has been assembled by the California art critic Alfred Frankenstein, whose research in separating William M. Harnett's paintings from those with faked signatures by other artists reads like a detective novel. The selection of over one hundred examples has been carefully made to obtain the utmost variety; pictures have been chosen that have not been exhibited before as well as many that are famous.

The exhibition traces the history of American still-life painting from works by the Peale family in the early 1800's to the close of the century, through outstanding pictures by Harnett, Peto, and Haberle. It also features works by less well known painters: Francis, Rosen, Harlow, Goodes, and others who interest us by their astonishingly realistic style and varied compositions.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 23, THROUGH SUNDAY, MARCH 1

Painting of the week\*

Tour of the week

Exhibition of African Sculpture. Central Gallery. Tues. through Sat. 1:00; Sun. 2:30. Modigliani. "Gypsy Woman With Baby" (Chester Dale Collection). Gallery G-10. Tues. through Sat., 12:00 & 2:00; Sun. 3:30 & 6:00.

Tues. through Sat. 12:00 & 2:00; Sun. 3:30 & 6:00.

Tour of the week

The Reconstructions of Altarpieces. Rotunda. Tues. through Sat. 1:00; Sun. 2:30.

Tour

Introduction to the Collection. Rotunda. Mon. through Sat. 11:00 & 3:00; Sun. 5:00.

Sunday lecture

Some Aspects of Nineteenth-Century Architecture (VII). Guest Speaker: Professor Sir Nikolaus Pevsner, A. W. Mellon Lecturer in the Fine Arts. Auditorium, 4:00.

Sunday concert

National Gallery Orchestra; Richard Bales, Conductor; Allison Nelson, Pianist. East Garden Court, 8:00.

All concerts, with intermission talks by members of the National Gallery staff, are broadcast by Station WGMS-AM (570) and FM (103.5).

Inquiries concerning the Gallery's educational services should be addressed to the Educational Office or telephoned to (202) 737-4215, ext. 272.

For reproductions and slides of the collections, books, and other related publications, self-service rooms are open daily near the Constitution Avenue Entrance.

FOOTNOTE

\*11" x 14" reproductions with texts for sale this week—15¢ each. If mailed, 25¢ each.

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that the Iowa winner of this year's Voice of Democracy Contest, sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary, is a resident of the district I have the honor of representing.

He is Thomas C. Thrans, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Charles B. Thrans of Mason City.

The theme of this year's contest was "Freedom's Challenge." I am glad to have the privilege of inserting the text of the young man's excellent speech in the RECORD:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

Nothing left loose is ever likely to do anything creative. No horse is likely to get anywhere until he is harnessed. No steam or gas ever drives anything until it is confined. No life ever grows until it is focused, dedicated, and disciplined. No country is ever great until it is challenged.

We, as citizens in a country bequeathed with a heritage based on man's quest of freedom, are accepting the challenge of preserving that freedom for both the present and the future. It is obvious that liberty means freedom to choose evil as well as good; freedom to suffer the penalties of bad judgment as well as the freedom to enjoy the rewards of good judgment. Were this not true, the word "freedom" would be meaningless.

To me, ladies and gentlemen, freedom's challenge is the demand to do something about it. Every life is unsatisfactory until its owner and possessor has made up his mind what he means to do with it. A commonly-held belief in the United States is well-illustrated by the words "My country right or wrong." This statement has been quoted many times and, like a text of scripture, has been the justification for the assumption that we must accept our nation's foreign policy,

Tour

Introduction to the Collection. Rotunda. Mon. 11:00, 1:00 & 3:00; Tues. through Sat. 11:00 & 3:00; Sun. 5:00.

Sunday lecture

"Some Aspects of Nineteenth-Century Architecture (III)." Guest Speaker: Professor Sir Nikolaus Pevsner, A. W. Mellon Lecturer in the Fine Arts. Auditorium, 4:00.

Sunday concert

Ylva Novik, pianist. East Garden Court, 8:00.

MONDAY, MARCH 2, THROUGH SUNDAY, MARCH 8

Painting of the week

Pontorno. "Monsignor della Casa" (Samuel H. Kress Collection). Gallery 15. Tues. through Sat. 12:00 & 2:00 Sun. 3:00 & 6:00.

Tour of the week

The Original Environments of Works of Art. Rotunda. Tues. through Sat. 1:00; Sun. 2:30.

Tour

Introduction to the Collection. Rotunda. Mon. through Sat. 11:00 & 3:00; Sun. 5:00.

Sunday lecture

Some Aspects of Nineteenth-Century Architecture (IV). Guest Speaker: Professor Sir Nikolaus Pevsner, A. W. Mellon Lecturer in the Fine Arts. Auditorium. 4:00.

Sunday concert

Johannes Bruning, Violinist; Wolfgang Kaiser, Pianist. East Garden Court. 8:00.

MONDAY, MARCH 9, THROUGH SUNDAY, MARCH 15

Painting of the week\*

Chardin. "The House of Cards" (Andrew Mellon Collection). Gallery 53. Tues. through Sat. 12:00 & 2:00; Sun. 3:30 & 6:00.

Tour of the week

The Revisions of Paintings. Rotunda. Tues. through Sat. 1:00; Sun. 2:30.

Tour

Introduction to the Collection. Rotunda. Mon. through Sat. 11:00 & 3:00; Sun. 5:00.

Sunday lecture

Some Aspects of Nineteenth-Century Architecture (V). Guest Speaker: Professor Sir Nikolaus Pevsner, A. W. Mellon Lecturer in the Fine Arts. Auditorium. 4:00.

