

241. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to Congress appropriating the full funding authorized by the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act of 1971; to the Committee on Appropriations.

242. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, urging the Government of North Vietnam to withdraw all Communist troops from South Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia and to release forthwith American prisoners of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

243. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alabama, relative to ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of

the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age and older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

244. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Federal disaster relief funds; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ICHORD:
H.R. 9726. A bill for the relief of Eddie Byrd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

101. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, York, Pa., relative to statehood for Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior & Insular Affairs.

102. Also, petition of Romualdo Maturan, Mindanao, Philippines, relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:
H.R. 9725. A bill for the relief of Moon Soo Park; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DAVENPORT AND "SATCH"

HON. FRED SCHWENDEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1971

Mr. SCHWENDEL. Mr. Speaker, while the Nation and the world mourn the death of Louis Armstrong, those of us from Davenport feel a special loss because of his early ties to this area. A recent article and editorial in the Davenport Times-Democrat discuss these early ties to Davenport.

The article follows:

DAVENPORT AND "SATCH"

(By Bill Wundram)

He was a shy, fat-faced young man, and he carried his cornet in a paper bag when he first saw Davenport, but Satchmo Armstrong never forgot this river city.

"I always called it showboat town," Satchmo grinned whenever he'd visit Davenport in later years.

No one ever heard of Louis Armstrong when he tooted his horn in Davenport in the early 1920s, but in his own way he was making the foot of Brady Street a bit of Bourbon Street.

Some of Satchmo's most colorful days hark back to Davenport. Here, he joined the Streckfus Excursion Boat Line. The Streckfus Line wintered in Credit Island Harbor, and headquartered in Rock Island in those palmy days of the river.

"Every spring for years I'd come to Davenport and get on those big boats like the St. Paul and the Sidney, and what a wild time we'd have all summer long," Satchmo recalled during one concert date visit here a few years ago.

Satchmo was playing with the legendary Fate Marable's band aboard the Streckfus boats, and received \$15 a week, with room and board. One steamy August morning, on a run to Dubuque, and while the rest of the musicians were still sleeping, Satchmo especially remembered writing a song.

"It was 'I Wish I Could Shimmy Like My Sister Kate.' Gosh, I didn't think it was anything and I sold it for 50 bucks."

Armstrong seemed to have perfect recall about Davenport.

"I remember always starting out the riverboat season in Davenport. Sometimes I'd go down to the levee. I remember it was brick, and pretty steep. (This was the era when the Davenport levee was a real levee, and not a mass parking lot).

"Most of the time, though, the band guys would take some roads out into the country and climb on the Streckfus boats in a harbor." (He was referring to Credit Island

Harbor, where as many as a half-dozen Streckfus boats wintered).

Satchmo had special memories of Davenport's chilly spring weather. "Man, it was always cold when I'd get on the boat in Davenport. I think it was so cold that once I stood on the deck and told Capt. Streckfus that I would have to blow my horn to crack the ice so we could get out of that harbor."

HIS HORN STILLED

New York.—Louis "Satchmo" Armstrong, beloved troubadour of the jazz trumpet, with a delightful rasp to his voice and roll to his eye, died Tuesday, his heart worn out, his golden horn silent at last. He was 71 years old on Sunday.

"Me and my horn, we come a long way together," Armstrong once observed.

Together, they came out of a waif's refuge in New Orleans, upriver to Chicago along the trail of jazz itself, then on to the show business pinnacles of New York and Las Vegas, and the motion picture studios of Hollywood.

And before they were through, Armstrong and his horn, together, had fascinated millions on five of the earth's continents, entrancing both the humble and the royal.

Armstrong and his horn pierced even the Iron Curtain, as he became one of the best ambassadors the United States ever sent abroad, a representative of democracy whose portfolio's contents, in his words, "ain't politics, it's just music."

"In Africa," Armstrong once reminisced, "the local tribe carried in their chief to where I was playing. All he did was just look down and say just one word, 'Satchmo!' Man, they knew me even there."

THE GREAT "SATCHMO"

Quad-Citians and the rest of the world lost a friend Tuesday. He was Louis (Satchmo) Armstrong who blew his trumpet and with a gravelly voice sang his way into the hearts of millions across the world.

Along the way from a waif's home in New Orleans to a New York hospital where he was 71 Sunday "Satchmo" went from one-night stands in hamlets all across the nation to jazz concerts in most of the world's capitals.

"Satchmo" through the years played on excursion boats in the Quad-City area and became a familiar sound and sight to thousands in eastern Iowa and western Illinois.

There was about him a warm quality and an easy smile that made one relax in his presence. Yet he was such a giant in the musical world that it was a bit surprising to discover he was short in physical stature—a little under 5 foot 6.

As a jazzman "Satchmo" never put on airs. "Look, you don't pose, never. That's the last thing you do, because the minute you do you're through as a jazzman. Maybe not as a musician. But jazz is only what you are."

Another time, he said: "I play the trumpet and that's for me. There are only two kinds of music—good and bad. We (referring to himself) try to play good music."

When Armstrong turned three-score-and-ten on the Fourth of July in 1970, he said, "I'm happy. Every time I wake up it's a good day and I feel in the pink. It's awful nice to be breathing on your 70th birthday, let alone feeling in the pink."

On that same occasion he played a recording of one of his early trumpet solos and had this to say: "Ain't nobody played nothing since, and can't nobody play nothing like it now."

That could be his epitaph and as long as old records, movies and television films and the printed word are around to give witness to his talents that epitaph will stand.

THE ARIZONA INDIANS

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 12, 1971

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, Arizona Progress, the monthly publication of the Valley National Bank in Arizona, contains in its June-July 1971 issue a very concise and interesting resume of Arizona's Indians and how they are progressing. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

ARIZONA'S INDIANS: AMERICANS BEFORE COLUMBUS

The first Americans—the Indians—are the most deprived and most isolated minority group in our nation. On virtually every scale of measurement—employment, income, education, wealth—the condition of the Indian people ranks at the bottom.

But, the story of the Indian in America is something more than the record of white man's frequent aggression, broken agreements, intermittent remorse and prolonged failure. It is a record also of endurance, of survival, of adaptation and creativity in the face of overwhelming obstacles. It is a record of enormous contribution to this country—to its art and culture, to its strength and spirit, to its sense of history and its sense of purpose.—President Nixon, Message to Congress, July 8, 1970.

Arizona is Indian Country. Within the state's borders are 19 reservations covering about 31,000 square miles, or more than 27% of the total land area in Arizona. By comparison, land held in private hands accounts for

less than 15% of the state's geography. The area within the borders of Arizona's reservations is roughly equivalent to that of New Hampshire, Delaware, Vermont and Massachusetts combined!

Arizona land ownership

	Percent
Indian	27.03
Federal	44.91
State	13.12
Private	14.94

Arizona boasts the largest native American population in the U.S.—one-fifth of all Indians in the nation live here—and their number is increasing more rapidly than the whole state's population (and three times faster than the U.S. population).

Arizona	1960	1970	Percent gain
Total population	1,302,000	1,772,000	36.1
Indian population	83,000	114,000	37.3

Source: U.S. Census and Bureau of Indian Affairs.

The resurgence in Indian population is amazing in face of the fact that:

U.S. average life expectancy for Indians is 44 years;

Infant mortality is 50% higher for Indians than for the entire U.S. population;

Per capita income of Indians is \$1,500, compared with \$3,900 nationwide.

The gains achieved by Indians have not been limited to population. The educational advances by Indian youth actually are paving the way for development of the reservations. Indians in increasing numbers are entering all streams of economic life. For example, a recent meeting in Tempe, Arizona, was attended by approximately 80 Indian law students! Skills and knowledge that until recently were not available to large numbers of Indians now are being acquired and employed to foster economic growth.

Both white man and Indian will benefit from development on the reservations. In earlier years, economic progress largely was roadblocked by ethnic, cultural and social differences between white men and Indian. These ethnic problems now are gradually being resolved.

The principal advantages to businesses locating on a reservation are the availability of (1) an untapped labor pool, (2) direct and/or institutional job training for workers at low cost to employers, (3) equipment and plant financing, (4) some tax advantages, and (5) the availability of strategically located industrial and commercial sites.

ARIZONA INDIAN POPULATION BY RESERVATION

Reservation and tribe(s)	Population	Square miles
Ak-Chin (Maricopa): Papago	248	34
Camp Verde: Yavapai-Apache	690	1
Cocopah: Cocopah	101	1
Colorado River: Mohave-Chemehuevi	1,730	353
Fort Apache: Apache	6,230	2,601
Fort McDowell: Yavapai	335	39
Fort Mohave: Mohave	336	37
Gila Bend: Papago	446	16
Gila River: Pima-Maricopa	7,992	581
Havasupai: Havasupai	370	5
Hopi: Hopi	6,144	3,863
Hualapai: Hualapai	1,033	1,550
Kaibab: Paiute	138	188
Navajo: Navajo	71,396	14,014
Papago: Papago	7,218	4,334
Salt River: Pima-Maricopa	2,345	73
San Carlos: Apache	4,709	2,898
San Xavier: Papago	2,090	111
Yavapai-Prescott: Yavapai	90	2

Source: Bureau of Indian Affairs.

The Pima and Maricopa Indians on the Gila River Reservation, with financial assistance from the Economic Development Administration, have formed a non-profit company to establish the Pima-Chandler Industrial Park. There are five plants located in the park producing: styrofoam containers,

mobile homes, valves, cleaning equipment and food products.

Sunrise Park, consisting of a ski resort and lakeside facilities, has been completed on the Fort Apache Reservation.

Exciting new copper deposits are being readied for mining by the Papagos in conjunction with Hecla and Newmont mining companies.

About 900 Navajos are employed in assembly of electronic components for Fairchild Camera and Instrument Corporation. General Dynamics employs about 200 Navajos at Fort Defiance, also in electronics assembly.

Although the development of some reservations has been hampered by a remote location and lack of urban facilities, the San Xavier Papagos, the Yavapai-Prescott Community, the Salt River-Pima-Maricopa Community and the Hopi Reservation are contiguous to metropolitan centers.

The San Xavier Industrial Park adjoins the Tucson International Airport, and is near two major interstate highways, which facilitates overnight truck delivery to Phoenix, Los Angeles, Las Vegas, Albuquerque and El Paso.

The Yavapai Community is adjacent to scenic Prescott, and it works in close association with officials of the city in area development.

The Salt River Community offers choice commercial-industrial locations in the immediate Phoenix area. The Salt River Reservation adjoins three of Arizona's fastest growing cities: Tempe, Mesa and Scottsdale.

The Hopi Tribal Industrial Park is situated in Winslow, a major railroad center for Northern Arizona.

Various state and local governmental and quasi-governmental agencies are occupied in economic development activities for Arizona. The Indian Tribes in the state have established their own organization, the Indian Development District of Arizona, which is actively engaged in attracting business and industry to the reservations. IDDA also is assisting individual Indians in establishing their own businesses.

The Indian in Arizona has grasped the opportunity for determining personally his future, and he is proceeding at an accelerating pace in economic development of the reservations. He long has been respected for contributions to America's social and political heritage, and now, his role in the American economic picture is expanding, also.

For it is out of a rich Indian democratic tradition that the distinctive political ideals of American life emerged. Universal suffrage for women as well as for men, the pattern of states within a state that we call federalism, the habit of treating chiefs as servants of the people instead of as their masters, the insistence that the community must respect the diversity of men and the diversity of their dreams—all these things were part of the American way of life before Columbus landed.—From *The Legal Conscience* by Felix S. Cohen

ALTRUSA—HELPING PEOPLE TO HELP THEMSELVES

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1971

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to call to the attention of my colleagues the selfless humanitarian services of the Altrusa Club of Louisville to the Kentucky Rehabilitation Center for the Blind. The purpose of the center is to help blind people to adjust to their handicap, and to prepare themselves for independent and productive lives. In its first year, the center has moved a long

way toward that worthy goal.

Miss Ella Fishback, community service chairman for Altrusa, and Mrs. Ronald Kaplan, liaison between the club and the rehabilitation center, have focused the efforts of their club toward providing a vital link between the residents of the rehabilitation center and the local community. Working with center supervisor Marshall Fletcher and Director Charles Cox, these ladies have made it their task to help the residents of the Kentucky center to help themselves.

Mrs. A. Luke Brown, who is just retiring as president of Altrusa, has a right to be "very, very proud." The ladies of Altrusa have helped to prove a basic truth in which I have long believed: given the opportunity, given a helping hand, the handicapped members of our community can develop their talents and become useful, productive members of our society. Altrusa and the Kentucky center deserve our thanks for holding out such a helping hand.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD at this point an article by Joan Kay in last week's Courier Journal about the fine efforts of the ladies of Altrusa at the Kentucky Center for the Rehabilitation of the Blind:

ALTRUSA VOLUNTEERS SERVICE AT CENTER FOR THE BLIND

(By Joan Kay)

The aim of the year-old Kentucky Rehabilitation Center for the Blind is to provide help in personal adjustment and to teach skills for personal independence.

Beginning last fall, the center received an assist in this goal through a series of lectures and recreational programs set up by Altrusa Club of Louisville, a service club made up of women in executive positions.

The center is open to people who are legally blind, said supervisor Marshall Fletcher; there are varying types of visual impairments. Currently there is room for 12 residents, and by fall there will be facilities for 18 residents and possibly six day students. The age range is about 17 to over 50, and the length of stay generally is between 12 and 24 weeks.

Some of the clients are newly blind, and "more than 50 per cent do not read Braille when they come," said Fletcher.

The objectives are "to provide an adjustment period, psychological and emotional, to blindness, and to learn basic skills for personal independence," such as typing, Braille and how to identify clothing.

"One of the very important things is mobility instruction—how to travel with the use of a cane.

"Our primary objective is to rehabilitate (the clients) to work," Fletcher said. They may go on to vocational school or into jobs. The state has placement counselors who work to place the people, and work evaluations made by a center staff member are sent to the clients' rehabilitation counselors.

HOUSES KENTUCKY INDUSTRIES

The building at 1900 Brownsboro Road houses the center and the Kentucky Industries for the Blind. Both are under the Kentucky Department of Education, Bureau of Rehabilitation, and are individually budgeted.

"The center is free to everyone who comes here, through state and federal funds," said Fletcher.

A year ago June the first clients came to the center, which is a new program in Kentucky. Previously clients were sent to other states for this service.

Last September Miss Ella Fishback, Altrusa's community service chairman, and Mrs. Ronald R. Kaplan, who later became

liaison between the club and the center, met to discuss possible service with Charles Cox, director of Kentucky Industries and Rehabilitation Center for the Blind. Among the needs were recreation, taping of materials for instruction and leisure and lectures.

Altrus's first fellowship hour was held in October, and later ones included a program by a disc jockey and a dinner at a shopping center department store.

Weekly lectures on Friday afternoons included a talk on Social Security benefits for the blind by Miss Waltzie Cooke, a claims representative for the Social Security Administration in Louisville, and care of teeth by Dr. Edri Lohri, director of the curriculum of dental hygiene at the University of Louisville School of Dentistry.

On their first field trip, the center's clients were taken aboard an airplane at Standiford Field, and recently Sgt. Don Cummins of the Louisville Fire Prevention Bureau, who had given a talk on safety earlier, returned with a fire truck for the clients to become acquainted with.

ACCUMULATING A LIBRARY

Altrusa Club is building a cassette library for the center by taping the lectures and also books and pamphlets. The club also stocked a publications display, useful to sighted members of clients' families, on such topics as financial aid or travel concessions for the blind.

Most of the expenses of the service project came from club members' donations. A donation from the Fred Kunz Foundation bought a microphone for recording equipment.

"We're very, very proud" of the program, said Mrs. A. Luke Brown, whose term of office as Altrusa president ended last week. "We're trying to help them adjust on a local level."

Altrusa was the first club to volunteer its services, said Fletcher, and the only organization presently doing volunteer work. The lecture series he feels has been very beneficial to the center. "It's the kind of information the clients continually want to know and are asking questions about."

This summer the center has a special 10-week prevocational and precollege course in progress for an age range of 16 to 19, and Altrusa is continuing its lecture series, with first aid training slated for August. The club's volunteer program will continue at the center next year.

A MOTHER'S APPRAISAL OF HEADSTART

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 12, 1971

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the mail from constituents is a constant delight. Even the critical mail is meaningful, sometimes humorous and frequently helpful. But every once in awhile a letter comes in that is especially significant. One such letter is from one of my neighbors in Helena, Mont., Mrs. Eickmeyer—whom I have never met, but I am certainly going to try to meet her on my next trip home—has written an eloquent and heart-warming letter about Headstart. This is a mother's appraisal of Headstart. She says to "keep Headstart, enlarge Headstart, push Headstart."

Here is a voluntary expression from a mother: "Headstart is great."

I ask unanimous consent that Mrs. Eickmeyer's letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter

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

Helena, Mont.,
June 24, 1971.

Mr. JOHN GARCIA,
Office of Job Development,
Denver, Colo.

DEAR SIR: How does one thank the Federal Government for feeding, teaching, loving and caring for a child for a period of three years? This will be a feeble attempt to do so by an appreciative and concerned Mother.

My family has been fortunate to be considered "middle class" with advantages others have not had. However when a faltering marriage and ultimate divorce forced me to seek employment, I needed help for my three year old daughter. Luckily my little Lori entered one of Helena's two Head Start Day Care Centers. This was a difficult transition but overcome in a short time.

The teachers, field trips and knowledge these children are exposed to, still amaze me. I do not exclude snacks, excellent lunches, habit and manner training and just plain tender, loving care. This program is great!

I brag about Head Start, particularly our patient, professional staff. There are too many people to single out, but the staff in Helena, Montana deserves much credit for such a successful and tremendous program.

I feel I have "carried my torch" by attending parent meetings, social functions and serving on the local PAC. Even my other two children have contributed to this overwhelming program. We hope to continue even the Lori is now a graduate of Head Start.

My point in this letter is: keep Head Start, enlarge Head Start, push Head Start. I feel it is not just for the dire poor, but for those of us who are trying to support and raise our families properly. I would like to see the income limitation bend where the circumstances warrant. God and the Government help those who only help themselves.

My deepest regards,

JEAN M. EICKMEYER.

GEN. BRUCE K. HOLLOWAY ADDRESSES THE CHICAGO CLUB ROOM ONE HUNDRED GROUP

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1971

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Bruce Holloway, Commander in Chief of the Strategic Air Command, addressed the Chicago Club Room One Hundred Group on May 27 and advanced some very positive thoughts on today's state of the Nation and the dilemma it faces. I commend it to the Members of the House and Senate as it contains General Holloway's studied evaluation of the Communist threat evolving from the Soviet strategic offensive force expansion of the past few years:

REMARKS BY GENERAL BRUCE K. HOLLOWAY

Ever since 1949—when the Russians set off their first atomic device—I have heard military planners in positions of responsibility say that the next year, or next five, or ten years will be the most crucial that the United States has ever faced. You hear more of it today: that the 1970's are the most crucial; that we will make or break ourselves during the next decade.

This time I believe it. They are, manifestly, extremely crucial years that will require a steadfast will and resolve by the people of this country to support adequate programs of both internal and external orientation if the great things we believe in are to survive.

As you know, I am in the business of national defense. This is regarded by most people as defending our country against attack, invasion, or some type of forceful incursion by an enemy country or countries. It is of course, that, but it is also much more; and must be regarded as a mission of much broader context than was the case until a relatively short while ago. In a world battleground where ballistic missiles are aimed at continents in the manner that artillery pieces were once aimed across the river, defense of a national future, or a national way of life, or even moral survival becomes an intricate, many-faceted endeavor of awesome significant proportions and surpassing importance.

In looking back briefly into recent history, I would say that this country became an indisputable world power about the year 1898. Our spectacular growth of 122 years, with only minor periods of external interference, proved not only the wisdom and strength of a government built around freedom, dignity, and equal opportunity for the individual; but equally the advantages of capitalism under free competition. For the succeeding 50 years we prospered further—almost unbelievably—in spite of participation in two world wars, due in large part (as some people now tend to forget) to the endowment of a magnificent defense. Our foreign policy from 1898 to 1948 was a rather simple but adroit one which capitalized on this natural defense of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans; on a relatively weak Asia; and on a balance of power in Europe which helped to maintain, in a most favorable manner, our well-being and prosperity. In 1948—or thereabouts—all of this changed, drastically and irrevocably. The bomber and the atomic weapon and the ICBM changed it. In other words, technology changed our security and well-being.

I believe there are many people in the United States who do not fully understand this—and the implications to our security. We no longer have a weak Asia. And we no longer have a balance of power in Europe that puts us in a position of unquestionable superiority over any probable coalition of enemies.

Today I want to tell you in a few words what this means to me in terms of securing the United States against the external threat of the 1970's, and how my business, the Strategic Air Command, figures principally in this security. In order to frame my thoughts, I want first to say a little about the threat, and more importantly, the nature of the threat as I see it.

From 1949 until 1962, the Russians worked hard to build up their strategic forces of atomic weapons and intercontinental vehicles. We worked hard, too, and—with the admitted help of a head start—vastly outstripped them. At the time of the Cuba confrontation, the Russians backed down and took their missiles out. I do not profess to know all of the considerations which led to this decision, but principal among them must have been our unquestioned superiority in strategic forces. Certainly, the Russians lost tremendous face and prestige throughout the world from this action—and especially in the Communist world over which they are trying so desperately to maintain control. I think the lesson—the fundamental importance of strong strategic forces to international negotiation—was learned much more forcibly by the Russians from the Cuba affair than it was by any other participant or spectator. We see this by their actions of the past nine years. Without any apparent political or economic restraint, their improvement and enlargement of strategic forces has proceeded at a rate far in excess of our own.

During these nine years, we have introduced no new missiles, although improved versions of the Minuteman, of which we now have one thousand, and of the Polaris, of which we have 656 in 41 submarines, are being brought into the program, and further

improvements of these weapon systems are scheduled. Our bomber force has numerically decreased. All B-47s and all B-58s have been phased out, and the B-52 force has been reduced in size. However, the FB-111 of which there will be 66 aircraft in a total of 4 squadrons, is currently being introduced into the operational force. The B-1, which promises to be a fine bomber, is now scheduled for full-scale development, and could be in operation in the late 70's if a decision to produce is made later on. Both the missile and bomber improvement programs are important—and vital—and must be supported if the balance is not to tip in favor of the Russians, because they are continuing strongly to bolster their strategic forces.

The Soviet Union now has an intercontinental ballistic missile force of various sizes and shapes approaching 1500 operational launchers. The SS-9 is certainly the most formidable weapon of war yet built by man. It is able to launch warheads of up to 25 megaton yield for intercontinental ranges. There are already about 300 SS-9s under construction or operational and several improvements are under active flight test, including one which can deliver 3 re-entry vehicles of an estimated 5 megatons yield each. Recently we have discovered evidence of construction of a large new silo system, which could house a modified version of the SS-9 or possibly a new ICBM system.

This is perhaps the most notable advancement on the Russian side in the 1962-71 period, but there are several more, to include intermediate range ballistic missiles, medium range missiles and—most notably—a fast growing fleet of ballistic missile submarines similar to our Polaris fleet. In addition to almost 200 heavy bombers in its strategic inventory, the Soviet Union has over 700 medium range bombers—including a new "swing wing" supersonic one—all of which could carry atomic weapons into Europe, or on one way missions into the United States. Air defenses have improved and expanded tremendously—interceptors, surface to air missiles, and anti-aircraft; as well as ABM systems, and radar coverage for warning and control of all systems. There is no sign of this letting up, although the SALT conference at Helsinki and Vienna does herald a step toward eventually checking the trend of ever-more powerful and annihilistic weapons. I think the President phrased well this danger in these words: "If we pursue arms control as an end in itself, we will not achieve our end. The adversaries of the world are not in conflict because they are armed. They are armed because they are in conflict, and have not yet learned peaceful ways to resolve their conflicting national interests."

This trend in strategic power which I have briefly described is well known—or should be. The statistics, and more, have been made public several times. I have not told you anything new, but have reviewed it principally to introduce some thoughts on why the Russians are doing it—and why the trend to our disadvantage continues. I cannot believe it is because they are afraid of an attack by the United States.

Aside from the limited U.S. military intervention in Russia following the Russian Revolution, there is nothing in the history of our country—by word or deed—that could foreseeably give the Russians cause to fear a military aggression on our part. All signs are, in fact, just the opposite. On the other hand, there is much to cause the Russians big concern in the Communist world itself. They are the leaders, or have been until recently, and have tolerated very little deviationism in either a practical or ideological sense. Most of the satellite countries have made it manifest that they would like to break away. Communist China, with 800 million restless, hungry people has broken away. One of the staunchest allies of Russia today is North Korea, but it has been proved many times that allegiances in the Communist alliance

can be short-lived: matters of expediency to be broken when the issues at stake no longer warrant alliance. Communist nations know and understand this, although it seems that citizens of the free world sometimes do not.

Communist China is surely the number one immediate worry of Russia. The country itself has survived forty centuries of great vicissitudes that we know of. Its leadership has already challenged Russian leadership of world-wide communism, and the Soviets find themselves facing a decade during which they could lose this control; and if they do, they lose their world. Thus ----- if the 1970's are crucial to the United States, they are perhaps even more so to the Russians. Sooner or later they must bring Communist China back into line—by military force as they did Czechoslovakia—or by continuing to exploit the unresolved conflicts of the west and the third world. The choice, in order to maintain Communist leadership so necessary to eventual world domination, is about that simple.

A Russian military suppression of China would be a very costly affair. It not only would entail great outlays of men, weapons, and rubles which would weaken their overall structure, but it would further consolidate the rest of the world against them. Pre-emptive use of atomic weapons would particularly galvanize the free nations, and it is hard to see how Russia would survive such an undertaking in a shape and form which could successfully go on toward their dream of international Communism for all.

Looking at the other choice, it is interesting to engage in the game of "what if?" What would happen if the Cuba affair occurred today? What would we do? What would they do? I don't know, but I do know that we came through this crisis particularly unscathed because of our unquestioned strategic superiority. What if they put their missiles in there again? I don't think they would, because since 1962 they have found a better mousetrap to substitute for their purpose: the SLBM. So we can probably dismiss this "what if," but what if they directly supported an East German effort to seal off the corridors and take possession of Berlin by military force, and then said, "Now let's negotiate." What would we do? Again, I don't know what we would do, but it would be tragic if we were to do nothing. Should it come to pass that their strategic forces become stronger than ours, and that they know they are stronger—there is every reason to expect that they would undertake incursions, erosions, or outright territorial grabs. We could expect effort to blackmail both the Communist world, and the free world, to achieve Soviet goals. The star of the future would be quite clear, and it is a very ugly star for us to contemplate.

The fifty states of the United States and our territories and treaty partners do not want to break away. They are bound together through common beliefs and collective cause. This is a giant moral strength, the likes of which the USSR does not enjoy. The Soviet choice has been to strive for overwhelming strategic force as a means toward realizing ultimate goals. We dare not let them achieve this. The people of the United States must understand this fundamentality, and support—at least for the 1970's—a structure of strategic military power which will ensure our ability to deter nuclear war. This is the route whereby the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks can succeed. I believe it is the only route if we are eventually to persuade the Kremlin that its grand design is futile—unachievable.

Translating these beliefs into the terms of my job, here is where we stand. Both the U.S. and the USSR have strategic nuclear forces of awesome damage potential. Each could inflict massive casualties and economic ruin on the other. I spoke of the comparative weaponry earlier, and speaking in terms of

massive intercontinental nuclear exchange, it is true that deterrence seems at the moment to be well served. But the chess game is much deeper and more sophisticated than that. I have tried to describe the form of the danger as I see it, and the importance of insuring that we can negotiate from strength, and hope eventually for a better world where armaments can be reduced without the things we hold dear also being reduced. It cannot be done by disarming unilaterally, further Soviet arms growth—or technological advancement—could turn the tide if we fail to maintain a healthy defense program—and most particularly that which pertains to strategic forces.

Two years ago at the Air Force Academy graduation ceremonies, President Nixon made this comment: "I do not consider my recommendations infallible. But if I have made a mistake, I pray that it is on the side of too much (defense) and not too little. If we do too much, it will cost us our money. If we do too little, it may cost our lives." Not so recently, in New York City on November 11, 1902, President Theodore Roosevelt made a point that we need to keep in a position of preparedness, not because we want war, but because we desire to stand with those whose plea for peace is listened to with respectful attention.

Our great nation is made up of many forces, many problems, many resources and many needs. My role is not that of one who pleads in his own narrow self-interest. I am first of all an American, and I have always believed that in the American system the telling is as important as the doing—that communication is all-important. Second, after being an American I am a professional, and my profession is national defense. Therefore, my hope was to use this meeting with a most distinguished group of fellow-Americans to discuss that facet of our life and our future for which I have some responsibility—to give you one view for your use, along with those views you will get from experts in other areas of national importance, in developing your own sound judgments about the course we must steer into the challenging future.

In the final analysis, I work for the President, and the Secretary of Defense, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and I have the greatest admiration and enthusiasm for the defense goals which they have established for the immediate and proximate future. I work for you, too, and for me and my kids. I have then, attempted, for all of us, to tell you why I think it is of cardinal importance to support a strong, strategic military force program for the 1970's. The motto of the Strategic Air Command is "Peace is our Profession." It is certainly a worthy motto, and one not without precedent. Saint Luke, in the XIth Chapter of his Gospel, 21st Verse, said: "When a strong man armed keepeth his palace, his goods are in peace." Thank you.

DRUG ABUSE

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 12, 1971

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, drug abuse has fast become one of the most serious problems facing our entire Nation. It has affected every State and many communities where most of us never thought this kind of problem would occur.

A resolution was adopted unanimously recently by the Board of City Commissioners of the City of Fargo, N. Dak., requesting that \$1 billion be appropriated to combat this plague. This is

some indication of how serious the people of North Dakota view this problem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this resolution printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

RESOLUTION ADOPTED ENDORSING THE FEDERAL NARCOTICS TREATMENT AND RESEARCH AGENCY

Whereas, The explosion of the drug culture among all groups of American citizens poses a serious threat to the health and well-being of our Nation; and

Whereas, In the United States today drug addiction knows no neighborhood lines, no state, county or city boundaries, and no racial or ethnic distinctions; and

Whereas, The shattered minds and hopeless futures of thousands upon thousands of our children are grim testimony to governments' inadequate response; and

Whereas, In America today, the narcotics plague ravages our people, fills our streets with terror and our homes with desperation; and

Whereas, The Federal Government has a fragmented effort bereft of coordination and hence, local officials waste time and energy attempting to weave the fragmented Federal contributions into a focused local program; and

Whereas, The Plague of narcotics addiction will not yield to anything less than a total commitment to treatment and research, focused in a single agency at the national level and funded with real awareness of the devastating human and dollar cost of the narcotic problem.

Now, therefore, be it resolved, That the City of Fargo, concurring with the United States Conference of Mayors calls upon the Federal Government, both the Congress and the President, to provide for a single, professional, fully-funded Federal Narcotics Treatment and Research Agency with a goal of a billion dollar program in three years providing basic financing for each city to establish a local comprehensive drug treatment program to rid our nation of this evil.

Be it further resolved, That this Resolution be inscribed upon the permanent records of the proceedings of the Board and certified copies forwarded to the North Dakota Congressional Delegation, the Majority and Minority Leaders of the House and Senate, the President of the United States, the Department of Justice, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and to the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Second by Schuster. On the vote being taken on the question of the adoption of the Resolution Commissioners Lashkowitz, Schuster, Bromenschenkel, See and Markey all voted aye.

No Commissioner being absent and none voting nay, the Vice President declared the Resolution to have been duly passed and adopted and returned the Chair. (President Lashkowitz presiding)

FIFTH ANNUAL POLL FROM THE FIRST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT IN IDAHO

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1971

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to insert my fifth annual poll, taken from the First Congressional District in the State of Idaho, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This poll

seems to be significant in several major areas.

First, I would like to call attention to the fact that the support for the President's Vietnamization program is almost identical with the results of the same question last year: 51.2 percent in favor this year, and 51.3 percent in favor last year.

Second, over one-third of the people of the State admit they do not understand the President's family assistance plan, and another third definitely oppose it. Eighty-two percent are in favor of requiring all able-bodied recipients to accept any job they are physically capable of performing.

And finally, it is interesting to note that though the people of Idaho may not understand the family assistance plan, over 63 percent understand and favor the President's revenue-sharing plan.

The poll follows:

FIFTH ANNUAL POLL FROM THE FIRST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT IN IDAHO

The District-wide results follow:

1. Concerning VIETNAM: Which of the following statements comes most closely to representing your own personal views at the present time?

51.2% A. We should continue the present course, phase out our combat role and replace American troops with trained Vietnamese.

23.3% B. We should make a more definite effort toward military victory.

24% C. We should withdraw all American personnel immediately.

No answer—1.5%.

Has your opinion on the war changed in the past year?

19.2%—Yes.

72.5%—No.

No Answer—8.3%.

2. Concerning agriculture: Federal farm controls and subsidies should be—

47.8% A. Phased out within 5 years.

6.1% B. Continued substantially as they are.

2.6% C. Made permanent with increased subsidies.

3.4% D. Made permanent with subsidies reduced.

29.9% E. Continued with a limit on subsidies any one farm could receive.

No answer—10.2%.

The present payment limitation of \$55,000 is—

67.7%—Too high.

1.2%—Too low.

11.7%—About right.

No answer—19.4%.

3. Concerning WELFARE: Do you favor the President's Family Assistance Plan?

20.5%—Yes.

34%—No.

35%—I don't understand it.

No Answer—10.1%.

Which of the following do you feel are essential to any change in the Welfare system?

16.4% A. Set a minimum welfare level and authorize the Government to pay the difference between the recipient's income and the poverty ceiling.

82% B. Require able-bodied recipients to accept any job they are physically capable of performing.

48.3% C. Require welfare recipients to enroll in job-training programs.

30.9% D. Provide day-care centers for children of working mothers.

47.2% E. Distribute family planning information to welfare recipients.

42% F. Provide for local administration of the program whenever possible.

4. Concerning health insurance: Do you favor the concept of a national health insur-

ance program underwritten by the Federal Government?

23.1% A. Yes, complete coverage for all Americans regardless of income.

29.6% B. Yes, but only in cooperation with private insurance companies and limiting the Government's role to catastrophic illnesses.

41.5% C. No, keep the Government out.

No answer—5.8%.

5. Do you feel that the Sawtooth-White Cloud-Boulder mountain region should be—

11.4% A. A national recreation area.

12.9% B. A national park.

25.7% C. A joint park and recreation area complex.

40.7% D. Left as it is.

No answer—9.3%.

If you favor designation of all or a part of the area, do you feel the boundaries should be—

45.3%—As presently proposed.

39.7%—Larger.

15%—Smaller.

6. Do you favor:

A. The President's proposal to share Federal revenues with State and local governments.

63.4%—Yes.

25.9%—No.

10.7%—No answer.

B. Wage and price controls as a means of curbing inflation.

64.8%—Yes.

27.2%—No.

7.9%—No answer.

C. Continued development of the anti-ballistic missile system.

57.6%—Yes.

31.1%—No.

11.2%—No answer.

D. A crash program to find a cure for cancer.

66.9%—Yes.

23%—No.

10.1%—No answer.

E. A major Federal effort to revitalize rural America.

31.9%—Yes.

51.1%—No.

17%—No answer.

F. Compulsory arbitration for nationwide transportation strikes.

76.2%—Yes.

14.8%—No.

9%—No answer.

G. Limiting the amounts of money a candidate for public office can spend on his campaign.

86.6%—Yes.

8.7%—No.

4.7%—No answer.

H. An all-volunteer Army and an end to the draft.

51%—Yes.

41.6%—No.

7.4%—No answer.

PUT UNINSURED DRIVERS ON THE SPOT

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1971

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, WTOP has broadcast an editorial applauding legislation introduced by our colleague, GILBERT GUDE, which would rectify the serious problem of uninsured drivers in the District of Columbia. I was very pleased of this well deserved recognition given to Congressman GUDE and this legislation.

At present, almost one-third of all vehicles registered in the District are not covered by liability insurance. If the driver of an uninsured car is involved in

an accident, and cannot pay for the damage they inflict, the victim is held liable. Congressman Gude's bill would cover the victims of uninsured drivers with a special fund, created with funds collected when the vehicles are registered.

Congressman Gude should be praised for this excellent piece of consumer protection legislation. It is but one more addition to a brilliant legislative record.

The editorial follows:

PUT UNINSURED DRIVERS ON THE SPOT

If you ride in a car in—or walk on the streets of—the District of Columbia, you run a serious risk of being hit by an uninsured driver and not being able to collect a penny. It's a scandalous situation. A bill being pushed by Congressman Gude will do something about it.

The District is the only place in the country where uninsured drivers literally have a free ride—at least for one accident. The magnitude of the danger can be seen in that 80,000 automobiles—almost one-third of those registered in D.C.—have no liability insurance coverage.

If one of those cars strikes another car or a pedestrian, and the offending driver can't produce sufficient money out of his own pocket, the poor victim is on his own. It happens often. Almost 7,000 uninsured drivers were involved in accidents in the District in one recent year who couldn't cover the costs of the damage they inflicted on people and property. It's a scandal—nothing else.

Congressman Gilbert Gude of Maryland and others are sponsoring legislation which will require an uninsured driver to post a \$40 fee before he can get a tag for his car. Those payments would go into a special fund to cover unsatisfied judgments resulting from auto accidents. The bill also would require policies for insured drivers to contain a clause for protection from uninsured operators.

Both Maryland and Virginia already have roughly similar protection in force. The protection gap in the District is incredible. Exposed most constantly to the danger of course, are those who live in the District. But the countless millions of commuters, shoppers, and visitors who come here temporarily also have less protection from uninsured drivers than anywhere else in the country.

For over a decade, Congress has turned its back on corrective legislation. The insurance lobby must prevail no longer. Let's put the District's uninsured drivers on the spot.

This was a WTOP Editorial—Norman Davis speaking for WTOP.

OVERREGULATION OF TRANSPORTATION

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 12, 1971

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, on numerous occasions I have pointed out that over regulation of transportation industries is hurting the American consumer. The 43 trillion railroad rates on file with the ICC simply illustrates the over regulation which is stifling this great industry. The July issue of *Fortune* magazine contains an article entitled "It Is Time To Unload the Regulators" written by Dan Cordtz, which I commend to the attention of Senators. The article raises important questions with respect

to regulation which should be the basis for our review of the regulatory system. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

IT'S TIME TO UNLOAD THE REGULATORS (By Dan Cordtz)

Federal regulation of transportation is a failure—a creaky anachronism no more suited to a modern America than an oxcart to an expressway. It costs the public billions of dollars a year in inefficiencies and misallocations of resources. And in spite of its extravagant price, regulation contributes little to either good service for travelers and shippers or the financial well-being of most transportation companies.

The regulatory apparatus has failed utterly to keep pace with changes in technology and economic conditions. On the contrary, it has attempted to apply outdated rules to rising new forms of transportation. One of the most obvious examples of this misapplication of principles appropriate to a different set of circumstances is the treatment of the airlines by the Civil Aeronautics Board (see page 66). It frequently behaves as if the air carriers dominated long-distance passenger transportation the way the railroads did, even though the actual share is relatively small as measured against the use of private automobiles.

Slowness to adjust to change—indeed, to recognize the magnitude of change—has also been a striking characteristic of the older and bigger Interstate Commerce Commission. The ICC has clung to the notion that transportation is inherently unsuited to competition in spite of the development of new competitive modes. Now eighty-four years old, the commission still bears the marks of its origin. It started out to oversee railroad cartels, and it still oversees the U.S. transportation system, or large parts of it, in the cartel spirit.

The ICC was created to deal with destructive competition among railroads, which as a group held a virtual monopoly on intercity transportation of passengers and freight in the nineteenth century. Most of the railroads in the East and Midwest systematically practiced collusive rate making and even pooled traffic and revenue on some routes. These private cartels encouraged proliferation of railroad lines. Then, as the share of the traffic assigned to individual lines dwindled—to as little as 13 percent on the Chicago-Omaha run—the temptation grew to break out of the cartel. One way was to build many branch lines, since traffic that originated in a railroad's monopolized territory was not subject to the pooling. The result was overbuilding of low-density track.

Rate wars were common, but to make up losses on service between points where heavy competition existed, railroads charged sharply higher rates to shippers in towns along their routes where they enjoyed a monopoly. This pattern brought about many situations in which short-haul shippers paid more than long-haul shippers over the same route, and engendered violent popular resentment against the railroads.

To end the instability, railroad supporters in the Senate proposed a commission with broad discretionary power to enforce the cartels. But the House of Representatives, responding to shippers, preferred merely to outlaw the railroads' abusive practices. The unsatisfactory compromise that emerged in 1887 was a weak ICC. Dozens of amendments over the years strengthened the commission's powers until by 1920 it controlled entry into the industry, exit, capital formation, and minimum rates. Thus the ICC evolved from a body to facilitate private cartels into the operator of a compulsory railroad cartel.

In the early 1920's the commission's in-

structions from Congress to work for a "fair return" on rail investment produced one of the earliest examples of regulatory backfire. The regulators acted as if the railroads still had no effective competition when in fact they were already beginning to lose traffic to trucks. The commission's efforts to improve rail returns, by raising rates by as much as 40 percent, merely sent the companies chugging downhill at an even faster pace. Highway motor carriers were quick to seize the opportunity that the ICC had presented them. Between 1920 and 1925, truck registrations more than doubled.

THE TROUBLE WITH PARTIAL FREEDOM

Rather than acknowledge that the rise of the truckers had ended the railroads' dominance and hence the need for regulation, the legislators decided in 1935 to bring trucks under control, too. But not all trucks. Showing its usual solicitude for farmers, Congress exempted trucks carrying farm products—a category later interpreted by the courts to include many processed agricultural products—and trucks used exclusively to haul their owners' goods. Even broader exemptions were granted when barge traffic was brought under ICC control in 1940. While all rail traffic is regulated, only about one-third of truck volume and one-tenth of barge volume are now under control. Since the effectiveness of any cartel depends on its ability to bring in all competitors, this alone is enough to doom the ICC to failure—regulated carriers are undercut by unregulated competitors. F. sent regulatory arrangements, then, offer neither the benefits of a free market nor those of a well-organized cartel. As economist George W. Hilton of U.C.L.A. observes: "Common carriers are in an incomplete cartel which produces most of the consequences public policy should seek to avoid."

Unwilling to acknowledge that the commission is a cartelizing body, Congress has given it a vague and contradictory mandate. The commissioners seem no clearer about the fact that they are attempting to manage a cartel. Professor Hilton, who has spent more than a decade studying the agency closely, says, "In the most literal sense, the ICC doesn't know what it's doing."

Where regulation is effective, the consequences are overwhelmingly negative. It has generally kept rates at levels designed to share most traffic among competing modes. This has encouraged the inefficient use of inappropriate means of transportation, such as truck transport of freight over long distances where railroads could carry it at lower cost. By reducing competition, regulation has discouraged development of improved technology. The ICC's slowness to permit reductions in obsolete services has kept the railroads from getting rid of money-losing facilities. And the paternalistic atmosphere of regulation has stifled managerial initiative.

Many times over the years, discontent with the system has reached levels that could no longer be ignored. But attempts at reform have never succeeded in curing the industry's ills. Indeed, the situation today is worse than at any time in recent memory. The threat of bankruptcies hangs over the railroads, and the possibility of having to nationalize them haunts Washington. The plight of the railroads has prompted much of the current preoccupation with the regulatory problem, but the railroads are not alone. Regulated truckers, while currently in better financial shape, are losing more and more business to their unregulated rivals. And complaints over deteriorating freight service are louder and more widespread than ever.

Much of the cacophony of criticism originates with the regulated carriers themselves, and it is predictable. Truckers want freedom to raise their prices and expand their operations, but at the same time they want continued protection from potential

competitors. Rail executives want rate flexibility, plus the freedom to get out of the railroad business and into the truck and barge business. The partial deregulation proposed by the carriers, while a selfish goal, would be a step in the right direction. But it would be only a half measure. The problem is greater than the cumbersome procedures of a bureaucracy or the inconsistencies and loopholes of a patched-up law. The problem is regulation itself, and the ultimate solution is to get rid of the whole regulatory mess and let the transportation companies take their chances in the marketplace.

THE VOTERS DON'T CARE

Such an idea, on its face, may seem politically naive, and admittedly it doesn't look very feasible right now. The forces that see themselves as beneficiaries of the present system are numerous, powerful, well organized, vigilant, determined, and resourceful. In the past, at least, their opponents have displayed none of these characteristics. Even the railroads, which ought to be vigorous partisans of deregulation, hardly seem anxious to submit themselves to the rigors and uncertainties of complete freedom. Former Senator George A. Smathers of Florida, now general counsel of the railroad-sponsored America's Sound Transportation Review Organization (ASTRO), recently told a Senate subcommittee that "complete deregulation would be totally chaotic and, in the end, would serve the best interests of no one."

Defenders of the status quo are strengthened by the indifference of most Congressmen, who perceive that few of their constituents care anything about the regulatory mechanism and its inadequacies. To the typical voter, the nation's transportation system consists of his own automobile and the streets and highways he drives on. He never goes anywhere by plane, train, or bus (except, in a few large cities, to get to work). While he is dimly aware that virtually everything he consumes must be transported, he doesn't know how his goods get to him or what the service costs. Consequently, on those rare occasions when Congress is stirred into action on transportation, its interest is likely to be fleeting and misdirected. The great wave of concern about intercity rail passenger service, which affects only about 1 percent of intercity travelers, is a case in point.

Nevertheless, the cause of deregulation is not hopeless. The Administration has developed an ambitious legislative program that would include quite significant reduction in the ICC's authority to control rates and to compel railroads to continue money-losing service. There is good reason to believe this plan is more than an idle exercise. The President's 1971 Economic Report argued strongly that "a deregulated transportation industry would better serve the public interest." Richard W. McLaren, Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, recently declared, "Of one thing I am sure, competition as a regulator has a far better track record than the administrative agencies." There are some indications that these sentiments are shared in Congress. Senator Majority Leader Mike Mansfield has submitted a bill to abolish the ICC, and it has been cosponsored by eight of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Some of the critics—including Senator Mansfield—are not against regulation per se. They merely want to alter its scope or direction to force improvements in passenger service or ease the boxcar shortage that annually plagues western grain growers. It is significant, however, that men as mistrustful of the market mechanism as Ralph Nader are attacking the present system. A team of Nader's associates last year published a devastating critique of the ICC and joined in

with the voices urging its elimination. Critics of this stripe, while not necessarily in agreement with the adherents of total deregulation, may be expected to give political support to some of the initial steps toward curbing the regulators.

Plainly, deregulation must be a step-by-step process. Hendrik S. Houthakker of the Council of Economic Advisers is a strong advocate of eventual complete deregulation, but even he acknowledges: "It will take time to reverse the history of nearly a century. The patterns imposed by regulation have become part of the structure of the transportation industries." However alluring the probable benefits of deregulation, he adds, "nothing would be gained if the industries suffered irreparable damage in the process."

THE PRICE OF FREEDOM

The repercussions of ending transportation regulation cannot be dismissed lightly, but the changes would not be as traumatic as its defenders profess to fear. With little evidence save the recollections of a distant time, they assert, among other things, that many isolated areas and small shippers would find themselves with no service at all. Others would find themselves at the mercy of un dependable operators engaged in ruinous cutthroat competition. It is certainly true that individual companies—particularly the holders of certificates for major trucking routes—would lose some of the value of their franchises with increased competition. Production facilities located to take advantage of present regulations would also suffer. But as Hilton, one of the most articulate and persuasive advocates of total deregulation, points out, "A misguided policy ought not to be perpetuated out of concern for the well-being of those who have profited from it."

In a society already concerned about traffic congestion and pollution, probably the most worrisome question is: Would a free market in transportation generate further geographic concentration of economic activity and population? Transportation is obviously an important factor in economic development. But transportation economists generally argue that the present system does not really foster population dispersal. Richard N. Farmer of the Indiana University Graduate School of Business contends that, because regulation compels truckers to carry less-than-truckload shipments at a loss, the carriers now employ every stratagem to avoid them. "The small shipper gets no service," he says. "He might pay more under deregulation, but he would get service."

Farmer and other economists believe that the presumed benefits of the common-carrier system are overrated, and that most such benefits could be provided by truck brokers similar to those who now book ocean-shipping cargoes on tramp steamers. The capital requirements and skills for entry into the trucking business are so modest, these experts say, and the economies of scale so unimportant, that—if entry is not impeded by government regulation—new companies will spring up anywhere traffic exists or can be developed. In any case, if dispersal of economic activity is an important national goal, it can be promoted more effectively by direct subsidies rather than by imposition of public-utility responsibilities on transportation companies that do not enjoy the guaranteed returns accorded to utilities.

THE CHICKEN EVIDENCE

Ideally, a freight transportation system should be organized so that all traffic moves by the means best suited to haul it (considering its weight, perishability, susceptibility to damage, and other characteristics), and at the lowest possible cost. Carriers should not maintain capacity to handle traffic inappropriate to their technology. Such capacity not only misallocates resources, but also cuts into the carriers' own

profitability. Public policy should be directed toward providing users with cheap, flexible transportation, and should concern itself with the carriers' prosperity only in order to ensure the availability of such service.

Measured against these guidelines, the present system fails badly. For one thing, the cost of excessive freight rates over what they might be in a free market has been estimated at \$2 billion a year. The experience of shippers of chicken and frozen food under a brief period of deregulation offers some evidence. In 1956 truck tariffs on such shipments were freed, and by the following year, the Department of Agriculture found, rates on fresh chicken had fallen 33 percent and those on frozen chicken 36 percent. Rates on frozen foods generally declined by an average of 19 percent in a year. Quality of service, the department said, actually improved.

The excessive charges can be blamed almost entirely on regulatory policies. When the ICC was given jurisdiction over railroad rates, it accepted as proper the railroads' traditional discrimination against high-value manufactured goods in favor of cheaper raw materials and agricultural commodities. Such discrimination was justified on grounds that transportation costs ought to be more or less proportionate to the value of the goods being shipped, rather than to the cost of hauling them. In the nineteenth century, that notion made both political and economic sense. It helped support farm incomes, encouraging settlement of the West, and helped protect fledgling western industries against established eastern competitors. The system also maximized the railroads' profits. Because of the huge initial investment required, railroads had high fixed charges relative to total costs. Where competitive pressures existed, as in the transport of bulk commodities, rates were pressed down to the point where they covered only the variable costs. But there was little competition for the carriage of manufactured goods, and even with higher rates the cost of transportation represented a small portion of their total price. Thus the railroads could earn enough hauling these products to cover all of their fixed charges.

When regulation was extended to trucks in 1935, this value-of-service rate structure was applied to them as well. But for the most part the trucks were not competing for the low-value commodities that the railroads carried cheaply. Truckers went after the more valuable products, whose rail rates were at a level where truckers could make money even with much higher costs. Since trucks were faster door to door, were not restricted to rigidly fixed routes, and did not damage freight the way the railroads did, they were quickly able to capture a heavy share of this business.

Rail executives eventually woke up to what was happening and sought to reduce their rates to counter the truckers' service advantages. By that time, however, Congress had directed the ICC to "foster sound economic conditions" among all competing transportation modes. The commission correctly took this as a mandate to keep rates at a level where everyone could get a piece of the available business.

Then as now, the railroads had few friends in the legislature. Many members of Congress were suspicious of the railroads' monopolistic potential. So there is little doubt that the idea was to keep the railroads from cutting prices to drive the trucks and barges out of business. In a long list of "umbrella rate" decisions of the Fifties and Sixties, the ICC refused to let railroads cut their rates to recapture traffic taken from them by highway and water carriers. These anti-competitive rulings obviously have contributed to keeping up the general level of transportation rates.

A COLLECTION OF MINI-MONOPOLIES

If these direct costs are the most readily visible of regulation's adverse consequences, they are by no means the only ones. Professor Hilton points to:

The regulated transportation cartel, like any other cartel, breeds underutilization of resources.

Umbrella rate making encourages misallocation of traffic among various modes.

Regulation imposes a bias in favor of present technology, and thus slows progress.

The excessive costs associated with regulation create incentives for shippers to avoid the use of common carriage.

And the ICC's susceptibility to political pressure causes it to impede the phasing out of obsolete services.

The trucking industry, with something like half of its physical capacity employed, is the most obvious example of underutilized resources. When the industry was brought under the jurisdiction of the ICC in 1935, existing carriers received "grandfather rights," which allowed them to go on handling whatever business they had handled in the past. Since the industry had been highly specialized and fragmented, it remained so—and the award of operating certificates continued to be severely restricted. Often the curbs are preposterous. Many carriers are limited to a few commodities, hauled between certain points—often in a single direction and over a prescribed route, with stops permitted only at specified intermediate points if at all.

Thus the trucking industry, which economists regard as ideally suited for competition, is a collection of mini-monopolies. The Nader study calculated that only 16 percent of trucks are fundamentally unrestricted. Mergers and acquisitions are intended primarily to enlarge the scope of a company's operating rights, rather than to seek economies of scale.

Overcapacity is guaranteed by the ICC's rules barring truckers from cutting rates in order to fill empty trucks on return trips. The ICC has no specific authority to do this, but obviously if cheap backhauls were allowed, that would destroy the value-of-service pricing principle on which the regulated freight-transportation industry rests. So the ICC customarily justifies its policy under its responsibility to prevent "unfair or destructive competitive practices." The consequences of the policy are clear. A study by the Highway Research Board some years ago found that only 52.4 percent of common carriers had full loads in both directions.

The impact is even greater on private carriers, truckers that carry exempt agricultural products, and operators of contract trucking services for a limited number of particular shippers. Although carriers in these categories are not subject to the usual rate control in their customary operations, they are forbidden to carry other kinds of goods on return trips. And since the traffic of all three classes is very unbalanced, the trucks run empty much of the time. The Highway Research Board study found that contract carriers are fully loaded in both directions only 7.9 percent of the time. For private carriers the figure was 7.3 percent, and for agricultural truckers 5.2. Besides wasting transportation resources, of course, this pattern contributes mightily to traffic congestion and automotive air pollution.

Restrictions on what may be hauled by whom also make for underutilization of resources in barge service, though to a lesser extent. Barges are restricted by the "rule of three"—tows made up of barges carrying more than three different commodities lose their exemption from rate regulation. The result is that barge operators frequently carry smaller tonnages than their towboats

could handle. And on return trips they find themselves moving many empty barges that could be filled if it were not for the restriction.

There is some disagreement among transportation experts about the extent to which misallocation of traffic results from the ICC's practice of setting rates that enable all carriers to compete. But it certainly leads to some degree of misallocation. In a 1969 study for the Brookings Institution, Professor Ann F. Friedlaender of Boston College concluded that freight-rate discrimination has systematically diverted rail traffic to trucks at distances above 200 miles. She estimates that railroads could recapture such freight if they were free to set rates as they chose. Other economists argue that railroads would still have some competitive disadvantages. Merton J. Peck of Yale says that under deregulation railroads could probably take away from trucks and barges about 10 percent of their present business.

By keeping new competitors out of the trucking business and maintaining rates that protect the least efficient of existing common carriers, the ICC creates substantial incentives for shippers to seek alternative means of transportation. Unregulated truckers have been taking a growing share of highway traffic, and a large but undetermined volume of goods is hauled illegally. Encouragement of private carriage, with its extremely low rate of utilization, seems clearly contrary to the public interest. Companies that operate their own fleets, moreover, must devote managerial effort to a function that could better be performed by a company specializing in transportation. The fact that private trucking thrives in spite of such disadvantages is in itself conclusive evidence that something is seriously wrong with the economics of regulated common carriage.

THWARTED TECHNOLOGY

The bias of ICC policies in favor of present technology has reinforced the conservative bent of most railroad managers and made it difficult for them to find a new role for railroads in an integrated transportation system. When the Southern Railway sought permission ten years ago to haul grain in new, 100-ton aluminum hopper cars, at a rate for multicar shipments far below charges prevalent at the time, it took four years and a decision by the U.S. Supreme Court to force the ICC's grudging approval. Regulatory hostility to special rates for multicarload shipments is an old problem. More recently, the ICC's attitude toward special rates has retarded the use of unit trains—lengthy trains devoted to hauling a single commodity, such as coal, directly from its place of origin to a single destination.

The climate of sluggishness to which the regulatory apparatus has contributed has seriously delayed containerization, which some transportation experts regard as the only thing that can save the railroads. The technology of piggybacking—hauling containers on rail flatcars—has been available for thirty years or more, but only in the past decade has piggybacking shown significant growth. Even now, the potential of containerization cannot be fully exploited because the law generally forbids railroad acquisition of truck and barge lines. Intermodal transportation companies would almost certainly move most traffic in containers by whatever mode is most economical. Railroads' main lines would constitute the backbone of the system, carrying the containers over long distances. Barges might well handle low-value commodities where time is unimportant. With trucks pulling the containers to and from rail marshaling points, most switching and branch lines could be elim-

inated. Railroads could also dispense with the huge yards that cost them heavily in taxes and waste thousands of acres in and around cities.

Many railroads are already clamoring for permission to get rid of money-losing branch lines. But the commission's procedures make abandonments so costly and time-consuming, rail executives complain, that there is no sense in trying. It is a weak argument. While the procedures are indeed onerous, railroads would have a much better case against the ICC if they had fought hard, even if unsuccessfully, for what they believe should be done.

BEYOND THE FIRST STEPS

In spite of the unimpressive record of past attempts to patch up the system, a government appointed panel has proposed to have another try at it. The Advisory Council on Executive Reorganization, headed by Roy Ash of Litton Industries, has suggested that the ICC, the CAB, and the Federal Maritime Commission be combined under a single chief. Conceivably, the plan could yield greater bureaucratic efficiency. But the example of the ICC—which already has responsibility for four modes of transportation—is hardly encouraging. In any event, opposition of most carriers has been so firm that the plan is given little chance of enactment.

Of the varied proposals for partial deregulation that are floating around, prospects are probably best for two that are strongly favored by the Association of American Railroads and probably would not be actively opposed by the truckers. The first would allow carriers to change rates up or down within a specified range, without prior approval of the ICC. Such rates could later be challenged by shippers, but they would have to prove unfairness and injury before the ICC would order the rates rolled back. The second proposal would put reasonable limits on how much time the ICC could take before acting on mergers and abandonments of services and facilities. Such limitations would undoubtedly entail some curtailment of the rights of protesting parties to be represented in person before the commission or its hearing examiners.

These minimal first steps would by no means be sufficient, and supporters of an efficient, competitive transportation system should continue to press for much stronger measures. The setting of minimum rates should be abolished. The setting of maximum rates should be restricted to those rare situations where only one possible carrier for their goods is available to particular shippers. Collusive rate setting should be forbidden, and price competition encouraged. Railroads should be permitted to merge more readily and to abandon any money-losing lightly used trackage. Above all, to provide improved transportation for those no longer served by rail as well as those inadequately served by other modes, totally free entry should be permitted into any segment of the transportation industry. This freedom would surely lead to the development of intermodal companies, the best hope for rationalization of U.S. transportation.

Achievement of these goals will not be easy. Other impediments aside, the politically powerful truckers and their Teamster allies would put up a fierce fight against many of these proposals. But half-measures will not be enough. A modern, competitive, efficient transportation system cannot develop within the present regulatory framework.

A particularly vigorous expression of this viewpoint comes from that fount of clear thinking about transportation, Professor Hilton of U.C.L.A. The ICC's history, he wrote not long ago, shows that its present behavior is inevitable. "Staffing the commission with different people, or making minor

changes in the statutory delegation of authority cannot result in significantly different behavior. The disadvantages of the present system are intrinsic to the commission's existence, and can be rectified only by its abolition."

PLEA TO STUDY NORTH VIETNAM OFFER

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1971

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in today's RECORD an article that appeared in the Friday, July 2, 1971, edition of the Glendale, Calif., News-Press.

The article, an interview with Mrs. Arthur S. Mearns, wife of an Air Force major who has been missing in action for over 5 years, urges our Government to give careful study and consideration to the latest proposal offered by Hanoi to release American prisoners of war. Mrs. Mearns points out that there would be no necessity for prisoner-of-war proposals, if the nations who signed the Geneva Convention would live up to its provisions. However, since that obviously is not the case, she would like the U.S. Government to explore every facet of the latest proposal. If it then turns out to be phony and more propaganda, it should be exposed for what it is, but until that time, we should regard every proposal as a possible solution to the prisoner problem.

The prisoners should not be treated by either side as a political matter because the treatment of POW's is wholly a humanitarian effort. The main consideration is to get the POW's back. Propaganda and politics should take a back seat.

The article follows:

PLEA TO STUDY N. VIET OFFER

If the 127 nations that signed the Geneva Convention lived up to that agreement any prisoner-of-war proposals from North Vietnam would be unnecessary, Mrs. Arthur Mearns of Los Feliz, a member of POW-MIA International, said today.

Mrs. Mearns said Hanoi's offer to release POW's simultaneous with complete American troop withdrawal should be studied very carefully.

She said the offer may be phony and if so it should be unmasked, noting that if governments adhered to their treaties and conventions designed to protect people there would be no POW issue.

Mrs. Mearns has been campaigning for the release of her husband, Major Arthur S. Mearns who was shot down over North Vietnam Memorial Day, 1966. She said a very grave concern to families of MIA's and POW's is that the issue has become political.

"We have been stressing the issue for years but just recently the POW's have become popular, they are in vogue now and many politicians are using the issue to further their own aims. It shouldn't be handled as a political issue," said Mrs. Mearns.

She said that members of POW-MIA International are trying to stop the trend of putting POW riders on every congressional bill regarding the war in Vietnam.

"That trend garbages up the whole issue. People are supporting bad bills because of the POW riders. We have been trying to tell people that resolutions are fine if used properly.

"We are grateful for the latest Hanoi offer and we are encouraged, but we will not let up in our efforts. Relaxing is a luxury we cannot afford as long as there are 339 known POW's and 1200 MIA's still in the hands of the enemy."

IN DEFENSE OF THE MILITARY

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 12, 1971

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, for the last several years one of the chief form of entertainment for many of the Nation's writers and publications has been an attack on the man in uniform.

Why this has had to be is a reason understood only by those people who have been practicing it as disgusting as it is to the majority of American citizens. It is, therefore, a source of real encouragement to see such an outstanding American as George Ball defend the military as he did in the issue of Newsweek for July 5, 1971. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

IN DEFENSE OF THE MILITARY

(By George W. Ball)

It is time to speak up for the soldiers. For the past several years we have made them the scapegoats for our misfortunes. Yet, to continue to seek exculpation by loading the blame on the military is not only unjust, it risks harm to our security, so we had better take a lesson from the experience of France—something we lamentably failed to do when we committed our forces to Indochina.

In the bitter aftermath of the second world war the French Army and Air Force were given a dreary series of dirty and foredoomed assignments to sustain the remnants of colonial power, first in Syria, then Indochina, then Morocco, and finally Algeria. For almost a decade and a half, graduates of St. Cyr fought under the most frustrating conditions, taking frightful casualties, yet losing each conflict not from failure of valor on the battlefield but from a decay of political will in Paris, a decision by the politicians—reflecting public weariness—that the game was no longer worth the candle.

PERNICIOUS EROSION

By 1958 these agonizing experiences in far-off lands had loosed poisons throughout the whole military establishment. France had done what no modern democratic state should ever do; by pushing its armed forces into conflicts only fragilely supported on the home front, it had detached them from the national life of their country. For, as the politicians abandoned first one war and then another, the military suffered a pernicious erosion of their traditional role as the respected protectors of *la patrie*. Thus, inevitably they developed a festering resentment of the politicians who bartered away the

gains hard won by their blood and toil, until the imminent abandonment of Algeria might have triggered a revolution had it not been for General de Gaulle on his white horse.

Today these pressures are beginning to be felt on the American scene. For ten years we have embroiled our armed forces in the wretched paddies of Indochina. Our valiant airmen have been killed in futile sorties against the north; our army has lost far more than the normal percentage of its professional officer corps. Yet, though there have been ample courage and devotion, Vietnam is now associated in the public mind not with heroes but heroin. We scorn our soldiers for being careless of civilian lives, overlooking the brutalizing character of colonial wars—while we condemn our Air Force because bombs strike whoever happens to be under them, refusing to recognize that the alternative to sophisticated weapons is more American boys dying in the jungle. Meanwhile we are assaulted by the scribbings of junior Clausewitzes designed to prove that the conflict could have been won long ago if only their patented recipes had been followed.

FATAL ERROR

No wonder our soldiers are demoralized as we speed our withdrawal from Vietnam. How could they be otherwise, since the fatal error was the choice of mission, not its execution; and what the McNamara documents plainly show is that the military did not push us into Vietnam half so much as the civilian theoreticians with theses to prove—doctrines of counter-insurgency and guerrilla tactics all reeking of the lamp?

Thus, we had better stop carping at the soldiers if we are to learn the true lessons of this ghastly experience. We had better be sure that, as a necessary and honorable element in our society, they are not pushed toward alienation or bitterness. Otherwise, though we are unlikely to repeat the shattering constitutional crisis of France, we may well drive our most gifted and competent officers out of our armed forces—men we shall desperately need when the going again gets rough.

As an urgent first step, let the universities tone down their derision; since, at the end of the day, the real "treason of the intellectuals" may well be judged not to be what Julien Benda had in mind—their abandonment of meditation for activism—but rather their role in undermining society's protective institutions. Part of the blame will no doubt fall on the young faculty cheerleaders who encouraged the campus yahoos to identify all policemen as "pigs," but the most grievous offense will be the academicians' effort to off-load the sins of this melancholy time on the military, who, skilled more with the sword than the pen, cannot adequately defend themselves against eggheaded *franc-tireurs* blowing beanshooters from the sanctuary of their ivory towers.

IMPORTATION OF METALLURGICAL CHROME ORE FROM RHODESIA

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 12, 1971

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Richmond Times-Dispatch of July 9 contains an excellent editorial concerning a bill to permit resumption of the importing of metallurgical chrome ore from Rhodesia.

All U.S. trade with Rhodesia is now prohibited, under an Executive order issued by President Johnson pursuant to a resolution of the United Nations Security Council.

Prior to the imposition of the U.N. embargo on Rhodesian trade, Rhodesia was the chief source of chrome ore for the United States. Chrome ore is essential for the manufacture of such defense items as jet aircraft, missiles, and nuclear submarines.

Today the United States is dependent on the Soviet Union for chrome ore. We import 60 percent of our supply of this strategic commodity from Russia.

To me, our present policy makes no sense. My legislation, S. 1404, would end our dependence on the Soviet Union for this vital commodity.

The editorial in the Times-Dispatch makes the point that the U.N. sanctions were imposed largely because Rhodesia is not adhering to the principle of majority rule. The absurdity of this position is underscored by the fact that in the country now supplying most of our chrome, the Soviet Union, a handful of Communist Party leaders control the lives of 240 million people.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks. The editor of the editorial page of the Richmond Times-Dispatch is Edward Grimsley.

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

SANITY ON RHODESIA

It would be difficult to cite a more idiotic inconsistency in American foreign policy than the United States' grotesque attitude toward Rhodesia, that proud nation which has offended the world by daring to insist upon the right to manage its internal affairs.

Soon after Rhodesia declared its independence from Great Britain in 1965, the United Nations Security Council, at London's insistence, imposed economic sanctions on that African country, primarily because of its refusal to adopt constitutional provisions guaranteeing eventual majority rule. Rhodesia's population consists of about 4.9 million Africans and approximately 234,000 whites of European descent.

No matter how passionately the United States might believe in the principle of majority rule, its support of the embargo is morally inconsistent and pragmatically indefensible, as Virginia Sen. Harry F. Byrd Jr. eloquently argued in a recent appearance before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Sen. Byrd has introduced a bill that would restore some sanity to the U.S. policy by allowing this country to import chromium ore from Rhodesia. Used in the manufacture of such defense items as jet aircraft, missiles and nuclear submarines, chrome is vital to the United States. Lacking a domestic source, the U.S. used to depend heavily upon Rhodesia for this essential metal. Now, believe it or not, the United States receives 60 per cent of its chromium ore from Soviet Union.

Herein lies the major inconsistency. For if the United States will not buy chrome from Rhodesia because it refused to guarantee majority rule, how can Washington justify its decision to buy chrome from the Soviet Union? Has Russia guaranteed majority rule? Not to anyone's knowledge. Russia has been, is now and probably will continue indefinitely

to be ruled by a Communist minority. Moreover, as Sen. Byrd has noted, at least 37 members of the United Nations "do not have a form of government based on majority rule, and . . . adherence to the majority rule principle is questionable in 24 member countries."

Further, if it be morally wrong to trade with a country that refuses to guarantee majority rule, how can it be morally right to trade with a country that has snuffed out the light of liberty for millions? Is Russia's brutal subjugation of such countries as Latvia, Estonia and Czechoslovakia more acceptable to the moralists than Rhodesia's refusal to vow that some day it will transfer control of its government to its black citizens?

Washington also seeks to justify its boycott against Rhodesia by calling that country "a threat to international peace and security, which is more nonsense and another inconsistency. Each year the U.S. spends billions of dollars to defend itself not against Rhodesia but against possible Russian—or Red Chinese—aggression. If Washington is convinced of the undesirability of trading with a country that poses a "threat to international peace and security," it should sever its economic ties with Russia and proceed no further with efforts to woo Peking.

From a practical viewpoint, Washington's attitude toward Rhodesia makes no sense either. For one thing, the policy is costing the United States money, since the Soviet Union has increased the price of the ore from \$25 to \$72 per ton. For another, the U.S. finds itself supporting an ineffective policy. Some nations do not even pretend to comply with the Security Council's sanctions policy and others frequently violate it. And Rhodesia has progressed economically despite the boycott.

Among those who has endorsed Sen. Byrd's measure is Dean Acheson, who was President Truman's secretary of state. Mr. Acheson is convinced that economic "sanctions cannot be expected to force a people to action which they believe contrary to their vital national interests." And he warns that continued "meddling in the internal affairs of Rhodesia, South Africa, and Portuguese Angola will not bring the U.N.'s stated goal of international peace and security, but, on the contrary, the bloodiest warfare and insecurity."

Congress and President Nixon should heed the words of Acheson and Byrd, The United States, the Senator insists, "faces an imminent and serious shortage of chrome." It is dangerous and illogical for the U.S. to depend upon Russia—it's most menacing potential enemy—for this vital metal, especially since the Soviet Union is far more guilty than Rhodesia of the offenses to which the Security Council and the U.S. object.

WILL THE UNITED STATES SURRENDER AT PARIS?

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1971

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the same people that called for the unilateral surrender of our enemies in 1945, are now asking for the unilateral surrender of the United States in Vietnam. As Mr. Crawford points out in his editorial in the Washington Post of July 11, 1971, some feel "that the United States bear 'full re-

sponsibility' for war damages in North and South Vietnam, thus accepting as an obligation the payment of reparations. The only concession the Vietcong made was an undertaking to free U.S. prisoners of war."

Mr. Speaker, in evaluating the morality of the wars mentioned above, I do not see that our basic purpose has changed—and a spark of democracy will, we pray, continue to glow in Southeast Asia.

At this point, I include the editorial:
THE STEEP ASKING PRICE AT PARIS FOR
U.S. "SURRENDER"

(By Kenneth Crawford)

What Madam Nguyen Binh handed the United States delegation in Paris was not a demand for unconditional surrender. It was a demand for surrender on condition that the U.S. pay for the privilege of surrendering. The Vietcong asking price was on its face was unconscionable. Unless marked down, President Nixon could not possibly pay it. No American President could.

Ambassador David Bruce made this quite clear at last week's formal session but failed to lure the Communists into more private talks to find how much, if any, markdown could be negotiated. The Communists like the propaganda odds.

They proposed: (1) That all American military personnel and equipment be removed from Vietnam by next Jan. 1, and meanwhile that hostilities be suspended and Vietnamization discontinued; (2) that the Thieu regime in Saigon be dumped in favor of an interim coalition, including, of course, the Vietcong, to conduct elections; (3) that the U.S. bear "full responsibility" for war damage in North and South Vietnam, thus accepting as an obligation the payment of reparations. The only concession the V.C. made was an undertaking to free U.S. prisoners of war.

To accept these conditions would be to turn South Vietnam over to the Communists lock, stock and barrel, with Camranh Bay and other such installations thrown in for good measure. It would be to proclaim that thousands of Americans have fought and died for nothing and that millions of dollars have been flushed into the Mekong. Many Americans contend that this is what has happened but even they may not want it proclaimed. Given a chance to think it over, most Americans would find this hard, if not impossible, to swallow.

Sen. George McGovern and others who have rushed to the microphones to urge that the administration grab at the Communist offer may have occasion to regret their impetuosity.

So far public opinion has not had much chance to take form. The proposal was thrown on the table in Paris just as the long Fourth of July weekend was starting, when news of any kind commands minimum attention. Moreover the news media, especially radio and television, have taken slight notice of six of Madam Binh's seven points—those which dangle the price tag. And the Nixon administration has, perhaps wisely, withheld analytical guidance pending "clarification" of the terms.

Madam Binh's point one—the offer to release U.S. prisoners of war gradually as U.S. military personnel and arms are withdrawn—has diverted attention from the conditions in points two through seven. And even these six points are couched in cleverly misleading language. Elections are to be fair. Democracy is to prevail. The Vietnamese will settle their own differences amicably. There

will be no reprisals. Vietnam, happily reunified in due course, will be a neutral nation, on good terms with all the world, including the U.S.

This is the kind of language the Communists have used to make this kind of promise to every nation they have overrun and subjugated since the Second World War. Go back to the Soviet plan for "freeing" Poland, one of the earliest victims, in 1945, and the same combinations of plausible words will be found. What they meant then is what they mean now—that the country promised autonomy is to have satellite status, that what is called democracy will be dictatorship and that what is called freedom will be tyranny.

It has been apparent for a long time that the North Vietnamese and their Vietcong brethren meant to use the American prisoners of war as hostages, exacting as high a price as possible for their release. Mr. Nixon has played into their hands, up to a point, by emphasizing the prisoner issue for his own purposes. Even so, the price, now that it has been stated, is staggering. Concern for the prisoners, who have never received the treatment normal under the Geneva conventions, whose camps have never been subject to inspection by the International Red Cross, is highly emotional. The Communists have exploited it for all it is worth.

Not only did Madam Binh wrap her conditions in it but Le Duc Tho, the highest ranking North Vietnamese in Paris, tied a bow on it by stating in an interview that point one in her proposal was separable from the other points. The U.S. could, he said, accept the prisoner-for-withdrawal deal and leave the political settlement for later. This changed nothing, though it was represented as an important concession. The North Vietnamese would naturally be happy to settle their score with the South once the South had been reduced to impotence by the withdrawal not only of U.S. personnel but of the guns U.S. forces would not be permitted to leave behind.

In spite of all this, the Nixon administration is handling Madam Binh's offer as a break in the Paris stalemate meriting exploration. Le Duc Tho has been at pains to say that the Communist position is "flexible." There are even some indications that Mr. Nixon, working through secret channels, encouraged the Communists to make their offer. At a meeting with Republican congressional leaders on June 15, he said a development that would make the Hatfield-McGovern end-the-war legislation moot was imminent in Paris.

At the same meeting Henry Kissinger, the President's foreign-affairs adviser, urged the legislators not to throw away any bargaining advantage that might be wrung from the administration's refusal to set a time certain for withdrawal on its own initiative. After all, he argued, the Communists have lost 700,000 to 800,000 men in the war, the equivalent of a loss of 10 million by the U.S., given the population differential, and were themselves war-weary.

Perhaps Leslie H. Gelb, coordinator of the team that produced the Pentagon Papers, is right when he says that the war in Vietnam is a civil conflict that can't be compromised and must be won by one side or the other. The Communists are obviously assuming that they have won and are demanding the victor's spoils even though South Vietnam remains unconquered.

Mr. Nixon's alternative, if he fails to persuade the Communists to grant terms reasonably acceptable to the U.S. and to South Vietnam, is to proceed with Vietnamization, gradually withdraw American forces and then continue to supply the South Vietnam-

ese with enough arms to give them a chance of holding their own while trying to negotiate a settlement with the North. Unless the Communists modify their terms more drastically than they seem disposed to do, this is what he most likely will do.

ESSAY BY RICHARD P. SHIELDS

HON. J. GLENN BEALL, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 12, 1971

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, the Montgomery County Board of Realtors in conjunction with the Make America Better program of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, recently sponsored an essay contest for senior high school students in Montgomery County. The topic for the essay in this contest was entitled "How I Would Make America Better in Montgomery County."

The essay that won first place in this contest, was written by Richard P. Shields, a recent graduate of the Richard Montgomery High School.

It is Mr. Shield's belief that the spirit of the people is what makes America great, people who are "willing to give themselves in serving others." He urges us to "take stock of what we have and to tell others, so that they will understand and appreciate it and work themselves to make it better."

Mr. President, this young man very succinctly expresses views with which many Americans find themselves in agreement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Richard Shield's contest winning essay be printed in full in the RECORD.

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

HOW I WOULD MAKE AMERICA BETTER—IN MONTGOMERY COUNTY

Winston Churchill said once that democracy is absolutely the worst form of government there is—except for all others. When I hear some of the people my own age today knocking our country, they almost seem to be saying: "The United States is the worst country in the world." I feel like replying with Churchill's line: "except for all others."

No matter how great a country we have, it can always be improved in some ways. When I was working for my Eagle Scout rank, I had to carry out a project of service to my community. While I was working with our Rockville fire chief on a program of safety training for baby sitters, I came to realize that he was a man who was giving a great deal of his free time to promote something he believed in; something valuable to the community, and with no expectation of any reward.

As I've gotten a little older, I can see that one of the most important things that has made our country such a great one is the spirit of people, like the fire chief, who are willing to give themselves in serving others. This is not just a case of a few people doing a big job (although this often happens), but of a great many people with this spirit each doing little "extra" things—giving their time for a cancer or heart fund drive; giving

up evenings or weekends to work with Scout troops or other youth groups; devoting time and money to service clubs which carry on worthwhile service projects.

An example of this is the annual light bulb sale by a service club to raise money to help the blind and to help prevent vision problems. Every year a member of this club comes to our door selling light bulbs for this purpose. I don't know who he is or what his business is, but I know his time has got to be worth a good deal to him, and that pounding on people's doors is a real sacrifice. You would never think this to talk to him, though, simply because he knows that what he's doing is important and worthwhile, and he has the spirit of help and cooperation which makes the program a success, and which makes our country a better place.

How can we make it even better? Partly, I think, by calling attention and honoring the civic spirit that always has been so important to Americans—doing voluntarily things we don't have to do, but which we know help make a better life for everyone.

Another way that we could make our country a better place would be to insist that our schools turn out not only educated people but citizens who know what their country is all about. We need education in civics and history that doesn't stop with just dry facts and dates. This is not just a matter of a new course or two, but a spirit by our educators that one of their most important jobs is making certain their students don't just know what's wrong with our country but know the very many things that are right about it.

We don't lack good teachers; most of mine have been good ones. What seems to be missing, though, is more willingness to sing a few praises when they are deserved. It seems to be a question of what is or isn't "stylish," or whether students will accept the teaching of some truths that are so obvious that we have come to consider them outdated.