Sunday concert

The Catholic University Chorus; Michael Cordovana, Director. East Garden Court. 8:00.

MONDAY, MARCH 16, THROUGH SUNDAY, MARCH 22

Painting of the week\*

Bosch. "Death and the Miser" (Samuel H. Kress Collection). Gallery 35A. Tues. through Sat. 12:00 & 2:00; Sun. 3:30 & 6:00.

Tour of the week

The Framings of Pictures. Rotunda. Tues. through Sat. 1:00; Sun. 2:30.

Tour

Introduction to the Collection. Rotunda. Mon. through Sat. 11:00 & 3:00; Sun. 5:00.

Sunday lecture

Some Aspects of Nineteenth-Century Architecture (VI). Guest Speaker: Professor Sir Nikolaus Pevsner, A. W. Mellon Lecturer in the Fine Arts. Auditorium. 4:00.

Sunday concert

National Gallery Orchestra; Richard Bales, Conductor; Craig Sheppard, Pianist. East Garden Court. 8:00.

MONDAY, MARCH 23, THROUGH SUNDAY, MARCH 29

Painting of the week\*

Grünwald. "The Small Crucifixion" (Samuel H. Kress Collection). Gallery 35A.

March 2, 1970

the day to day behavior in the halls of deliberation, and the statements of our political leaders. It is well illustrated in the version by Stephen Decatur in 1816 in a toast: "Our country, in her intercourse with foreign nations, may she always be right; but, our country, right or wrong." I, friends, would like to suggest to you, however, the version of Carl Schurz in an address in Congress when he said, in 1872, "Our country, right or wrong. When right, to be kept right. When wrong, to be put right." This is the challenge that I would like to place before you.

All people have certain human rights. These rights must be respected in order to preserve freedom. One man's interpretation of liberty must not be stretched to infringe upon the rights of others.

I feel that we should retain always the sense of the true place of religion in education, the spiritual values in social stability, the equality of opportunity for all men, the devotion of genuine and unashamed patriotism.

With the same zeal that we respect the position of our country in the world, we should strive to make this position possible for all people. Our freedom to compete and our readiness to cooperate has won for us the title of the most productive on our earth today. I sincerely hope that this willingness never dies.

A short time ago, a Cuban refugee was asked why Cubans like himself wanted to come to the United States rather than go to Latin American countries with the same language and the same general culture. Was it just the thought of greater economic opportunity?

"No," he said, "many of us would have an easier time economically in a Latin country. It's just that we feel better here. We can feel like a human being. There seems to be something universal about this country."

This is living testimony, not abstract argument, from men who know the meaning of America in their bones and marrow.

Without the examples of the strength of our forefathers, prosperity, and progress in a free America, there is nothing to inspire men in the struggle for victory between freedom and totalitarianism. You and I can buy our own example of freedom and liberty as friends of free people. Our conduct in every crisis, large or small; our resistance to propaganda and passion and the fanatic action of minorities; our conformity to constructive criticism; our compromise in the case of difference; our determination that it is more patriotic to oppose an unjust government and its policies than it is to follow those policies blindly; but also, our steadfast determination to not let rabid agitators unseat us. These can pave the way for future generations to preserve this liberty for our posterity.

The Greek philosopher, Solon, is alleged to have said, "Justice will come to Athens when those who are no victims of injustice are as indignant as those who are." May those of us who are not victims of social, political, and economic injustice become as concerned about the achievement of a just society as we are about and unorderly one. Once this has happened, we will have a society which is both just and orderly, and is at its best.

#### THE CHALLENGE OF FREEDOM

**HON. RICHARD H. ICHORD**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, the urgency with which many of our young people today view the challenges in need

of solution if society is to resolve its problems and continue to progress is most heartening.

The fact that the vast majority of our Nation's youth are committed to the fundamental principles of this great Republic and reject the wanton approach of anarchists and revolutionaries is a credit to our system for all of its frailties. It is also a credit to the alertness and comprehension of America's youth.

An example of this has been provided recently in my own district where a student at Crystal City High School from Festus, Mo., won the Veterans' of Foreign Wars Twin City Voice of Democracy Contest. His name is Danny Schunks and he faced the competition of 49 other local high school students who delivered talks on Americanism. Each of their speeches were tape recorded and judging was done from the tapes. Danny's 3-minute talk was entitled "Freedom's Challenge" and I would like to share his remarks with my colleagues in this House:

#### FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

Despite the affluence which exists in the U.S. today and despite the apathy which abounds among a large segment of the American society, the challenges of freedom are greater perhaps today than at any other time in our short history.

The challenges of freedom are great and many, but let's examine a few of the most important ones. In a free society a man can improve himself by his own deeds. Stop and consider this a minute.

Here is a challenge that has only been a dream to many civilizations. Here, a man regardless of his race, color, his religion, or his creed, can improve himself by his own deeds. This causes incentive and often times will instill a sense of pride, a pride of equality.

Freedom challenges us to help our less fortunate American brother. For too long this need has been ignored.

We must accept the challenge today. We must then extend the helping hand of American brotherly love and not the hand of complacency which too many times has been thrust forward. By helping the less fortunate, the poor, the disabled, we also help ourselves. By helping these people increase their knowledge we help strengthen the bonds that bind our nation together.

We promote a general feeling of concern which in turn can plant the all important seed of incentive.