For instance, when my grandfather was born, probably half—or more—of the people in this country lived in what today someone would call "poverty." By the time my father was born, 30 years later, this figure was probably around 20 or 25 percent. Even with depression occurring when he was a boy, we live in a country today where those living in such conditions are down to around 10 or 11 percent. Yet we rarely find anyone pointing out this fact.

It is easy to say that our country would be better if we had greater respect for rights of others and for our laws and government. What is hard is making this a reality. When so much that we see on television emphasizes the oddballs, the dissatisfied, and the destructive, you could easily convince yourself that the country is going to pieces. And this simply isn't so. The answer isn't censorship. It is, partly anyway, more balanced and responsible use of newspapers and broadcasting.

How can we make our country better? By letting ourselves catch the "disease" of unselfish service to others—even on a very small scale if that's all we can do. By being concerned enough to insist that our environment be protected and preserved, but without making a "fad" of the subject or destroying our system of manufacturing and business which is envied by every country on earth. By insisting that our education give at least equal time to the positive aspects of our country, instead of overlooking much of it because "patriotism is bunk." I think that every generation of young people has to be told about our country, educated in its meaning. Today we seem to think that we'll just "pick it up" naturally. This isn't always so.

We can make our country better by feel-

ing—and showing—our pride in it. We have to think and act in a positive way instead of a negative one. This is a job where leadership has to come from the attitudes of our politicians, our teachers, our religions, but in which each one of us has an important role to play too.

We have an awful lot to be thankful for and proud of. If we work to make things better, they will become better. They will never be accomplished by people who sit on the sidelines and offer nothing but criticism. If we don't bother to do what we are capable of as individuals, and let people who think only in terms of tearing down have their way, and let them dominate public media, their gloomy predictions will come true.

You don't have to use propaganda to glorify a country which has always been a goal for a lot of little people all over the world. We do have to take stock of what we have, though, and to tell others—especially our own children—about it, so that they will understand and appreciate it and work themselves to make it better.

But in the end, it is not just words and ideas that are going to make it that way. It is the private actions of each one of us, because we're not just a people, or a nationality; we're 200,000,000 Americans—each one an individual, and each one free to add to or detract from this country of ours.

**CBS, CFR AND THE PEOPLE'S
RIGHT TO KNOW**

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, we will be voting shortly on a resolution to find CBS in contempt of Congress.

The CBS propagandists are wrapping themselves in the Constitution and chanting, "The right of the people to know must not be jeopardized."

Every Member of this body agrees that it is the right of the people to know what is at issue. But, has the CBS conglomerate been telling the people the facts or simply what CBS wants them to know? It has been CBS that has been the censor—not this body. The CBS "Selling of the Pentagon" was in turn followed by a second lateral assault called the Pentagon papers incident. Both Pentagon attacks must be considered as concerted efforts by the influential opinion molding monopoly to degrade our military forces under the guise of hastening an early Vietnam surrender date.

But the CBS people, who would have us believe they want to tell the American people the truth of what is going on involving imaginary financial and control conspiracies, have not told the American people about a very real conspiracy—which is to transfer the defeat of our foreign policy in Vietnam from the responsible parties and make the military forces, who have had no voice in the planning of the no-win policy nor little control over the operations, the scapegoat. Pressure from the top and bottom now becomes lateral pressure from both sides.

I hold a copy of the so-called Pentagon

papers booklet, which has been printed for profit by the New York Times.

Commencing at page 630 are contained the biographies of key figures in the Vietnam study. Eight of the 14 named Americans involved in the secret history are members of a financial-economic-industrial group known as the Council on Foreign Relations. The Pentagon, except for having an image of being the command post of our military, is not even involved. Why then does not CBS, which wants the American people to know what is going on, tell them all about the Council on Foreign Relations and its role in the United Nations and the Vietnam war?

Why does not CBS tell the American people that Mr. Sulzberger, president and publisher of the New York Times, the late Mr. Graham, former chairman of the board of the Washington Post, as well as its board chairman Frederick S. Beebe are listed in the Council on Foreign Relations membership list?

Why do not CBS's interpretive analysts tell our people that their president, Frank Stanton, is listed as a member of the CFR as well as former chairman of the Rand Corp., or that Daniel Ellsberg, admitted thief of the stolen top secret Pentagon papers, is a member of CFR?

What is it about the CFR that the CBS refuses to tell the people?

Could it be that every U.S. Ambassador to the Paris peace talks, David K. E. Bruce, Henry Cabot Lodge, and Averell W. Harriman, are all listed as members of the CFR?

Could it be that the Presidential advisers Henry A. Kissinger, Walt W. Rostow, and McGeorge Bundy are listed as members of the CFR?

Could it be that the U.S. Ambassadors to Saigon, Frederick Reinhardt, Henry Cabot Lodge, Maxwell Taylor, and Ellsworth Bunker are all listed as members of the CFR?

Could it be that the Directors of the CIA, Allen Dulles, John J. McCloy, and John A. McCone are all listed as members of the CFR?

Or could it be that the military leaders who were entrusted with the lives of our men and with the honor of our country, Gen. William C. Westmoreland, Gen. Harold K. Johnson, Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz, and Air Force Gen. Carl A. Spaatz are all listed as members of the CFR?

Could it be that Stanley Resor, Secretary of the Army; former Secretaries of State Dean Rusk and Dean Acheson; former Secretaries of Defense Thomas S. Gates and Robert Strange McNamara are listed as members of the CFR?

Could it be that CBS and many of its other opinion-making friends do not want to tell the American people that Mr. Arthur Ochs Sulzberger, president and publisher of the New York Times; Mr. Frederick S. Beebe, chairman of the board of the Washington Post; Mr. Osborne Elliott, president of Newsweek; Walter Lippmann, syndicated news columnist and editor of the New Republic magazine; Mr. Bill D. Moyers of Newsday; and Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff are all listed as members of the CFR?

Certainly CBS, in addition to knowing its president, Frank Stanton, is a member of the CFR, must fully understand the complete scope of this intellectual-financial-industrial complex, in fact, in December of 1965, the CBS Foundation made a \$300,000 grant to the CFR to fund a fellowship reportedly to "a promising American foreign correspondent" for "study and reflection."

And how do we know who are members of the CFR? From the CFR annual report, which is supplied voluntarily to each Member of Congress and each Senator. There are reportedly but 1,451 members. Yet this small group of Americans includes men in positions of control or influence in every military, financial, and diplomatic decision from the start of our involvement in Vietnam to the present.

I do not want to create any impression that there are any secret or mysterious associations. But when the policies and activities of the CFR are against the best interests of the American people and constitutional government, then they, like all other decisionmakers, must bear their share of the responsibility for the thousands of American boys who have been killed and the waste of billions of taxpayers' dollars that have been poured into this international economic venture.

It was not the average American citizen nor the U.S. fighting man who wanted this war in the first place or who have wanted it to continue. If CBS and Mr. Stanton want to lift their self-imposed censorship so that the American people know the truth, then this matter would not be before Congress in this instance.

"The Selling of the Pentagon" and the Pentagon papers have not scratched the surface of the kingmakers and new ruling royalty. Who will tell the people the truth if those who control "the right to know machinery" also control the Government?

I insert a clipping from the December 30, 1965, New York Times:

EDWARD R. MURROW FUND FOR FELLOWSHIPS
SET UP

John J. McCloy, chairman of the Council on Foreign Relations, announced yesterday the establishment of an Edward R. Murrow Fellowship for American Foreign Correspondents.

William S. Paley, chairman of the Columbia Broadcasting Company, joined Mr. McCloy in making the announcement. The C.B.S. Foundation has given \$300,000 to pay for the fellowship program.

A spokesman for C.B.S. said one fellowship would be awarded each year to "a promising American foreign correspondent" for "study and reflection." A committee composed largely of men connected with the council will make the selection. C.B.S. will also be represented on the committee. The stipend is expected to be about \$10,000 in most cases.

I particularly call the attention of my colleagues to my remarks "CFR: For Whom We Serve." CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 115, part 30, page 41305, and my article, "Television and the Mass Slicks," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 116, part 23, page 31405, which includes

the history of some of these manipulators of war and peace. I insert them in the RECORD again at this point:

CFR: FOR WHOM WE SERVE

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, like many of our colleagues, I receive frequent inquiries as to who or what is responsible for causing the wars and in preventing peace. Most people do not buy the story that people provoke wars—therefore, they seek to discover sinister alternatives such as the lust for profit and power.

Many inquiries suggest the existence of an international conspiratorial plot—an invisible government—promoted by and for industrialists, intellectuals, and wealthy financiers. The CFR, Council on Foreign Relations, is commonly mentioned—and to the inquisitive mind the CFR itself may supply many answers.

Almost as a Christmas gift, I was supplied by the CFR with its annual report for the year ending June 30, 1969. The report, in addition to containing impressive data and accomplishments, supplies the CFR membership list. Among the 1,451 CFR members are former military commanders of Vietnam and Korea, Secretaries of State under both parties, labor czars, international bankers, and newsmen. Undoubtedly an index to the most powerful group of men ever assembled within one organization. In addition to their own finances they acknowledge grants received from Ford Foundation, Rockefeller Brothers Fund, and the Carnegie Corporation Fund.

Since the CFR membership list contains so many prominent individuals who preside as unelected decisionmakers in our Government—those who have and who are making the overall policy and decisions—perhaps it would be more feasible to direct the many inquiries of parents and survivors of our fighting men and POW's to them CFR, Harold Pratt House, 58 East 68th Street, New York.

Mr. Speaker, I include pages of the CFR list following my remarks.

CFR ANNUAL REPORT
MEMBERSHIP

For some time the Council has been in the process of a serious self-study regarding the direction and emphasis its program of studies and related activities should take in light of present and, insofar as they can be anticipated, future foreign policy priorities of the United States. An important aspect of this investigation relates to the quantity of the Council's membership and the degree to which balance is maintained among the different types of members. Recognizing the need for a comprehensive examination of the membership situation, the Board of Directors set up an *ad hoc* committee, with Carroll L. Wilson as chairman, to review the present composition and to suggest guidelines for the future. It met during the past winter and spring and expects to present its conclusions and recommendations to the Board in the coming winter.

The Advisory Committee on Younger Members has just completed its second year and as a result of its recommendations, 34 exceptionally qualified younger members (principally in their thirties, with the remainder in their twenties) have been admitted during this period. The following have been serving on the committee: Eugene B. Skolnikoff, Michael V. Forrestal, Gerald Freund, Gerald M. Mayer, Jr., Lawrence C. McQuade, Stephen Stamas, and Alexander B. Trowbridge.

As of June 30, 1969, there were 1,451 members, of whom 704 were resident and 747 non-resident.

LORNA BRENNAN,
Membership Secretary.

Resident Members as of September 8, 1969

A

Akers, Anthony B.; Albrecht-Carrie, Rene; Aldrich, Winthrop W.; Alexander, Archibald S.; Alexander, Henry C.; Alexander, Robert J.; Allan, F. Alley; Allen, Charles E.; Allen, Philip E.; Alley, James B.; Allport, Alexander W.; Alpern, Alan N.
Aitschul, Arthur G.; Aitichul, Frank; Ames, Amyas; Ammidon, Hoyt; Anderson, Robert B.; Armour, Norman; Armstrong, Hamilton Fish; Ascoli, Max; Attwood, William; Aubrey, Henry G.; Ault, Bromwell.

B

Backer, George; Badeau, John S.; Baird, Charles F.; Baldwin, Robert H. B.; Ball, George W.; Bancroft, Harding F.; Barber, Charles F.; Barber, Joseph; Barker, Robert R.; Barlow, William E.; Barnds, William J.; Barnes, Joseph; Barnes, Robert G.; Barnett, Frank R.; Barrand, Harry P., Jr.; Barnett, Edward W.; Barzun, Jacques; Bassow, Whitman.

Bastedo, Philip; Bator, Peter A.; Beal, Gerald F.; Becker, Loftus E.; Bedard, Pierre; Beebe, Frederick S.; Beinecke, William S.; Bell, Daniel; Bell, David E.; Benjamin, Robert S.; Bennett, Jack F.; Bennett, John C.; Benton, William; Beplat, Tristan E.; Berle, Adolf A.; Besse, Simon Michael; Bienstock, Abraham L.; Bingham, Jonathan B.; Birkelund, John P.

Black, Joseph E.; Black, Peter; Blake, Norman P.; Blough, Roger M.; Blough, Roy; Blum, John A.; Blumenthal, W. Michael; Bogdan, Norbert A.; Bolte, Charles G.; Bonnal, Dudley B.; Borch, Fred J.; Borton, Hugh.
Bowers, John Z.; Boyd, Hugh N.; Braxton, Carter M.; Breck, Henry C.; Brinckerhoff, Charles M.; Brittenham, Raymond L.; Bronk, Detley W.; Brown, Courtney C.; Brown, Irving; Brown, Walter L.; Brownell, George A.; Bruce, James.

Bzezinski, Zbigniew; Buffum, William B.; Bullock, Hugh; Bundy, McGeorge; Burden, William A. M.; Burkhardt, Frederick; Burnett, John G.; Bush, Donald F.; Bushner, Roland H.; Butler, William F.; Buttenweiser, Benjamin J.

C

Cabell, Richard A.; Calder, Alexander, Jr.; Calhoun, Alexander D.; Camp, Hugh D.; Campbell, John C.; Canfield, Cass; Canfield, Franklin O.; Carey, Andrew G.; Carroll, Mitchell B.; Carson, Ralph M.; Carter, George E.; Carter, William D.

Cary, William L.; Case, John C.; Cates, John M., Jr.; Cattier, Jean; Chartener, William H.; Chase, W. Howard; Chittenden, George H.; Chubb, Hendon, 2nd; Chubb, Percy, 2nd; Church, Edgar M.; Clay, Gen. Lucius D.

Cleveland, Harold van B.; Cleveland, William B.; Clinchy, Everett R.; Coffin, Edmund; Cohen, Jerome B.; Coles, James S.; Collado, Emilio G.; Colwell, Kent G.; Conant, James B.; Conant, Melvin; Connor, John T.; Considine, Rev. John J. M.M.

Cook, Howard A.; Cooldge, Nicholas J.; Coombs, Charles A.; Cooper, Franklin S.; Cordier, Andrew W.; Costanzo, G. A.; Coughran, Tom B.; Cousins, Norman; Cowan, L. Gray; Cowan, Louis G.; Cowles, Gardner; Creel, Dana S.; Cummings, Robert L.; Cusick, Peter.

D

Darlington, Charles F.; Darrell, Norris; Davenport, John; Davidson, Ralph K.; Davison, W. Phillips; Dean, Arthur H.; Debevoise, Eli Whitney; De Cubas, Jose; de Lima, Oscar A.; Deming, Frederick L.; De Rosso, Alphonse; de Vries, Henry P.; Dewey, Thomas E.; Dexter, Byron.

Dickson, R. Russell, Jr.; Diebold, John; Diebold, William, Jr.; Dillon, Clarence; Dillon, Douglas; Dilworth, J. Richardson; Dodge, Cleveland E.; Donahue, Donald J.; Donovan, Hedley; Dorr, Goldthwaite H.; Dorwin, Oscar John; Douglas, Lewis W.; Douglas Paul W.; Dubinsky, David.

E

Eagle, Vernon A.; Eaton, Frederick M.; Eberle, W. D.; Eberstadt, Ferdinand; Edelman, Albert I.; Edelstein, Julius C. C.; Eder, Phanor J.; Eichelberger, Clark M.; Elliott, L. W.; Elliott, Osborn.

Elson, Robert T.; Emmet, Christopher; Engel, Irving M.; Engelhard, Charles W., Jr.; Erpf, Armand G.; Estabrook, Robert H.; Ewing, Sherman; Ewing, William, Jr.; Exter, John.

F

Fear, Mark C.; Fenn, William P.; Ferguson, Glenn W.; Field, William Osgood, Jr.; Finger, Seymour M.; Finlay, Luke W.; Finletter, Thomas K.; Finney, Paul B.; Fischer, John; Fleck, G. Peter.

Ford, Neil; Forrestal, Michael V.; Fowler, Henry H.; Fox, Joseph C.; Fox, William T. R.; Foye, Arthur B.; Frankel, Charles; Franklin, George S., Jr.; Franche, Dean F.; Fredericks, J. Wayne.

Freedman, Emanuel R.; Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B.; French, John; Freudenthal, David M.; Friele, Berent; Friendly, Henry J.; Frye, William R.; Fuerbringer, Otto; Fuller, C. Dale; Fuller, Robert G.; Funkhouser, E. N., Jr.

G

Gage, Harlow W.; Gallatin, James P.; Gardner, Richard N.; Garretson, Albert H.; Garrison, Lloyd K.; Gates, Samuel E.; Gates, Thomas S.; Geneen, Harold S.; Gideones, Harry D.; Gillespie, S. Hazard; Gilpatric, Roswell L.; Goldberg, Arthur J.; Golden, William T.

Golden, Harrison J.; Goldstone, Harmon H.; Gordon, Albert H.; Grace, J. Peter; Graft, Robert D.; Grazier, Joseph A.; Griffith, Thomas; Grimm, Peter; Gross, Ernest A.; Grover, Allen; Gruson, Sydney; Guggenheim, Harry F.; Gunther, John; Gurfein, Murray I.

H

Hager, Eric H.; Haider Michael L.; Haight, George W.; Halaby, Najeeb E.; Halberstam, David; Hamilton, Fowler; Hammond, Capt. Paul; Hance, William A.; Harari, Maurice; Harbar, J. G.; Harriman, E. Roland; Haskell, Broderick.

Hauge, Gabriel; Hayes, Alfred; Hayes, Samuel P.; Haynes, Ulric, Jr.; Hazard, John N.; Heath, Donald R.; Heckscher, August; Helm, Harold H.; Henderson, William; Henkin, Louis; Herod, W. Rogers; Herter, Christian A., Jr.

Herzog, Paul M.; Hester, James M.; Hickey, William M.; Hill, Forrest F.; Hill, James T., Jr.; Hilsman, Roger; Hochschild, Harold K.; Hochschild, Walter; Hoffman, Paul G.; Hognuet, Ellis S.

Hognuet, Robert L.; Hohenberg, John; Holland, Kenneth; Holmes, Alan R.; Hoyt, L. Emmett, Jr.; Homer, Sidney; Hoover, Lyman; Horn, Garfield H.; Horton, Phillip C.; Hottlet, Richard C.

Houghton, Arthur A., Jr.; Houston, Frank K.; Hovey, Allan, Jr.; Howard, John B.; Howell, John I.; Hughes, John Chambers; Hurewitz, J. C.; Hyde, Henry B.; Hyde, James N.

I

Ingils, John B.; Irwin, John N., 2d; Iselin, O'Donnell; Issawi, Charles.

J

Jackson, Elmore; Jackson, William E.; James, George F.; Jamieson, J. K.; Jaretzki, Alfred, Jr.; Jastrow, Robert; Javits, Jacob K.; Jay, Nelson Dean; Jessup, Alpheus W.; Jessup, John K.; Johnson, Edward F.; Johnson, Joseph E.; Johnson, Lester B.; Jones, David J.

K

Kahn, Herman; Kalinski, Felix A.; Kammer, Peter H.; Kane, R. Keith; Katzenbach, Nicholas de B.; Keezer, Dexter M.; Keiser, David M.; Kempner, Maximilian W.; Kenen, Peter B.; Kenney, F. Donald; Koppel, Francis; Kern, Harry F.; Kettaneh, Francis A.; Keyser, Paul V., Jr.; King, Frederic R.;

Kirk, Grayson; Kleiman, Robert; Knight, Douglas; Knight, Robert Huntington; Knoke, L. Warner; Knoppers, Antonie T.; Knowlton, Winthrop; Knoenig, Robert P.; Kriedler, Robert N.

L

Labouisse, Henry R.; Lacy, Dan B.; Lamb, Horace R.; Lamont, Peter T.; Larmon, Sigurd S.; LaRoche, Chester J.; Lary, Hal B.; Laukhuff, Perry; Laybourne, Lawrence E.; LeBarron Eugene; Lee, Elliott H.; Lehman, John R.; Lehman, Orin; Lehman, Hal; Leonard, James G.

Leroy, Norbert G.; Leslie, John C.; Levy, Walter J.; Lewis, Roger; Lieberman, Henry R.; Lillenthal, David E.; Lilley, A. N.; Lindbeck, John M. H.; Lindquist, Warren T.; Lindsay, George N.; Lindsay, John V.; Linsen, James A.; Lippmann, Walter; Lissitzyn, Oliver J.; Locke, Edwin A., Jr.; Lockwood, John E.; Loeb, John L.; Loft, George; Loomis, Alfred L.; Loos, Rev. A. William; Loucqs, Harold H.; Lubar, Robert A.; Lubin, Isador; Luckey, E. Hugh; Ludt, R. E.; Luke, David L., 3rd; Lunt, Samuel D.; Lyford, Joseph P.

M

McCance, Thomas; McCarthy, John G.; McCloy, John J.; McCloy, John J., 2nd; McCoolough, C. Peter; McDermott, Walsh; McGraw, James H., Jr.; McKeever, Porter; McLean, John G.; MacEachron, David W.; MacGregor, Ian K.; MacIntyre, Malcolm A.; Mafray, August; Manshel, Warren D.

Mark, Rev. Julius; Markel, Lester; Marshall, Burke; Marvel, William W.; Masten, John E.; Mathews, Edward J.; Mattison, Graham D.; May, A. Wilfred; Mayer, Gerald M., Jr.; Menke, John R.; Merz, Charles; Metzger, Herman A.; Meyer, John M., Jr.; Mickelson, Sig.

Millard, Mark J.; Miller, Paul R., Jr.; Mills, Bradford; Model, Leo; Moe, Sherwood G.; Moore, Ben T.; Moore, Edward F.; Moore, George S.; Moore, Maurice T.; Moore, Robert A.; Moore, Walden; Moore, William T.; Morgan, D. P.

Morgan, Henry S.; Morley, James William; Morris, Grinnell; Morrisett, Lloyd N.; Morley, Philip E.; Moyers, Bill D.; Muir, Malcolm; Munroe, George B.; Munroe, Vernon, Jr.; Munyan, Winthrop R.; Murden, Forrest D., Jr.; Murphy, Grayson M. P.; Murphy, J. Morden.

N

Neal, Alfred S.; Nelson, Clifford C.; Newton, Quigg, Jr.; Nichols, Thomas S.; Nichols, William I.; Nickerson, A. L.; Nielsen, Waldemar A.; Nimitz, Chester W., Jr.; Nolte, Richard H.; Notestein, Frank W.; Noyes, Charles Phelps.

O

Oakes, John B.; Ogden, Alfred; Olmstead, Cecil J.; O'Neill, Michael J.; Osborn, Earl D.; Osborn, Frederick H.; Osborn, William H.; Osborne, Stanley de J.; Ostrander, F. Taylor, Jr.; Overby, Andrew N.; Overton, Douglas W.

P

Pace, Frank, Jr.; Page, Howard W.; Page, John H.; Page, Robert G.; Page, Walter H.; Paley, William S.; Palfrey, John G.; Parker, Philo W.; Passin, Herbert; Patterson, Ellmore S.; Patterson, Frederick D.

Patterson, Herbert P.; Payne, Frederick B.; Payne, Samuel B.; Payson, Charles Shipman; Peardon, Thomas P.; Pearson, John E.; Pennoyer, Paul G.; Pennoyer, Robert M.; Perkins, James A.; Perkins, Roswell B.; Perry, Hart.

Petersen, Gustav H.; Petschek, Stephen R.; Phillips, Christopher H.; Picker, Harvey; Pickering, James V.; Piel, Gerald; Pierce, William C.; Piercy, George T.; Pierson, Warren Lee; Pifer, Alan; Pike, H. Harvey.

Place, John B. M.; Platten, Donald C.; Plimpton, Francis T. P.; Polk, Judd; Poor, J. Sheppard; Potter, Robert S.; Power, Thomas F., Jr.; Powers, Joshua B.; Pratt, H. Irving; Probst, George E.; Pulling, Edward.

Q

Quigg, Philip W.

R

Rabl, Isidor I.; Ramblin, J. Howard, Jr.; Reber, Samuel; Reed, Philip D.; Reid, Ogden R.; Reid, Whitelaw; Reston, James B.; Rhein-stein, Alfred; Richardson, Arthur Berry.

Riegelman, Harold; Robbins, Donald G.; Jr.; Robertson, Charles S.; Robinson, Gerold T.; Roche, James M.; Rockefeller, David; Rockefeller, John D., 3d; Rockefeller, Nelson A.; Rockefeller, Rodman C.; Rockhill, Victor E.; Rodriguez, Vincent A.

Rogers, Lindsay; Roosa, Robert V.; Root, Oren; Rosenman, Samuel I.; Rosentiel, Lewis; Rosenthal, A. M.; Rosenwald, William; Rosin, Axel G.; Ross, T. J.; Rueb-hausen, Oscar M.; Russell, T. W., Jr.; Rus-tow, Dankwart A.

S

Sachs, Alexander; Sachs, Howard J.; Salis-bury, Harrison E.; Saltzman, Charles E.; Sar-geant, Howland H.; Sargent, Noel; Sarnoff, Brig. Gen. David; Schachter, Oscar; Schaff-ner, Joseph Halle; Schapiro, J. Salwyn; Scherman, Harry; Schiff, John M.

Schiller, A. Arthur; Shilling, Warner R.; Schilthuis, Willem C.; Schlesinger, Arthur, Jr.; Schmidt, Herman J.; Schmoker, J. Ben-jamin; Schwartz, Harry; Schwarz, Frederick A. O.; Scott, John; Scott, Stuart N.; Sea-grave, Norman P.; Seligman, Eustace.

Seymour, Whitney North; Shapiro, Isaac; Sharp, George C.; Sharp, James H.; Shea, Andrew B.; Sheehan, Vincent; Sheeline, Paul C.; Sheffield, Frederick; Shepard, David A.; Shepard, Frank P.; Shulman, Marshall D.; Shute, Benjamin R.

Silver, K. H.; Simons, Hans; Sims, Albert G.; Slater, Joseph E.; Slawson, John; Smith, Carleton Sprague; Smith, Datus C., Jr.; Smith, Davis S.; Smith, Hayden N.; Smith, W. Mason; Sommers, Davidson; Sonne, Christian R.

Sonne, Christian H.; Sorenson, Theodore G.; Soubry, E. E.; Spang, Kenneth M.; Spencer, Percy C.; Spofford, Charles M.; Stackpole, Stephen H.; Stamas, Stephen; Stanton, Frank; Stebbins, James H.; Steb-bins, Richard P.; Steinger, Edward L.; Stern, Fritz; Stern, H. Peter.

Stewart, Robert McLean; Stillman, Chaun-acey; Stillman, Ralph S.; Stinebower, Leroy D.; Stoddard, George D.; Stokes, Isaac N.P.; Straka, Jerome A.; Stratton, Julius A.; Straus, Donald B.; Straus, Jack I.; Straus, Oscar S.

Straus, Ralph I.; Strauss, Simon D.; Strel-ber, Theodore C.; Strong, Benjamin; Sulz-berger, Arthur Ochs; Sutton, Francis X.; Swearer, Howard R.; Swing, John Temple; Swinton, Stanley M.; Swope, Gerard, Jr.

T

Taylor, Arthur R.; Thomas, Evan; Thomas, H. Gregory; Thompson, Earle S.; Thompson, Kenneth W.; Tibby, John; Tomlinson, Alex-ander C.; Topping, Seymour.

Townsend, Edward; Townsend, Oliver; Trager, Frank N.; Traphagen, J. C.; Travis, Martin, B., Jr.; Trippe, Juan Terry; Trow-bridge, Alexander B.; Tweedy, Gordon B.

U

Uzielli, Giorgio.

V

Vance, Cyrus R.; Vila, George R.; von Klemperer, Alfred H.; Voorhees, Tracy S.

W

Wagley, Charles W.; Walker, A. Lightfoot; Walker, George G.; Walker, Joseph, Jr.; Wal-kowicz, T. P.; Warburg, Eric M.; Warburg, Frederick M.; Ward, F. Champion; Warfield, Ethelbert; Warner, Rawleigh, Jr.; Wasson, Donald.

Watson, Arthur K.; Watson, Thomas J., Jr.; Wauchope, Vice Adm. George; Weaver, Syl-vester L. Jr.; Webster Bethuel M.; Werni-mont, Kenneth; Wharton, Clifton R. Jr.; Wheeler Walter H., Jr.; Whidden, Howard P.; Whipple, Taggart.

White, Frank X.; White, Theodore H.

Whitney, John Hay; Whitridge, Arnold; Wil-bur, C. Martin; Wilhelm, Harry; Wilkey, Mal-colm Richard; Wilkinson, Theodore L.; Wil-liams, Franklin H.; Williams, Langbourne W. Wilson, Donald M.; Wilson, John D.; Win-gate, Henry S.; Winslow, Richard S.; Wofford, Harris L., Jr.; Wood, Bryce; Woodman, Her-bert, B.; Woodward, Donald B.; Wooley, Knight; Wriston, Henry M.; Wriston, Walter B.

Y

Yost, Charles W.; Young, Edgar B.; Young, John M.; Young, Kenneth T., Jr.

Z

Zagoria, Donald S.; Zurcher, Arnold J.

NONRESIDENT MEMBERS AS OF SEPTEMBER 8, 1969

Abegglen, James C.; Abelson, Philip H.; Abram, Morris B.; Acheson, Dean G.; Achilles, Theodore C.; Agar, Herbert; Allen, Raymond B.; Amory, Robert, Jr.; Anderson, Dillon; Anderson, Adm. George W., Jr.; Anderson, Roger E.; Angell, James W.; Armstrong, Brig. Gen. DeWitt C., 3rd; Armstrong, John A.; Austin, Vice Adm. B. L.

B

Babcock, Maj. Gen. C. Stanton; Baker, George P.; Baldwin, Hanson W.; Ballou, George T.; Barco, James W.; Barger, Thomas C.; Barghoorn, Frederick C.; Barker, James M.; Barkin, Solomon; Barnett, Richard J.; Barnett, A. Doak;

Barnett, Robert W.; Barnett, Vincent M., Jr.; Barrows, Leland; Bartholomew, Dana T.; Bass, Robert P., Jr.; Bates, Marston; Bator, Francis M.; Baumer, William H.; Baxter, James P., 3rd; Bayne, Edward Ashley; Beam, Jacob D.; Bechtel, S. D.; Beckhart, Benja-min H.;

Beckler, David Z.; Beer, Samuel H.; Behr-man, Jack N.; Bell, Holley Mack; Benda, Harry J.; Bennett, Lt. Gen. Donald V.; Ben-nett, Martin Toscan; Bergson, Abram; Berg-stein, C. Fred; Bernstein, Edward M.; Betts, Brig. Gen. Thomas J.;

Billington, James H.; Bissell, Richard M., Jr.; Black, Cyril E.; Black, Brig. Gen. Edwin F.; Blackie, William; Blake, Robert O.; Bliss, C. I.; Bloomfield, Lincoln P.; Boardman, Marry; Boeschstein, Harold; Bohlen, Charles E.;

Bonesteel, Gen. C. H., 3rd; Bonsal, Philip W.; Boorman, Howard L.; Boothby, Albert C.; Bowle, Robert R.; Bowles, Chester; Bowles, Frank; Braden, Thomas W.; Bradford, Rich-ard; Bradford, Amory H.; Braisted, Paul J. Bramstedt, W. F.; Brewster, Kingman, Jr.; Briggs, Ellis O.; Brimmer, Andrew F.; Bristol, William M.; Bronwell, Arthur; Brooks, Har-vey; Brorby, Melvin; Bross, John A.; Brown, Harold; Brown, Lester R.; Brown, William O.; Brownell, Lincoln C.

Bruce, David K. E.; Brundage, Percival F.; Bundy, William P.; Bunker, Ellsworth; Bun-nell, C. Sterling; Burchinal, Gen. David A.; Burgess, Carter L.; Burgess, W. Randolph; Burns, Arthur F.; Bussey, Col. Donald S.; Byrne, James MacGregor; Byrnes, Robert F.; Byroade, Henry A.

C

Cabot, John M.; Cabot, Louis W.; Cabot, Thomas D.; Caldwell, Robert G.; Calkins, Hugh; Caraway, Lt. Gen. Paul W.; Carpenter, W. Samuel, 3rd; Cary, Maj. Gen. John B.; Case, Clifford P.; Case, Everett N.

Cater, Douglass; Chapman, John F.; Char-pie, Robert A.; Chartener, William H.; Chayes, Abram J.; Cheever, Daniel S.; Chenery, Hollis B.; Cherrington, Ben M.; Childs, Marquis; Church, Frank; Cislis, Walker L.; Clark, Ralph L.; Cleveland, Harlan.

Clough, Ernest T.; Coffee, Joseph Irving; Cohen, Benjamin V.; Cole, Charles W.; Col-lings, L. V.; Collingwood, Charles C.; Conlon, Richard P.; Conrad, Gen. Bryan; Coombs, Philip H.; Cooper, Chester L.; Cooper, John Sherman; Cooper, Richard N.

Copeland, Lamot du Pont; Corson, Dale R.; Cotting, Charles E.; Cowles, John; Cowles, John, Jr.; Crane, Winthrop Murray, 3rd; Cross, James E.; Crotty, Homer D.; Crowe, Philip K.; Curran, Jean A., Jr.; Curtis, Edward P.

D

Dale, William B.; Dallin, Alexander; Danglerfield, Royden; David, Donald K.; Davidson, Alfred A.; Davies, Fred A.; Davies, Roger P.; Davis, John A.; Davis, Nathanael V.; Davis, Nathaniel; Davison, Daniel P.; Dean, Edgar P.; Deaver, John V.

Decker, William C.; De Guigne, Christian, 3rd; DeKiewiet, C. W.; DePalma, Samuel, Despres, Emile; Deuel, Wallace R.; Deutch, Michael J.; Dickey, John S.; Doherty, William C., Jr.; Dollard, Charles; Donham, Paul.

Donnell, James C., 2nd; Donnelley, Lt. Gen. Harold C.; Dorr, Russell H.; Doty, Paul M., Jr.; Douglas, Donald W., Jr.; Dowling, Walter; Draper, William H., Jr.; Dreier, John C.; Drummond, Roscoe; Ducas, Robert; Duke, Angier Biddle; Dungan, Ralph A.; Durdin, F. Tillman.

E

Eckstein, Alexander; Edwards, A. R.; Edwards, William H.; Einaudi, Mario; Elliott, Byron K.; Elliott, Randle; Elliott, William Y.; Ellsberg, Daniel; Emeny, Brooks.

Emerson, Rupert; Enthoven, Alain C.; Eppert, Ray R.; Ernst, Albert E.; Evans, John K.; Evans, Roger F.; Everton, John Scott.

F

Fahs, Charles B.; Fainsod, Merle; Fairbank, John King; Fairbanks, Douglas; Falk, Richard A.; Farmer, Garland R.; Farmer, Thomas L.; Fels, Herbert; Ferguson, John H.; Fifield, Russel H.

Finkelstein, Lawrence S.; Firestone, Harvey S., Jr.; Fishel, Wesley R.; Fisher, Adrian S.; Fisher, Roger; Flanigan, Peter M.; Florinsky, Michael T.; Folsom, Victor C.; Ford, Thomas K.

Forkner, Claude E.; Fosdick, Raymond B.; Foster, William C.; Frank, Isaiah; Fankel, Max; Free, Lloyd R.; Freeman, Fulton; Freund, Gerald; Fuller, Carlton P.; Furber, Holden.

G

Galbraith, J. Kenneth; Gallagher, Charles F.; Gallagher, John F.; Gant, George F.; Gardiner, Arthur Z.; Gardner, John W.; Garthoff, Raymond L.; Gaud, William S.; Gaylord, Bradley; Geier, Paul E.; Gerhart, Maj. Gen. John K.; Grevers, Max E.

Gibney, Frank B.; Giffin, Brig. Gen. Sidney F.; Gil, Peter P.; Gilbert, Carl J.; Gilbert, H. N.; Gilchrist, Huntington Gilpatrick, Chadbourne; Ginsburg, Brig. Gen. Robert N.; Gleason, S. Everett; Glennan, T. Keith; Cohen, Robert F.

Goodhart, Arthur L.; Goodpaster, Gen. Andrew J. Goodrich, Carter; Goodrich, Leland M.; Gordon, Kermit; Gordon, Lincoln; Gornick, Alan L.; Gorter, Witzye; Grant, James P.; Graubard, Stephen R.; Gray, Gordon.

Gray, William Latimer; Green, Joseph C.; Greene, James C.; Greene, Brig. Gen. Michael J. L.; Greenwald, Joseph A.; Griffith, Brig. Gen. Samuel B., 2nd; Griffith, William E.; Grondahl, Teg C.; Gruenther, Gen. Alfred M.; Gullion, Edmund A.

H

Hall, John W.; Halle, Louis J., Jr.; Halperin, Morton H.; Hamilton, Edward K.; Hamilton, Thomas J.; Hammonds, Oliver W.; Hanes, John W., Jr.; Hansell, Maj. Gen. Haywood S., Jr.; Harbison, Frederick; Hare, Raymond A.; Harriman, W. Averell; Harris, Irving B.; Harris, James T., Jr.; Harsch, Joseph C.; Hart, Augustin S.; Hartley, Fred L.; Hartley, Robert W.; Haskins, Caryl P.; Hauck, Arthur A.; Haviland, H. Field, Jr.; Hays, Brooks; Heald, Henry T.

Hefelinger, Totton P.; Heilperin, Michael A.; Heintzen, Harry L.; Heinz, H. J., 2nd; Henderson, L. J., Jr.; Henderson, Loy W.; Heshburgh, Rev. Theodore M., C.S.C.; Hill, George

Watts; Hill, Robert C.; Hinshaw, Randall; Hirscham, Albert O.

Hitch, Charles J.; Hofer, Philip; Hoffman, Michael L.; Hoffmann, Stanley; Holland, William L.; Holst, Willem; Holt, Pat M. Hoopes, Townsend W.; Hoover, Herbert W., Jr.; Hopkins, D. Luke; Hopper, Buce C.; Horton, Alan W.

Hoskins, Harold B.; Houghton, Amory; Hovde, Frederick L.; Hoyt, Edwin C., Jr.; Hoyt, Palmer; Hughes, Thomas L.; Huglin, Brig. Gen. H. C.; Humphrey, Hubert H.; Hunsberger, Warren S.; Hunt, James Ramsay; Hunter, Clarence E.; Huntington, Samuel P.

I

Isaacs, Norman E.; Iverson, Kenneth R.

J

Jacobson, Harold K.; Jaffe, Sam A.; Jansen, Marius B.; Jenney, John K.; Jessup, Philip C.; Jessup, Philip C., Jr.; Johnson, Gen. Harold K.; Johnson, Howard C.; Johnson, Howard W.; Johnston, Henry R.; Johnstone, W. H.; Jones, Peter T.; Jones, Thomas V.; Jordan, Col. Amos A., Jr.; Jordan, William J.

K

Kahin, George McT.; Kaiser, Philip M.; Kamarck, Andrew M.; Katz, Milton; Katzenbach, Edward L., Jr.; Kaufmann, William W.; Kaysen, Carl; Kempner, Frederick C.; Kennan, George F.; Kerr, Clark; Killian, James R., Jr.; Kimberly, John R.

King, James E., Jr.; King, John A., Jr.; Kitner, Col. William R.; Kissinger, Henry A.; Kistiakowsky, George B.; Kitchen, Jeffrey C.; Knorr, Klaus; Kohler, Foy D.; Kohler, Walter J.; Korbel, Josef; Korry, Edward M.; Kotschnig, Walter M.; Kraft, Joseph.

L

Ladejinsky, Wolf; La Farge, Francis W.; Laing, R. Stanley; Lampert, Lt. Gen. James B.; Lamson, Roy, Jr.; Lang, Robert E.; Langer, Paul F.; Langer, William L.; Langsam, Walter Consuelo; Lanham, Maj. Gen. Charles T.

Lansdale, Maj. Gen. Edward G.; Lasswell, Harold D.; Lawrence, David; Lawrence, William H.; Laylin, John G.; Leddy, John M.; Lee, Charles Henry; Leghorn, Richard S.; Leich, John F.; Lemnitzer, Gen. Lyman L.; Leslie, Donald S.; Le Sueur, Larry.

Levine, Irving R.; Levy, Marion J., Jr.; Lincoln, Gen. G. A.; Lindblom, Charles E.; Linder, Harold F.; Lindley, Ernest K.; Lindsay, Franklin A.; Lingle, Walter L., Jr.; Linowitz, Sol M.; Lipson, Leon; Little, Herbert S.; Little, L.K.

Lockard, Derwood W.; Lockwood, Manrice de F., 3rd; Lockwood, William W.; Lodge, George Cabot; Lodge, Henry Cabot; Long, Franklin A.; Longstreet, Victor M.; Loomis, Henry; Lovestone, Jay; Loy, Frank E.; Lynch, Edward S.; Lyon, E. Wilson.

M

McCabe, Thomas B.; McClintock, Robert M.; McCone, John Alex.; McCormack, Maj. Gen. James; McCracken, Paul W.; McCutcheon, John D.; McDaniel, Joseph M., Jr.; McDougal, Myres S.; McFarland, Ross A.; McGee, Gale W.; McGhe, George C.

McKay, Vernon; McKinney, Robert M.; McLaughlin, Donald H.; McLean, Donald H., Jr.; McNamara, Robert S.; McQuade, Lawrence C.; MacArthur, Douglas, 2nd; MacChesney, A. Brunson, 3rd; MacDonald, Gordon J. F.; MacDonald, J. Carlisle.

MacIver, Murdoch; MacLaury, Bruce K.; MacVeagh, Lincoln; Machold, William F.; Maddox, William P.; Mallinson, Harry; Mallory, George W.; Mallory, Walter H.; Mann, Thomas C.; Manning, Bayless; Manning, Robert J.; Mansager, Felix N.

Marcus, Stanley; Marcy, Carl; Marshall, C. Burton; Martin, Edwin M.; Martin, William McC., Jr.; Mason, Edward S.; Matthews, William R.; May, Ernest R.; May, Oliver, May, Stacy; Mayer, Ferdinand L.

Mayer, Gerald M.; Meagher, Robert F.;

Meck, John F.; Merchant, Livingston T.; Merillat, H. C. L.; Merriwether, Duncan; Metcalf, George R.; Meyer, Albert J.; Meyer, Charles A.; Meyer, Cord, Jr.; Milbank, Robbins; Miller, Col. Francis P.

Miller, J. Irwin; Miller, William J.; Millikan, Max F.; Minor, Harold B.; Mladek, Jan V.; Molina, Edgar R.; Montias, J. Michael; Moore, Hugh; Moran, William E., Jr.; Morgan, Cecil; Morgan, George A.; Morgenstern, Oskar.

Morgenthau, Hans J.; Morse, David A.; Morton, Louis; Mudd, Henry T.; Muller, Steven; Munger, Edwin S.; Munoz Marvin, Luis; Munro, Dana G.; Murphy, Franklin D.; Murphy, Robert D.; Myers, Denys P.

N

Nason, John W.; Nathan, Robert R.; Nelson, Fred M.; Nelson, Merlin E.; Neustadt, Richard E.; Newman, Richard T.; Nicholas, Calvin J.; Nitze, Paul H.; Nolting, Frederick E., Jr.; Norstad, Gen. Lauris; Nover, Barnett; Noyes, W. Albert, Jr.

O

O'Connor, Roderic L.; Oelman, R. S.; Oliver, Covey T.; Osborne, Lithgow; Osgood, Robert E.; Owen, Garry; Owen, Henry.

P

Paffrath, Leslie; Palmer, Norman D.; Pantzer, Kurt F.; Park, Richard L.; Parker, Barrett; Parkhurst, George L.; Parsons, John C.; Patterson, Gardner; Paul, Norman S.; Paul, Roland A.; Pedersen, Richard F.; Pell, Clalborne.

Pelzer, Karl J.; Penfield, James K.; Perera, Guido R.; Peretz, Don; Perkins, Courtland D.; Peterson, Howard C.; Petty, John R.; Pheiger, Herman; Pierotti, Roland; Piquet, Howard S.; Plank, John N.; Platig, E. Raymond.

Plimpton, Calvin H.; Pogue, L. Welch; Poletti, Charles; Polk, William R.; Pool, Ithiel DeSola; Posvar, Wesley W.; Prager, Frederick A.; France, P. F. A.; Price, Don K.; Prizer, John B.; Pusey, Nathan M.; Putzell, Edwin J., Jr.; Pye, Lucian W.

R

Radway, Laurence I.; Rathjens, George W.; Ravenholt, Albert; Ray, George W., Jr.; Redmon, E. Hayes; Reeves, Jay B. L.; Reinhardt, G. Frederick; Reischauer, Edwin O.; Reitzel, William; Rennie, Wesley F.; Resor, Stanley R.; Reuss, Henry S.; Reuther, Walter P.

Revelle, Roger; Reynolds, Lloyd G.; Rich, John H., Jr.; Richardson, David B.; Richardson, Dorsey; Richardson, Elliot L.; Richardson, John, Jr.; Ridgway, Gen. Matthew B.; Riefler, Winfield W.; Ries, Hans A.; Ripley, S. Dillon, 2nd; Roberts, Henry L.; Rogers, James Grafton.

Rogers, William D.; Roosevelt, Kermit; Rosengarten, Adolph G., Jr.; Ross, Roger; Rostow, Eugene V.; Rostow, Walt W.; Roth, William M., Jr.; Rouse, Robert G.; Rowen, Henry S.; Rubin, Seymour J.; Rubina, J. P.; Rush, Kenneth; Rusk, Dean; Ryan, John T., Jr.

S

Salmon, Irving; Samuels, Nathaniel; Satterthwaite, Joseph C.; Sawin, Melvin E.; Sawyer, John E.; Scalapino, Robert A.; Schaezel, J. Robert; Schelling, Thomas C.; Schiff, Frank W.; Schmidt, Adolph W.; Schorr, Daniel L.

Schuyler, Gen. C. V. R.; Schwab, William B.; Schwebel, Stephen M.; Seaborg, Glenn T.; Seabury, Paul; Sedwitz, Walter J.; Seymour, Forrest W.; Shaplen, Robert; Sharp, Walter R.; Shearer, Warren W.; Sherbert, Paul C.; Shields, Murray.

Shirer, William L.; Shishkin, Boris; Shuster, George N.; Simons, Howard; Simpson, John L.; Sisco, Joseph L.; Skolnikoff, Eugene B.; Slocum, John J.; Smith, Gerard C.; Smith, Horace H.; Smith, Robert W.

Smithies, Arthur; Smyth, Henry DeW.; Solbert, Peter O. A.; Solomon, Anthony M.; Sonnenfeldt, Helmut; Sontag, Raymond James; Soth, Lauren K.; Southard, Frank A., Jr.; Spaatz, Gen. Carl A.; Spaeth, Carl B.

Spain, James W.; Spencer, John H.; Spencer, William C.; Spiegel, Harold R.; Sprague, Mansfield D.; Sprague, Robert C.; Sprout, Harold; Staley, Eugene; Stanley, Timothy W.; Stason, E. Blythe; Stassen, Harold E. Stein, Eric; Stephens, Claude O.; Sterling, J. E. Wallace; Stevenson, John R.; Stevenson, William E.; Stewart, Robert Burgess; Stillwell, Lt. Gen. Richard G.; Stone, Donald C.; Stone, Shepard; Straus, Robert Kenneth. Strus, R. Peter; Strauss Lewis L.; Strausz-Hupe, Robert; Strayer, Joseph R.; Struble, Adm. A. D.; Sullivan, William H.; Sulzberger, C. L.; Sunderland, Thomas E.; Surrey, Walter Sterling; Swihart, James W.; Symington, W. Stuart.

T

Talbot, Phillips; Tanham, George K.; Tannenwald, Theodore, Jr.; Taylor, George E.; Taylor, Gen. Maxwell D.; Teller, Edward; Templeton, Richard H.; Tennyson, Leonard B.; Thayer, Robert H.

Thompson, Llewellyn E.; Thomson, James C., Jr.; Thorp, Willard L.; Timberlake, Clare H.; Trezise, Phillip H.; Triffin, Robert; Truman, David B.; Turkevich, John; Tuthill, John W.; Tyler, William R.

U

Ullman, Richard H.; Ulmer, Alfred C., Jr.; Uppgen, Arthur R.

V

Valentine, Alan; Van Dusen, Rev. Henry P.; Van Slyck, DeForest; Van Stirum, John; Vernon, Raymond; Von Mehren, Robert B.

W

Wait, Richard; Walker, George R.; Wallich, Henry C.; Walmsley, Walter N.; Ward, Rear Adm. Chester; Warren, John Edwin; Washburn, Abbott M.; Wasson, R. Gordon; Watkins, Ralph J.; Weaver, George L. P.; Weiner, Myron; Weisskopf, Victor F.

Welch, Leo D.; Wellborn, Vice Adm. Charles, Jr.; Wells, Herman B.; West, Robert LeRoy; Westmoreland, Gen. W. C.; Westphal, Albert C. F.; Wheeler, Oliver P.; Whipple, Brig. Gen. William; Whitaker, Arthur P.; White, Gilbert F.; Whiting, Allen S.

Wiesner, Jerome B.; Wight, Charles A.; Wilcox, Francis O.; Wilcox, Robert B.; Wild, Payson, S.; Wilde, Frazar B.; Wilds, Walter W.; Williams, Haydn; Williams, John H.; Willits, Joseph H.; Wilmerding, Lucas, Jr.

Wilson, Carroll L.; Wimpfeimer, Jacques; Winton, David J.; Wohl, Elmer P.; Wohlstetter, Albert; Wolf, Charles, Jr.; Wood, Harleston R.; Woodbridge, Henry S.; Wriggins, W. Howard; Wright, Adm. Jerould; Wright, Quincy; Wright, Theodore P.; Wyzanski, Charles E., Jr.

Y

Yarmolinsky, Adam; Yntema, Theodore O.; Young, T. Cuyler; Youngman, William S.; Yukkin, Maj. Gen. Richard A.

Z

Zimmerman, Edwin M.

FINANCES

During the Council's fiscal year ending on June 30, 1969, there were a number of important increases in income. Membership dues were raised during the year, resulting in new income of \$60,900. Largely through a drive undertaken last January, subscriptions to the Corporation Service were increased by \$46,600. For the first time in many years, the gross income of *Foreign Affairs* exceeded direct expenses, resulting in a net income of \$7,600, as compared with a net loss of \$12,300 in the preceding year. Net proceeds from the sale of Council books, on the other hand, fell slightly during the year, partly because extensive revisions have delayed publication of the *Political Handbook*.

The Council's expenses increased substantially, in part because of the pressures of inflation. In three areas, however, there were major increases not attributable to inflation. The largest of these, \$91,000 was due to the Council's reassuming for the past seven

months the major responsibility for the Foreign Relations Library, which in each of the two previous years had benefitted from \$100,000 provided by a most generous anonymous donor. Second, the International Affairs Fellowship Program is now in full swing, as the increase in expenses of \$54,500 indicates; this entire program is financed by the Rockefeller Brothers Fund. Third, with the help of a fine special grant from the Ford Foundation, work has started on the *Foreign Affairs Fifty-Year Bibliography*, which will take three years to complete.

The Council's financial statements, as audited by Price Waterhouse & Co., follow. More detailed information is available to any member on request.

RUTH C. WITHERSPOON,
Comptroller.

FOREIGN RELATIONS LIBRARY

Use of the library's facilities, including reference services, books, and clipping files, has increased approximately 10 per cent during the past year, reflecting greater use of the Library by permanent staff and visiting fellows. The pattern of reference requests continues to be similar to that of the past few years in that the Library staff works more closely with the research staff, particularly in the bibliographical field.

The collection now contains 50,500 accessioned volumes, an increase of only 1,000 over last year's total. This is a pleasing statistic because it reflects progress in the program of weeding out obsolete and redundant material. Even with a large inflow of new volumes each year, it is possible through judicious discarding to maintain the collection within bounds. Discarded books are given to selected local and foreign libraries with interests similar to the Council's.

Some 53,000 United Nations documents were added, bringing the total to almost 126,000, which require considerable effort to house and catalog. The Library's collection of United Nations material is frequently consulted by others associated with similar depository organizations, a fact which is a source of pride to the staff. Documents of other international-intergovernmental organizations continue to flow in, and, as noted in an earlier report, our collection is among the finest in this field.

The clipping files continued to be used extensively. Almost the same number, 29,000, of clippings were added as last year, but there was a decided increase in the total number of complete folders circulated. It appears that with a change of administration in Washington, with many new envoys and special representatives seeking background information for new assignments, this phenomenon may be expected periodically.

Three steps were taken to ease the problem of limited space. The weeding-out process was continued as noted, a project which is now approximately 50 percent completed.

The card catalog in which there was no further room for expansion has been photocopied and will appear in book form (nine bound volumes) in November, 1969. It will be sold commercially to other libraries, so that aside from saving space and recouping perhaps a small portion of cataloging expenses, a good bibliographical tool will be available to other libraries in this country and abroad.

The decision to start replacing original U.N. documents with microprint copies has been implemented. It was first necessary to approach the United Nations for formal permission to do this. Permission has been granted, much to our satisfaction and that of other libraries which will use this decision as a precedent. Microprints of all U.N. documents and Official Records from 1946 to 1953 have now been purchased, thus freeing over 400 feet of shelving.

Since the early days of the Library it has been active in cooperating with other libraries and library associations. A large num-

ber of domestic and foreign books, documents, and pamphlets were received in exchange for 306 copies of Council books.

DONALD WASSON,
Librarian, *Foreign Relations Library*.

DIRECTORS AND OFFICERS

Original board of directors

Isaiah Bowman, 1921-1950.
Archibald Cary Coolidge, 1921-1928.
Paul D. Cravath, 1921-1940.
John W. Davis, 1921-1955.
Norman H. Davis, 1921-1944.
Stephen P. Duggan, 1921-1950.
John H. Finley, 1921-1929.
Edwin F. Gay, 1921-1945.
David F. Houston, 1921-1927.
Otto H. Kahn, 1921-1934.
Frank L. Polk, 1921-1943.
Whitney H. Shepardson, 1921-1966.
William R. Shepherd, 1921-1927.
Paul M. Warburg, 1921-1932.
George M. Wickersham, 1921-1936.

Succeeding directors according to beginning of term of office

Allen W. Dulles, 1927-1969.
R. C. Leffingwell, 1927-1960.
George O. May, 1927-1953.
Wesley C. Mitchell, 1927-1934.
Owen D. Young, 1927-1940.
Hamilton Fish Armstrong, 1928.
Charles P. Howland, 1929-1931.
Walter Lippmann, 1932-1937.
Clarence M. Woolley, 1932-1935.
Frank Altschul, 1934.
Philip C. Jessup, 1934-1942.
Harold W. Dodds, 1935-1943.
Leon Fraser, 1936-1945.
John H. Williams,* 1937-1964.
Lewis W. Douglas,* 1940-1964.
Edward Warner, 1940-1945.
Clarence E. Hunter, 1942-1953.
Myron C. Taylor, 1943-1959.
Henry M. Wriston,* 1943-1967.
Thomas K. Fineletter,* 1944-1967.
William A. M. Burden, 1945.
Walter H. Mallory,* 1945-1968.
Philip D. Reed,* 1945-1969.
Winfield W. Riefler, 1945-1950.
David Rockefeller, 1949.
W. Averell Harriman, 1950-1955.
Joseph E. Johnson, 1950.
Grayson Kirk, 1950.
Devereux C. Josephs, 1951-1958.
Elliott V. Bell,* 1953-1966.
John J. McCloy, 1953.
Arthur H. Dean, 1955.
Charles M. Spofford, 1955.
Adlai E. Stevenson, 1958-1962.
William C. Foster, 1959.
Caryl P. Haskins, 1961.
James A. Perkins, 1963.
William P. Bundy, 1964.
Gabriel Hauge, 1964.
Carroll L. Wilson, 1964.
Douglas Dillon, 1965.
Henry R. Labouisse, 1965.
Robert V. Roosa, 1966.
Lucian W. Pye, 1966.
Alfred C. Neal, 1967.
Bill D. Moyers, 1967.
Cyrus A. Vance, 1968.
Hedley Donovan, 1969.

FROM FOUNDING TO PRESENT

Honorary Presidents

Elihu Root, 1921-1937.
Henry M. Wriston, 1964.

Chairman of the Board

R. C. Leffingwell, 1946-1953.
John C. McCloy, 1953.

Presidents

John W. Davis, 1921-1933.
George W. Wickersham, 1933-1936.
Norman H. Davis, 1936-1944.
R. C. Leffingwell, 1944-1946.
Allen W. Dulles, 1946-1950.
Henry M. Wriston, 1951-1964.
Grayson Kirk, 1964.

* Directors Emeriti.

Vice Presidents

Paul D. Cravath, 1921-1933.
 Norman H. Davis, 1933-36.
 Edwin F. Gay, 1933-1940.
 Frank L. Polk, 1940-1943.
 R. C. Leffingwell, 1943-1944.
 Allen W. Dulles, 1944-1946.
 Isaiah Bowman, 1945-1949.
 Henry M. Wriston, 1950-1951.
 David Rockefeller, 1950.
 Frank Altschul, 1951.
 Devereux C. Josephs, 1951-1952.

Secretaries

Edwin F. Gay, 1921-1933.
 Allen W. Dulles, 1933-1944.
 Frank Altschul, 1944.

Treasurers

Edwin F. Gay, 1921-1933.
 Whitney H. Sheppardson, 1933-1942.
 Clarence E. Hunter, 1942-1951.
 Devereux C. Josephs, 1951-1952.
 Elliott V. Bell, 1952-1964.
 Gabriel Hauge, 1964.

Executive directors

Hamilton Fish Armstrong, 1922-1928.
 Malcolm W. Davis, 1925-1927.
 Walter H. Mallory, 1927-1959.
 George S. Franklin, Jr., 1953.

TELEVISION AND THE MASS SLICKS

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume, 116, part 23, page 31405, I extended remarks on "The Free Press" to include an analytical report covering the newspaper industry by the celebrated journalist and lecturer, Mr. Gary Allen.

Mr. Allen has now followed that knowledgeable report with a like factual, documented and interpretive analysis of television and the slick paper magazines.

Many American people behold to that ancient maxim that the "policies of the king are those of his creditors." For certain, Mr. Allen's research into the ownership and finance of the organs of communication is so revealing that it constitutes must reading for everyone concerned about why today's news is so one sided and distorted.

I submit Mr. Allen's article, "Teleslick," which appears in the October 1970 edition of American Opinion, Belmont, Mass., to follow my remarks:

TELESLICK—TELEVISION AND THE MASS SLICKS

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

Communication is power, proclaimed Chairman ——. He was talking about television, upon which the great masses of Americans rely so heavily for their hard news. This, despite the fact that such news is both distorted and limited. As Dean Burch, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, declared on July 20, 1970: "The entire contents of a typical TV evening news show would take only three columns in a newspaper."

Even so, television in America has become almost as influential as the schools and churches in creating public opinion. There are in the United States an estimated 57.5 million homes with television, and somewhere between 40 and 50 million Americans watch television network news each night.

The ideological slant of television "news and commentary" has recently produced much indignant comments. But months be-

fore Spiro Agnew became a household word by shouting at the thunder of television's surf, a number of media newsmen had already complained to *TV Guide's* Edith Efrom about the Leftist bent on their comrades. As Fred Freed of N.B.C. News put it:

"This generation of newsmen is a product of the New Deal. These beliefs that were sacred to the New Deal are the beliefs that news has grown on. This is true of the networks, of *Newsweek*, of the *New York Times*, of all media. Men of like mind are in the news. It's provincial. The blue- and white-collar people who are in revolt now do have cause for complaint against us. We've ignored their point of view. It's bad to pretend they don't exist. We did this because we tend to be upper-middle-class liberals. . . ."

Bill Leonard of C.B.S. says that television newsmen are not only "Liberals," but they are bad reporters. Speaking of his TV news colleagues, Leonard notes:

"Most reporting is lousy. It's lousy because people are lazy, because people don't think ahead, because they approach things in rote ways. We have these kinds of reporters here, unfortunately. The worst problem of all is the reporter who doesn't ask the next question—the cheap, lousy reporter who'll quote an attack but doesn't go to the other side because the answer might kill his story. . . ."

The severest criticism of television's Leftist bias came from one of the least-expected sources, A.B.C. anchorman Howard K. Smith. Mr. Smith, who describes himself as "left of center" and a "semi-socialist," is well remembered as the commentator who brought Soviet spy Alger Hiss onto nationwide TV to discuss "The Political Death Of Richard Nixon." Just what motivated Smith to become the Joe Valachi of the television industry, we do not pretend to know. The inference in his confession, published in *TV Guide* for February 28, 1970, is that while he is himself a "Liberal," he is not like some of his colleagues an anti-American. Interviewer Edith Efrom writes of Smith:

"He is generally in disagreement with political Conservatives on virtually everything. And, for that matter, he finds it psychologically easier to defend TV news departments than to criticize them. But on this issue of anti-American, pro-New-Left bias in the network news departments, his observations are identical to those coming from the right.

"Many of my colleagues," Smith says, "have the depth of a saucer. They cling to the tag, 'Liberal' that grew popular in the time of Franklin Roosevelt, even though they've forgotten its content. They've really forgotten it. They don't know what 'liberal' and 'conservative' mean any more! They've forgotten it because the liberal cause has triumphed. Once it was hard to be a liberal. Today it's 'in.' The ex-underdogs, the ex-outcasts, the ex-rebels are satisfied bourgeois today, who pay \$150 a plate at Americans for Democratic Action dinners. They don't know what they stand for any more, and they're hunting for a new voice to give them new bearings."

"The search for a 'new voice,' he says, has catapulted such men into the arms of the New Left. They want to cling to the label 'liberal,' and they cling to those who seem strong—namely, the New Left. The New Left shouts tirades, rather than offering reasoned arguments. People bow down to them, so they have come to seem strong, to seem sure of themselves. As a result, there's a gravitation to them by the liberals who are not sure of themselves. This has given the New Left grave power over the old Left. It is this New Left 'power' over many of the Nation's liberal reporters, he says, that underlies an anti-American and pro-radical bias in network coverage. . . ."

The remarkable Mr. Smith went so far as to confirm that the term "effete snobs," applied to television newsmen by the Vice

Footnotes at end of article.

President, fits media reporters like a pink glove. The self-proclaimed sophisticates of network news are, he said, seriously self-deluded about the intentions of the communists. Howard Smith explains:

"Some [newsmen and commentators] have gone overboard in a wish to believe that our opponent has exclusively peaceful aims, and that there is no need for armaments and national security. The danger of Russian aggression is unreal to many of them, although some have begun to rethink since the invasion of Czechoslovakia. But there is a kind of basic bias in the left-wing soul that gives the Russians the benefit of the doubt."

The Leftist bogtrot of the networks is not unappreciated by the Communists. In his incredible book, *Do It!* published by the Establishment firm of Simon and Schuster, self-proclaimed Communist Jerry Rubin writes that "every revolution needs a color TV." He cites Walter Cronkite of C.B.S. News as "the S.D.S.'s best organizer," and goes on to cheer about the way Cronkite "brings out the map of the U.S. with circles around the campuses that blew up today." Rubin calls these the "battle reports." He notes that "the first 'student demonstration' flashed across the TV tubes of the nation as a myth in 1964. That year the first generation being raised from birth on TV was 9, 10, and 11 years old. 'First chance I get,' they thought, 'I wanna do that too.' The first chance they got was when they got to junior high and high school five years later—1969! And that was the year America's junior high and high schools exploded! . . . TV is raising generations of kids who want to grow up and become demonstrators."

Jerry Rubin calls television news "a commercial for the revolution." And, he knows what he is talking about.

Alan Dale is a well-known singer and television entertainer who has recently become a newspaper columnist and television critic in New York. He noted in a recent column that the TV networks are a propaganda machine "engaged in psychological warfare against the American people." Alan Dale says the networks "are waging the greatest advertising campaign in history—selling the propaganda of the Left to our children." Mr. Dale lays it on the line:

"You believe that communism cannot co-exist with free nations. The philosophy and doctrine that is communism tells you that; the communist conquests and enslavement of the peoples of 28 nations tell you that; the communist leaders tell you that. But the voices of TV say there is nothing to fear from communism. Your children buy it!

"You believe that Revolution must be resisted by loyalists, and that treason is punishable by death. But the voices of TV say treason is an American tradition called 'dissent' and America was founded on Revolution. The voices of TV compare Americans with the British of 1776. You think that's insane, but your children buy it!

"You believe that only criminals 'shoot it out' with the police. But the voices of TV say that certain groups are justified to shoot it out with the police. These groups wear uniforms and have their own 'minister of defense' within our own nation. You believe only a sucker would fall for that trick twice in 30 years. But the voices of TV say that the police should be investigated for participating in such a shoot out. Your children buy it!

"You know drugs have been around since you can remember, so you believe that it is the climate of permissiveness and indoctrination that is now turning on a generation, including your own children. But the voices of TV say that if you can drink, the kids can turn on. Your children buy it!

"You believe that in a nuclear age we need defense against nuclear attack—that such defense has probably prevented World War III. The voices of TV say America should for-

get about missiles and defense. Your children buy it!

"You believe that socialism and a 'one-world order' mean the end of individuality and freedom. You believe that a 'one-world order' under socialism is the consummate dream of the communists. Your dictionary tells you that is correct. But the voices of TV say socialism and a "one-world order" will be the salvation of mankind. Your children buy it!"

If there is a fault in Alan Dale's analysis, it is that he underrates the vulnerability of adult viewers. Many of them also buy the propaganda line. Most would not recognize a Communist plot if you showed them the grave of Karl Marx. The media sell Marxists to the public as innocent and idealistic reformers, even as they depict Conservative anti-Communists as diabolical conspirators.

The Vietnam War, for example, would have been forced to a successful conclusion five years ago had the networks presented their audience of over 40 million Americans with the truth about the situation. Instead, they have propagandized for the Vietnicks, Marxists, and Communists.² One remembers that during World War II the media devoted themselves to creating heroes out of every military figure from G.I. Joe to our generals and admirals. But they would have us believe there are no heroes in Vietnam. Every mistake, every possible situation in which our military or our allies can be made to look low, incompetent, or corrupt is magnified a hundredfold. Howard K. Smith cites one example of the thousands available:

"The networks have never given a complete picture of the war. For example: that terrible siege of Khe Sanh went on for five weeks before newsmen revealed that the South Vietnamese were fighting at our sides, and that they had higher casualties. And the Vietcong's casualties were 100 times ours. But we never told that. We just showed pictures day after day of Americans getting the hell kicked out of them. That was enough to break America apart: That's also what it did."

And what applies to Vietnam applies to every other serious problem faced by our nation. It is no wonder that Vice President Agnew's attack on the media was received with enthusiasm by so many Americans. He dared to tell the truth—that the country is being psychologically sabotaged from within. What seems to have caused the most frenzy among the media, however, is the fact that the Vice President indicated the slanting of the news is conspiratorial in nature. He spoke of a "tiny, enclosed fraternity of privileged men in New York and Washington, whose power is absolute. As Mr. Agnew observed:

"They decide what 40 to 50 million Americans will learn of the day's events in the nation and the world.

"We cannot measure this power and influence by traditional democratic standards for these men can create national issues overnight. They can make or break—by their coverage and commentary—a moratorium on the war. They can elevate men from local obscurity to national prominence within a week. They can reward some politicians with national exposure and ignore others. For millions of Americans, the network reporter who covers a continuing issue like A.B.M. or civil rights, becomes in effect the presiding judge in a national trial by jury."

The Vice President then wondered aloud "whether a form of censorship already exists when the news that 40 million Americans receive each night . . . is filtered through a handful of commentators who admit to their own set of biases." It was a rhetorical question so obvious that many wondered why they had never heard it asked before. Theo-

dore H. White, himself a member of the Establishment's Council on Foreign Relations, comments:

"The increasing concentration of the cultural pattern of the U.S. is in fewer hands. You can take a compass with a one-mile radius and put it down at the corner of Fifth Avenue and 51st Street in Manhattan and you have control of 95% of the entire opinion-and-influence-making in the U.S."

All of which raises the question of who owns and controls the opinion makers—selecting the membership of that little fraternity of "electronic journalists" which controls what 40 million Americans will or will not know about the day's news? It is a question worthy of investigation.

CONTROL OF CBS

At the apex of the networks stands the Columbia Broadcasting System. The gargantuan C.B.S. network consists of wholly owned television outlets in New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, Philadelphia, and St. Louis plus over two hundred affiliate stations scattered throughout the continental United States. The network also owns radio outlets in a number of key cities and has 255 affiliated radio stations.

Chairman of the Board and key man at C.B.S. is William S. Paley. Mr. Paley is the son of Samuel and Gold Palinsky, who immigrated to America from Russia before the turn of the century. Sam Paley became a wealthy cigar manufacturer. As he did not want his son in the cigar business he arranged purchase of fifty percent of C.B.S. from Paramount for \$5 million. The year was 1928, and William Paley was twenty-one years old. The system had only twenty radio stations when young Paley took control. He was interested in social causes and saw great potential in radio for furthering them.

Another group interested in "social causes," the international banking firm of Lehman Brothers, a satellite of the worldwide Rothschild investment network, also became a major investor in C.B.S. Paley and his brother-in-law, Dr. Leon Levy, are however, the largest C.B.S. stockholders.

During World War II, William Paley was able to develop his propaganda theories as Deputy Chief of the Psychological Warfare Division on the Headquarters Staff of General Dwight D. Eisenhower. After V-E Day he was Deputy Chief of Information Control in Germany. So far is he to the Left that he received the order of *Polonia Restituta* from Communist Poland.

Paley is an important member of what is called the American Establishment. A devout internationalist, he is on the Advisory Council of the U.S. Committee for U.N. Day. He serves on the racial Ford Foundation's Fund for Resources for the Future. Mr. Paley is also listed in the Hearings of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on the Institute of Pacific Relations as "one of those to be invited to appropriate small dinners" held by the I.P.R.'s Edward C. Carter to arrange a pro-Maoist policy for America. The I.P.R. was a subsidiary of the Council on Foreign Relations, of which Paley is a member, and was primarily responsible for delivering China to the Communists. The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee has noted of it:

"The Institute of Pacific Relations (IPR) has been considered by the American Communist Party and by Soviet officials as an instrument of Communist policy, propaganda, and military intelligence.

"The IPR disseminated and sought to popularize false information originating from Soviet and Communist sources.

"Members of the small core of officials and staff members who controlled IPR were either Communists or pro-Communist.

"The IPR was a vehicle used by the Communists to orientate American far eastern policies toward Communist objectives."

Not surprisingly, the C.B.S. Foundation

has been a major financial donor to the C.F.R. monolith through which the I.P.R. was spawned. Mr. Paley is reputed to be very generous to radical causes. Despite the fact that his parents came from Russia, Paley is a member of The Pilgrim Society, sometimes called the world's most secret organization, which has as its goal the reuniting of England and America.

Current Biography says of William S. Paley that "CBS policy continues to reflect his own personality, principles and taste." From his involvement with the C.F.R., the Pilgrims, the Ford Foundation, and the U.N. Day Committee, one must assume that the views of the corps of Leftist reporters at C.B.S. are indeed an extension of those of its Chairman of the Board. And those radical views reach into the homes of tens of millions of Americans every night.

The president of C.B.S. is Dr. Frank Stanton, whose Ph.D. in psychology is from Ohio State. He became president of the network at thirty-eight when William Paley moved upstairs. Under the Paley-Stanton team, C.B.S. has become the largest advertising and communication medium in the world.

Stanton is, like Paley, a "limousine Leftist." He is a long-time member of the C.F.R. and has been chairman of the Rand Corporation, a highly secretive think-tank whose Orwellian radicalism has periodically produced international scandals. He also serves as a trustee of the Carnegie Institution and is a trustee and on the executive committee of the Rockefeller Foundation, as well as a director of the William S. Paley Foundation (where Paley hides some of the enormous profits he makes from preaching socialism). Dr. Stanton is also a director of Pan American Airways, headed by the notorious Leftist, Najeeb Halaby; is a trustee and former chairman of the radical Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences; and, has served as chairman of the United States Advisory Committee on Information.

According to Zygmund Dobbs, perhaps the world's foremost expert on the Fabian Socialist movement, "Frank Stanton has been a Fabian socialist all of his adult life." He has, for example, been active with the Tamiment Institute (formerly the Rand School of Social Sciences) in New York City. The Rand School has for decades been notorious as a training ground for Marxist revolutionaries of every stripe.

Columnist Sarah McClendon has noted that Frank Stanton is a close friend of Lyndon Johnson. In 1964, while Senator Barry Goldwater was seeking the Presidency, Stanton addressed the National Broadcast Editorial Conference, declaring that TV networks ought to take sides in political controversies. He demanded they commence a continuing editorial crusade to implement the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and suggested that C.B.S. might formally endorse particular Congressional and gubernatorial candidates.

The power and influence of C.B.S. ranges far beyond its television and radio networks. From its original base in broadcasting, it has expanded into theatrical motion pictures and film syndication, direct marketing services, the manufacture of guitars and drums, publishing; educational services, materials, and systems; research and development for industry, the military, and space technology; and, it even owns the New York Yankees.

The Columbia Broadcasting System is, in fact, the world's leading producer of phonograph records through its Columbia and Epic labels. Employing extensive full-page advertisements in "underground" newspapers around the country, the C.B.S. recording firms keep many of these revolutionary sheets afloat. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, a wholly-owned C.B.S. subsidiary, is one of the nation's largest producers of textbooks and a major publisher of contemporary "literature." C.B.S. is also the world's largest exporter of films produced especially for tele-

Footnotes at end of article.

vision. It has broadcast or record producing facilities in Sweden, Australia, Switzerland, Holland, Germany, Israel, Belgium, Costa Rica, Mexico, Brazil, Canada, England, Austria, France, Italy, Japan, Argentina, and Columbia. Paley's firm owns thirteen subsidiary corporations within the United States and sixty-six corporations abroad.

While C.B.S. was originally backed by the international banking firm of Lehman Brothers, it now seems to have a lot of Harriman money behind it. W. Averell Harriman (C.F.R.) received numerous concessions from the Soviets during the Twenties to develop the mineral resources of Communist Russia.² His father had worked closely with Jacob Schiff, Kuhn, Loeb & Company, one of the chief financiers of the Russian Revolution of 1917. Among the directors of C.B.S. is Robert Lovett of the Harriman Bank, and several others are closely allied with the Rockefeller family.⁴

CONTROL OF NBC

The Avis of network television is the National Broadcasting Company, a subsidiary of the Radio Corporation of America. (Another subsidiary, coincidentally, Hertz Auto Rentals.) In the N.B.C. constellation are 207 television stations and 219 radio outlets.

Until his recent retirement the head man at Radio Corporation (and therefore at N.B.C.) has been Brigadier General David Sarnoff.⁵ Mr. Sarnoff is generally credited with founding R.C.A. As Arthur Howden Smith notes in *Men Who Run America*, it was not that simple:

"R.C.A., it should be stated, however was not Sarnoff's brainchild. It came about because the Navy Department wanted American wireless American-owned—American Marconi was an affiliate of British Marconi, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, took up the matter with Owen D. Young, of General Electric, and in October, 1919, General Electric bought over complete control of American Marconi and reorganized it as Radio Corporation of America. A.T. & T. bought into it in July, 1920, swapping radio patents for devices helpful in telephony. . . . Then, in November, Westinghouse electrified the country by broadcasting from an experimental station in Pittsburgh the Hardin-Cox election returns. The United States became radio-minded in a return for a sizable block of Radio stock.

"Obviously, R.C.A. was no more than a selling agency to work up a market for the instruments the two manufacturing companies were commencing to turn out. It controlled practically every patent of value required to build such instruments. . . .

"General J. C. Harbord had been elected president on the company's organization. He was the front for the corporation. But David Sarnoff, practical radio man, general manager, was the 'works.' It was he who made the wheels go round—and in 1920 he was twenty-nine years old. He . . . shoved broadcasting as hard as he could. National Broadcasting Company was the result. In 1926, he persuaded Radio to buy station WEAF from A.T. & T. for one million dollars, and broadcasting as we know it today had its birth."

Navy Intelligence was more than slightly naive if it thought that in getting American Marconi away from the Rothschild-owned British Marconi it was freeing American broadcasting from control by the Rothschild clique and the international financiers. Since its inception, "His Master's Voice" at R.C.A.-N.B.C. came from the Rothschild's new world affiliates—Kuhn, Loeb & Company, Lehman Brothers, and Lazard Freres. Sarnoff, like his counterpart William Paley at C.B.S., was a bright young man backed by the banking *Insiders*.

In 1969, André Meyer of Lazard Freres, who had been a member of the board of

directors of R.C.A. since 1947, retired. André, who was married to Bella Lehman, was replaced by Donald A. Petrie of Lazard Freres. One goes off, another comes on. The "Big Boys" are not about to relinquish control of so powerful a conglomerate as R.C.A. At the same time, Stephen M. DuBrul of Lehman Brothers joined the board of directors. Lewis L. Strauss, a partner at Kuhn, Loeb & Company, has been a board member for many years. He was also a trustee of the subversive Institute of Pacific Relations. The Chairman and chief executive officer at N.B.C. is Walter Scott, a partner in Lehman Brothers.

As radio mushroomed, the ambitious Sarnoff and his backers began looking at related fields to conquer. Arthur Howden Smith tells us how N.B.C. got into the movie business:

"Radio's laboratories had developed a device they called Photophone, and in seeking an opening for it Sarnoff came upon the twin companies of Keith-Albee-Orpheum, operator of a chain of two hundred theaters, and Film Booking Office Production, makers of motion-pictures. Both were in difficulties because they hadn't got in on the new sound equipment, and Sarnoff succeeded in obtaining a substantial interest for R.C.A. without spending a dollar or a share of stock. The theater chain became Radio-Keith-Orpheum (R.K.O.), the producing company R.K.O. Productions, later simplified to Radio Pictures."

R.C.A. subsequently sold R.K.O. to the Atlas Corporation and Lehman Brothers.

Much of what we can learn about Sarnoff comes from his biography by Eugene Lyons, the former editor of *Soviet Russia Pictorial* and a director of the Soviets' TASS news agency who had a fight with Stalin and was until recently a senior editor at *Reader's Digest*. One suspects, however, that there may be considerable eyewash involved as Lyons is Sarnoff's cousin (a matter the biography neglects to mention). Eugene Lyons was born in Uzlian, Minsk, Russia to one Minne Privin. Sarnoff was born in Uzlin, Minsk, Russia, the son of Lena Privin. Mr. Lyons writes of his cousin's political and ideological proclivities that "Sarnoff is not a man of intense political feeling or overmastering convictions outside his business-scientific preserves."