Today we hear, we see, and we read about equality, a major challenge which lies before us. Equality is one of the most, if not the most important challenges extended to us. While we may have freedom, without equality we will not know freedom in its most refined form.

Freedom thrives on equality, religious equality, but most important racial equality. For if we do not have racial equality, then one segment of our population, regardless of size, be it minute or large will not be totally free.

While we sit here speaking about challenges of freedom we are being called. Either we answer the challenge or we don't. There is no putting off an answer. We must be ready when we are challenged for these perilous times make our answer more important than ever. If we refuse to answer we are in fact stating that our freedom means very little if anything to us.

We are stating that the brave men who fought and died to preserve freedom have died in vain for a worthless cause. We are stating that we do not believe in the basic principles on which our country was founded and that our forefathers should be regarded

as little more than arch rebels who chased after an illusion or a fantasy.

But if we answer, we will be striving for perfection in the American spirit. While we may not change the world, we will be working for the benefit of mankind.

#### THE CHALLENGE OF RACE RELATIONS

**HON. PAUL FINDLEY**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, at the annual dinner of the Abraham Lincoln Association February 12 in Springfield, Ill., the eminent historian, Bruce Catton, who has done so much to enrich our understanding of the Civil War period, was the principal speaker.

In his remarks he analyzed the facts and factors which led Abraham Lincoln to the Emancipation Proclamation. He described the proclamation as only the beginning of the long term challenge, only partially met to this day, of race relations in the United States. In my view, it is one of the most significant statements by a public figure on this topic in a long time.

Here is the text of Mr. Catton's address:

#### ADDRESS BY MR. BRUCE CATTON

About one year ago an Afro-American magazine editor informed his readers that the black people of this country should no longer feel that they owed anything to Abraham Lincoln.

Lincoln, said this editor, was simply a racist. He freed the slaves by force of circumstances and not because his heart led him that way. He did not believe in racial equality. He did believe in the colonization of black people on some continent entirely away from the United States. He fought the war solely to preserve the Union and said flatly that if he could win the war by freeing no slaves at all he would do it that way. When, at last, he issued the Emancipation Proclamation he issued one of the weakest documents ever to come out of the White House—a proclamation that ordained freedom for the slave in precisely those areas where the Federal government had no power to enforce it, and left black people in slavery in the areas where Federal control was secure.

In short, said the editor, Lincoln deserves neither affection nor gratitude from black people. He was simply a Honkey.

Ordinarily we devote February 12 to a celebration of Abraham Lincoln's role as the great emancipator. Here we have—to put it mildly—a jarring note. I suggest that it may be worth our while to examine this indictment briefly. We may learn something—about Lincoln himself, about the inner meaning of our terrible Civil War, and about ourselves. Let's look at the record.

To begin with, it ought to be remarked that the men who had the most immediate, material, dollars-and-cents reason for understanding just what Lincoln's attitude was never had the slightest doubt about it. To them Lincoln was an emancipationist, and because they unanimously felt that way they went to war against a government that dared to make him president.

I refer, of course, to the great slave-owners of the Southern cotton belt—the men who held vast plantations worked by gang labor, and whose wealth and social standing de-



ended directly on a continuation of that system.

The news of Lincoln's election had hardly been announced before these men were moving with determination to take their states out of the Union. They had so little doubt of their appraisal of the man, so little doubt that his installation as President would mean the realization of their worst fears, that they took their states out of the Union before he even got to Washington. The seven great cotton belt states had formally seceded, and the Confederate government was an established fact, before Lincoln became President. Secession had taken place before Lincoln took the oath of office.

If Lincoln was indeed a racist, who had no desire to interfere with the institution of slavery and no sympathy with the black man, these wealthy slave-owners were singularly ill-informed—and singularly stupid. They bet everything they had on the assumption that their appraisal was correct. That they won the bet, and winning it lost their wealth and power forever, may be one of the ironies of history, but it does not necessarily mean that they had made a faulty diagnosis. They knew, better than anyone today can know, that with that man in the White House the "peculiar institution" was not safe. What they were quite unable to see—and I suppose living at the summit of a slave society does not bring great breadth of vision—was that Lincoln would rally the power of his fellow countrymen and destroy the institution they were so eager to protect. But they were entirely correct in their belief that Lincoln himself was an emancipationist.

Yet to say this does not necessarily mean that the indictment brought by the black editor is incorrect. He can easily cite chapter and verse for the separate counts in his indictment, and we cannot dismiss it as nothing more than the ill-founded complaint of an unhappy man. As admirers of Abraham Lincoln we may indeed feel that the picture here painted is wrong, but the separate details of the picture are quite true.

Let us have a look at them.

Begin by accepting one obvious fact—that Abraham Lincoln was a man of his time, sharing in its concepts, touched by at least some of its prejudices. He was not looking back on the terrible problem of the 1860's from a safe vantage point one hundred years later. He was there himself, compelled to cope with the problems of that day on the basis of what he knew and felt at that time. He lacked the advantage we have—the clarifying power of the long backward glance. He was a part of the bad time he had to contend with.

With so much understood, let us go on and admit once and for all that Lincoln did not believe in racial equality. He said so flatly, at least once, during the Lincoln-Douglas debates. He said so again after the 1861 election, when the editor of *The New York Times* sent him an inquiry from a Mississippi legislator. To the editor, Lincoln wrote: "Mr. Lincoln is not pledged to the ultimate extinction of slavery; does not hold the black man to be the equal of the white." Presumably this word was passed along to the inquiring Mississippian—without having the least effect.