Yet, we are asked to believe that David Sarnoff was at one time a fierce opponent of Communism. In 1955, he prepared a detailed memorandum boldly entitled *Program For a Political Offensive Against World Communism*. "On May 9, 1955," writes Lyons, "James Hagerty, the press secretary, released it to White House correspondents, with the implication at least of presidential blessings." You may judge how far to the Right this plan was by the fact that it was read into the *Congressional Record* with laudatory remarks by Senator Lyndon Baines Johnson. Mr. Johnson later traveled to New York to address a dinner at the Waldorf Astoria in Sarnoff's honor. There L.B.J. praised the Sarnoff memorandum and called for "the greatest political offensive in history . . . to win the cold war." The scheme was as phony as a rubber cane.

Although the Sarnoff thesis advocated an end to cream-puff appeasement of the Russians, it presented the "Liberal" line that the only threat is external and that Communism can best be thwarted by a massive redistribution of wealth in the non-Communist world and the creation of a socialist World Government to oppose the Soviet bloc. As usual, Americans were presented with false alternatives: One side (Atlantic Unionists and related groups) was proposing a socialist World Government to stop the spread of Communism, while the other (United World Federalists and similar organizations) advocated World Government with the Communists. Upon the election of John F. Ken-

nedy, Establishment Group II came into the ascendancy and Sarnoff dropped his scheme. Cousin Lyons writes:

"Around 1961 David Sarnoff ceased to talk publicly about Communism. Tactically he acknowledged that the 'hard' line of the cold war, of which he had been so determined an exponent, no longer had much chance—that his crusade had failed . . ."

For a man without "intense political feeling," David Sarnoff has strayed into some very intense political associations. For many years he has been a member of the Establishment *Insiders' Council* on Foreign Relations—about as intensely political a group as you could hope to assemble. (R.C.A. has been a major financial contributor to the C.F.R.) Also, at the urging of President Kennedy, Sarnoff in 1961 became vice chairman of the Citizens Committee for International Development. "Its objective," writes Lyons, "was to help generate public support for the Foreign Aid Program. An equivalent organization, in which Sarnoff served as a member of the board of directors, was constituted by President Johnson in February, 1965."

The public is supposed to believe that the lobbying for foreign aid is a product of the efforts of average citizens who see the need to help America's neighbors. Far from it! The *Insiders* of international banking profited enormously from America's foreign aid program—which has cost us over \$182 billion since 1946. Both J.F.K. and L.B.J. knew that Sarnoff has been a lifelong front man for the international banking fraternity, and accordingly selected him for the International Development posts.

In September 1965, Sarnoff addressed three thousand delegates from more than one hundred nations at a privately sponsored World Conference on Peace Through Law, a Front promoting socialist World Government. Earl Warren was its honorary chairman, former Presidents Truman and Eisenhower were co-chairmen, and Lyndon Johnson was a featured speaker. Sarnoff advocated that world "control" (a monopoly for the *Insiders*) be arranged over international television. The "General" even served on the Rockefeller Committee on Department of Defense Organization, created by President Eisenhower to reduce control by the military over the nation's defense policies. Little wonder that Sarnoff received a medal from the Communist-dominated United Nations "for his contribution to the field of human rights."

David Sarnoff is also a member of the super-secret Pilgrim Society, whose official logo is entwined American and British flags. This group, which is dedicated to merging Britain and America, has a number of internationalist members like Paley, Sarnoff, and John Schiff whose ancestors were not British.⁶ Cousin Eugene forgot to mention Cousin David's C.F.R. and Pilgrim activities.

Over a period of a decade, David Sarnoff's vice president at N.B.C. and chairman of N.B.C. International was Alfred R. Stern. Mr. Stern's mother is Marion Rosenwald Stern, daughter of Julius Rosenwald of the Sears Roebuck fortune. In 1851, his great-grandfather emigrated to America from Germany. He is reported to have been a veteran of the Red Revolution of 1848. The *National Encyclopedia of American Biography* says (Volume 26, Page 111) that Alfred's grandfather, Julius Rosenwald, gave \$6 million to Stalin for "recolonization" within the Soviet Union. Included in the Rosenwald group sending millions to finance "farm development" in the workers' paradise were international financiers Felix Warburg, Louis Marshall, Herbert Lehman, and John D. Rockefeller. It has been estimated that Rosenwald's total gifts to Josef Stalin exceeded \$18 million.

On August 1, 1951, Congressman Eugene Cox placed in the *Congressional Record* a report detailing the millions Alfred R. Stern's

Footnotes at end of article.

grandfather spent financing U.S. Communists. Like many of the financiers of the revolution in America today, Stern's grandfather set up a tax-free foundation to finance his pet Communist causes. Among those he backed with large sums of cash were W. E. B. DuBois, a Communist and a founder of the N.A.A.C.P., Red poet Langston Hughes, Communist James Dombrowski of the Southern Conference Educational Fund, and the late editor of the *Atlanta Constitution*, Ralph McGill.

In 1957, while Alfred R. Stern was chairman of N.B.C. International, his father—Alfred K. Stern—fled behind the Iron Curtain with his second wife, Martha Dodd. A federal grand jury had returned a three-count indictment against them for spying for Soviet Russia, which could have brought the death penalty had they been brought to trial. Both were charged with being members of a Soviet spy ring that included Boris Morros, a U.S. double agent, and Vassili Zublin, former second secretary of the Soviet Embassy in Washington. The senior Stern and his second wife had been subpoenaed on March 14, 1957, to appear before the same grand jury which indicted the Sobels and other Soviet spies. Martha Dodd Stern is the daughter of a former U.S. Ambassador to Germany and brags of once trying to seduce Adolph Hitler.

After fleeing justice, the father of the N.B.C. International chairman set about training black revolutionaries and saboteurs in Communist Cuba. Alfred K. Stern's latest activities were indicated over a Vietcong radio station in Hanoi during August 1966. He announced a gift of \$5,000 to Communist troops.

The nephew of Soviet spy Alfred K. Stern (and cousin of television executive Alfred R. Stern) is Washington Leftist Phillip Stern, who helped staff the Kennedy State Department and was Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs at the time of the Bay of Pigs debacle was planned. Cousin Stern sat in on the planning. His top aide was Leftist Carl T. Rowan, for whom he later arranged an appointment as Director of the U.S. Information Agency. Phillip Stern also played an important role in the persecution of Senator Joseph McCarthy while an assistant to Senator Henry Jackson during the Army-McCarthy Hearings.

Like other members of the family, Cousin Phillip promotes Leftist causes in the media through a tax-free foundation. In a glorifying article titled "The Happy Philanthropist—Phillip Stern" the *Washington Star* details in its issue of February 1, 1970, some of the pro-Communist activities to which Phillip Stern devotes himself. The *Star* notes:

"The Stern grant that made the biggest splash of 1969 was money given Seymour Hersh to research reports of a massacre of Vietnamese civilians by soldiers at My Lai. Hersh's research, aided by a special [Stern] fund to promote investigative reporting, led to stories that shocked the nation and the world."

Besides bankrolling the radical Fund for Investigative Journalism, Phillip Stern has also been a major benefactor of the Far Left's Institute for Policy Studies and is also author of *The Case of J. Robert Oppenheimer*, which glorifies the late Communist and "security risk."

Phillip's mother (the aunt of TV's Alfred R. Stern) is Edith Rosenwald Stern, who sits on 690,000 shares of Sears Roebuck and Company—which not only keeps the wolf away from the mansion door, but allows her to indulge the Communists. When New Orleans police raided the headquarters of the Communist Southern Conference Educational Fund, for instance, they discovered a cancelled check for \$5,000—a token of Mrs. Stern's esteem. Mrs. Stern also uses the media to promote her radical interests—she openly owns WDSU television and radio in

New Orleans, but has otherwise chosen to finance others in the purchase of newspapers and radio and television stations.

Edith Stern's son, Edgar B. Stern Jr., is a member of the board of directors of Sears Roebuck and Company—which may explain why many newspapers, anxious for advertising revenue, are reluctant to make editorial connections between the World Communist Movement and the American Establishment. Edith's sister Marion, formerly wed to Red spy Alfred K. Stern and the mother of television's Alfred R. Stern, is currently married to Max Ascoli (C.F.R.) Mr. Ascoli was brought to this country from Italy in 1931 when the Rockefeller Foundation interceded in his behalf after he had been arrested for Red activities. Max Ascoli dumped his Italian wife to marry the wealthy Mrs. Rosenwald Stern, who financed his establishment of the radical *Reporter* magazine.

Alfred R. Stern, who was for many years chairman of N.B.C. International and vice president of N.B.C. Enterprises Division, has himself kept out of overtly Communist activities, but being raised in a home where his father was a Russian spy, his mother a committed Leftist, his grandfather and many of his relatives leading pro-Communists and financial supporters of Josef Stalin, is not the sort of environment which produces screaming eagles. Mr. Stern is currently Chairman of the Board of Television Communications Corporation, 45 Rockefeller Plaza, New York City.

Succeeding David Sarnoff at R.C.A. is his son Robert, a director of the Advertising Council, another avatar of the Council on Foreign Relations. After graduating from Harvard and studying law at Columbia, Robert Sarnoff served as an assistant to Gardner Cowles (C.F.R.), publisher of *Look* magazine. He also spent several years on the *Look* staff before joining R.C.A. He is a director of Random House Publishers, which is owned by R.C.A. (Random House's Bennett Cerf is a director of R.C.A.) and he is a director of Manufacturers Hanover Trust Company.

In 1950, Robert Sarnoff married Felicia Schiff Warburg, daughter of Kuhn, Loeb & Company's Paul Felix Warburg. She is the great granddaughter of Trotsky's financial angel, Jacob Schiff. The Sarnoff-Warburg merger wound up in the Mexican courts early this year and Felicia married F.D.R. Jr. in July.

THE LITTLE ONE

The American Broadcasting Company is the Tag-Along Toooloo of the Big Three networks. It has 153 primary television affiliates and owns a chain of 399 motion picture theaters, the largest such chain in the country. A.B.C. is also very big in the record business under the Dunhill, Impulse, A.B.C., Command and Westminster labels. Like N.B.C. and C.B.S., it is a heavy supporter of "underground" revolutionary papers through its ads promoting acid-rock music.

A.B.C. specializes in escapist entertainment and generally leaves the documentary propaganda to the Big Two. Its news audience amounts to only 7 million, while the other networks divide up the remaining 35 million or so news watchers. It does not have the ties to the C.F.R. and international banking establishment that C.B.S. and N.B.C. do, but seems content to try to imitate their radicalism.

SLICK MAGAZINES

Although the advent of television has somewhat diminished the influence of the slick magazines upon mass opinion, their importance is still significant. The nation's second leading magazine in circulation is *Look*, with 7,750,000 copies distributed per issue. *Look* is owned by Cowles Communications, headed by Gardner and John Cowles.

The Cowles publishing empire encompasses *Harper's*, a list of trade journals, a

string of newspapers and television stations, and Harper & Row publishers. Running Harper & Row for the Cowles family is Cass Canfield of the C.F.R., World Federalists, and The Pilgrims. John Cowles is married to Canfield's daughter. Both Cowles brothers are members of the *Insiders' Council* on Foreign Relations.

John Cowles runs the *Minneapolis Tribune* and *Des Moines Register*. He is a trustee of the Establishment's subversive Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and of the Ford Foundation, and he is a member of the National Policy Board of American Assembly—a Front created by Averell Harriman, the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations, and the C.F.R. to run propaganda seminars for leaders in American business, labor, communications, and the academy. He is on the Advisory Council of the U.S. Committee for the U.N. and the ultra-Leftist National Committee for an Effective Congress, which operates a "be kind to the Communists" lobby in Washington.

According to the American Legion's *Firing Line* of August 15, 1954, John Cowles joined twenty-three others signing telegrams to U.S. Senators "asking support of measures which would stifle all Congressional Investigations of Communism." Little wonder, Brother John is very serious about merging America into a World Government with the Communists. The following is from a U.P.I. dispatch of June 7, 1959:

"John Cowles, publisher of 'The Minneapolis Star and Tribune' said today that the traditional American concept of national sovereignty is obsolete. Mr. Cowles, speaking at the 109th annual commencement of the University of Rochester, said Americans have believed so deeply in the principle of national sovereignty that they have instinctively opposed anything which it could be claimed might impair national sovereignty.

"I suggest for your open-minded consideration the proposition that national sovereignty in its traditional meaning no longer exists. It has become obsolete," he said.

Gardner Cowles, chairman of the board of *Look*, works hard to keep up with the Leftist activities of his brother. Besides being a member of the C.F.R., he is also a member of the Atlantic Union Committee which advocates scrapping the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution and forming a political union with England and the countries of Western Europe as a first step toward a World Government. He is a member of The Pilgrims. Cowles was also head of fund-raising for the American Assembly's Freedom House, set up in honor of Wendell Wilkie by A.D.A. founder Russell Davenport of *Fortune* and notorious Communist-fronter Rex Stout.

Gardner Cowles became a member of the Institute of Pacific Relations (officially cited as "an instrument of Communist policy") at the recommendation of Alger Hiss (C.F.R.). During World War II, Gardner was deputy director of the O.W.I., where he played a role in placing the foreign language press within the U.S. under the domination of the Communist-controlled Victory Council.

Running *Look* magazine for the Cowles boys is William Atwood (C.F.R.), who once wrote that we could "thank our lucky stars that Castro is not a Communist."

What Americans can thank their lucky stars about is that *Look*, which has published more smears against anti-Communists than any other publication outside the official Communist Press, is reportedly going broke. The magazine has now become so thin that one might almost shave with it. Corporate advertisers have cut back on their budgets and the slick magazines have been hit very hard. Also, the ad men are pouring a higher percentage of their budgets into television. The Cowles have already been forced to sell

Footnotes at end of article.

a valuable newspaper in Puerto Rico to pump the \$10 million proceeds into keeping *Look* afloat. Those close to the scene say *Look* could go under.

And things aren't any better over at *Life*, despite a whopping circulation of 8.5 million. *Life* is now down to 68 pages, less than half its former self. *Time*, the leading newsweekly, with a circulation of 4.2 million (as compared to *Newsweek's* 2.5 million and *U.S. News & World Report's* 1.8) is healthy, as are *Time*, Inc.'s *Sports Illustrated* and *Fortune*.

The *Time* corporation recently bought its first newspaper, the *Newark Evening News*, for \$34 million—then turned around and bought thirty-two more in the Chicago suburbs. It also owns Little, Brown & Company, an Establishment book publisher; 300,000 shares of Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer; 600,000 acres of timberland; and, in part owner of media in South America, West Germany, Hong Kong, and Australia. In addition to all this, *Time* Inc. owns some thirty television stations in America, giving this mammoth conglomerate a voice in every form of mass media—newspapers, magazines, movies, television, book publishing, and even teaching machines.

The builder of this empire was the late Henry Luce, whose impact on American thinking has been incalculable. As Theodore White (C.F.R.) has noted, "He . . . revolutionized the thinking of American readers." Luce started his rise to publishing glory with loans from Establishmentarians Thomas Lamont and Dwight Morrow (like Lamont a J. P. Morgan partner), Harvey Firestone, E. Roland Harriman, and various members of the Harkness family (Standard Oil fortune). Their influence became especially apparent when he started his business magazine, *Fortune*, in the middle of the depression. As John Kobler writes in *The First Tycoon*:

"It is a bemusing paradox that *Fortune*, the magazine of business, questioned the efficiency of the free-enterprise system and even took on a faint socialist tinge. Some of its editors and contributors stood far to the left. Luce realized this—but he also realized that he needed iconoclasts to shake up the business world and make it notice *Fortune*."

"Under the managing editorship of Russell Davenport, a progressive [sic] Republican, *Fortune* appeared to favor a mixed economy. It was Davenport who saw presidential qualities in Wendell Willkie, and interested Luce in backing him against Roosevelt. . . ."

Apparently that is what Luce's financial angels wanted. And, although he later seemed to oppose F.D.R., Henry Luce cheered his accomplishments: "I didn't vote for F.D.R. but it was all right with me that he won. He accomplished a lot of necessary social reform."

Jeanne Harmon, a former *Life* staff writer, tells in *Such Is Life* how tolerant Luce was of the Communist cell openly working at *Time-Life*. Mrs. Harmon relates how headlines were suddenly altered to convey meanings never intended, and how she and her fellow reporters were subjected to pressures to ignore some stories and push others. She also reveals that Whittaker Chambers was not welcomed back to *Time-Life* after he had testified against Alger Hiss (C.F.R.). Mrs. Harmon's description of life with Luce was considered important enough to be reproduced by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

Luce, like William Paley and Gardner Cowles, was a member of the I.P.R. (the officially cited "instrument of Communist policy"), and he and his corporation provided it with large financial contributions. The I.P.R. Hearings revealed that Henry Luce had done everything possible to bury evidence that Communists were working within the I.P.R. to insure the sellout of Chiang to the Chinese Reds—even as he pretended to be a friend and supporter of Chiang Kai-shek.

Luce's involvement with the Communist I.P.R. helps explain why his magazines went to every length to smear Senator Joseph McCarthy. *Life* and *Time* have always attacked and ridiculed anyone who pointed out that the success of Communism around the world have been a result of the policies of our own government. The fact that Luce was himself deeply involved with the men making those disastrous policies was undoubtedly a motivation factor.

Henry Luce was at one time actually considered an anti-Communist. Yet he always bitterly opposed anyone like Robert Taft, General Douglas MacArthur, or Barry Goldwater, whom he thought might actually do something about Communist subversion in the United States. Luce's bogus anti-Communism was used to promote his World Government crusades. Besides his I.P.R. membership, he was a member of the C.F.R. and the Atlantic Union. Henry Luce was also a strong supporter of the United Nations, even after Alger Hiss's role in its establishment was revealed.

In the late Fifties, Henry Luce switched from the "World Government to oppose Communism" line to the "peaceful coexistence and World Government with Communism" line and *Life* went back to glorifying the Soviet Union as it had done during World War II. In 1966, Luce and *Time's* publisher James Linen (a sponsor of the occult Temple of Understanding and a member of the C.F.R., Atlantic Union, and The Pilgrim Society) took a group of forty-three U.S. businessmen behind the Iron Curtain to promote aid and trade with the enemy.

Editor-in-chief of all *Time* Inc. publications, is Hedley Donovan, a Rhodes Scholar, former reporter for the Leftist *Washington Post*, and a member of the C.F.R. and The Pilgrim Society. Other Establishmentarians in the *Time* Inc. hierarchy are vice chairman Roy Larsen (C.F.R.) and directors John Gardner (C.F.R.) and Sol Linowitz (C.F.R.). The late C. D. "Jackson" (C.F.R.) divided his time between the Luce interests and his role in President Eisenhower's "palace guard," where he was leader in the "get McCarthy" movement.

The man who is now reported to be leading the march of *Time* is a Canadian named Edgar Bronfman, head of the worldwide Seagram's whiskey empire, who controls *Time* Inc. through ownership of M-G-M. Bronfman inherited great wealth from his father Samuel Bronfman, who made his fortune as Al Capone's supplier during prohibition. Edgar Bronfman, one of those who accompanied Luce behind the Iron Curtain in 1966, is married to Ann Loeb of the Kuhn, Loeb international banking families. She is the daughter of Frances Lehman and her father is J. L. Loeb Sr. (C.F.R.), a senior partner in Loeb, Rhodes and Company, a firm with historic ties to the Rothschilds.

Bronfman, a contributor to Hubert Humphrey in 1968, is part of John Kenneth Galbraith's "Referendum '70," the goal of which is to support Vietnik candidates who are to the Left of the general Democrat Party. As Galbraith puts it: "The Democratic Party must henceforth use the word *socialism*. It describes what we need."

It is clear that the mass media in America, whether it be the newspapers we discussed in the September issue of *American Opinion*, network television, or the slick magazines, are disproportionately in the hands of the radicals of the Establishment. It is also clear that same Establishment is committed to the formation of a One World Government which it intends to rule—thereby gaining control of all the wealth of the world. The Establishment uses its mass media to promote that end.

FOOTNOTES

¹ The enormously profitable *TV Guide* is owned by Walter Annenberg. Richard Nixon's Ambassador to the Court of St. James' Annenberg, who until recently was owner of

the *Philadelphia Inquirer*, also inherited ownership of *The Daily Racing Form* from his father Moe, a quasi-hood who spent many years in prison as a result of conviction on tax evasion. Walter Annenberg is a recent addition to the board of directors of the Times-Mirror Company (*Los Angeles Times*, *Newsday*, etc.) along with Keith Funston (C.F.R.), former president of the New York Stock Exchange and a member of the conspiratorial Pilgrim Society.

² Readers may wish to write C.B.S. News suggesting production of a documentary on Aid and Trade With the Communist Enemy, discussing how America finances and equips the Vietcong and North Vietnamese through loans, gifts, and transfusions of technology to Russia and her satellites—the very arsenal of an enemy killing our sons in the field. Perhaps N.B.C. would be interested in putting together one of its famous White Papers on the Treason Road we are building to link Russia with Southeast Asia, or the Rockefeller-Eaton combine to build factories behind the Iron Curtain.

³ See Anthony Sutton's *Western Technology And Soviet Economic Development 1917 to 1930* Hoover Institute, Stanford, 1968.

⁴ In the issue of *Realty—The Real Estate Newspaper of New York* for September 18, 1951, columnist Elias Cohen tells of his personal experiences in dealing with Schiff and Kuhn, Loeb & Company when they were in the process of maneuvering to establish the Federal Reserve System. Cohen drops this information about the relationship between Schiff and John D. Rockefeller.

"At that time, Mr. Schiff, the senior member of Kuhn, Loeb & Company, still held, together with one (James) Stillman, the power of attorney over the fortune of Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Sr.; he had been pronounced so ill that he could not, at that time, attend to any business at all and it had been necessary to turn over the direction of his affairs to these two men." Rockefeller had worked closely with the financiers of the Communist takeover of Russia since his early days in the oil business when Kuhn, Loeb & Company granted him a secret rebate on the oil shipped over their Pennsylvania Railroad.

⁵ Sarnoff is not a military man; F.D.R. made him an instant general during World War II.

⁶ According to the group's 1969 membership list, other members in the United States of The Pilgrims, 74 Trinity Place, New York 10006, are: Frank Altschul, John Astor, Hugh D. Auchincloss, George W. Ball, Rudolph Bing, Douglas M. Black, Roger M. Blough, Brigadier General George A. Brownell, David K. E. Bruce, Ellsworth Bunker, Admiral Arleigh Burke, Arthur F. Burns, Gardner Cowles, Thomas E. Dewey, Thomas E. Dewey Jr., Clarence Dillon, C. Douglas Dillon, Hedley Donovan, Captain Douglas Fairbanks Jr., G. Keith Funston, Leonard W. Hall, Lyndon B. Johnson, James A. Linen, William McChesney Martin, The Reverend Norman Vincent Peale, Elmo Roper, Dean Rusk, and Henry M. Wriston.

⁷ Hersh wrote speeches for Eugene McCarthy in his primary battles, then berated the Senator as just a "Liberal" with no feeling for the "revolution." Mr. Hersh was also connected with the notoriously pro-Communist Pacifica Foundation. In October, 1969, he was a speaker for the Vietcong Moratorium in support of the Vietcong. † Edith Rosenwald Stern's late husband Edgar was a director of the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta and treasurer of Lehman Stern & Company. The Sterns and Lehmans are related. The Lehman ancestors helped start the family fortune—which now allows them to finance "Civil Rights" causes—by dealing in slaves in Montgomery, Alabama.

⁸ While *Time* dominates the newsmagazine field, competitors *Newsweek* and *U.S. News* are also closely connected with the C.F.R. *Newsweek* is owned by the Washington Post

(whose ownership and control was discussed in detail last month). Chairman of the board Frederick Beebe is a member of the C.F.R. as was the late Philip Graham. Retired editor Malcolm Muir is a C.F.R. member, as is current editor Osborn Elliott. Other C.F.R. men at *Newsweek* include columnist Stewart Alsop, contributing editor Carl Spaatz, and Atlanta Bureau chief William Anderson. The top man at *U.S. News*, David Lawrence, is also a member of the C.F.R.

THE PENTAGON PAPERS

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 12, 1971

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, one of the most outstanding leaders of the Air Force during World War II, Gen. Ira C. Baker, retired, has written some interesting additional information relative to the experience he had in the early days of World War II with some of the events outlined in the Pentagon papers. Because of the importance, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

THE NEW YORK TIMES VIETNAM EXPOSE (By Ira C. Eaker)

The courts eventually will decide the legal aspects of the publication of the purloined Pentagon study about the decisions in the Vietnam War. In the meantime a review of some historical incidents from World War II may help concerned citizens make valid judgments about these disclosures.

In April 1942 the head of the Washington bureau of a prominent newspaper called the Information Division of the War Department in the Pentagon and said, "Yesterday afternoon 16 U.S. bombers took off from a carrier 700 miles from the Japanese coast, bombed Tokyo and flew on to land in China. We propose, with your clearance, to go with an extra edition immediately."

The Pentagon censor replied promptly, "Hold, absolutely, until this story is released officially. The carrier is still vulnerable to Jap air and sub patrols. The crews are behind enemy lines. Announcement of their number and location obviously will intensify the search for them."

This great newspaper (not the New York Times) did not publish its dramatic exclusive but awaited the release by President Roosevelt.

In the war years, hometown newspapers were encouraged to publish letters from veterans overseas, after censorship to eliminate anything which might violate security. This was good for troop morale. A midwestern weekly published a letter from a member of a submarine crew which somehow escaped censorship and which read, "Mom, we were hit by a Jap depth charge while cruising at 300 feet below the surface and it did no damage, just made our lights blink." Very shortly thereafter the Japs doubled the power of their depth charges. Many submarine crews paid with their lives for this gratuitous information to the enemy.

Counsel for the New York Times contend that there is no legal precedent or authority to prevent the publication of secret government documents. The government may, after

publication, bring a criminal action against the newspapers if it wishes.

Let's try this on for size measured by other historical incidents.

If the New York Times had published a story on June 5 1944, after Eisenhower's invasion fleet had sailed, naming the beaches upon which allied troops were to land next morning, Field Marshal Rundstedt would have moved his reserve Panzer divisions to those points immediately. All troops which stormed the beaches would have been killed or captured. The invasion would have failed.

It would have been cold comfort to the relatives of 100,000 dead stacked on the Normandy beaches to know that the U.S. government could bring an action against the Times.

Editorializing in its defense the Times says that it published the Pentagon secret study because the events were more than three years old and publication could not therefore hazard national interest.

No newspaper nor any private individual possesses all the facts necessary to make that judgment. Only the President who is charged with the responsibility for the security of our forces engaged with the enemy and with the conduct of international relations has all the data requisite to valid decisions in these areas.

The Department of Justice, obviously with President Nixon's approval, contends that the New York Times publication of the secret Vietnam documents "would result in irreparable injury to the national defense."

Some idea of the damage may be realized by considering what our leadership would give for a recording of Ho Chi Minh's war conferences with his principal advisers during the same period.

Those who favor freedom for the news media to publish secret government documents at will choose to overlook the fact that we are still at war and suffering more than 100 casualties each week.

Despite the bitter divisions among our people how and why we got into the Vietnam War, cannot we now agree that so long as the war continues nothing will be done which may aid the enemy, prolong the war or increase our casualties?

SPEECH OF U.S. AMBASSADOR GEORGE BUSH BEFORE THE 51ST SESSION OF THE U.N. ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

HON. DELBERT L. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1971

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to the speech of the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, George Bush, before the 51st Session of the U.N. Economic and Social Council wherein he stated that the United States can maintain its international obligations at present levels only if other countries drop discrimination against American products. He said America's trading partners risk "great damage" unless they lower these protective trade barriers.

A U.P.I. release on the ambassador's speech is as follows:

U.S. officials said Bush's statement should be viewed as one of Washington's most serious warnings yet that correction of the

American payment deficit is an international responsibility.

"If the United States were to try to restore its external balance unilaterally, we would inflict great damage on all our trading partners as well as ourselves," Bush said. "We have chosen a more rational course."

We are looking towards international cooperation to assist us in a task in which all concerned have a stake."

Bush said the United States is not at present cutting back on international obligations, "particularly foreign assistance."

"But cooperation is a two-way street," he said. "We too expect cooperation from others. If the U.S. economy is to continue to play a constructive role in the world it must be allowed to export to markets in which it has a natural competitive advantage."

THE PENTAGON PAPERS

HON. DAVID W. DENNIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1971

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. James S. Copley, publisher of the Copley newspapers, has made a very significant and worthwhile statement regarding the recent conduct of the New York Times in publishing stolen Government documents, which deserves attention and which merits much wider publicity than it has yet received.

I call to the attention of my colleagues a news account of Mr. Copley's statement, taken from the Chicago Tribune of July 11, 1971:

PUBLISHER ASSAILS USE OF WAR REPORT BY
NEW YORK TIMES, POST

CORONADO, CALIF., July 10.—The American people want to know why newspapers published the Pentagon's secret study of United States involvement in Viet Nam without any effort to get them declassified first, Publisher S. Copley said today.

He said they want to know why the New York Times hasn't been prosecuted for unauthorized possession of stolen goods.

NOT FREE PRESS ISSUE

"What has happened really has nothing to do with freedom of the press," said Copley, chairman of the corporation publishing the Copley newspapers.

"The First Amendment prohibits the Congress from passing laws abridging freedom of the press," said Copley in a speech. "I doubt if there is any likelihood that Congress has any such intent."

Journalism was done a disservice by the Times and other newspapers which elected to identify with the Times, he said.

Speaking at the annual meeting of California and Nevada Associated Press newspaper publishers, Copley said: "The New York Times came into possession of stolen documents which the government regards as sensitive. Making no known effort to procure their declassification to permit their legal publication—and against the advice of the government—The Times elected to publish the documents. In short, there was a straightforward route to follow, not in any way involved with freedom of the press, and the Times chose not to follow it."

NOT CONDONED BY COURT

Copley said there was no ruling on freedom of the press in the decision of the Supreme Court that held publication of the

material in the hands of the Times and the Washington Post would not gravely injure the United States.

The high court "did not in any way condone the fact that the Times and its colleagues received stolen property and that they did so knowingly," Copley said.

LOCKHEED AIRCRAFT CORP.

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1971

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives will soon be considering a loan guarantee for the Lockheed Aircraft Corp. I realize that there are many sincerely held feelings on both sides of this issue, but am confident that my colleagues here in the House will want to carefully weigh all evidence available to them. A very significant letter which strikes at some very important points was written by Mr. A. W.—Tony—LeVier, an internationally recognized, top rated test pilot with a high degree of technical ability. His words cannot be treated lightly and I submit the following which I commend to the attention of my colleagues:

JUNE 1, 1971.

Mr. FRED J. BORCH,
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, General Electric Co., New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. BORCH: I was considerably troubled by your letter to President Nixon and others and by the related press conference relative to the proposed legislation which would provide loan guarantees to a consortium of 24 banks in support of the Lockheed L-1011 TriStar program. It is not surprising that as a long-term Lockheed employee, I am troubled by your actions. I have always had confidence in big business and believed that it acted in good faith, but it is at best alarming that you put into circulation on a national scale information which was both false and misleading. Even casual inquiries would have proved them so. In the current atmosphere in which charges of mismanagement are rampant, it seems worthwhile to ask you as the head of the General Electric Company to look inward and determine how you as an individual and General Electric as a corporation could have been led into this needless trap.

My reaction is not prompted by my role as a 30-year Lockheed employee. It is prompted by my recognized role as one of the nation's leading test pilots who has spent hundreds of hours behind General Electric engines in the most hazardous flying circumstances as the first American test pilot assigned to this country's first operational jet aircraft. The airplane was the Lockheed F-80 and the engine was the General Electric 1-40. In case your G.E. experience does not include this particular jet, on March 20, 1945, I was almost killed in this airplane when the turbine disc disintegrated in flight shattering the rear fuselage with the loss of the tail assembly and complete loss of aircraft control.

I spent many painful months in the hospital recuperating from a fractured lower spine and only by the providence of God was my life spared.

During this period, General Electric employees in whom I had great confidence acknowledged to me that G.E. had experienced

this same type of failure with this engine at your jet engine facility at Lynn, Mass., but had not seen fit to advise Lockheed up until that time. Subsequently, two other great American aviators, Test Pilot Milo Burcham and War Ace Major Richard Bong, met untimely and apparently needless death behind the G.E. 1-40 engine due to faulty overspeed governor operation.

But we live in a close community in aviation, a community which works together and, if necessary, suffers together. Thus, it was without hesitation that I straddled the G.E. J-79 engine in our Lockheed F-104 Starfighter series. Suffice it to say there was plenty of opportunity to remember my earlier experience with the G.E. 1-40 engine. This engine kept the Starfighter program in jeopardy throughout its early life, but not only did we support G.E., not blabbing our problems with your product, we lent you both technical and moral support in correcting your problems.

This is the environment in which we at Lockheed continued to work with G.E. as a partner in those areas where our skills best complement one another . . . hopefully, without fear or favor. I am obviously not an expert on G.E.'s engine business, but I would hazard the guess that through the C-5 transport, the S-3A ASW aircraft and the AH-56 over and above the F-104 program itself, we are the largest user of G.E. engines in the world.

When we chose the Rolls-Royce RB.211 engine for the Lockheed TriStar, we did not do it from weakness but rather from strength. No one is more familiar with G.E. engines than Lockheed, but the Rolls-Royce commercial experience so overshadows G.E. experience that there was no room for serious contest. As a pilot with long experience behind General Electric engines, I am confident you will ultimately produce a fine commercial engine. If that should happen in 1971 or 1972, it will be in contradiction of the experience cycle of all other complex technical equipment in the history of aviation . . . whatever your experience with the CF-6 engine . . . and I wish you nothing but the best.

But, as a man who stood behind General Electric products when there was little cause to do so, and as part of a company which did the same, I condemn you and the General Electric Company for the crass manner in which you have operated in the matter of the proposed Lockheed loan guarantee. Despite my natural tendency to support big business, your transparent lack of good faith is disheartening to me personally and a disservice to General Electric, and its thousands of stockholders.

Yours truly,

TONY LEVIER.

DRESSING UP DRESSING

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1971

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of the Truth-in-Food-Labeling Act, I note with interest the statement of the Mayonnaise and Salad Dressing Institute, urging all dressing manufacturers to begin immediately declaring all ingredients on the labels of standardized dressings.

At the present time, the Food and Drug

Administration does not require the listing of ingredients in such standardized products as mayonnaise, margarine, ice cream, and cola. I believe it should. The consumer has the right to know, for his convenience and, most importantly, for his protection, the ingredients in the food products he buys.

Unfortunately, despite the institute's commendable action, it concedes there may be a delay of up to 1 year before most manufacturers have completed changing the labels on their products. This seems to be an unnecessarily long delay.

Mr. Robert Kellen, institute president, would not name those companies he said are considering supplying the public with a list of the ingredients that go into their products.

The problem, of course, lies in the fact that the institute is calling for voluntary compliance on the part of the salad dressing manufacturers. Its new policy lacks both the status of law and any hint of the means necessary to insure that the manufacturers will follow the suggestion.

It is not enough that individual manufacturers disclose the contents of their products on a random, voluntary basis. We need a law that will have the authority to require all food manufacturers to comply quickly and uniformly. My bill, H.R. 8670, would require that all ingredients contained in a food product be listed on the label in the order of their predominance in the food. The protection of the consumer makes it mandatory that this bill be adopted.

THE PLIGHT OF OUR VETERANS

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1971

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, the number of Americans who are now veterans of the Vietnam war is greater than the population of 23 States.

Yet our Vietnam veterans are one of the most forgotten, neglected, and ignored groups in America.

Their problems are enormous. They need a lot of help. But for them to get help, the American public is going to have to wake up to their plight and show some vocal concern.

Over 375,000 veterans are out of work and cannot get jobs. Upwards of 50,000 young veterans are addicted to hard narcotics, and many of these have been given dishonorable discharges under a kind of thinking we are now growing away from. And at least another 30,000 addicts will soon return from South Vietnam.

Thirty percent of the Vietnam veterans now in VA hospitals are psychiatric cases. And who knows how many more are walking the streets in need of treatment?

Our veterans hospitals are so crowded

and understaffed that thousands of veterans of all ages are on waiting lists to get in. And many who are in hospitals simply do not get the attention they need.

A great many Vietnam veterans are embittered about their country because they think it does not care about them. A man returning from Vietnam is likely to be told by his friends that he was crazy to go over there in the first place. For someone who has risked his life for a year, that can be the beginning of a very real psychological problem.

Add to that the inability to find a job. I would like to read part of a letter I received from a recently discharged veteran in my district:

You spend four years in the service, and when that's over they dump you out with a letter from the Governor which says, "Sincere appreciation for the service you have rendered to our nation." I wonder how sincere that appreciation is when you can't find a job after five months.

Over a third of a million Vietnam veterans are in the same boat as this young man. The unemployment rate among Vietnam veterans under the age of 25 is 14.1 percent—more than twice as high as that among the population as a whole. It is also substantially higher than the rate among nonveterans of the same age group.

An estimated one out of every four addicts in the country is a veteran. But right now we don't have adequate means to treat them. For example, the VA hospital in Washington, D.C., has only 10 beds for narcotics addicts, even though by the VA's own estimate there are 2,500 veterans in the District of Columbia who are addicts.

Our veterans need—and I might add, deserve—far better medical care than is now being provided by VA hospitals. There is an acute shortage of personnel in critical areas—doctors, nurses, psychiatrists, and therapists to name a few. A VA mental patient may get to see a psychiatrist for only an hour a month. Many VA hospitals, including more than 30 in the South, do not have air conditioning.

All these things—lack of jobs, inadequate medical treatment, the apparent unconcern the rest of America shows for them—are turning a great many Vietnam veterans off. They have made a tremendous sacrifice for their country and they deserve better thanks. Not just a pro forma letter from a Governor. If we do not give them the help they need, I think our country is in great danger of permanently losing the respect and support of an entire generation of her veterans.

There are bills now in Congress, some of which I have introduced, to meet these problems. To give veterans' preference in a program to provide 150,000 public service jobs. To remove present restrictions and allow the VA to treat all of the 50,000 veterans who are narcotics addicts. To substantially improve the quality of medical care in VA hospitals by hiring at least 25,000 more doctors, psychi-

atrists, nurses, and other medical personnel. Rhetoric will not pay for these improvements. It might take about \$3 or \$4 billion.

But Congress will not act unless the American people express their concern. These are not somebody else's sons and brothers we are talking about—they are our sons and brothers.

THE DIEM CASE AND AFTERMATH

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1971

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, the respected Washington columnist, William S. White, has written a thought-provoking article on the Diem assassination and its aftermath.

I believe that a careful and thorough analysis of this article, as well as related articles including the stolen Pentagon papers, will place the blame for the Vietnam mess precisely where it belongs—on the shoulders of the party in power during the 1961-68 period and on those U.S. policymakers who pursued a no-win policy in Southeast Asia.

The column appeared in the Birmingham News and was sent to me by a Montgomery constituent. I commend the article to my colleagues.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

THE DIEM CASE AND AFTERMATH

(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON.—The latest "secret document" about Vietnam to come to light should cause the country to think it hadn't seen anything yet when it was being treated by The New York Times and other newspapers to excerpts from the stolen Pentagon papers.

This secret was the decision of officials of the United States government under President John F. Kennedy to condone, if not to participate in, the assassination in 1963 of the last truly effective president of South Vietnam, Ngo Dinh Diem.

The man who more than any other official (with the possible exception of Sen. J. William Fulbright) for five years most implacably attacked the Johnson Administration over the war was the Senate Democratic leader, Mike Mansfield of Montana. It is this same Mansfield who has now brought the Diem thing into the open.

"I have always felt," he says, "that our troubles began with the assassination of Diem, who was basically a good man." Diem's murder, Mansfield adds, led to a series of coups and resultant chaos which forced the entry of the United States more fully into the war.

Another witness, Rep. Paul McCloskey, a California Republican who is so antiwar that he is preparing to enter the GOP primaries against President Nixon next year, asserts that he is already in possession of Pentagon documents that make it unmistakable that the United States "encouraged and authorized" the liquidation of Diem.

There is nothing new in all this to those few in Washington who were really close to events in 1963; all knew that some in the State Department, notably Roger Hilsman, were bitterly anti-Diem and that the non-

political military were bitterly opposed to ousting him.

The point was that though Diem was far from perfect, all the same he was the only politician with a demonstrated capacity to keep South Vietnam together to the degree that it could put up some kind of a fight against the North Vietnamese invaders.

Ever since his murder, the situation in South Vietnam has been so weak politically as to add immeasurably to the burden of the United States, which had after all accepted a commitment to help defend the country and could hardly forget it because the political leadership, post-Diem, was poor, indeed.

To this columnist's direct knowledge at the time, the then vice-president Lyndon B. Johnson was appalled at the Diem assassination but felt that his obligation of loyalty to President Kennedy forbade him to speak up.

I always believed, too, that President Kennedy himself had grave reservations about it in the afterglow, though I cannot claim he ever told me in so many words.

At all events—and speaking of documentary evidence—one of Mr. Johnson's earliest acts upon assuming the presidency was to order Hilsman's dismissal. Whereupon, Hilsman went off to write a book saying, in substance, that he had voluntarily left the State Department because his conscience could not bear the war policy any more.

First, however, he had come to this correspondent to beg his intercession with the Johnson administration that he (Hilsman) be kept on in the department.

Whatever happens to the man who gave out the top-secret material of The Times in violation of the Espionage Act, and regardless of the ultimate decision of the courts as to whether further publication is to be halted as damaging to military security, two points are and will remain obvious.

One is that many copies are floating about and will at length come to light. The other is that men having or having had high office—President Nixon and President Johnson—are substantially helpless before the onslaughts of the peace-at-any-price people because they are unwilling to act irresponsibly in retort to anonymous antiwar Pentagon "analysts" who are troubled by no such scruples.

Both Mr. Johnson and Mr. Nixon have "documents," too, that could smash the efforts of the "analysis" to drive us out of Vietnam. Neither is prepared to go that far to defend himself.—(c.)

TWO APPROACHES TO SOUTH VIETNAMESE OIL INVESTMENTS

HON. JAMES ABOUREZK

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1971

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. Speaker, the question of American involvement in South Vietnamese offshore oil deposits is inextricably intertwined with the larger matter of American foreign and military policy toward all of Indochina. Given the valuable tool of hindsight that we now have, it is clear that the history of U.S. intervention in Southeast Asia was based on the deliberate failure of the executive branch of Government to provide the citizens and Congress of this country with sufficient information regarding our aims, plans, and entanglements in that

part of the world. As Members of Congress, I believe that we must never allow this to happen again.

Toward that end, I have spoken out several times over the last 4 months asking this body to undertake an investigation into the matter of potential American involvement in oil deposits off the coast of South Vietnam. I have not done this because I am anti-oil. Rather, I have done it because it is my firm conviction that the American people deserve and must be given all the relevant information pertaining to current or potential U.S. involvement in Indochina. Given this information, then, the American people will be in a position to determine the extent to which they want their Government, or their military or their corporations involved in the affairs of Southeast Asia. Without this information, we are merely groping in the dark.

Two alternative approaches to the possibility of massive investments by U.S. companies in South Vietnamese offshore oil have been suggested recently and I would like to take this opportunity to have them placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The first, by Dr. Michael Tanzer of New York, is a suggestion that an amendment be made to the Foreign Assistance Act. Such an amendment would prohibit U.S. assistance to any country using outside capital to explore for oil while American troops were involved in military operations there. It is my understanding that my distinguished colleague, Mr. BINGHAM of New York, intends to offer a similar amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act in the very near future.

On the other hand, another possible approach was suggested editorially on the prestigious *Oil and Gas Journal* on June 28, 1971. While I do not agree with some of the statements the editor makes, I believe that his major point—that the U.S. oil industry should exercise self-restraint in regard to Vietnamese investments as long as American troops are present there—is most laudable. The fact that the industry press is now proposing that American oil companies refrain from investing in Vietnamese oil as long as the war goes on adds a new dimension to the entire question. I sincerely hope that the companies will heed this sound and courageous advice. The full text of these statements follow:

STATEMENT OF DR. MICHAEL TANZER

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee and guests, I am happy to be able to testify before you today on the subject of oil and the Indochina war, and to suggest an amendment to the foreign aid bill aimed at preventing possible future U.S. oil exploration offshore Indochina from getting us more deeply embroiled in that area.

My qualifications for discussing this problem are as follows: After receiving my Ph.D. in economics in 1962 from Harvard University, where I had taught economics and social sciences, I worked for two years as an economist for Esso Standard Eastern, Inc., the Asian-African affiliate of Standard Oil Company of New Jersey. Following that I worked for several years as a management consultant and wrote a book entitled *The Political Economy of International Oil and*

the Underdeveloped Countries (Beacon Press, 1969). For the last two years I have been head of my own consulting firm which specializes in oil and energy problems. I appear before you today solely as a citizen concerned that the United States withdraw from Indochina as quickly as possible.

In recent months there have been a spate of stories in the petroleum press and elsewhere about possible huge oilfields existing off the coast of Indochina. These stories have been accompanied by mounting speculation and controversy on the extent to which the possibility of such oil reserves may influence the course of the Vietnam War. In turn, the reports themselves partly were stimulated by the December 1, 1970 promulgation of a South Vietnamese law governing oil exploration, along with that government's expressed intention to lease offshore oil concessions in the near future, and the interest indicated in such concessions by a large number of major U.S. oil companies. (I have appended to my written statement two documents which give much useful background information on the development of this situation.)

The question may be raised as to why Congress should be concerned if private American oil companies may choose to undertake such exploration? In my view the reason for concern is that the entry of the oil companies could lead to a prolongation of the war by providing powerful long-run support for the Thieu-Ky government—a government whose continued existence is incompatible with a negotiated settlement to the war. Moreover, this danger exists now even if it ultimately turns out that Vietnam does not have any offshore oil.

Thus, much of the debate over oil and Indochina has centered around what I believe to be largely a false issue: namely, the estimates of how much oil exists there. On this question there is much speculation, rumors and even fascinating typographical errors, but little hard information publicly available (a situation, parenthetically, which requires Congressional investigation to rectify).

While there have been preliminary surveys along much of the Asian offshore areas, as every oil man knows the only sure way to know if oil exists is to drill for it. On the other hand, such preliminary work adds considerably to one's knowledge of the probabilities of finding oil, as well as the quantities and types which might exist. Here clearly the oil companies have information which they are not disclosing. In this connection it is worth noting that Standard Oil of New Jersey, which has expressed interest in bidding for South Vietnamese offshore oil concessions, last year made a reportedly significant oil find (details of which it refuses to divulge) in Malaysian waters bordering the South Vietnamese tracts.

Nevertheless, in assessing the situation it is important for political leaders and the public alike not to be detoured by the arcane mysteries of the geologists' seismological data and probability charts. For, assuming some inevitable degree of uncertainty at this point, the operational questions facing the big American oil companies are not only "Will we ultimately find oil down there?", but also "If there is a chance of oil being found down there, how do we insure that our competitors do not get it (be they other independent oil companies or foreign governments)?"

After all, the basic foundation of the incredible profits of the five huge American companies (Standards of New Jersey and California, Texaco, Mobil and Gulf), which along with Royal Dutch Shell and British Petroleum dominate the international oil industry, is their ownership of enormous quantities of low-cost crude oil all over the

world, particularly in the Middle East, North Africa and Venezuela. In conjunction with their farflung refining and marketing facilities, the Big Five's control of this crude oil allows them to sell it at prices far above cost. Their gravest danger is not that they will fail to obtain large quantities of oil in Indochina, but that others might obtain it and by throwing it on the market badly depress world oil prices as well as the Big Five's profits.

The dangers of Indochina oil for the Big Five are particularly great because the logical market for this oil would be Japan, the world's largest oil importer as well as the fastest growing one. Since Indochinese oil may well be of a low sulphur type, and definitely would have a geographical advantage for the Japanese market, it could easily back out billions of dollars worth of oil which the Big Five would otherwise ship to Japan annually, while creating unpleasant competitive ripples throughout the rest of the world.

To prevent this, the Big Five would need not only to obtain oil concessions in Indochina, but also to have these concessions secured by some form of continuing American military presence in the area, in order to keep in power the concession-granting government. Thus, if the Big Five get oil leases off the coast of Vietnam they will have a strong incentive to use their historically demonstrated ability to influence foreign policy, towards maintaining the U.S. presence in Vietnam indefinitely.

In order to forestall such a situation where powerful oil companies become enmeshed in the Vietnam War, it seems to me entirely appropriate for the foreign aid bill to be amended in the following fashion: to provide that no assistance shall be furnished under this Act to any country which uses outside capital to explore for oil, as long as United States armed forces are involved in military operations in such country.

Such an amendment would serve notice that foreign governments cannot hope to maintain their long-run tenure by back door American assistance via drawing in the powerful U.S. oil industry. By effectively barring all foreign oil exploration in war torn countries, it would not put U.S. oil companies at a competitive disadvantage; instead it would preserve the status quo as regards oil until peace can be restored.

Some have claimed that the Vietnamese oil situation is merely a tempest in a teapot, stirred up by emotional antiwar groups. The fact is, however, that the most glowing accounts of possible oil resources have come from the South Vietnamese government itself. More important, as I have stressed, is that how much if any oil ultimately is found offshore South Vietnam is not what will determine actions today or in the near future.

If, on the basis of data now available to them, the U.S. oil companies would independently decide not to explore offshore South Vietnam, then the proposed amendment will have been superfluous. If, on the other hand, the companies would have wanted to explore absent such an amendment, and no oil exists, they and the American taxpayer would be saved millions of dollars. The only possible harm to the companies under the amendment would occur in the case that they wanted to explore and large quantities of oil do exist. But, since in my view any possible economic gains to the companies would be vastly outweighed by the losses suffered by the American people from fighting to maintain the kind of government the oil companies would require, the amendment would still be beneficial.

In sum, then, this amendment can be viewed as a costless form of insurance. Since this committee and the American people

have had a long and bitter experience of little commitments growing into ever larger ones as regards Vietnam, the amendment would seem to be at minimum a prudent precaution.

LEASING NOW OFF SOUTH VIET NAM WOULD BE MAJOR BLUNDER

Salgon has committed a serious blunder in speeding up plans for leasing its offshore areas in the South China Sea for oil exploration. The South Viet Nam Economic Ministry has picked the worst time imaginable to decide to invite bids from oil companies by September and grant concessions before year-end.

The action can have only one result: Give support to absurd charges that the Southeast Asia war is being prolonged to preserve profits of U.S. oil companies.

Salgon is ignoring the political uproar already raised by some misguided Americans and quieted only recently on the Viet Nam leasing issue. Salgon also is disregarding the ticklish political position faced on this issue by the U.S. Government and American oil companies.

This is a moral issue charged with deep emotion. It involves a suspicion that American soldiers are being asked to risk their lives for a crass commercial cause.

The very thought of this possibility recently aroused Mothers For Peace to flood Congress with thousands of protest letters. Their fears that oil interests were moving into South Viet Nam and that the war might become an operation to protect "fabulous" oil deposits offshore were laid to rest, however. Oil people and political leaders, even some critics of oil, knew these charges were absolutely false, but they also knew the protesters were sincere and not of the stripe of many Washington protesters.

Oil was cleared of any Viet Nam involvement, and all charges were proven unfounded. But the Salgon decision to invite leasing revives this fiction and throws the oil industry right into the middle of a furious debate over U.S. disentanglement from the war.

The U.S. Government must exert all the pressure within its power to persuade Salgon to delay offshore leasing until the war is over or until U.S. forces have withdrawn.

American oil companies should avoid participating in the leasing. Their image at home will be tarnished by an inevitable public backlash. Demands already have been made that U.S. aid be denied other Southeast Asian countries using U.S. and other private capital to develop offshore oil during the war. Any U.S. company participating in the proposed leasing could hardly avoid some type of retaliation from the public or the politicians.

This doesn't mean South Viet Nam must keep its potential oil resources in deep freeze forever. That country will need oil for post-war reconstruction. It will need—and undoubtedly get—the help of international oil companies in developing any reserves found.

But there's no need to rush a lease sale. Any oil in the South China Sea will still be there a few months from now when all, or most all, U.S. troops have withdrawn. Now is just not the time to add an oil flap to the other U.S. problems in South Viet Nam.

DAR ESSAY WINNER, MIDLAND, TEX.

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1971

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, Miss Lynne Rucker of Midland, Tex., has become the

fourth member of her family to win first place in the Daughters of the American Revolution essay contest in Midland. This is a remarkable achievement and I wish to take note of it by placing her award-winning essay, entitled "The History of the Constitution," in the RECORD. We cannot do too much to preserve our heritage and strengthen our country. The essay follows:

THE HISTORY OF THE CONSTITUTION

(By Miss Lynne Rucker)

The Constitution is the complete law of our land. It made our nation complete and is called the "rugged constitution" because it is the oldest written constitution still in use.

Our country won its independence from Great Britain in the year 1781. For eight years after that, this country was governed under a constitution called the *Articles of Confederation*. But there were faults in the *Articles of Confederation* because they were in war. It hadn't worked well during the war, and it was hardly working at all now. In time some of the states became less friendly toward one another. Soon they began to quarrel seriously. There was danger that the states might break away and become small separate countries.

As early as 1776, Tom Paine called for a constitutional convention to draft a national constitution. This group of citizens began its meetings in May, 1787 at Independence Hall in Philadelphia. The main men of this convention were George Washington, James Madison, Benjamin Franklin, Gouverneur Morris, Alexander Hamilton, and John Dickinson. George Washington was the presiding officer and soon became the president of the United States. James Madison brought to the convention a plan of government which served as a model for the new government. He was called "the father of the constitution" because he made many speeches and tried to compromise between all the people. Benjamin Franklin was full of wisdom and common sense. Gouverneur Morris actually wrote the constitution. Alexander Hamilton argued for the constitution, which would create a strong federal government. John Dickinson came to offer legal advice.

For a while the delegates tried to patch up the *Articles of Confederation* and make them work. But they decided to make an entirely new plan of government in order to form "a more perfect union".

The danger of a failure to get all the states into one nation was very severe. The large states did the best arguing, while the little states shouted and screamed and threatened that if they could not have their way, they would go back home.

They did not break up the convention or give up trying to form the groundwork for our country. It is to the eternal glory of the constitutional convention that although all the members wanted their own way, they wanted still more to set up the best possible government for their country.

They argued all day long, and sometimes the arguing got so bad that the delegates were going to go home and forget all about it.

Under the *Articles of Confederation*, most of the power of government belonged to the states and few belonged to the national government. But under the Constitution, the powers are more equally divided between state government and the national government. This system gave our country a *federal* government.

The Constitution called for a *separation of powers*. This meant that the national government had three distinct branches each with its own separate powers and duties. Each branch helped to keep the other two from doing unwise or unjust things. This arrangement was called a "system of checks and balances" because each branch helps to check and balance the powers of the other two branches. The three branches are (I) the

legislative branch, which makes the laws; (II) the executive branch, which carries out the laws; and (III) the judicial branch, which tries cases in court and explains the meaning of the laws.

Critics said they had no bill of rights, that the president had too much authority, congress had too much power also, and that the national government had too much control. There were two groups fighting over this. Those in favor of the constitution as it was written were known as Federalists. The ones against them were anti-federalists.

Finally, after two months of discussion, the delegates worked out a compromise, that is, an agreement in which both sides gave up something. Roger Sherman from Connecticut proposed the compromise that ended the arguments of equal representation. His plan said to have equal representation in one house of Congress. This pleased the smaller states, which thus kept their equality with the larger states in one house of Congress.

The Convention agreed that if nine states approved the constitution, the government could be organized.

Delaware was the first state to ratify the constitution on December 7, 1787.

In 1790, people had joined together and on February 4th, George Washington was unanimously named President of the United States. On March 4th, the first congress met in New York City.

There has never been a reason to have a second Constitutional Convention because "our rugged constitution" has come down through the years with sovereignty of the people, a supreme national government, respect for the states, a division of power by having three equal branches of government and by a majority rule.

In present time, our constitution holds strong and the Preamble written so many years ago still holds truth for our country:

PREAMBLE

"We, The People of The United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

U.S. PRISONERS OF WAR

HON. JAMES F. HASTINGS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1971

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, on March 26, 1964, an American adviser, Capt. Floyd J. Thompson, was captured in South Vietnam and thus became the first American prisoner of war.

Today, 7 years and 108 days later, he is still being held captive by Hanoi, along with an estimated 400 other Americans. In addition, approximately 900 more are missing in action. Their fate is uncertain because Hanoi refuses to give out any information, coldly unkindful of the added pain this imposes on their families back home.

In fact, since the beginning, Hanoi has shown a callous disregard for basic concepts of decency. In violation of the 1949 Geneva Convention, Hanoi has denied the International Red Cross permission to inspect prison camps. It has refused to release those who are sick and wounded and it has denied the prisoners a regular exchange of mail.

All this has placed an almost intolerable burden on their wives, their children, their families and their friends, who must wait and wonder.

We, in the Congress, must never lessen our efforts to focus world attention on the plight of our prisoners and what it means to their families.

Many groups, including the Veterans of Foreign Wars, in a petition-signing campaign directed by Mrs. Alexander Cottone, of Olean, N.Y., in my district, have taken part in nationwide drives to draw world attention to our POW's and let Hanoi know that we care.

Nothing short of their release and return home to their loved ones can suffice. We must never let Hanoi forget that we have not forgotten.

INSTANT EXPERTS

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1971

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, under date of July 8 the Washington Daily News carried an article by one of its syndicated writers, Mr. Ray Cromley, entitled, "Instant Experts."

I commend Mr. Cromley's article to the reading of my colleagues and I do so with the full knowledge that I recognize Ray Cromley as a man eminently qualified to write on this subject. Mr. Cromley was in Japan at the outbreak of the war as the representative of one of the American newspapers and, along with other correspondents, was immediately jailed. He had been in Japan for many years prior to this; his wife was a Japanese medical doctor as were most of the members of her family. He speaks and writes Japanese and is knowledgeable in all facets of the Oriental thinking and living.

I had the privilege of knowing him at the conclusion of World War II before his return to Asia at the request of General MacArthur, when he spent a good deal of time in China. Ray Cromley knows the Oriental mind. Therefore, I believe that what he tells us about the Orientals is of the utmost importance.

The article follows:

INSTANT EXPERTS

(By Ray Cromley)

A careful reading of the Pentagon Vietnam documents discloses the haphazard willingness with which men in high positions leaped to mastermind U.S. strategy in a type of war whose techniques they did not begin to understand—and how willing they were to predict what an enemy whose philosophy they had not explored would do or not do under various types of pressure.

Yet some of these recommendations would result in the deaths of many thousands of Americans and Asians, and vitally affect the future of this country and a number of our close allies.

The introduction of U.S. conventional divisions in a guerrilla war, the policy of retaliation against Hanoi to cause Ho Chi Minh's men to cease specific acts in the

South, the destruction of North Vietnamese industry as a psychological deterrent, the institution of search and destroy missions as a means of sapping the enemy's overall fighting ability, the principal of graduated escalation as a war of nerves. All these operations were introduced as theories and adopted with little attempt (except of the most cursory sort) to learn whether there was any evidence in fact that these actions would destroy Hanoi's military-political strength or its will to win.

It was as the Mao Tse-tung, Ho Chi Minh and General Giap and their associates had not written or spoken millions of words on their policies and their tactics and had not demonstrated in practice over the past 20 to 40 years in one country or another what had proved ineffective (or effective) against their particular type of warfare.

In too many cases, therefore, the theories turned out to be tragically wrong or ineffective.

Take some of the propositions mentioned above—all pushed by senior men:

The theory that if Hanoi became convinced by a sufficient buildup of U.S. forces and by stronger and stronger U.S. actions that Washington was determined, Ho's government might stop sending troops to South Vietnam. A principal factor here was to be air attacks. But no one bothered to find out factually whether the air attacks did in fact lower morale and cause divisiveness in North Vietnam.

The theory that if Hanoi saw its small industry about to be destroyed, Ho's associates would be willing to negotiate or cut back on their operations in the South. No one looked to history to determine whether Ho or any other Asian Communist leader had ever been deterred by the threatened destruction of anything.

The theory of reprisals as an effective means of stopping assassinations and attacks on U.S. bases in the South. But no one presented factual evidence to show that reprisals had worked in the past against Asian Communists. There was evidence that they would not.

Judgment of how Hanoi's leaders would react was not based on studies into their previous actions or on the previous actions of Communist leaders in Peiping or other Asian countries. In fact, intelligence on Hanoi and its operations was next to non-existent and no one bothered to do what was necessary to improve that situation.

THE LATE SENATOR TOM MARTIN

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1971

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to have served several years in the House with the late and lamented Thomas E. Martin of Iowa. After eight terms in this body he was elected to the Senate and voluntarily retired after one term there.

While serving in the House Tom was quite active and I recall that he was influential and effective. An expert in the field of taxation and trade, his views on matters relating to those subjects were eagerly sought by his colleagues. In addition, he was, of course, well informed on all subjects.

Tom Martin was affable and well

liked. He had many friends in both parties. He was a strong supporter of an adequate national defense. A real patriot, he was devoted to our form of government and to its preservation. The significant contribution he made to sound legislation and to the cause of good government will be long remembered and appreciated.

ADDRESS OF ASTRONAUT FRANK BORMAN

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1971

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, on July 4 Frank Borman, the distinguished astronaut, gave the address at the dinner for the Medal of Honor winners at Daytona Beach, Fla., and his remarks have such import for our time that I want all the Members of the House to have an opportunity to read them.

Frank Borman is not a man who calls a spade a garden implement. He calls things as he sees them. The important message for all of us in his address is that our beliefs concerning ourselves and our country are what is important.

These words might have been delivered by a number of men. But coming from a man of action such as Frank Borman, they have a particular significance. I urge all the Members of the House to read them.

ADDRESS OF ASTRONAUT FRANK BORMAN, DAYTONA BEACH, JULY 4, 1971

I'm certain that all of us in this hall feel the same sense of admiration and gratitude that I do in the presence of our honored guests this evening. These are men who have not only served their country, but who, by their actions, earned our Nation's most honored decoration. Our society has recognized their gallantry in trying and extremely dangerous situations. They are obviously men of action, but they are also men of strong beliefs. For, as John Walthour has said, "The most important part of any man's life is what that man believes. What he does and what he becomes grow from the roots of what he believes."

This is a truth which our age has attempted to defy. Contemporary voices are telling us constantly that it is the things we do that count. The importance of action is enlarged and the importance of belief is minimized. Contemporary minds are forgetting that behind every man's action—causing that action, even compelling it—lie those things that a man believes.

We celebrate our Independence Day today because of the actions (almost 200 years ago) of a remarkable group of men; but even more important than the Declaration of Independence were the beliefs upon which it was based, ideas that have guided the development of this Nation for the better part of two centuries.

Foremost among the beliefs of our Founding Fathers was the proposition that the light of Liberty must never be extinguished. The preservation of a free society was, and has been, the number one priority of our people through the years. In the past decade, however, a strange malaise has over-

taken us. The symptoms are readily apparent; from the "hard rock drug culture" to the passive politician who blandly but incessantly calls for a reordering of our national priorities, neglecting all the while our number one mission of insuring our freedom.

This American illness has been recognized abroad, as well as domestically. Raymond Aron, writing in *Le Figaro*, put it very clearly:

"The U.S. of 1971 is profoundly different from the U.S. of 1961: The first world power 10 years ago because of its conventional and nuclear arms, its technical preeminence, and its combination of liberty and determination, it has now lost its military superiority, and its moral unity. Indifferent to the rise of the Soviet Union, the U.S. Senate is waging a guerilla war against the Executive aimed at reducing the President's freedom of action and compelling him to liquidate without delay the war in Vietnam and other commitments abroad. It is not yet a return to isolationism, but without any doubt a rejection of the imperial burden. Some may deplore this and others welcome it, but the fact remains: the American Era is ending."

I can understand how a foreign observer could interpret the widely publicized actions of some American citizens as foretelling the end of the "America Era".

Consider:

(1) The adulation of a one-time whiz kid who leaked stolen TOP SECRET papers to the press.

(2) The incredible—almost unbalanced—performance of a United States Senator reading these same presumably still SECRET papers between bursts of sobbing.

(3) The sorry discipline of an Army which permits as many as 80% of its members to experiment with drugs in Vietnam and introduces the new word, "fragging," to our vocabulary.

(4) The arrogant action of the men, women, and children who attempt to shut down the Government and lead today's Peace Crusade and, in the process, make it impossible for serious councils to be heard in the halls of government.

Today, on this Independence Day, July 4, 1971, it is time to dispel the cynicism which such actions have spread throughout our land. It is time that we relegate to the back pages the incessant remedies of our problems and our acknowledged shortcomings.

Today, as we inaugurate the celebration of our bicentennial, I propose that we focus our attention on the beliefs that led to the creation of this great nation and on the beliefs of those who have sustained and defended it for the past 200 years.

Without pausing in the pursuit of worthwhile but ancillary goals we must reassert, publicly and privately, the national priority that out-paces all others—the preservation of a Free Society.

We must re-acknowledge that the light of liberty the world over is dependent on a strong and united America. And we must make certain that our actions match this proposition.

Finally, we must remind ourselves that this people, this society, this country is an ongoing organization. The actions of today cannot be made in the interest of expediency for the here-and-now but in the manner of a statesman considering the future.

In the order of civilization, ours is a young country and we can point to a glorious beginning. But the first two hundred years is only the beginning.

Before Sir Francis Drake set out on his most difficult and prolonged voyage into the unknown he gathered his crew around the mast to invoke divine guidance. His prayer is particularly appropos to America today!

"Oh Lord, when Thou giveth Thy servants

to endeavor any great matter, grant us also to know that it is not the beginning but the continuing of the same until it be thoroughly finished which yieldeth the True Glory."

LEGISLATION TO PROTECT WILD HORSES AND BURROS

HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1971

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, this Wednesday, July 14, 1971, the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will continue its consideration of legislation designed to protect wild horses and burros. At this time I would like to share with my colleagues an article, brought to my attention by Senator MARK HATFIELD of Oregon, that appeared in the July 2, 1971, issue of the *Portland Oregonian* further illustrating the need for stronger legislation to protect these animals. The article follows:

FBI TO INVESTIGATE ALLEGED ILLEGAL WILD MUSTANG HUNT IN SOUTHERN OREGON

(By Chris Carlson)

WASHINGTON.—The FBI has been called in by the Department of Justice to investigate charges that an illegal wild mustang roundup took place on public land near Adel, Ore., 30 miles east of Lakeview, last May 19th.

Groups seeking passage of stronger protective measures in Congress for wild horses and wild burros are using the alleged incident as further ammunition in their drive for stiffer legislation.

After learning of the incident, protectionists here notified the Bureau of Land Management that the illegal round-up had taken place. Under Public Law 86-234, passed in 1959, it is illegal to hunt wild mustangs on the public lands, particularly with the use of aircraft.

Attention was drawn to the incident when a light plane, used in the round-up, crashed, killing James Benson of Klamath Falls, who was chief pilot for Southern Oregon Aviation, and George Anderson of Paisley. The horses from the round-up were used in the All-Indian Rodeo at Klamath Falls on Memorial Day.

George Lea, spokesman for the BLM here, acknowledged the incident. "It's true, there was an illegal round-up," he said. He pinpointed the location near Beattie's Butte, east of Adel, and north of the Winnemucca-to-the-Sea highway.

FBI NOTIFIED

Lea said that the BLM, after conducting a preliminary investigation of its own, turned the case over to the Department of Interior's solicitor in Portland, John Bishop, who in turn reportedly notified the Justice Department. Lea said the Justice Department called in the FBI last Friday to begin the investigation.

Protectionists here, however, are not satisfied. A spokesman for the wild horse protection group said they were promised they would get quick prosecution, but that "nothing has happened." Lea replied that BLM had fulfilled its responsibility and that it was now up to the FBI.

The protection group charged that there was also a helicopter involved in the illegal round-up and that the round-up party was

"hunting with shotguns from the helicopter."

Lea said he could see why the protectionists would use this incident as ammunition for tougher legislation.

"The old law is ineffective because it says a person cannot chase and capture wild horses on public land, but it does not prohibit the capturing of branded stock using aircraft, if an owner thinks his branded stock is running with a wild herd," said Lea.

He pointed out that the ambiguity created problems, since stock owners do have the legal right to round up their own stock, even on public land, if they suspect branded stock is mixed with wild stock. "They can be both within the law and breaking it," he said.

"There is no doubt that we need better legislation to protect the wild horses," he added.

Better legislation appears to be on the way. Sen. Henry M. Jackson, D-Wash., chairman of the Interior Committee, has introduced tougher legislation providing more protection for wild horses and wild burros on the public range. His bill was reported favorably to the Senate by the Interior Committee on June 25, and favorable action is expected. Similar measures are being considered in the House. Jackson's bill has 34 co-sponsors, including Sens. Mark Hatfield, R-Ore., and Frank Church, D-Idaho.

A Jackson aide said the proposed law is tougher in several respects than the 1959 law. It states that the "sense of Congress" is to protect wild horses and wild burros as "free roamers" on ALL public lands. It stipulates that branded stock should be kept on private lands, so as not to mingle with wild stock on public lands.

However, the new bill does retain the owner's right to round-up stock on public land if he suspects any branded stock is mixed with the wild roamers. An owner must prove immediate ownership, and release unbranded stock, however, the spokesman said.

Both civil and criminal penalties are provided, which include fines up to \$2,000 and a prison term, or both, for "anyone who willfully removes wild roamers from the public domain," or anyone who tames a wild roamer, or causes the death of a wild roamer.

Any designated employee of the Department of Interior is also empowered to arrest without warrant anyone caught violating the law, the spokesman reported.

Prospects for the legislation being passed seem particularly good, judging both from the number of bills introduced in the House, and the lobbying campaign being waged by the nation's schoolchildren, including one group from Portland.

Incidents such as the one east of Adel provide the protectionists with their most effective ammunition.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1971

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 1,600 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

BLACK CITIZENS DENIED THE VOTE IN MISSISSIPPI COUNTIES

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1971

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, during this administration, we have seen a continuous assault on personal liberties and the constitutional rights accorded individuals. Recently, I have had the sad duty to investigate and discover the denial of one of the most basic rights, the right of U.S. citizens to vote. Mr. Milton Viorst, in an article which appeared in the Washington Post, briefly outlines the situation:

MISSISSIPPI AND THE BLACK VOTERS

While Atty. Gen. John N. Mitchell leans on a lamppost smoking his pipe, white politicians in Mississippi have been at work in recent months systematically violating federal law to disenfranchise the state's black voters.

Using a little violence and a lot of guile, they may well succeed in nullifying much of the arduous effort of the last five years to register Mississippi blacks to vote.

In the last election, an estimated 272,000 blacks were qualified to go to the polls, almost a third of the state's electorate and a major political factor. But by November, it's possible that this figure will be slashed by a hefty fraction—and black political power will again be in eclipse.

Oddly, the country has paid the matter small attention. The nation's press seems to have lost interest in the voting-rights struggle, as have many of the old civil rights lawyers.

But despite the absence of publicity, the Justice Department has been amply notified of what's been going on, particularly of the open flouting of the Voting Rights Act of 1956, which it has explicit obligations to enforce.

To be sure, Mississippi's white politicians are craftier than they were in the days of police dogs, cattle prods and night-riders—though antiblack violence remains very much a part of Mississippi life. Now their efforts are harder to beat.

Their current strategy is not focused at the state level, where a law can be struck down by a court at a single blow. For this campaign, they've decentralized, concentrating their work in Mississippi's 82 counties.

To stop them means the need for as many as 82 separate investigations and 82 sets of lawsuits. Obviously, none of the independent civil rights organizations—like the NAACP Inc. Fund and the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights—has the resources for such a battle.

Only the government has the resources—in Justice Department lawyers, FBI investigators, federal registrars. So when the government chooses to sit idly by, Mississippi's anti-black politicians get virtually a free ride.

What they are doing in some counties is redistricting, ostensibly to correct violations of the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote doctrine. But it is hardly coincidence that much of this redistricting gerrymanders blacks right out of power.

In other counties, they are instituting at-large, winner-take-all elections, despite a recent Supreme Court ruling of illegality. Where blacks are a minority, these elections assure all-white representation in the elected councils and offices.

But perhaps the cleverest disenfranchisement ploy is the requirement established in at least 26 counties—some say as many as 41, but no one is sure of the number—that all

voters must re-register to be eligible to vote in the fall.

It's based on an 1892 Mississippi statute which authorizes re-registration when county enrollment books are in a "state of confusion." Suddenly, after 79 years of disuse, the statute is being applied all over the state.

Under the Voting Rights Act, the Justice Department has the power to stop this re-registration requirement, if it discerns a discriminatory intent. So far, it has not.

It has an even clearer obligation to stop it in those counties where, prior to the act, discrimination was so blatant that federal registrars had to be sent in to enroll voters.

But when the Voting Rights Act came up for re-enactment last year, the Justice Department fought—in vain—to eliminate not only this obligation, but the entire federal registrar system.

Leading that fight in the department's behalf was a career lawyer named David L. Norman. It is interesting that Norman was recently promoted to acting assistant attorney general in charge of the Civil Rights Division. In that capacity, he is now presiding over the department's languor in Mississippi.

Black leaders in the state—helped by many Northern college students—have struggled manfully to get their people re-registered, but the odds against them have been overwhelming. Last Friday, re-registration in Mississippi closed.

But the attorney general still could, if he chose, bring suits, or even criminal actions, to overcome the statewide fraud of redistricting, at-large elections and re-registration.

He is, however, on the threshold of another political campaign—and he obviously wants federal law used, not to enforce civil rights, but to bolster the Southern strategy.

ANOTHER LOOK AT THE NEWS

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1971

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, the June 28 issue of the Daily Signal of Huntington Park, Calif., contained an editorial commenting on a particularly "brain-numbing" aspect of the controversy over the Pentagon papers. At this point in the RECORD I would like to commend the column by the editor of the Daily Signal, Tom Hageman, to the attention of my colleagues in the House:

ANOTHER LOOK AT THE NEWS

(By Tom Hageman)

The big debate goes on over the publication of the Pentagon papers—the story of the Vietnamese war and how it grew. The average American is still meeting himself as he goes around in circles trying to decide just what can be labeled "secret" in a democracy and whether truth is all that important.

It was stated here before that publication of the Vietnam war record might be justified because of its (the war's) terrible influence on the morals of government and the millions of young people born and raised in its shadow.

To support the publication of supposedly classified material—even though such publication might head off another, similar national tragedy—comes dangerously close to taking the position that the end justifies the means.

Well, in actual fact we all at times support the idea of the end justifying the means. But to live with one's self while making that kind of decision it is necessary that you remain consistent.

Along that line, the Republican National Committee has blown the whistle on the New York Times and the Washington Post—both have published classified Vietnam documents.

In 1962, the GOP people recall, the N.Y. Times roasted authors Stewart Alsop and Charles Bartlett for a magazine article giving the inside of what went on at a National Security Council meeting during the Cuban missile crisis.

Although Alsop and Bartlett refrained from quoting any document or secret report, the N.Y. Times at that time asked rhetorically:

"How can advisers to the President be expected to give advice freely and easily and at all times honestly and with complete integrity if they have to worry about what their arguments will look like in print a few weeks later?"

And the GOP further recalls, in 1963 when State Department security officer Otto Otepka furnished a Senate subcommittee with two classified documents to prove that certain of his superiors had lied under oath the Washington Post was outraged.

The Post said what Otepka did was "unlawful" and "unconscionable."

"He gave classified information to someone not authorized to receive it . . . he had no authority to give it . . ." the Post said. "If any underling in the State Department were free at his own discretion to disclose confidential cables or if any agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation could leak the contents of secret files whenever he felt like it, the Executive branch of the Government would have no security at all."

It would seem the Washington Post and the N.Y. Times are finding themselves going round and round even as you and I.

STRIP MINING MUST BE ABOLISHED

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1971

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, here follows an article which appeared in the July 1971 issue of Not Man Apart magazine which is published by "Friends of the Earth":

STRIP MINING: A CLEAR AND PRESENT DANGER

(By Congressman KEN HECHLER)

From the tribal lands of the Hopi and Navajo to the rugged hills of Appalachia, giant gouging machines are ruthlessly ravaging the land to get at valuable seams of coal close to the surface. When a super-colossus like the eastern Ohio earth-mover called "Big Muskie" picks 325 tons at one gulp, a jumble of topsoil, rocks, small trees, flora, fauna and wildlife habitat are chewed up and spewed out with awesome results. The scalping and decapitation gives the land the look of the surface of the moon. Spring rains on the exposed rocks produce sulfuric acid run-off, deadly to aquatic life. Streams fill with sediment and overflow their banks. The loosened land cover is highly vulnerable to landslides. Even the water table is shaken by the blasting.

Strip mining is escalating by the hour, in the 25 states where 128 billion tons of strip-pable coal exist. Yet well over five times that amount is recoverable by underground methods, and even the strippable coal which is not very close surface could be recovered by deep mining methods. The difference in technique is simple: deep mining removes the coal from the earth; strip mining removes the earth from the coal. Ten years ago, 29 percent of the nation's coal came from strip min-

ing; a few months ago, the figure was 35 percent, but it is now rapidly bumping 40 percent and still rising.

ENVIRONMENTAL COSTS

Coal operators joyfully proclaim that strip mining is cheaper. This is utter nonsense. No coal operator has to pay a cent in environmental costs. If the strip miners had to compute the damage they do to the soil, forests, hillsides, and streams, then it would turn out to be a very expensive way to extract coal from the land. Of course, there is a more immediate and compelling reason why strip mining is increasing at such a rapid rate: the strippers know that an outraged public will sooner or later clamp down and put a stop to this assault on the environment, so they are making a killing while they can get away with it.

Some feeble efforts have been made at the state level to control strip mining through requiring varying degrees of reclamation. The uneven standards from state to state have promoted economic competition, as well as extreme pressure by those interests who bend enforcement agencies to weaken further the laws which are already riddled with loopholes.

WEAK ADMINISTRATION BILL

President Nixon sent up to Congress in February, a federal strip mine control bill which some of his own environmental experts are ashamed of. The Nixon bill allows two years for the states to come up with state recommendations on how they propose to control strip mining, following which at some vague and indefinite future time the Secretary of the Interior may set or impose federal standards—with the primary responsibility left to the states for enforcement. This approach simply invites the same type of artful dodging and delay which characterized attempts to control air and water pollution in the 1960's. Furthermore, the two-year period of grace allowed for states to submit their plans is tantamount to a license for the strip-miners to step up their ruthless ravaging for two undisturbed years.

On February 18, 1971, I introduced H. R. 4556, to ban all strip mining of coal six months after the enactment of the bill, and to prohibit any underground mining of coal in national forest and wilderness areas. Instead of placing enforcement in the Department of the Interior, whose activities include stimulating a constantly higher production of minerals, my bill is enforced by the Environmental Protection Agency, which now handles air and water pollution control and is better equipped as a regulatory agency. The response to my bill was immediate and heartening. Over 30 Members of the House of Representatives were the initial co-sponsors, and this number has since swelled to 85 Congressmen from 26 different states. Four Senators—Nelson of Wisconsin, McGovern of South Dakota, Case of New Jersey and Kennedy of Massachusetts—are also co-sponsors. A flood of popular support in letters, telegrams and phone calls has welled up from all over the nation.