When the war actually began, Lincoln willingly accepted an act of Congress asserting that the north was fighting solely to restore the Union and not to change the domestic institutions of the states in any way. He believed that neither he nor the Congress had the constitutional power to abolish slavery, and at least in the early stages of the struggle he was content to have it that way. He over-ruled first General John C. Fremont and later General David Hunter when those officers undertook to proclaim emancipation in the military departments. He rebuked a member of his own cabinet, Secretary of

War Simon Cameron, when that individual inserted emancipationist language in his annual report. A little later Cameron ceased to be a cabinet member.

Lincoln's first step in the direction of emancipation was halting and unsuccessful. It came in the spring of 1862, when he urged leaders of the slave-holding border states which had remained in the union to accept a plan for gradual, compensated emancipation. His plea was rejected, and Congress then proceeded to get ahead of him. Early that summer it passed a new confiscation act, providing (among other things) that slaves owned by men in rebellion could be set free, as could slaves fleeing from bondage to such men. Acting on this, Lincoln again called in the border state leaders, urging them to realize that if the war continued "the institution in your states will be extinguished by mere friction and abrasion." He begged them to accept—in his words—"not emancipation at once, but a decision at once to emancipate gradually." This had no more effect than his former plea to the border state men had had, but at least it is clear that Abraham Lincoln was not rushing things. Congress obviously was trying to press him along, but he was moving slowly.

This act of Congress, incidentally, empowered the President to spend Federal money on a colonization scheme. Lincoln had been doing some investigating, to see where a suitable place for colonization might be found. He seems to have believed that there was a good prospect somewhere in Central America, and in August of 1862 he called to the White House a group of free colored men from the north. To them he spoke frankly—and in what he said we can hear the year 1862 talking to itself, recognizing its prejudices and its handicaps, trying to find an easy way out of a dilemma.

"Even when you cease to be slaves", Lincoln said to these black leaders, "you are yet far removed from being placed on an equality with the white race. You are cut off from many of the advantages which the other race enjoys. The aspiration of man is to enjoy equality with the best when free, but on this broad continent not a single man of your race is made the equal of a single white man." He added that he simply presented this "as a fact with which we have to deal", adding, "I cannot alter it if I would", and concluding: "It is better for us both, therefore, to be separated."

This had no better luck than the appeal the border state leaders had had. Nothing further was ever heard of it. And it was at about this time that Lincoln wrote his famous letter to Horace Greeley, defining the policy on which he was making war. This policy, he said, simply embraced the restoration of the Union, and he went on:

"If I could save the Union without freeing any slave I would do it, and if I could save it by freeing all the slaves I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing some slaves and leaving others alone I would also do that."

All of this is perfectly clear: compensated long-delayed emancipation if necessary, colonization of the former slaves somewhere far away from the United States if possible, and a war to restore the union which if it seemed advisable would leave the hideous growth of slavery untouched. So far, the picture of the man who did not especially want to do anything for the black man seems justified.

Yet there are one or two other points to consider before the picture is completed.

It is interesting to note, for instance, that at the time when he talked in such a gloomy, brooding manner to the black leaders in the White House—at the time when he wrote to Greeley to insist that restoration of the Union was his one essential war aim—Abraham Lincoln had the draft of the preliminary Emancipation Proclamation in a desk drawer.

He had discussed it with his cabinet, he had made up his mind to issue it, and he was waiting only for a military victory to make it public. In his own mind he was committed.

His proclamation, to be sure, was on the face of it a weak and halting thing; little more than a gesture. But it came at a time when a gesture could be all-important. Remember, there was a war going on. It was more and more becoming obvious that a central fact in that war—the central fact, when all is said and done—was the existence in the United States of some millions of human slaves. For the President of the United States to assert publicly, with whatever qualifications and reservations, that certain of these slaves would be henceforward and forever free was in effect to say that all of them would be free. It was an irreversible forward step. The Federal union was not simply going to be restored—it was to be extended, made broad enough to take in millions of people who previously had had no part in it.

To understand this all one needs to do is consult the horrified outcry that the proclamation, when issued, drew from the Confederacy.

Jefferson Davis—in the ordinary acceptance of the term as humane a man as you would care to find—promptly denounced it as "the most execrable measure recorded in the history of guilty man." To the Confederate Congress Davis described it as "a measure by which several millions of human beings of an inferior race, peaceful and contented laborers in their sphere, are doomed to extermination." Davis said the proclamation must have one of only three possible results. He spelled them out in these words:

"The extermination of the slaves, the exile of the whole white population of the Confederacy, or absolute and total separation of these states from the United States."

That is fairly strong language, and it brings us face to face with the fact that we sometimes fail to see when we examine the Civil War.

Underneath slavery lay the race problem, which perhaps we understand a little better now than we did in the old days. If we don't understand it better, we can at least see it more clearly.

Not only did the race problem lie underneath slavery. It was what kept slavery alive. Under the slave system, the race problem did not have to be faced—for if one race owns the other outright, you do not have to worry about how the races are going to get along with each other. You just let the owning race run the police force, and that is that. Consequently, the prospect that slavery might be uprooted and destroyed rallied the whole south to the defense of the institution. Only a minority of southerners actually owned slaves; only a minority stood to lose money or property if the abolitionists had their way. But the South was almost a unit—at least until excessive war weariness set in, much later—in coming to the defense of slavery by force of arms, simply because nobody could see how the two races could possibly get along together if the insulation of slavery were removed.