The prospects for passage of my bill depend squarely on the amount and sustained volume of public support we can muster. Hearings on the Administration bill will probably be held by the Senate and House Interior Committees late in the summer, at which time it will be possible to offer testimony on my bill. Yet considerably more grassroots work is needed to fashion a majority to vote for a bill which has already stirred up massive opposition from coal, oil and electricity interests.

OPPOSITION IS WELL-ORGANIZED

Carl Bagge, President of the National Coal Association, has led the charge against H.R. 4556, on the grounds it would cause an immediate "energy crisis" by depriving the nation of over one-third of its coal. He overlooks the 750 billion tons of coal recoverable by underground mining. Whenever efforts

are made to protect the environment, there are those who rush forward to charge that such protection will create an "energy crisis," as though we are doomed to be prisoners of onrushing technology instead of masters of, our own destiny. Obviously, energy development and environmental quality must go hand in hand, and it's about time we decide once and for all that they are not mutually exclusive or incompatible.

A second argument levelled by the lobbyists against H.R. 4456 is that it will throw thousands of people out of work. Even the Director of the Bureau of Mines swallowed this argument by publicly announcing that 20,000 people would lose their jobs immediately if strip mining were abolished. Those now concerned about jobs gave little attention to the 300,000 miners displaced when the underground coal mines were mechanized in the 1950's. Many of the jobs in strip mining are highly skilled occupations, easily transferable to road construction or housing. But strip mining is like taking seven or eight stiff drinks: you are riding high as long as the coal lasts, but the hangover comes when the coal is gone, the land is gone and the jobs are gone and the bitter truth of the morning after leaves barren landscape and a month full of ashes. The tourist and recreation potential of a stripped area is nil; in fact, far more jobs are provided for the future through protection of the environment. Rep. John Seiberling (D. Ohio), a strong supporter of my bill, has added several amendments to give priority in job placement, as well as 52-week cash payments and relocation allowances to those workers displaced by the abolition of strip mining.

RECLAMATION HASN'T WORKED

The third argument advanced is that "reclamation" can make strip-mined land better than it was before it was disturbed. Bethlehem Steel Corporation ran some multi-color ads in *Time* and *Newsweek* magazines, depicting a blue fishing lake in Kentucky where a strip mine once existed. A skeptical *Baltimore Sun* reporter wrote: "If you circle the lake carefully, you can find a narrow angle from which, when the light is right, the proper filters are used, and the background forest is at season's peak, it all looks like a cameo from a Sierra Club publication. But don't look left or right. What you see there is characteristic of all strip mines: coal slides into the water, scars in the mountainside . . . gritty dust blowing from the irreparable gash in the slope opposite." The fact is if enough money is poured into a "showcase model" which photographs well in color, it is possible to reclaim stripped land, but it is uneconomic to pour that kind of money to "reclaim" all stripped land.

In West Virginia, the Surface Mine Association found a happy solution. They changed their name to the "West Virginia Surface Mine and Reclamation Association," announced they were raising \$180,000 to advertise the beauties of "reclamation" and immediately launched a media saturation campaign.

In the face of this type of pressure lobbying, those who want to protect the environment must stand up and be counted. Strip mining is a clear and present danger. The bill to abolish strip mining of coal can succeed only if a genuine grass roots movement, similar to the campaign against the SST, is launched.

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1971

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, word of the death of the Honorable Thomas E.

Martin came as sad news to all his friends. Although I served with Tom only during the 83d Congress, I well remember and value our association. After he went to the Senate our paths crossed less frequently, but we remained friends and I continued to admire and respect his ability and integrity. Tom was a gentleman and a wise and responsible legislator dedicated to the principles of our country and to the service of his State. His loss is shared by all who had the privilege of knowing him. My heartfelt sympathy goes to Mrs. Martin in her bereavement.

FIREARMS OWNERSHIP AND CRIME RATES

HON. BEN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1971

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, for the information of my colleagues, I am hereby inserting a copy of an article which recently came to my attention.

Entitled "Firearms Ownership and Crime Rates," this report concludes on the basis of several scientific studies that the number of serious crimes cannot be related to the number of people possessing firearms.

Recalling the emotionalism surrounding the debate of a few years ago, I am hopeful that today this article may be read in this scientific light in which it was created.

The article follows:

FIREARMS OWNERSHIP AND CRIME RATES

(By Alan S. Krug)

It is estimated that there are some 200 million firearms in this nation, owned by 40 or 50 million Americans. There is at least one firearm in more than half the homes in the U.S., and last year more than 20 million Americans took part in the various shooting sports.

Claims that this widespread availability of firearms is a contributing cause to rapidly rising crime in the nation have been widely circulated by proponents of "anti-gun" legislation.

Yet there is no reliable evidence to support such a contention. To date, not a single scientific study has shown a causal relationship between firearms and crime.

This alleged relationship has even been written into proposed federal legislation. The current version of the Dodd Bill, Amendment 90, contains the following statements as part of its preamble:

"The Congress hereby finds and declares—

"That the ease with which any person can acquire firearms . . . is a significant factor in the prevalence of lawlessness and violent crime in the United States;

"That there is a causal relationship between the easy availability of firearms and juvenile and youthful criminal behavior."

This study shows that there is no statistical support for these claims. The statistics even demonstrate the opposite—that crime rates tend to be lower where the percentage of gun ownership is higher. These findings confirm other scientific studies which have concluded that firearms are not a cause of crime, but merely one of many incidental factors.

Perhaps the most detailed study of homicide accomplished to date is that of Professor Marvin E. Wolfgang, Graduate Chairman of the Department of Sociology

at the University of Pennsylvania. Dr. Wolfgang's study dealt with the 588 criminal homicides which occurred in the city of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, between January 1, 1948 and December 31, 1952.

One segment of the work dealt with the weapons used in criminal homicide. The results of this study led Dr. Wolfgang to conclude:

"It is probably safe to contend that many homicides occur only because there is sufficient motivation or provocation, and that the type of method used to kill is merely an accident of availability: that a gun is used because it is in the offender's possession at the time of the incitement, but that if it were not present, he would use a knife to stab, or fists to beat his victim to death . . .

"Several students of homicide have tried to show that the high number of, or easy access to, firearms in this country is causally related to our relatively high homicide rate. Such a conclusion cannot be drawn from the Philadelphia data. Material subsequently reported in the present study regarding the place where homicide occurred, relationship between victim and offender, motives and other variables, suggest that many situations, events and personalities that converge in a particular way and that result in homicide do not depend primarily upon the presence or absence of firearms . . .

"More than the availability of a shooting weapon is involved in homicide . . . The type of weapon used appears to be, in part, the culmination of assault intentions or events and is only superficially related to causality . . . It is the contention of this observer that few homicides due to shooting could be avoided merely if a firearm were not immediately present, and that the offender would select some other weapon to achieve the same destructive goal . . ."

Another very comprehensive study of criminal homicide, which has just been published, deals with the 640 murders which occurred in the State of California in 1960. This study was done in the California Department of Justice, Bureau of Criminal Statistics. The author, Crime Studies Analyst Romney P. Narloch, reached much the same conclusion as did Dr. Wolfgang in regard to the relationship between the availability of firearms and the commission of criminal homicide:

"One of the clear conclusions of this research is that the mere availability of weapons lethal enough to produce a human mortality bear no major relationship to the frequency with which this act is completed. In the home, at work, at play, in almost any environmental setting a multitude of objects exist providing means for inflicting illegal death. Though the true number of times criminal homicide was attempted during 1960 cannot be known, and in spite of improved medical services, it is undoubtedly much more reasonable to conclude that the low yearly incidence of unlawful slayings is largely the product of human inhibitions to kill."

If the availability of firearms were indeed a cause of crime, crime rates should rise and fall fairly consistently with rates of firearms ownership. States where a high proportion of the population possesses firearms would be expected to have higher crime rates than states where a lesser proportion of the population owned firearms. This proposition can be examined in the light of basic statistics available to all.

Because the major use of firearms is for hunting, the number of individuals who purchase hunting licenses in each state is a reliable guide to the extent of firearms ownership in those same states. The accompanying chart shows the rate of hunting license holders per 100,000 of population and rates of serious crime, or murder, aggravated assault and robbery for each of the fifty states in 1966. The first can be taken as a reasonable

index of firearms ownership, and as such can be used in a statistical analysis to determine the correlation, if any, between the extent of firearms ownership and crime rates. It does in fact constitute the best index available at the present time. In this way, it is possible to test the hypothesis "there is a causal relationship between the availability of firearms and crime rates."

With this report is a graph of the index of firearms ownership and serious crime data. The line of the graph represents the over-all relationship of the various points on the graph, and was fit by the "method of least squares." This "line of best fit," which slopes downward, shows a negative correlation between the index of firearms ownership and serious crime rate, by state. This means that, in general, states with a high proportion of population possessing firearms have lower serious crime rates than states with a lower proportion of the population possessing firearms.

This finding appears to refute the claim by the supporters of anti-firearms legislation that the availability of firearms is a major contributing factor to a high level of crime rates. Beyond that it lends strength to the argument that widespread ownership of firearms may actually lessen crime. Opponents of unduly restrictive firearms legislation often contend that criminals are reluctant to attempt to attack or rob persons whom they have cause to believe might be armed.

According to the *New York Times* of August 31, 1967, "robbers have had a field day in Belgians' homes" in the Congo since the Belgians' firearms were ordered confiscated by General Mobutu, the Congolese president. On December 28, 1967, the *Times* reported that the Davidson County grand jury at Nashville, Tennessee, had recommended that citizens arm against an outbreak of crime in that area. To protect themselves, the grand jury said, "citizens should have at least one gun in every home." Earlier in the year, the *Detroit News* reported (July 20, 1967) that Detroit grocery holdups showed "a sharp reduction" since a grocers' organization began conducting gun clinics. The *Royal Oak, Michigan, Tribune* (July 19, 1967) quoted Highland Park Police Chief William E. Stephens as crediting "gun-toting merchants" for the fact that no store in that city of 38,000 had been robbed in almost three months. In Orlando, Florida, where police trained more than 2,500 women in the safe handling of firearms in late 1966 after a series of robberies and attacks on women in their own homes, forcible rapes, aggravated assaults and burglaries were reduced in the first nine months of 1967 by 90 percent, 25 percent, and 24 percent, respectively, from the first nine months of 1966.

In examining the connection between any two sets of variables, it should be pointed out that the presence of a correlation between the two does not necessarily mean that one causes the other. The relationship may be coincidental; one variable may be a cause, but not the sole cause, of the other; the two variables may be interdependent; or the two variables may be affected by the same cause. Therefore, the negative correlation between firearms ownership and crime rates supports, but does not necessarily prove, the theory that the greater the extent of firearms ownership, the lower the crime rates will be. But it does show that the idea of a causal relationship between the availability of firearms and crime rates is fancy and not fact. The hypothesis must be rejected.

Firearms are readily available in America, with some 200 million guns owned by 40 to 50 million individuals.

The intent of those who say that restrictive firearms legislation should be enacted because of the availability of firearms has been questioned in testimony before congressional committees. The Honorable Thomas L. Kimball, executive director of the National Wild-

life Federation, told the Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency that:

"This raises the question . . . as to whether or not the solution then is to make firearms not available because as long as we permit individuals in this country . . . to have guns, and to use them for lawful purposes, they are going to be readily available. And the only way that we are going to remove that availability is to take their guns away from them. And it is expressions such as this which give us considerable concern about the intent of S. 1592 (1965 version of the Dodd Bill).

"Now, if the concern is about crime and the use of guns in crime, this is one thing. If it is to make guns unavailable to the American public, this is another. And from the statements that have been made before this committee, it leaves some doubt . . . as to just what this objective is."

This study tested the hypothesis, "There is a causal relationship between the availability of firearms and crime rates." The extent of firearms ownership was compared with rates of serious crime, murder, aggravated assault and robbery in each of the fifty states. The comparison was made by statistical methods and the results were tested for significance.

It was found that there is no positive correlation between the extent of firearms ownership and crime rates. Rather, there is a negative correlation. These findings dictate that the hypothesis as stated above be rejected. In general, as the proportion of the population possessing firearms goes down, crime rates go up. Fewer people with guns do not mean less crime.

The negative correlations between the index of firearms ownership and serious crime, aggravated assault and robbery were statistically significant. This means that firearms ownership by the law-abiding public could be a factor in restricting the number of these criminal acts. However, such a cause and effect relationship is not proven by, but is only consistent with, the results of this study.

These facts should be considered by anyone evaluating proposed firearms legislation.

THE DISAPPOINTING ECONOMY

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1971

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, whenever the unemployment rate rises a few tenths of 1 percent, we are told that this is insignificant because the rise was just moderate. Whenever the rate drops by a few tenths of 1 percent, we are told that this is a major sign that the administration's policies are taking hold. As of last week, we were told that the unemployment rate dropped to 5.6 percent, yet there were a million more citizens out of work.

But what does the President intend to do about curbing inflation or lowering unemployment? To quote John Connally, the Nixon administration will not impose mandatory wage-price controls, will not impose a wage-price review board, will not ask Congress for tax relief and will not increase Federal spending. We know what he will not do, but we do not know what he will do.

Not too long ago, the President told the Nation 1971 will "be a good year" and 1972 will be a "very good year." An earlier prediction, made in March of

1970, raises doubts about President Nixon's ability to gage the economic problems realistically. He predicted then that "1970 is going to be a good year from an economic vantage point."

As we all know, 1970 was not a good year economically and the economic doldrums still prevail. Until a wage-price freeze is instituted as the New York Times suggests in an editorial in its June 23 edition, the economy will stagnate. At the same time, the editorial says:

The fiscal stimulus necessary for a sound economy should come primarily from expenditure increases sharply focused on aiding the poor, the unemployed, the staggering cities and the other areas of acute need, rather than tax cuts.

But instead of Executive leadership, we get a list of inaction. The recent drop in unemployment results, not from fewer people out of work, but from a fluke situation where more people are idle and students give up hope of ever finding jobs for the summer so just do not bother looking.

Despite the cheery predictions, the game plan is failing. Congress must apply pressure to revise the Nixon "play book." For my colleagues, I would like to insert several articles from Time magazine, Newsweek, Business Week, the New York Times, and the Wall Street Journal which explain how serious the situation is.

The articles follow:

[From Time magazine, June 14, 1971]

SEEKING MUSCLE FOR A FLABBY RECOVERY

Muscle Builder Charles Atlas might describe the present U.S. business recovery as a 97-lb. weakling—too puny to rout the bullyboy of unemployment. Members of Time's Board of Economists use more scholarly analogies, but they make the same point. At a recent all-day meeting, they offered this analysis of the nation's economy:

The recovery from last year's recession is the slowest and lowest of any since World War II.

Unemployment, which rose last month to 6.2% of the labor force, matching December's nine-year high, will still hover around 6% by year's end if nothing is done to put more muscle into the recovery.

Inflation is slowly subsiding, at least in terms of consumer prices, and a large growth in worker productivity will help to check it further this year.

The fast rise in productivity will also hold down new hiring.

Given these factors, the U.S. sorely needs a combination of tax cuts and accelerated Government spending to speed the recovery. Otherwise, this year's gross national product is likely to be about \$1,050 billion, far off the Administration's forecast of \$1,065 billion.

This analysis differs sharply from the reading of Administration economists and the monetarist school led by Milton Friedman, who see a vigorous expansion developing. Friedman recently went so far as to say that the problem is "to keep the economy from going too fast" and setting off another inflationary spiral. Yet most economists and businessmen tend to agree with Time's board.

Martin Gainsbrugh, chief economist of the Conference Board, a nonprofit business research organization, has compiled figures to prove that so far the current upturn has been notably weak. Gainsbrugh calculates that the 1970 "recession"—which was officially given that name by the National Bureau of Economic Research two weeks ago—hit bottom in November. Thus, by the end

of April, the present recovery was five months old. At that stage in the four previous post-war recoveries, industrial production showed increases ranging from 6.4% to 10.2% above recession lows, while real gross national product went up anywhere from 2.1% to 5%, and manufacturing employment rose 1.2% to 3.8%. In the current recovery, by contrast, industrial production has struggled up only 2.8% from its low point, real G.N.P. only 1.7%, and manufacturing employment a mere .6%.

SLEEPING GIANT

Assuming no change in Washington policy, members of the Board of Economists see small reason to expect a speedup soon. Despite much talk of expansionist federal budget policy, they find that Government tax and spending programs are not very stimulating. Arthur Okun pointed out that the major force in the recovery so far has been a jump in home building from an annual rate of 1.1 million starts in January 1970 to 1.9 million recently. The housing upturn, however, may be leveling off. Construction is getting close to the annual rate of 2,000,000 starts that some housing experts believe to be the probable average for the 1970s. Besides, mortgage interest rates have begun to rise again, and are likely to go still higher because other interest rates are climbing.

Business spending for new plants and equipment promises little help. A Government survey last week showed that companies are budgeting only a 2.7% increase in capital expenditures this year, the smallest rise in a decade. The consumer, says Walter Heller, is still a "sleeping giant." Consumers increased their liquid assets—mainly currency and bank deposits—by a startling \$91 billion from January 1970 through last April, to \$812 billion. But they show little inclination to spend this hoard until unemployment starts heading down decisively.

Some bankers make a case for a deliberately slow recovery. Heller summarized their view—with which he disagrees—as a belief that "by prolonging the agony of slack and unemployment, you increase the ecstasy of a lower rate of inflation at full employment." In other words, the longer it takes to get to full employment, the less inflation the U.S. will suffer when that point is reached. Okun also rejected that idea, contending that there is no certainty that a slow recovery will ever achieve full employment. "There may well be a certain orbital speed that you have to get to in order to make a recovery self-sustaining," said Okun, "and if you do not get that momentum, I can see a risk that the recovery could actually peter out."

Joseph Pechman and Otto Eckstein added that the social price of a slow recovery is intolerable. The chief cost: a recent alarming rise in poverty in the U.S. For ten years through 1969, the number of poor people in the country declined, but in 1970 the total rose by 1.2 million, to 25.5 million, or 13% of the U.S. population. (For a nonfarm family of four, the Government now defines "poverty" as an annual income of \$3,970 or less.) A major reason for this increase in poverty was rising unemployment. At its present pace, the recovery is putting few people back to work. There are just enough new jobs opening to offset increases in the number of persons looking for employment. Said David Grove: "As long as businessmen are very uncertain about the outlook, there is much more incentive for them to work their existing employees overtime than to hire new employees." Added Heller: "I don't see any chance of arriving at full employment before 1973."

PROSPECTS FOR PRODUCTIVITY

In the board's view, a swifter recovery is needed not only to produce jobs but also to contain inflation. Though consumer price rises have moderated lately, the more comprehensive G.N.P. index of prices went up

at a high annual rate of 5.6% in the first quarter. Wholesale and industrial prices have been jumping, and steel prices are bound to rise. On balance, however, most board members think that inflation has begun to subside slightly.

It is likely to diminish further largely because of rising productivity. Robert Nathan points out that productivity growth almost stopped between mid-1968 and mid-1970, leaving a gap of about 5% between what the present output per man-hour is and what that output would have been if normal growth had continued. He believes that the economy can make up the gap and get a further normal growth of 3% annually over the next three years—which adds up to a potential 14% rise in productivity by 1974.

Productivity usually leaps when the economy climbs out of a recession, since rising demand enables manufacturers to use machines and workers more efficiently. The trouble is that if recovery is creeping, productivity will not rise as much as it could, and wage increases are more likely to force up prices.

RISING TEMPTATIONS

How can the recovery be pepped up? Heller offers a five-point program: 1) pull forward into this year the \$4.5 billion of income tax cuts scheduled to take effect in 1972 and 1973; 2) have Washington pay now all of the costs of extending state unemployment compensation benefits for an additional 13 weeks, up to a maximum of 39 weeks; 3) enact the Family Assistance Program bill, setting national minimum income levels for welfare recipients; 4) give states and cities a temporary 10% federal "bonus" on top of the grants-in-aid that they now receive, for various programs; 5) provide federal funds that state and local governments could use to fill about 150,000 new public service jobs—The House and the Senate have passed public-service jobs bills putting up different amounts of money, but President Nixon is almost certain to veto the final bill on the grounds that it would conflict with his revenue-sharing plans. He vetoed a similar bill last December.

Such moves, board members think, would have to be combined with an incomes policy to fight inflation. David Grove fears that businessmen whose profits have been acutely squeezed by the recession will be tempted to raise prices as soon as they feel that demand is strong enough to support such action—especially if they have to pay large wage increases. The heart of an incomes policy would be Administration guidelines for non-inflationary wage and price increases, and presidential "jawboning" to unions and companies that violate those guidelines.

The wage standard might be 3% to cover long-term productivity increase, plus an addition to compensate partly for rising prices. Members of the Board of Economists concede that President Nixon could hardly put forward a wage guideline now; it would seem to be aimed specifically at the United Steelworkers in their current negotiations. But the economists think that a guideline promulgated after the steel settlement would have a strong impact on the next round of labor bargaining in 1972.

ACTIVIST ALLIANCE?

The Nixon Administration plans to wait until mid-July, when second-quarter figures will be in, before deciding whether to pursue a more expansionist program. Right now, Washington's policymakers are stalemated. Federal Reserve Chairman Arthur Burns has been arguing for a year in favor of an incomes policy, and lately he has been saying that he also favors more fiscal stimulus. So far he has been blocked by Budget Boss George Shultz, who, in Robert Nathan's words, is "ideologically, conceptually, religiously" against an incomes policy because it would interfere with natural market forces.

Paul McCracken, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, is thought to be on the fence, ready to propose an expansionary tax and spending program if asked.

The balance of power within the Administration quite possibly will be held by the newest member of the President's economic team: Treasury Secretary John Connally. If it appears that a sluggish business pace will hurt the Administration at the polls, Connally may well form an alliance with Burns for economic activism—more fiscal stimulus plus an incomes policy. One final and perhaps decisive argument against a slow recovery is that it does not produce votes.

TIME'S BOARD OF ECONOMISTS

Members of TIME's Board of Economists speak as individuals, not as representatives of the institutions with which they are associated. Present at the most recent meeting were:

Otto Eckstein, Harvard professor and former member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

David Grove, vice president and chief economist of IBM.

Walter Heller, University of Minnesota professor and former chairman of the CEA.

Robert Nathan, head of Robert R. Nathan Associates, a Washington-based economic consulting firm.

Arthur Okun, senior fellow of the Brookings Institution, former chairman of the CEA.

Joseph Pechman, director of economic studies at the Brookings Institution.

Robert Triffin, professor of economics and master of Berkeley College at Yale University.

Beryl Sprinkel, senior vice president of Chicago's Harris Trust & Savings Bank, was in Europe and could not attend the meeting.

[From Newsweek, June 28, 1971]

THE ECONOMY: A NEW GAME PLAN?

For six full months of slow and uncertain economic recovery, the most troubling symptoms of last year's recession—inflation and high unemployment—have stubbornly refused to go away. Yet the Nixon Administration has maintained its cheery insistence that full recovery was just around the corner. Last week's economic indicators were telling the same ambiguous story, but the government was beginning to hint that a new game plan might be in order.

The good news was that housing starts, a healthy element all this year, continued strong in May, and that personal income had gone up by a respectable \$6 billion. In addition, two recently published private surveys suggest that consumer spending, always an essential ingredient in any economic upswing, should show a gradual growth throughout this year. And the most encouraging news of all was that the index of industrial production, which measures the output of the country's factories, mines, and utilities, rose by an impressive 0.7 per cent, the largest monthly increase since January.

BUGABOOS

Yet soft spots still persist. Retail sales apparently declined in May, and U.S. automobile sales were off by 10.4 per cent in early June. Moreover, much of the increase in industrial output could be attributed to heavy steel production in anticipation of a possible strike this summer. If a long strike does occur, warns James Cooper, an economist with the Irving Trust Co. in New York, the painful climb out of recession would be interrupted, much as the automobile strike helped sabotage any chance of a recovery last year.

The government's own economists are even more concerned. Paul W. McCracken, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, admitted for the first time last week that the Administration was dissatisfied with the sluggish pace of the recovery. "We have to recognize," he said, "that the expression is

not yet moving fast enough to eat into the unemployment picture." He added that the President would decide in midsummer whether more direct economic stimulants, such as a personal income-tax cut, would be necessary. And the latest appointee to the council, finance professor Ezra Solomon of Stanford University, went still further. After his confirmation hearing with the Senate Banking Committee, he told a reporter that if unemployment should climb any higher than the current level of 6.2 per cent, and that if the rate of inflation continues to increase, he would favor outright wage and price controls.

CONSUMERISM: THE RACER'S EDGE

Detroit engineers have long looked with a jaundiced eye at the claims made by flamboyant Andy Granatelli for the oil additive produced by the company he heads, STP Corp. (NEWSWEEK, April 5). But more than a jaundiced look came this month from Consumer Reports. In its July issue, the publication of Consumers Union declares that STP's oil treatment is actually a worthless oil thickener—a "thick goo"—and its use may invalidate a new automobile's warranty.

News of the charges sent STP's stock down 4.87½% to \$53.12½, a drop of 7.9 per cent from the new 1971 high of \$58.75 it had reached the week before. The following day, an influx of orders brought trading in STP to a halt.

Granatelli, a onetime racing driver, wasn't taking the charges lying down. Last week he lashed back at Consumer Reports, calling its findings "untrue, unfair and completely distorted . . . a twisted set of alleged 'facts' assembled by incompetents." The suggestion that the additive might endanger warranties was, he added, "another deliberate distortion of the truth." But this time the bears held the racer's edge. STP's stock dropped an additional 11 points by the end of the week.

FARMING: THE BLIGHTED CORN

Albert Schneider was the first man in Edgar County to find them—the small gray spots on the leaves of his young corn that farmers across the Midwest have been half expecting and altogether fearing ever since the first seeds sprouted. The blight that withered 15 per cent of the nation's corn crop last year, costing farmers an estimated \$1 billion, has struck again.

"If it spreads, it's going to be a disaster," Schneider said. "I'll just keep watching it. I guess that's all I can do." And the blight is spreading; at last count, it had been reported in 124 counties in eighteen states, and was slowly spreading north with the summer weather. In an effort to monitor the fungus, teams from the Department of Agriculture, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Air Force are trying to spot it by aerial infra-red photography. In theory, the diseased plants generate more heat and should be detectable—but whether this works out in practice won't be known until the season is over.

By that time, the damage could be extensive. In Chicago, when corn-futures contracts shot upward with the news of the blight, traders were predicting gloomily that even though farmers planted more corn this year in anticipation of trouble, the season's crop might be well under last year's 4.2 billion bushels.

SWINDLE

Farmers had tried to head off calamity with a blight-resistant seed. But there was only enough available to plant one-fifth of the 71.5 million acres in corn this year—a fact that resulted in gray-market trading, a few outright swindles and at least one hijacking of a truckload of seed corn. Most farmers, like Schneider in Illinois, wound up with at least part of their land planted with a blend of resistant and susceptible seed. It was supposed to be half and half, he says, but "I can't find 50 per cent of the stalks that don't have blight."

At this point, no one can tell how badly the blight will affect the crop. But it has struck earlier in the season than last year, and Dr. Malcolm Shurtleff, plant pathologist for the University of Illinois, says he is amazed at how fast it is spreading. "The next two weeks are going to be very, very important," predicts George A. Jones, an independent trader on the Chicago Board of Trade. "The whole thing depends on the weather. If we have dry weather for ten days, I think the corn will win."

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 24, 1971]

CREDIBILITY AND ECONOMIC POLICY

(By Albert R. Hunt)

WASHINGTON.—Treasury Secretary John B. Connally recently lambasted some of his fellow Democrats as "politically oriented economists who were once close to power and long to return."

The thrust of Mr. Connally's criticism, echoed privately by other Nixon administration aides, was that some eminent economists have been so tainted by political partisanship that their views are losing believability. And it is true that some critics of the administration's policies plainly seem to have their eye more on the next presidential election than on the performance of the economy.

Yet it's interesting—and instructive—to examine the one who's throwing stones. For this administration is steadily building up a serious economic credibility problem of its own. The reason is that most administration spokesmen inevitably term any good economic figure a "turning point" or "solid evidence" of improving conditions, while adverse results are "statistically insignificant" or mere "aberrations."

Wholesale prices rise 0.3% in March and the Western White House trots out Labor Secretary James D. Hodgson to gloat that "our anti-inflationary fight is taking hold"; the same prices jump a steeper 0.5% a month later and the Washington White House produces Mr. Connally to caution reporters, "I don't think we ought to pay much attention to it." A 0.2% drop in the February unemployment rate shows the economy "is moving in a favorable direction," according to Mr. Hodgson; when the April jobless rate rises 0.1%, however, Mr. Hodgson notes that a pickup in employment always lags behind other signs of an economic upturn and he suggests, therefore, that this increase isn't cause for concern.

SELF-FULFILLING

There is, of course, a reason for all this upbeat talk. The key to a sharp economic upturn, many government analysts believe, is convincing consumers that things are getting better so they'll step up spending. Thus, these optimistic pronouncements can serve as self-fulfilling prophecies, some officials argue.

But, as laudable as this goal may be, some of the methods currently employed certainly are less than desirable and sometimes seem downright counterproductive. Recently several high administration insiders have gone beyond simple rhetorical hyperbole and either outright misled the public or flagrantly violated some of their own guidelines.

The most publicized instance was the Labor Department's cancellation of the monthly press conference of its Bureau of Labor Statistics on the unemployment and consumer price figures. These briefings, conducted by nonpolitical technical experts, were terminated, the administration said, for two main reasons: to speed up the release of the data and to avoid subjecting BLS professionals to the "awkwardness" of answering questions "with policy implications." A factor in this decision, the White House said, was the 1962 report of the Gordon Committee on the use of government economic statistics.

But the chairman of that committee, University of California economics professor R. A. Gordon, later told the congressional Joint Economic Committee a different story. There was "nothing" in his report to suggest doing away with these briefings, the author of the study said, and he went on to proclaim a "real need" for these sessions. He further wondered if what the administration really wants isn't "to be free to minimize bad news and maximize good news without any interference from its own technical experts who know most about the facts."

Geoffrey Moore, the BLS commissioner, later admitted that he couldn't recall a single instance in which questions caused "awkwardness" for career officials. And both the unemployment and price figures are now coming out almost at precisely the same time as before the briefings were cancelled.

The actual catalyst for the cancellations, insiders admit, came when a BLS official said the 0.2% drop in the February jobless rate was only marginally significant (an observation borne out by the increase in the rate in every month since then), while at the same time Mr. Hodgson was heralding the importance of the drop. Yet, top officials haven't publicly acknowledged this factor.

(An irony here is that another of the administration's top economists, Under Secretary of the Treasury Charis E. Walker, earlier had implored television news to devote more attention to economics in order to increase general public understanding. Only a few months later those economic results most conducive to coverage by that medium—the BLS briefings, replete with charts and tables for visual effects—were eliminated.)

Another double standard concerns the administration's pledge not to politicize the release of statistics. In 1969, the Budget Bureau told all agencies that "an adequate amount of time" (generally agreed to mean 15 to 30 minutes) should elapse between the release of figures and any comment by a political appointee. Thus the actual release of the figures wouldn't be colored by political pronouncements, it was pointed out.

Nevertheless, in early February Mr. Hodgson held a briefing for reporters an hour before the revised December and new January unemployment figures were released. Later the BLS' Mr. Moore admitted this didn't "square" with the administration's stated policy and pledged it wouldn't "happen in the future." Yet about 10 minutes before the April consumer price report was issued, reporters were handed a statement from the Labor Secretary hailing the moderate 0.3% advance.

In another instance, President Nixon also directed all agencies to "speed up the implementation and dissemination" of all statistics. Although this dwelled on avoiding unnecessary delays, Arthur F. Burns, then counselor to the President, explained that the intent was "to discontinue manipulation of release dates for statistics." High administration officials were openly scornful of their predecessors' penchant for either speeding up or delaying the release of figures for political purposes.

But two months ago the Commerce Department suddenly rushed out at 6 o'clock Friday evening a report showing that housing starts had jumped an impressive 11% the month before. Since officials had confidently stated all day that this report wouldn't be out until the following week, could it be that the government was taking its directive seriously and even putting out good news at an unpropitious time?

Alas, no such luck. President Nixon was holding a news conference that evening and, according to informed officials, late Friday afternoon the White House ordered the Commerce Department to rush out the housing figures so the Chief Executive could hail the results that evening. Sure enough, when the first economic question came up the Presi-

dent glowingly alluded to the housing figures.

In another promotional effort in late April White House Communications Director Herbert G. Klein sent an analysis to 1,300 newspaper editors and writers that noted how much money investors would have made if they had followed President Nixon's general advice to buy stocks in April 1970. Mr. Klein's analysis mentioned 10 specific securities.

This horrified even some of the administration's own economists. Besides giving the appearance of touting selected stocks, one top administration economist notes, Mr. Klein "just couldn't understand that he who lives by such swords can die by them too." With the Dow Jones Industrial Average generally declining since reaching a peak of about 950 in late April, Mr. Klein's tip service has been noticeably quiet.

As isolated instances, perhaps there's little reason to be unduly alarmed at any of these transgressions. But together, they add up to the makings of a real credibility problem that the Nixon people are creating for themselves.

1970: "A GOOD YEAR"?

They should realize that usually these shortcuts and gimmicks simply don't work. The next time the President repeats his confident assertion that this year "will be a good year for the economy" and that 1972 "will be a very good year," he might recall his own words at a March 1970 press conference. On the same subject and with equal confidence, he assured the nation that 1970 "is going to be a good year from an economic vantage point." Even most of the President's partisans now would agree this was hardly a self-fulfilling prophecy.

"One has to really produce things that are believable to affect consumers," says George Katona, director of the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research, which studies consumer attitudes and behavior. "Mere talk won't do it."

To be sure, the temptation to exaggerate is probably endemic in any administration, particularly when the economy is such a terribly sensitive political issue. And few would expect the President or his lieutenants to proclaim that the economy is going to be in rotten shape.

But a little more candor about setbacks, as well as successes, and a willingness to resist the temptation to bend or break reasonable rules for very short-run gains, wouldn't seem to constitute a suicidal course. Indeed, there's apt to be a time, with November 1972 quickly approaching, when the administration will need all the economic believability it can muster.

[From the New York Times, June 23, 1971]

OVERHAULING ECONOMIC POLICY

The sharp rise in consumer prices last month is an unpleasant reminder of what inflation is continuing to do to the value of the dollar. Announcement that the price index went up six-tenths of 1 per cent in May came just after President Nixon's chief economic adviser, Dr. Paul W. McCracken, gave the first official word that the Administration is dissatisfied with the way its economic "game plan" is working out. The economy is growing too slowly to bring unemployment down below the 6 per cent level it reached last December. With large numbers of graduates and veterans entering the labor force, the jobless rate may even rise.

The May jump in prices does not necessarily negate scattered signs earlier this year of some slowing of inflationary trends, but it is accompanied by other worrisome portents. The money supply has been climbing at an annual rate of 11.6 per cent since the end of 1970, and at an even faster rate in the past three months. Such rates of monetary growth are bound to reactivate inflation if they continue.

Inflationary expectations are driving up

the cost of money, further jeopardizing the slow economic expansion. Some banks have just boosted their prime lending rates, but others have held at the old rate under Administration pressure. However, the clear indication given by Chairman Arthur F. Burns that the Federal Reserve Board means to slow down the excessively rapid growth rate of the money supply is likely to put additional upward pressure on interest rates, at least in the short run.

Meanwhile, the wage-price spiral is unchecked. Excessive wage boosts are intensifying both inflation and unemployment. Although the Administration increasingly expresses its unhappiness over inflationary wage-price actions—as it did over the recent jump in aluminum wages and prices—its sporadic statements have no perceptible effect.

To get out of the inflation-unemployment bind, a change in basic Administration policy has become essential, with action to curb the leapfrog of wages and prices as its first element. An effective incomes policy needs the full support of the President and his top aides. Its starting point should be a temporary wage-price freeze—to dramatize the program and to prevent a final round of wage-price boosting before restraints can be put in place. During the freeze period a high-level stabilization board appointed by the President could work out procedures and standards to assure business, labor and the public that inflation will be equitably but firmly brought under control.

The overhaul of economic policy also requires a major shift of emphasis from monetary to fiscal. Faced as it is with large budget deficits, the Administration has been hesitant to offset any slowdown in monetary growth with a more stimulative fiscal policy. The big current deficits, resulting basically from a sluggish economy, are not particularly stimulative. These deficits, now likely to exceed \$20 billion in both fiscal 1971 and 1972, are attributable largely to revenue shortfalls. With faster growth, the deficits would shrink.

The nation's urgent social problems imply that extra fiscal stimulus should come primarily from expenditure increases sharply focused on aiding the poor, the unemployed, the staggering cities and other areas of acute need, rather than from tax cuts. However, this approach does not rule out consideration of temporary tax reductions, should they be needed to provide additional support for a stagnant economy. We have long favored a more flexible fiscal policy for economic stabilization.

But for the immediate future, we believe the President should use expenditure programs to attack acute problems, as he has done in making known his intention not to veto the public service employment bill but to use it for creating jobs for veterans. The nation's growing social and environmental problems leave no shortage of useful targets for a fiscal policy appropriate to the times.

[From Business Week, June 12, 1971]

THE ECONOMY—STORM CLOUDS DO NOT CHANGE THE COURSE

President Nixon's top economic advisers continue to insist that the nation's economy needs no additional stimulation. If anything, they feel less inclined than a month ago toward a mid-course correction in economic policy.

"Given the basic course of expansion up to now," says Council of Economic Advisers Chairman Paul W. McCracken, "I don't see that a clear case can be made for additional stimulus."

The decision to stick to current policy is not based on confidence that the economy is tracing the path laid out last January in the Economic Report. It represents, in fact, a lowering of the Administration's ambitious goals for more economic growth and less unemployment.

Officials candidly admit that last month's rise in unemployment probably foreshadows further increases. They now appear to expect little reduction in the jobless rate before yearend, and they have explicitly downgraded their earlier target of unemployment "in the zone of 4.5% by mid-1972" to "less than 5%" by the same date. The White House apparently feels that this level will not be an overwhelmingly political burden if the rate is falling sharply by the time voters go to the polls.

While there are differences in tone, the "steady-as-you-go" feeling is reflected throughout top-level economic circles around the White House. For the moment, a balance appears to have been struck—and sold to President Nixon—between concern for rising unemployment and fears of continued inflation. Worries about the ultimate impact of five months of rapid growth in the money supply have also made policymakers wary about throwing in more fiscal stimulus.

SOUL-SEARCHING

The balance could be changed, however, if the report on second-quarter gross national product is disappointing. Officials will get a preliminary estimate late next week and a better look early in July. There appears to be general agreement in Washington that a gain significantly less than \$20-billion would call for "some soul-searching." Although some technicians say there is a good possibility that the second quarter will come in below that mark, key officials appear relatively optimistic.

The new target, however, gives a far different profile than Administration economists had been sketching earlier. They are now ready to concede that the recovery has been distinctly modest, with no real enthusiasm on the part of either consumers or businessmen. With the third quarter clouded by a runoff in steel inventories, with or without a strike, fall is the earliest the economy can be expected to find a solid footing.

The worry now along Pennsylvania Avenue is that things will come on with a rush. Administration economists view the puzzling behavior of inventories—substantial liquidation almost everywhere but in steel—less as a vote of no confidence in the recovery than as a storing up of demand that will hit sometime toward the end of the year. For unexplained reasons, the economy has been slow in reacting to definite nudges from Washington.

"People don't quite appreciate how stimulative policies are now," says one senior Administration official, pointing to the very high rate of growth in the money supply and the fact that the fiscal 1971 budget is winding up considerably deeper in the red than had been anticipated last January. "The more stimulus you inject, the more superboom you are storing up for sometime in the future—and you don't know when," he adds.