And that was the real tragedy of the 1860's. There was a race problem—perhaps we ought to call it a white-race problem—that looked absolutely insoluble to most men of that generation. That was why the overwhelming majority of southerners rallied to the Confederacy; that was why such a huge body of opinion in the north was so extremely reluctant to go along with the abolitionists; that, I suspect, was why Abraham Lincoln so desperately and unavailingly looked for some remedy like colonization, which would perhaps enable the country to avoid what seemed then to be a terrible dilemma.

What the Civil War did—what Abraham Lincoln did—was to destroy the ugly protective device that kept the races from having

to try to live in one community. It pulled the race problem out in the open and left the country with one overpowering imperative—solve this problem! So far, we have contemplated it, off and on, for more than a century without making much progress toward a solution. But this is central to our existence as a free people.

It must be said that Lincoln recognized the ins and outs of all of this from the beginning. His first task was to save the Union, and if that could be done quickly it was possible that slavery could be left intact, for handling later. But if the war should turn into a long, all-out war there was no way to keep it from becoming a war over slavery; and if it became that, then the national horizons would be pushed back immeasurably.

Lincoln warned of this, early in the game. At the end of 1861, in a message to Congress, he asserted his determination to put down the rebellion and added: "I have been most anxious and most careful that the inevitable conflict for this purpose shall not degenerate into a violent and remorseless revolutionary struggle." He would try to avoid "radical and extreme measures," but he warned that "the struggle of today is not altogether for today—it is for a vast future also." Early in 1862, he bluntly warned the Marylander Reverdy Johnson: "It may as well be understood, once and for all, that I shall not surrender this game leaving any available card unplayed." The direction things might take in case of an extended war was emphasized by the grim Congressman from Pennsylvania, Thaddeus Stevens, who warned that the government could not win until it acquired "a revolutionary determination inspired by the grand idea of liberty, equality and the rights of man."

That Lincoln saw this from the beginning is clear. On his way to Washington, two weeks before his inauguration, he stopped off in Philadelphia to make a speech at Independence Hall. Here in this historic shrine of patriotism, he asked what great principle it was that had held the country together. Answering his own question, he said that it was "something in the Declaration giving liberty, not alone to the people of this country, but hope to the world for all future time. It was that which gave promise that in due time the weights should be lifted from the shoulders of all men, and that all men should have an equal chance." You might note that these are not exactly the words of a racist or a believer in inequality. He went on to say that he "never had a feeling politically that did not spring from the sentiments embodied in the Declaration of Independence."

This is what gives coherence to the story of Lincoln's years in the White House. He knew no better than any other man of his time how the two races were to get along, once the barriers between them were torn down and the idea of equality had been accepted; but he knew full well that precisely this was coming once the war became the "remorseless revolutionary struggle" which he had warned about.

Presumably Lincoln did not use a word like "revolutionary" lightly. If the Civil War was to become such a struggle, as in fact it did become, it was because something had been added to the original ingredients.

What got added was the simple word "freedom"—which is still the most explosive word known to man.

During the early days of the American Revolution, the men at Philadelphia added that word to their explanation of what they were fighting for. They wound up by breaking up an empire and putting the world into a ferment. In 1862 Americans did it again, putting "freedom" at the center of the nation's ideas about its future. That word is like phosphorous—expose it to air and it takes fire. You might find it interesting to reflect briefly

on the situation in Africa today, where a large number of new nations have come into existence and are trying to make their way in the world. There have been many revolutions there—based on the Communist model? Not at all. These are on the American pattern. The people want to get outsiders off of their necks; they want to be free. Washington and Lincoln would understand them perfectly. Karl Marx would have been wholly baffled.

The task Lincoln left us is so far from being finished that it can hardly be said to have been begun. It is the biggest task we have and if we fail at it none of our other accomplishments will mean much. Perhaps we need Lincoln's reminder: We cannot escape history. His words to the Congress in 1862 still apply:

"We—even we here—hold the power and bear the responsibility. In giving freedom to the slaves we assure freedom to the free—honorable alike in what we give and what we preserve. We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last best hope of the earth."

Freedom, to repeat, is a word touched with fire. It is not a negative thing; that is, it does not simply mean the absence of human slavery. It is the most powerful word known to mankind. It calls for a new understanding of the way men must live together; for acceptance of the idea that there are no grades and classes of citizenship, but that—in Lincoln's words—"the weights should be lifted from the shoulders of all men, and that all men should have an equal chance." That is the inescapable challenge Lincoln left us. The Civil War was a beginning, not an ending. Its final meaning is up to us, today.

#### AMERICA CAN RULE THE WAVES

### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a very effective editorial supporting the administration's proposed merchant shipbuilding program was carried in the Thursday, February 26, Southwest Messenger Press, a publication serving communities in my district. The editor of the Messenger Press, Mr. Elmer Lysen, is a penetrating analyst of the international as well as national scene and his commentary on the subject is certainly concise and timely.

The editorial follows:

#### AMERICA CAN RULE THE WAVES

Ordinarily the advertising of a shipbuilding concern might be expected to have a rather limited readership. Few people are likely prospects for the purchase of an ocean-going freighter. However, the message of one such concern explains in a dramatic way why there has been a resurgence of public interest in a buildup of the U.S. Merchant Marine.

First, it shows in a graphic illustration the manner in which Russia is outstripping the U.S. in merchant ship construction. At the top of a full-page advertisement is shown a thin scattering of ship profiles marked "Ours," below this is the word "Theirs" and under it, crowding the rest of the page, is depicted a massive fleet of ships of all kinds. Beneath this, the reader is reminded that the Russians are building seven times as many merchant ships as the United States. The Soviet Merchant Marine will have increased 600 percent in the 20 years ending in 1970. In contrast, the U.S. Merchant Marine is largely comprised of ships older than

the sailors who man them. The Soviets carry 50 percent of their international seaborne trade in their own ships. The U.S. carries only 5 percent.

This is an old story to the U.S. shipping lines that for years have endeavored to awaken the U.S. to its maritime tradition and the need to preserve its status as a first-rate maritime power. This effort is bearing fruit, at last, in the Administration's proposed merchant shipbuilding program which has received broad support from both congressional and industry quarters. The program is expected to add 300 vessels to the nations fleet in 10 years. If carried through, it will serve notice to the world that the U.S. expects to retain its share of world commerce and its heritage as a major sea power. The new merchant ship program deserves, and must have, sustained public support.

#### HOW SAFE IS SAFEGUARD?

### HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, although the controversy surrounding the anti-ballistic-missile system, a pet project of the Nixon administration, has seemingly taken a quieter place in the scheme of things, the debate is far from over. I, and many of my colleagues, still feel that to proceed with such a project is not in the best interest of the Nation, for it will not contribute to our national security.

I need not dwell on the reasonable, responsible, and plentiful arguments that scientists, members of the armed services, citizens, and others have raised with regards to blocking such a costly project. I include a recent editorial which appeared in the fine paper, the Long Island Press. For I feel it affirms the obligation that we all have to maintain this debate, and prevent this folly which will be costly and destructive to all efforts for world peace.

The editorial follows:

#### HOW SAFE IS SAFEGUARD?

President Nixon's plan to expand the Safeguard antiballistic missile system faces an uphill battle in Congress—and well it might. The President has left himself vulnerable to critical counterattack on several points—that he is inconsistent in his rationale for the ABM system; that he is taking serious risks of undermining the arms limitation talks with the Russians, and that the extremely expensive system itself will be ineffective.

Last March 14, the President, in announcing the revised Safeguard ABM system to succeed the Sentinel System, stressed that it means a shift from a defense of the Cities—as originally conceived by the Johnson administration—to a defense of the missile sites.

"There is no way," he said, "that we can adequately defend our cities without an unacceptable loss of life. The only way I have concluded that we can save lives—which is the primary purpose of our defense system—is to prevent war. And that is why the emphasis of this system is on protecting our deterrent, which is the best preventative for war."

At his press conference last Friday, Mr. Nixon returned to the original Johnsonian rationale—a defense capable of protecting the nation's cities against an attack by Communist China.

What effect this expansion will have on the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) due to reopen in April may become more clear after the details of Phase II are spelled out later this month by Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird. Phase I, which involves construction of an ABM shield around Minuteman sites in North Dakota and Montana, is already under way. If Phase II includes any significant expansion, such as a ring of ABMs around Washington, D.C., and a start of "thin" anti-China defenses around other cities, there is a serious risk of upsetting these promising talks.

And in addition to this risk, there's the expense. The President's budget sent to Congress yesterday authorizes \$1.49 billion to continue Phase I and start Phase II, with the eventual price tag estimated as high as \$50 billion. And all this for a system, as Sen. Mansfield points out, that might not even work at all. Doubts raised last year by such experts as Dr. Wolfgang K. H. Panofsky of the Sanford Linear Accelerator Center have still not been resolved. Dr. Panofsky maintains the system's radars and computers will not prevent penetration of offensive missiles.

In light of these serious questions, the administration owes the nation a more convincing case than it has made so far before we commit so much of our national wealth and energy to such a program.

SAVE YOUR VISION WEEK

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, this is Save Your Vision Week, an annual observance originated by the American Optometric Association 43 years ago, and which has just been proclaimed by the President for the seventh successive year.

This special week provides all who are concerned with good eyesight an opportunity to focus public attention on the need for taking proper care of the eyes. The number of accidents resulting in partial or total loss of vision remind us that strict adherence to basic eye safety practices is vital on the job and in all our pursuits.

With the tremendous advances made in the fields of optometric care, optics, medicine and surgery over the past few years, there is little reason for the neglect of eyesight. Proper professional care and advice are readily available to virtually all Americans.

The President's proclamation of Save Your Vision Week serves as a good reminder for each of us to review personal health records and determine how long it has been since the last vision examination. We should all remind our loved ones and fellow workers to do likewise.

It is my hope that observance of this special week may also renew the dedication of health care professionals throughout the Nation to carry on with their important work in both the public and private sectors, toward the goal of providing the best possible vision care to that 50 percent of the population experiencing some type of vision problem.

I ask you, my colleagues in the House of Representatives, to join me in offering congratulations to the eye care practitioners, researchers and optical goods

manufacturers who have done, and are doing, so much to assure the continued delivery of top quality vision care to the general public.

I would like to add my special personal thanks to the American Optometric Association, a national organization with headquarters located in my district, for its leadership in establishing Save Your Vision Week and for its willingness to share this important event with concerned health care professionals and their organizations for the good of the United States and her people.

DR. MORRIS N. GREEN

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Dr. Morris N. Green of 3823 Menlo Drive, Baltimore, has evolved a reorganization plan for the Food and Drug Administration. When this plan came to my attention, I was impressed by its contents and invited Dr. Green to testify before Congress when the various FDA reorganization bills came up for consideration. This plan was also sent to several Members of Congress, Dr. Ley, the past FDA Commissioner, as well as the present Commissioner.

Several of the suggestions offered in the plan have been utilized in the recent reorganization of the FDA under the new Commissioner, Dr. Edwards. For example, the scientific aspects of drug approval are now decided on the bureau level, rather than in the Commissioner's office as formerly, so that the present Commissioner is now in effect a chairman rather than an absolute head. The National Academy of Sciences has been given the job of evaluating many drug combinations. As a result, 3,000 drugs have been found ineffective by a panel of the National Academy and ordered removed from the market. The agency has increased its consumer orientation and the present Commissioner has stated that he hopes to work more closely with industry. In international cooperation, Yugoslavia has been given a research contract to evaluate the pill.

The recently retired Commissioner, Dr. Ley, has stated "the agency's false image as a policing agency must be changed to that of an agency of high level research." Dr. Green has amended the international aspects of the plan to make possible a talent and cost-sharing venture in drug and food evaluation and research with a group of nations with whom we have mutually advantageous interests.

I am sure the Members of Congress will be interested in Dr. Green's entire plan and I insert it in the RECORD for guidance in planning future legislation:

SUBMITTED BY DR. MORRIS N. GREEN, OCTOBER 21, 1967

OBJECTIVES

In the reorganization of the Food and Drug Administration, the following objec-

tives are to be achieved. All scientific decisions are to reflect the best available knowledge of the world community. The quality of scientific decision will be the most important component of the official activities of the FDA, all other actions taking a secondary role. The function of the FDA will not only be for the regulation of food and drugs in the USA but to stimulate the wholesome development of therapeutic and food science by both public and private agencies. In addition to safeguarding the Public Health, the FDA as hereinafter described shall protect the legitimate interests of consumer and manufacturer. Within the foreign policies of the United States, the FDA shall consider itself of World Public Health and in its international commitments shall work primarily with the United Nations World Health Organization to further its testing, research, and health programs. To further its intramural as well as its international objectives, the Food and Drug Commission as it shall hereafter be called, shall set up an Academy which will work out testing and administrative procedures for the control of drugs and food as well as a school for the training of American as well as foreign officials, the latter with the cooperation of the State Department. It is understood that a suitable phase of its development that the Commission with the approval of the Senate and the direction of the President may transfer suitable parts of its activity in the Academy to properly constituted World Authority such as the United Nations or its designate, the World Health Organization.

THE FOOD AND DRUG COMMISSION

The work of the Commission shall be in charge of five members appointed by the President as follows: Two scientific members appointed by the President upon the recommendation of the National Academy of Sciences; the other members being appointed directly by the President consisting of a Chairman, representing the Government, a Representative from Industry and a Representative of the Public. All members of the Commission shall serve for a period of five years at the pleasure of the President, initial appointments being staggered as follows: one Scientific Commissioner five years, the other Scientific Commissioner four years, Public Commissioner three years, Chairman two years, and Industry Commissioner one year. The Chairman may be reappointed for a full term at the pleasure of the President and with the approval of a majority of the Commission as well as the Advisory Committee whose composition will be described later. All other Commissioners may be appointed for additional terms at the pleasure of the President. A courtesy Commissioner from the World Health Organization may be appointed with the approval of the State Department who would be present at all meetings of the Commission except executive sessions, at the pleasure of the Commission.

SCIENTIFIC COMMISSIONERS

The Scientific Commissioners' recommendations in matters within their area shall be considered as final and accepted by the Commission as the basis of any further decisions. One commissioner shall be in charge of the central and regional routine testing laboratories of the Commission and shall be charged with the preparation of final reports on the scientific aspects of drug and food applications. Both Commissioners shall be required to approve scientific recommendations to the Commission as well as concur in the certifications and appointment of outside consultants. The other Scientific Commissioner shall be in charge of the research program of the Commission and shall recommend research grants to non-profit or industrial organizations in the areas of activity of the Commission. Outside review Boards shall be used to make initial recommendations after

which the Commission as a whole will make any final awards that it pleases.

#### PUBLIC COMMISSIONER

The Public Commissioner shall conduct a Bureau on consumer problems and be prepared to advise the Commission in this area.

#### THE CHAIRMAN

The Chairman of the Commission shall issue approvals or other decisions after official action by the Commission and shall be in overall charge of enforcing the decisions of the Commission. He shall be in charge of the Academy of the Commission. He shall recommend the appointment of a legal adviser to the Commission. The enforcement of the Commission's decisions shall be in charge of a special bureau presided over by an individual with legal and police training who shall be directly responsible to the Chairman.

#### INDUSTRY COMMISSIONER

The Industry Commissioner shall be the liaison of the Commission with all profit making organizations and work out with the Chairman arrangements for the processing of drug and food applications, if there are any problems in the application of the standard working procedures set up by the Commission. He shall work out with the Public or consumer representative the details of cost sharing by government and industry for the use of outside consultants required for clinical evaluation of applications. These Commissioners shall work out a formula for determining such charges which will be approved by the Commission as a whole. Charges for the use of consultants by non-profit groups if they retain rights to patents and licenses shall also be recommended by this subgroup of the Commission.

#### ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The Advisory Committee shall be appointed by the President consisting of five members appointed in the same manner as the Commission except that the Chairman need not be a government employee. This group shall be kept informed of the Commission's activities through an executive secretary and shall be required to submit a report to the President every two years or special reports at any time it desired. It shall at all times cooperate with the Commission. The Committee shall be required to hold one annual meeting in addition to the biennial meeting required for the approval of the report to the President. Meetings may be called at the instigation of the Chairman or any two members of the Committee. The Chairman of the Committee may either be full time or part time depending on the work load required.

#### PROCEDURE IN DRUG OR FOOD APPROVALS

The following represents typical procedures that may be used in processing food and drug applications. The initial application is checked either by a central or regional government laboratory. If the data warrants it, the material is turned over to an approved outside consultant by the scientific commissioner for clinical testing. Conclusive clinical tests are required to be performed by the consultants before the Scientific Commissioners give their reports to the Commission. By special permission of the Commission upon recommendation by the Scientific Commissioners the initial petitioner may be allowed to do a part of the clinical testing. Clinical testing will proceed under rules and regulations approved by the Commission for safeguarding the health of patients and their legal rights. No clinical report can be ac-

cepted for official action that doesn't contain independent clinical data obtained outside of the activities of the petitioner. After an adequate period of clinical testing by the consultant, he or they will report their results to the Scientific Commissioners who will check the facts in their laboratories or in clinical facilities at their disposal. The scientific commissioners may at their option engage one or more consultants or the facilities of the World Health Organization for testing outside of the United States. After all the preceding has been carried out to the satisfaction of the scientific commissioners, final recommendations to the Commission may be submitted. These recommendations may contain limited or complete approval, suggestions for other uses or require an entirely new approach to the application. The initiating group will have the first option in proceeding with these suggestions or if after a suitable period of time, they take no action, the Scientific Commissioners if in their opinion the public health will be benefited thereby, may order further development in the laboratories of the Commission or through outside grants after giving the initiating petitioner an opportunity to reconsider.

#### WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION FOOD AND DRUG INDEX

As an initial step aimed at stimulating world cooperation in food and drug matters, the Commission shall offer to start a computer file on all food and drug matters that they process with proper legal safeguards for material in the process of investigation, offering this information to the World Health Organization. Other countries who contribute information in a similar fashion will also be privileged to use this computer file. This action would be mandatory upon the Commission taking place within the first five years of the Commission's activity.

### ORDER IN THE COURT

#### HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1970

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, to judge from the anguished cries in some circles, the defendant in the recently completed trial in Chicago was Judge Julius Hoffman and not the Chicago "Seven." If a recent public opinion poll conducted by the Chicago Tribune is any indication, an overwhelming majority of the American public kept the trial in proper perspective and ruled in favor of Judge Hoffman's conduct of the proceedings and agreed on the results.

As a member of the House Internal Security Committee, which until recently was known as the House Committee on Un-American Activities, I have had occasion to see some of the same Chicago "Seven" in action before the committee as witnesses. Unlike the Chicago trial though, congressional committees cannot punish misbehavior in the hearing room as Judge Hoffman did at the end of the trial. Corrective legislation has been before Congress for almost 10 years

now to punish abusive witnesses but to date it has failed to be enacted. It was encouraging to see the disruptive tactics of the Chicago "Seven" swiftly punished and, as the Tribune poll would seem to indicate, a majority of American citizens agree.

I insert at this point the item, "Majority in Poll Support Hoffman," which appeared in the March 1, 1970, issue of the Chicago Tribune:

#### TRIAL QUIZ RESULTS: MAJORITY IN POLL SUPPORT HOFFMAN

Final results in THE TRIBUNE's public opinion poll on the Conspiracy 7 trial show an overwhelming majority in support of Judge Julius Hoffman's conduct of the proceedings and agreement on the outcome of the trial.

Readers indicated either approval or disapproval on those two issues. The results:

|  |        |
|--|--------|
| I approve of the conduct of the trial (84.1%)    | 36,092 |
| I disapprove of the conduct of the trial (15.9%) | 6,815  |
| I disapprove of the results of the trial (7.4%)  | 3,458  |
| I approve of the results of the trial (92.6%)    | 43,452 |

During the five-day vote many readers expressed varying opinions on events surrounding the trial and its outcome:

"I wonder why disrespect for the court was allowed by the court to the point where one defendant was bound and gagged. . . . It seems to me that the judge allowed the trial to degenerate into a farce by his inaction. The actions of the defendants are not condoned, but one assumes the judge is in control," a Davenport, Ia., reader wrote.

#### READER BLAMES LAWYER

"Mr. [Defense Atty.] William Kunstler's lack of propriety and disrespect for the judicial system of our great country entitles him to disbarment. He is an affront to all law-abiding citizens. My highest regards to Judge J. J. Hoffman for his skillful handling of the farce presented before him," another wrote.

"I am pleased that these poor, oppressed individuals were given a greater degree of freedom to speak than has ever been allowed in a courtroom. As a result, there can be no claim that they were 'railroaded,' 'framed,' or denied the right to a proper defense," a 24-year-old Chicagoan wrote.

"Judge Hoffman is the worst example of a judge I have ever seen. The seven were innocent," a reader observed.

A Champaign reader agreed: "The controversial trial of conspiracy is in my opinion a mockery of federal justice."

#### JUDGE'S RESTRAINT PRAISED

The majority opinion was voiced by one reader who said: "I feel the Conspiracy 7 received a very fair trial. Judge Julius Hoffman, in my opinion, has emerged the hero of the whole affair. He displayed an unusual amount of restraint in dealing with the constant displays of contempt and disrespect for his person and our system of law and justice. The Conspiracy 7 misled their followers."

"I wish to express my great admiration for Judge Hoffman for his dignified and fair conduct under such chaotic conditions. The disgusting appearance and actions of the defendants have branded them as enemies of our government and all civilized society," another said.