Another Administration argument against more stimulus is that such a move would increase the pressures for an incomes policy. "To the extent that your expansion is less than planned, you have less need for market restraint because markets are looser than you expected," says a top official.

FLEXIBILITY

In recent weeks, in fact, there has been a weakening of the earlier hard-nosed attitude toward wage and price behavior. The original 6% guide on construction wages has been replaced by more flexible "equity" rules, and Presidential displeasure at the aluminum price hikes was relatively mild, though accompanied by another warning to the steel industry.

Beneath the surface, however, the pressures are still there. Federal Reserve Chairman Arthur F. Burns still loses no occasion to push for a wage-price review board, and within the Administration Treasury Secretary John Connally talks openly of the need

for outright controls. This, apparently, has turned Management & Budget Director George Shultz away from the idea of rapid expansion.

Some Administration officials, including Connally, reportedly have a mild preference for early activation of the scheduled 1972 and 1973 tax cuts. But it is not strong enough for them to want to challenge Shultz on this point or to take the risk that a Democratic Congress will do more than they ask.

"JUST INSANE"

The White House line against more stimulus extends to government spending as well as tax cuts. The rise in unemployment gives Congressional Democrats another argument for their \$5-billion public service employment bill. But, says one high official, "the President is just as committed to a veto as before."

So far, at least, President Nixon does not seem to be getting much heat from his own party. "There are some Republican worriers," says Representative Barber Conable (R-N.Y.), a ranking member of the House Ways & Means Committee. But they are not particularly strong, he says. Barring a sharp rise in unemployment, most GOP congressmen are inclined to let the Administration determine the line on economic policy.

On the other hand, Democrats are exhibiting a fairly sharp split. Liberals such as Senator Edmund Muskie (D-Me.), a Presidential hopeful, and Senator William Proxmire (D-Wis.) are calling for quick tax cuts. But House Ways & Means Chairman Wilbur D. Mills is waiting for the second-quarter GNP figures to make up his mind. "My judgment is that it will not be as dramatic . . . as the first quarter," he says, "but it may be of sufficient growth to obviate the necessity of doing anything else."

[From the New York Times, June 20, 1971]

ENCOURAGING DATA ON ECONOMY LEAVE SOME UNCONVINCED

(By Thomas E. Mullaney)

Those businessmen and economists who have advocated a patient stance by Washington in dealing with the economy took heart last week from the latest batch of upbeat economic statistics. Their position, however, was far from universal.

Many observers remain skeptical of the underlying strength of the economy. And stock traders were also quite unimpressed by the recent trends and worried about higher interest rates. The market ended the week on a depressed note after suffering its worst loss in almost a year.

Last week's encouraging data were the Government reports on industrial production, personal income and housing for May—all of which showed a rising pulse of economic activity. There was also a faster tempo reported in retail business for the first half of June and moderately optimistic forecasts of consumer attitudes in two new surveys.

Brightest among the week's economic news were the strong 0.7 percent rise in industrial production, the buoyant 1.7 percent gain in housing starts and the fairly good \$6-billion jump in personal income during May.

To the optimists, these indicators confirmed their view that a strong expansion of the economy has taken root from the seeds of highly stimulative fiscal and monetary policies planted in 1970 and earlier this year.

Nevertheless, assessments of the latest economic numbers by several leading economists last week were not equally glowing. One depicted the economy as staging a "lazy recovery," and Martin R. Gainsbrugh, chief economist for the Conference Board, sounded a typical view when he remarked:

"The picture is a little bit more encouraging, but it does not indicate much acceleration for the balance of the year. On every count, the rate of expansion in this recovery

is lower than in the previous four recoveries. Some of the figures look good in terms of current dollars, but that is reflecting the factor of inflation. Unless we get some strong real growth, we won't get unemployment down."

A look at the prevailing trend of 26 major economic yardsticks by Statistical Indicator Associates last week was also rather disconcerting. It disclosed four leading indicators pointed upward and eight level; five coincident indicators up and three level, and two lagging indicators up, two level and two tending downward.

"With the trends of only four of the 12 leaders up," the analytical service commented, "the hesitance in the leaders is reminiscent of early 1968. The 1968 hesitancy turned out to be a temporary lull. Today's hesitancy seems to have a greater precautionary significance."

Even the Administration's top economic adviser, Paul W. McCracken, eschewed his consistently optimistic posture and expressed some dissatisfaction with the pace of the business recovery.

Dr. McCracken conceded that the economy was moving up too slowly to exert much effect in reducing the unemployment rate, which has been hovering about 6 percent, and he indicated that President Nixon would decide this summer whether it would be necessary to inject some new stimulus into the economy.

In Paris, the prestigious Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development also took a dim view of the unemployment situation in the United States, saying that the average rate of joblessness this year would be "almost one percentage point higher" than last year's 5 percent.

If that assessment proved to be correct, it would cast strong doubt on the Administration's ability to achieve its 4½ per cent unemployment target by the middle of next year in advance of the Presidential election.

President Nixon's advisers had been counting on a growth rate of at least 9 per cent for the American economy this year in their blueprint for significantly reducing the unemployment rolls. But it is obvious now, after six months of rather stimulative fiscal and monetary policies, that the goal is not being met.

Despite the strong burst of consumer buying that erupted in mid-March and retained its momentum ever since, it appears that the economy's growth in 1971 may not top 7 per cent. To get to the desired target, some prodding will be necessary, according to a spreading view in business and economic circles.

Since monetary policy has been exceedingly easy this year, with the money supply increasing by more than 11 per cent, it would not seem prudent to expect any further stimulus in that area.

That leaves only fiscal policy as an engine of expansion—tax reductions or increased Government spending or, perhaps, a combination of the two. But, with Federal spending already outrunning projections, the most likely avenue would seem to be the tax route.

The most broadly recommended program involves a speed-up of the cuts in personnel income tax already scheduled to take place in 1972 and 1973. This would produce some \$4.5-billion of added spending power for American consumers this year.

Among businessmen, there is wide advocacy of a suggestion that the 7 per cent investment-tax credit be restored to invigorate capital spending programs. And some businessmen as well as economists are urging the start of public works or social programs to put more people to work.

A recent poll by the National Federation of Independent Business found a strong tittle in favor of the Price Bill, which would restore the 7 per cent investment credit on the first \$15,000 of equipment and machinery purchased each year. Big business feels that it, too, needs restoration of such spending incentive on a permanent basis.

ECONOMIC INDICATORS

	Latest week June 13	Prior week June 6	June 14, 1970		Latest week June 13	Prior week June 6	June 14, 1970
Weekly comparisons:							
Commodity index.....	107.8	107.2	111.3	Daily oil production (barrels)...	9,752,000	9,745,000	9,485,000
Currency in circulation.....	\$58,078,000,000	\$57,851,000,000	\$54,261,000,000	Freight car loadings.....	553,552	496,743	567,235
Total loans.....	\$83,818,000,000	\$84,143,000,000	\$80,258,000,000	Electric power (kilowatt-hours)...	32,251,000,000	29,348,000,000	29,583,000,000
Steel production (tons).....	2,737,000	2,786,000	2,637,000	Business failures.....	193	205	198
Auto production.....	184,003	193,312	181,459				
Monthly comparisons:							
Employed.....	78,961,000	78,698,000	78,357,000	Consumer's price index.....	120.2	119.8	134.0
Unemployed.....	5,217,000	5,085,000	3,384,000	Money supply.....	\$221,200,000,000	\$219,400,000,000	\$203,300,000,000
				Construction contracts.....	161	142	203
				Manufacturers inventories.....	\$99,542,000,000	\$99,416,000,000	\$97,604,000,000
				Exports.....	\$3,543,100,000	\$3,814,600,000	\$3,449,700,000
				Imports.....	\$3,757,800,000	\$3,569,200,000	\$3,247,500,000
Industrial production.....	166.0	165.5	170.4				
Personal income.....	\$836,300,000,000	\$830,400,000,000	\$777,600,000,000				

¹ Figures subject to revision by source.

NOTES

Commodity index, based on 1957-59=100 and the consumers price index, based on 1967=100, are compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Industrial production is Federal Reserve Board's adjusted index of 1957-59=100. Imports and exports as well as employment are compiled by the

Bureau of Census of the Department of Commerce. Money supply is total currency outside banks and demand deposits adjusted as reported by Federal Reserve Board. Business failures compiled by Dun & Bradstreet, Inc. Construction contracts are compiled by the F. W. Dodge Division, McGraw-Hill Information Systems Company.

Statistics for commercial-agricultural loans, carloadings, steel, oil, electric power and business failures are for the preceding week and latest available.

Walter W. Heller, former chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, who also endorses the investment credit at 10 per cent, recently stated that "it should not be difficult to devise a package of perhaps \$10-billion of quick-acting fiscal stimulus that would not interfere with the objective of a balanced budget or a surplus when we again reach full employment.

The bond market continued its erratic pattern last week as traders and investors remained nervous and uncertain about the path of the economy and the course of interest rates. At the start of the week, the market saw prices dropping sharply, but later on there was an equally vigorous rally.

The early decline seemed to stem from fears of a general increase in the prime rate by major banks as well as an upturn in the Federal Reserve's discount rate.

On Monday, the First Pennsylvania Banking and Trust Company, the largest bank in Philadelphia, did lift its basic loan rate 5/4 per cent from 5 1/2, and the Bank of California raised its price rate to 6 per cent on the following day.

Even though those moves were applauded privately by many bankers because of the rising cost of funds obtained by the banks for lending, other major banks did not immediately follow the lead of the two medium-sized institutions, and talk of a general nationwide increase faded as the week progressed. However, the odds still seem to favor a broad increase in this key lending rate before very long.

The New York Times Weekly Index of Business Activity rose to 379.9 from 351.6 a week earlier. A year ago it was 359.9 (revised).

The following tables gives the index and its components, each of which has been adjusted to reflect the long term and seasonal variations:

	June 12, 1971	June 5, 1971	June 13, 1970
Combined index.....	379.9	351.6	359.9
7 weeks moving average.....	362.0	358.6	354.0
Miscellaneous loadings.....	109.8	99.0	112.5
Other loadings.....	50.3	44.8	51.5
Steel.....	174.6	177.8	169.9
Electric power.....	696.2	635.0	648.2
Paperboard.....	513.6	508.8	509.8
Lumber.....	100.9	84.9	86.5

¹ Revised.

Nevertheless, the market gained new buoyancy after the Treasury announced a \$4-billion financing on Wednesday. To some experienced bond dealers this appeared to

signify that the Fed would make no move with its discount rate at least until the Treasury's mid-August refinancing operations are out of the way.

With the atmosphere improved, several large corporate bond issues were successfully sold during the week, beginning with a \$60-million offering of the Ohio Edison Company's Aaa-rated bonds yielding 8.20 per cent on Tuesday. A \$150-million offering of the Phelps Dodge Corporation's notes and debentures moved out quickly on Wednesday, and a \$100-million issue of the Detroit Edison Company's bonds sold swiftly on Thursday.

All of the successful bond sales encouraged Wall Street and, consequently, bond prices advanced late Wednesday and again on Thursday.

The combination of diminished concern about higher administered interest rates and of successful bond sales accounted for last week's rather pronounced rebound in the bond market. Few bond dealers, however, showed any great conviction about the longer-term outlook for interest rates.

Price swings in the bond market recently have been dramatic but not long-lasting, and they probably will continue to gyrate that way—very erratically—until the outlook for the economy becomes clearer.

Other interest rates, particularly those in the home-mortgage sector, may also be due to increase. This would mean, of course, higher costs on the purchase of new homes.

Some sources expect that an increase in the F.H.A.-V.A. interest rate, which now stands at 7 per cent, will be forthcoming soon, even though the Government recently rejected suggestions for such action. In some parts of the country, there has already been a move to increase the number of "points" charged by lenders for making mortgage loans.

The stock market's sharp decline on Friday pushed the leading market averages last week to their sharpest losses since the final week of June a year ago.

The market's recent consolidation was accelerated as Wall Street showed increasing concern about the interest-rate picture and the economy's sluggish pace. Its downward course was accelerated as it slid below 900 in the Dow-Jones index for the first time in three months.

The Dow barometer closed the week at 889.16, showing a net loss of 27.31 points. The New York Times combined average fell 13.46 to 527.21; the Standard & Poor's 500-stock index declined 2.10 to 98.97, and the New York Stock Exchange composite was down 1.17 to 54.63.

Stocks that lost ground totaled 1,311 is-

sues, while those that advanced numbered 387. There were 136 issues with no change.

Volume on the Big Board remained relatively light at 68.4 million shares, against 66.3 million the week before.

THE PALESTINIANS IN 1971

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1971

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, there have been a great many changes in the Palestine movement and in the attitudes of Palestinians during the last year, Jesse W. Lewis, Jr., has written about some of these changes in an interesting set of articles which appeared in the Washington Post last week. I commend his articles to my colleagues:

PALESTINIANS NOURISH MEMORIES OF HOMELAND, HATRED OF ZIONISM

(By Jesse W. Lewis, Jr.)

BEIRUT, July 6—Whether you are squatting on the bare ground sipping tea in the teeming Shitla Palestinian refugee camp on the outskirts of Beirut or sitting in a tastefully appointed dining room having a multicourse lunch with a Palestinian professional man in Ramallah, in Jordan's occupied West Bank, you hear the same theme:

"We feel like strangers."

In countless conversations throughout the Arab world—across North Africa, in Lebanon, Jordan, Syria, Israeli-occupied territory and the Persian Gulf—Palestinians say the same thing.

Broadly they nourish the hope of returning to their former homes in what is now Israel or under Israeli occupation, though few appear to really want to go back to live in a country where Jews are in the majority.

But they feel uncomfortable, restricted and, in some cases used as a political football in the countries where they live, whether it is Lebanon, Syria or Jordan.

The way Palestinians feel today is the result of a melange of factors—their attachment to the area of land called Palestine during the British mandate that ended May 15, 1948, when Israel was created; the circumstances of their leaving their homes; their experiences since then; the 1967 Arab-Israeli war, and the intense political propaganda

they've been subjected to about their own situation and about Israel.

In the past six weeks, I asked more than 100 Palestinian Arabs scattered over several countries: "Why do you consider yourself a Palestinian?" Here are some typical answers: "I was born in Palestine," said one professional woman in Ramallah, a town of 40,000 on Jordan's occupied West Bank. "My mother and father were born here and their parents before them."

"Why do you consider yourself an American?" asked a senior civil servant in Abu Dhabi, who has been in that oil-producing sheikhdom in the Persian Gulf for the last five years. "I was born in Jerusalem and I feel it is my home."

A 34-year-old journalist in Beirut: "I was born in Haifa, Palestine, and I was forced to leave and I cannot go back." Haifa is now Israel's main port on the Mediterranean Sea.

While it is difficult to determine how strong this attachment is simply by asking the question "Why do you feel Palestinian?", any American journalist would probably get the same answer because the Palestinian question is such a hot political issue in the Middle East.

However, the casual question "where are you from?" asked in Arabic on meeting a Palestinian will bring the answer Haifa, Jaffa or Lydda rather than Beirut, Amman or Damascus even though the persons have been living in those Arab cities for the past 22 years.

HOW IT STARTED

It was in 1947, when the United Nations voted to partition Palestine into Jewish and Arab sectors, and in 1948, when Israel was declared a state that the bulk of the more than 700,000 Arabs became refugees. That number has swelled to an estimated 1.4 million today.

According to interviews with Palestinians who lived there during the bitter communal riots and civil war and later when Arab armies invaded Israel after May 15, 1948, and reading the historical record, there was an atmosphere of turmoil and fear throughout Palestine.

Arab villages were not as well defended as Jewish settlements and the Jewish paramilitary units were better trained and armed. There were atrocities on both sides, but the one most frequently cited by Arabs occurred in April 1948 when a group of Jewish terrorists massacred 350 Arabs, half of them women and children in the village of Dier Yassin, near Jerusalem.

Stories of other atrocities—real or imagined—spread among the Arab population. The Arabs were getting the worst of the civil war and word spread that it would be safer to leave temporarily until the shooting ended.

The bulk of the Arabs left by foot, carrying with them what they could on their back or on carts.

Since then, the Palestinians have been like unsettled ballast in the keel of a ship on stormy seas. Because of their unsettled status, their anger and hope of return, they have been susceptible to political appeals from many sources.

In order to understand this, it is necessary to examine how after 23 years the Palestinian issue has stayed alive. There are four principal factors.

Perhaps the most important reason is the nature of the Palestinians themselves. The refugee population has doubled in the 23 years. They feel they were expelled from their homes by force and hence they have an outstanding claim. Property owners have not been compensated and they feel deprived and humiliated.

An Arab who lives in East Jerusalem and who since 1967 has visited his former residence in Jaffa said: "It breaks my heart to see my house with strangers living there and I'm not allowed to go back. I can't describe

how it feels. By what right do they live there?"

The way the Palestinians feel about Israelis is also an element in the story. Most Palestinians, when asked, will say they bear no feelings towards Jews as such, but only toward adherents of Zionism calling for a Jewish nation in Palestine at the expense of the Arabs who lived there.

Yet there is considerable anti-Jewish feeling. For example, you hear the word "Jew" rather than "Israeli" when talking about a Jewish citizen of Israel.

Both Palestinian Arabs and Israelis who lived in Palestine during the mandate say that at the turn of the century there was little religious or racial conflict between the two communities. Many Arabs and Jews were neighbors and friends and it was not uncommon for both to speak each other's language.

But as the index of Zionism caught on in Europe and Jewish immigration increased in Palestine, the Arabs began to feel threatened and communal attitudes became more sharply defined.

A similar phenomenon occurred in Iraq, Syria and Egypt where there were large Jewish communities.

As the Zionist campaign to establish a Jewish nation in Palestine reached a crescendo in 1947, the two communities in Palestine were ripe for violence.

I asked Palestinians if the wholesale slaughter of millions of Jews during World War II made a difference when they considered their own grievances.

"I am deeply sorry for what happened to the Jews in Europe," one lawyer said. "But that does not give them the right to cause pain to me and force me to leave my home in Palestine."

"What on earth can justify a Jew coming from Russia to live in Palestine and we who were born here have no right to live in Palestine," said a professional woman living on the West Bank. "Who can accept that?"

The Palestinian Arab, like many other Arabs in the Middle East, sees himself as the victim of a world-wide "Jewish" or "Zionist" conspiracy.

They talk of the "Zionist" or "Jewish"-controlled press throughout the world that refuses to print stories about the plight of the Palestinians.

SYMBOL OF DEFEAT

Another factor is that because Palestinians are a symbol of the defeat of Arab armies in 1948, Arab governments have used the resistance of the refugees, often cynically, as a political issue.

In Egypt, for example, the late President Nasser rarely gave a speech that did not dwell on the Palestinian issue as the outstanding problem the Arabs had with Israel. This remained so until 1956, when Israel occupied Sinai, when for Egypt the main item was to get the Israelis to withdraw. And now since 1967, Syria, and Jordan along with Egypt have their territory occupied, pushing the Palestinian issue back to second place.

But while expressing solidarity with the Palestinians, Egyptian security officers kept a close watch on Gaza refugees and permitted only a small and carefully screened number to enter Egypt.

In Lebanon also security forces kept control of Palestinian movements throughout the country.

In Jordan there has been chronic trouble between the East Bank where the Bedouins dominate and the Palestinians, who feel they are better educated than the East Bankers whom they consider backward.

But it was the 1967 Arab-Israeli war that has had the greatest recent impact on the Palestinians. "The six-day war was 1948 all over again for us," explains an Amman businessman and former resident of Jericho, a town that was virtually abandoned when the Israelis occupied Jordan up to the West Bank of the Jordan River.

"There were the same scenes of people leaving, frightened and uncertain."

Between Nov. 29, 1947, when the United Nations voted to partition the British mandate of Palestine into Jewish and Arab sectors and riots erupted throughout the mandate, and July 20, 1949, when the Syrian-Israeli armistice agreement was signed ending 14 months of Arab-Israeli warfare, an estimated 729,000 Arabs left what is now Israel.

Most ended up on the West Bank of the Jordan while others went to Gaza, Lebanon and Syria.

Of those who left, about 600,000 were share-croppers, itinerant farmers or unskilled laborers. They lost either their homes or jobs or both.

They moved into emergency camps set up by various international services organizations until 1949 when the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestinian refugees (UNRWA) was created.

Since then, the number of refugees has doubled to 1.4 million, according to U.N. figures. The total number of Palestinian Arabs—those who were born in the area of the former mandate and their offspring—is estimated at 2.7 million, nearly as large as Israel's population of 2.8 million and larger than Jordan's 2.2 million.

If the creation of Israel caused the refugee problem, the actions of the Arab countries have kept it alive as a political issue and in some case made the condition worse.

After the 1948 war that ended with the establishment of Israel, Egypt became the administering power in Gaza.

It was Egyptian policy to conduct a program of political indoctrination. "In the schools every morning, students used to pledge allegiance to the Egyptian and Palestinian flag and would end the recitation with a vow to recover Palestine," said Gaza resident.

CROWDED CONDITIONS

In the narrow strip of land about 25 miles long and about four miles wide are packed 453,000 Palestinians under Israeli administration since the 1967 war. That comes out to about 3,235 persons a square mile, second only to Monaco in density.

Of the 1.4 million refugees UNRWA says are on its rolls, nearly a half million live in camps such as the Beach Camp in Gaza.

In the Beach Camp for a total population of 33,250 there are 414 outdoor toilets, constructed of corrugated metal over a concrete platform with an oval hole leading to a pit. There is no flushing facility.

There are 47 water collection points, with a total of 125 taps to serve the entire population, according to U.N. officials.

Scattered throughout the camp are 89 garbage collection bins. "We try to empty them every day," said a UNRWA spokesman. But each bin I saw was overflowing.

NOT LIKE WELFARE

Long-time UNRWA officials say that the Palestinian refugee is not comparable to a person on welfare in the West.

"Unlike the relief recipient in the United States or England, the Palestinian refugee does not attribute his condition to his own shortcomings or bad breaks," one UNRWA source said.

"They feel that what UNRWA gives them is only a small part of what is due from the international community who they blame for their condition. And the 22 pounds of flour a month and a cholera shot doesn't begin to meet their real needs.

"They don't feel grateful," he said. "On the contrary they feel much, much more is due."

What the congested conditions of the camps does produce over a lifetime, observers say, is a volatile blend of bitterness "that expresses itself in intense anti-Western feeling."

FINANCIAL PROBLEMS

For the past several years UNRWA has had a series of financial crises. Currently the agency has more than a \$85 million deficit.

If there were to be any cuts in services they would probably be in education, which is a highly popular program.

Some observers said even a slight cutting of education services would increase the pool of men that might be susceptible to radical political ideas.

Many Palestinian employes of UNRWA have joined the guerrilla movement, particularly Fatah.

Frequent guerrilla attacks and bombings in Gaza have resulted in numerous Arab deaths since the war. The guerrillas attack other Arabs to discourage Gaza residents from working in Israel.

In Lebanon, guerrilla organizations are in effective control of most of the 15 refugee camps and use seven UNRWA buildings in camps for organizing activities.

But an UNRWA spokesman insists that the organization has no official contact with Fatah. "They have power but no official status as far as UNRWA is concerned," he said.

PALESTINIANS CHART SEPARATE COURSE

(By Jesse W. Lewis, Jr.)

AMMAN, July 8—An attractive Palestinian woman who works for the United Nations here in Jordan spends most of her free time—and some of her working hours as well—arranging for public relations activities for the guerrilla movement.

Outside Beirut, in a make-shift hospital an 18-year-old Palestinian boy who was born in a refugee camp recuperates from injuries he said he received on a guerrilla raid into Israel across the Lebanese border. His left leg was amputated.

In Kuwait, a Palestinian businessman divides his 18-hour working day between operating his firm and acting as a liaison officer for Fatah, the largest Palestinian guerrilla organization.

These are just three Palestinians living in different parts of the Arab world who are deeply involved in the Palestinian nationalist movement, a movement that was dormant until the 1967 Arab-Israeli war.

NEW WAVE OF REFUGEES

The war produced a new wave of refugees from Jordan's West Bank and Syria's Golan Heights that were occupied by Israel. This produced a general feeling among Palestinians that Arab governments were unable to protect them and they decided to try to guide their own future.

Since then the movement has attracted the active help or the imagination of most of the estimated 2.7 million Palestinians.

One key reason for this militancy is the youth of the Palestinian population and the high ratio of literacy and educated Palestinians. An estimated 50 per cent of Palestinians are under 15.

Not all Palestinians are as involved as the United Nations employe, the wounded guerrilla or the Kuwaiti businessman.

More typical may be the Palestinian professor at the American University of Beirut who occasionally attends "skull sessions" to discuss Palestinian political strategy. Or the Palestinian shipyard worker in Goteberg, Sweden, who sends part of his salary to the guerrilla movement fund in Beirut.

ARMS MULTIRACIAL STATE

The arm of the Palestine nationalist movement, as outlined in the "Palestine national charter," is to establish a multiracial state in the former mandate area of Palestine, in which Arabs and Jew would live.

To do this, the movement has tried through propaganda and through much less effective guerrilla tactics to press its case.

There are several aspects to the Palestinian nationalist movement.

Ironically, the one that has received the most attention—the guerrillas as a para-military force against Israel—has been the least effective, according to analysis. Even many guerrilla leaders will say privately that the guerrillas have never been more than a token threat to the Jewish state.

Israel has a highly professional, well-equipped army, and excellent defenses in the Jordan valley and northern Israel, the area in which the guerrillas usually operate. When guerrillas try to infiltrate they are detected by electronic devices and helicopter-borne troops intercept them, usually inflicting high casualties.

Also the guerrillas are fragmented into at least 10 major organizations that have never established uniform training or operation tactics. The publicity photographs that show guerrillas in training jumping over burning automobile tires and carrying automatic rifles is quite different from engaging in a fire-fight where real bullets are used.

When they were crossing the Jordan River before the Jordan civil war, for example, the number of guerrillas killed or captured by Israel was often as high as nine out of ten. Many guerrillas never made it across the river because they did not know how to swim.

Until the civil war last September, when King Hussein reestablished his authority, the guerrillas were a powerful political force within Jordan. In June, 1970 for example the guerrillas forced the king to fire his army chief of staff and other senior army officers, one of whom was the king's cousin.

But since the war in Jordan, the guerrilla's power has been severely curbed. There are no longer armed guerrilla patrols in downtown Amman nor guerrilla bases in the city. Most of the guerrillas are restricted to the desolate hills around Jerash and Ajloun, in North Jordan.

EASIER ACCESS

Many of their forces have shifted to Lebanon, where they have easier access to Israel across Lebanon's southern border. This access is tacitly permitted by an agreement signed in November, 1969, by Yasser Arafat, leader of Fatah, and the then Lebanese army commander.

But the key to the guerrillas appeal and political power in Jordan and Lebanon is that Palestinians form a sizable part of the population in those countries.

In the non-occupied part of Jordan, there are an estimated 700,000 Palestinians of a total population of 1.3 million. And in Lebanon, there are approximately 350,000 Palestinians out of a total of 2.7 million.

A closer examination of the Palestinians in Lebanon illustrates their force. When United States Secretary of State William Rogers visited Lebanon last May, one of the considerations in planning the route of his motorcade was that it had to pass within yards of several Palestinian refugee camps that straddle the main access to Beirut's international airport.

Only after Lebanese authorities worked out an agreement with guerrilla leaders did American security officials give the green light for Rogers to travel by car.

15 CAMPS IN LEBANON

There are 15 Palestinian refugee camps in Lebanon containing 90,000 persons. Six camps are around the capital, Beirut, while others are located around the major cities of Sidon and Tyre, in the south, and Tripoli, in northern Lebanon.

In October and November 1969, Lebanon hovered on the brink of civil war because the army used force to try to curtail guerrilla activities.

Perhaps the most successful aspect of the revived Palestinian movement has been to force world attention toward the 23-year-old Palestinian problem.

The spokesmen for the Radical Popular

Front for the Liberation of Palestine, Ghasan Kanafani, says that the main purpose of guerrilla airline hijackings and bombings in Europe is to dramatize the plight of the Palestinians in the Middle East.

Not all Palestinians endorse such terror tactics, but there was general agreement at the time that they started such acts did draw world attention to the issue.

The parent organization for nearly all Palestinian political activity is the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) that is headed by Yasser Arafat, who is chairman of the executive committee. Arafat is also head of Fatah, one of the groups making up the PLO.

The PLO, which was formed in 1964, is recognized by the 14-nation Arab League as the political organization that represents all Palestinians. When Arafat travels, whether to an Arab summit meeting or outside the Middle East, it is as head of the PLO.

The PLO has offices in every Arab capital, several in western Europe and in New York. Most of the propaganda activities abroad consist of giving lectures and distributing literature.

The main policy making body of the PLO is the Palestine National Council, whose membership has been recently expanded to 151 delegates. It is currently meeting in Cairo.

Palestinians living on the West Bank and in Gaza under Israel occupation, however, feel that the PLO does not always reflect their point of view.

"But," as one West Bank lawyer put it, "the PLO is the only group we have until we get something better."

PALESTINIANS ARE DIVIDED ON SOLUTION

(By Jesse W. Lewis Jr.)

BEIRUT.—"If I want to be an extremist, I will say that the whole of Palestine is my land. Maybe this is the feeling of most Palestinians," said a Ramallah professional man.

"But as a practical matter, the partition of 1947 or a modification of the partition plan whereby every Palestinian would have the right of return and those who choose not to return would be compensated—I think that would be acceptable."

This is just one Palestinian's view in the midst of many conflicting opinions of how the 23-year-old Palestinian problem can be solved. Because they have been scattered across the Middle East and had different experiences under different Arab governments they have different ideas on what is an acceptable settlement.

The guerrillas will say they will accept nothing less than to "de-Zionize"—or end the exclusive Jewish nature of—the former mandate of Palestine which is now controlled by Israel.

Most Palestinians feel they have an outstanding, unsettled claim against Israel and the world still owes them something because it recognized the Jewish state of Israel in 1948, giving a de jure stamp to their status as refugees.

Before considering possible solutions to the Palestinian problem a few basic elements must be discussed.

First, there does not appear to be any one proposal for a solution that commands the approval of a majority of the Palestinians themselves. And, if there is one, there is no way of determining that a majority support it.

"The difficulty with any proposal," says Hamdi Canaan, a businessman and political leader in the West Bank town of Nablus, "is that Palestinians cannot meet to discuss their future."

The guerrilla movement, for example, calls for the establishment of a multi-racial democratic state in which Arabs and Jews would live.

For most Palestinians this may be an ideal solution, but not a very practical or likely one.

In general, the guerrilla solution, which is to be achieved by armed struggle, appeals to the young refugee camp-dweller, the young educated Palestinian and a group of racial intellectuals, most of whom live in Beirut.

But the middle-class Palestinians—the group that has traditionally supplied the political leadership—would in general, rather have the right to return, choose not to and accept compensation for their lost property and continue their lives in peace.

"If given the choice, I wouldn't go back to Jaffa because it's a Jewish city," said one Palestinian, now living in Jerusalem. "But it's my right. Whether I use it or not is up to me. I know Jaffa as an Arab city. I want to live in an Arab environment."

A second basic element is that any solution to the Palestinian problem must be acceptable to the Arab countries on Israel's fringe as well as to the Palestinians. This is a key element because the future of the refugees that now live in Lebanon, Syria, Jordan and Gaza is of crucial importance to those countries.

A solution, for example, that does not provide funds and training for the smooth transition from dependent refugees to productive persons for the 176,000 Palestinians refugees, the majority of whom are Moslems, now living in Lebanon would create severe strains on Lebanon's economy and political-religious balance.

Lebanon's political system is delicately balanced between Christians and Moslems.

In East Jordan, there are 700,000 Palestinians, more than half of the population of 1.3 million. The Palestinian populations of both the West Bank and East Jordan total 1.35 million, or about two-thirds of Jordan's inhabitants.

Such statistics illustrate another dimension of the conflict between the regime of King Hussein and Palestinian guerrillas. Many Palestinians, even though they enjoy citizenship under Hussein, feel they are not represented in relation to their numbers in Jordan.

In short, as long as the Palestinian problem is outstanding in the Middle East, there will be cause for war with Israel and domestic conflict in Jordan and Lebanon.

It was the cause of last September's civil war in Jordan, and it nearly brought on a civil war in Lebanon in October, 1969.

What, then, can be done?

"I think of one solution and that is one based on self-determination under a free plebiscite, a referendum, that is 100 per cent free and supervised by the United Nations . . . to ask each Palestinian what he wants. Just ask what he wants," said Mahmoud Abu Zalaf a Palestinian who edits "al Quds", an East Jerusalem Arabic daily.

"Palestinians have been prevented from thinking freely for years," he said, "because of political terror, occupation, restrictions and lack of mature political leaders and political guidance."

This is the only answer that approached something of a consensus. Almost without exception, Palestinians said they wanted the opportunity to express themselves as Palestinians. No one, however, could be sure what the result of such a referendum would be.

There is also general recognition that there cannot be a solution to the Palestinian problem before there is progress toward an overall settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

Harb Harb, a city council member in Ramallah, put it this way: "Our problem will be solved when the whole Arab-Israeli problem is solved."

Most feel it is premature to talk about a solution until the Middle East is further down the road to peace as a whole.

"There are too many questions unanswered," one diplomat said. "What's going to be the future of Jerusalem, which is an integral part of the Palestinian issue? What's going to be the future of the West Bank? Of Gaza? Only the Israelis can answer these questions."

"It is generally accepted, however," he said, "that if you get some kind of pragmatic political settlement in the Middle East it would create an atmosphere that would make possible the solution of the Palestinian question."

"But in order to begin to solve it, UNRWA (U.N. Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees) would have to be restructured by a new mandate from the General Assembly, perhaps a new name—change it from a caretaker agency to an organization with the muscle to solve the problem."

"The ideal time to do this is this fall when UNRWA's mandate is up for another three year renewal. But something has to be done," he said.

"Circumstances just won't allow the Palestinians to continue like this for another 23 years."

"ACTIVIST" OPEN HOUSING

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has recently taken steps to assure itself even more control over local and individual private property rights.

The administration "open housing" policy is unfolding as "more activist" than previously believed according to Father Theodore M. Hesburgh, Chairman of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission. Father Hesburgh added that he "liked what we heard." He was referring to President Nixon's 8,000-word open housing statement issued earlier this month.

Immediately following the Presidential message, the Justice Department filed a suit against Black Jack, Mo.—a St. Louis suburb—which charged that community with racial discrimination by restrictively rezoning land.

It soon became apparent that the Federal Government intends to bring heavy pressures to bear against any local community not toeing the line as dictated by the national bureaucracy. GSA Administrator Robert L. Kunzig announced that his agency would cooperate with the Department of Housing and Urban Development in investigating all prospective sites for both public buildings and leased spaces. If low and moderate housing on a nondiscriminatory basis was found to be inadequate in a community, it could be ruled out as a site not only for Federal low-income housing assistance, but for other types of Federal building as well.

HUD Secretary George Romney announced further that HUD personnel will use new checklists to rate proposed projects as "superior," "adequate," or "poor." Romney said that a key item on the checklist would be "nondiscriminatory location." "A proposed project," he disclosed, "will earn a 'superior' rating if it is outside an area of minority concen-

tration." This, of course, means that the Federal Government is now in effect telling individuals at the most basic governmental level how their towns and communities are to be organized. And this coercion, as Robert L. Carter, president of the National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing, points out, is backed up by the threat that "a local community which refuses federally subsidized low-income housing is going to get cut off from other types of Federal aid."

A confirmation of this interpretation came when Secretary Romney announced that a similar policy would be implemented with regard to water and sewer grant programs.

Among other things these further "guidelines" require sponsors of subdivisions, multifamily projects, and mobile home courts of 25 or more units to—

(a) Carry out an affirmative program to attract applicants of all races, including the requirement that all advertising carry either the HUD-approved Equal Housing Opportunity logo or slogan and that all advertising depicting persons shall depict persons of majority and minority races. (b) Maintain a nondiscriminatory hiring policy in recruiting from both minority and majority races for staff engaged in the sale or rental of properties. (c) Specifically solicit eligible buyers or tenants reported to the sponsor by HUD area or insuring offices.

Indeed, this does represent a "more activist" housing policy. The Federal Government, by threat of withholding our own tax moneys from us at the local level, is coming to dictate not only a community's organization and distribution, but also who must be solicited for housing sales, how housing must be advertised and even the composition of sales staffs.

Recent developments in the 35th Congressional District toward expansion of low-income housing financed by the Federal Government makes one wonder at the political masochism of the administration with reference to its coercive activities in what has been one of its most powerful strongholds.

THE SIGHTS OF SUMMER

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1971

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, those who love good writing will enjoy an article entitled "Sights of Summer." It is by Tom Bell, who writes for the Pensacola News Journal. Those who read his work will attest to the skill with which he portrays the sights and sounds of summer. It is well worth reading. I include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

SIGHTS OF SUMMER

(By Tom Bell)

Sights and sounds of Summer . . .

Epitomized for West Florida by the moss-festooned live oak under which the fledgling Florida Legislature met in the 1820s.

Epitomized by barefoot boys, who, shirt-sleeved climb to the protecting bower of

branches spreading from its giant bole . . . a pirate's lair . . . a white-sailed tall ship. Sights and sounds of Summer.

Surf on the beach. Sound and sights and smells . . . aroma acrid from charring meat on coals . . . the faint spice of crabs boiling on driftwood fire . . . the full moon a silver crescent, then, medallion-like, full-blown as it rises above high-piled clouds above the Gulf.

Sights of Summer . . . The aged, resting on park benches . . . resting after years of toil . . . gnarled hands now idle, searching bird-like for occupation. Forest and glade . . . broad fields of grass, corn, beans and melons . . . all hung, suspended in the heat of noon sun, a ball of fire but momentarily pausing high above the land on transit from dawn to dusk.

Mullet nets drying in the sun . . . seine boats on the shore.

The sounds of Summer . . . The scrape of metal on wood as fishermen rid the boats of Winter's accumulation . . . fresh-paint smell, and oakum.

Gentle breezes that can whip to hurricane force, impelled by nature in the tropics.

The sights of Summer . . . Gold gushing from the spout as new oats are blown from the combine. The sheen of gold from sun on wheat stubble.

Youths, sunfreckles painted across their faces, rushing to be the first in the surf . . . mothers languid in the sun as their sons' race for the water.

Summer . . . Day starts with fresh cooling wind from Gulf before the sun, roseate below the horizon, brings full light to give the day progressive heat.

Long days, becoming shorter as the sun continues on its orbit South, toward Winter. But the sights and sounds . . . and smells of Summer.

Long lines of cars, bumper to bumper, progressing slowly from beach to home . . . tired, hot parents . . . irritated youngsters . . . all driving into the Summer sun . . . the end of a long Summer day.

But Summer is more. Summer . . . the ultimate season when the earth produces. Seeds, germinated in the Spring, produce their fruit. This is the harvest time . . . the season when the earth, dormant through Winter months, gives her bounty to sustain the world . . .

. . . all drenched by Summer storm, or bathed in bright blue light. Epitomized . . . by the sights and sounds and smells of Summer.

DR. RICHARD L. HOPPING OF DAYTON, OHIO, ELECTED PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN OPTOMETRIC ASSOCIATION

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1971

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor to acknowledge that Dr. Richard L. Hopping of my district assumed the presidency of the American Optometric Association at its 74th annual congress in Houston, Tex., on June 27. Dr. Hopping's stature and reputation are well known in Dayton and throughout Ohio, and I am personally delighted to be able to extend to him my warmest congratulations.

The dimension of Dr. Hopping's honor is reflected by the fact that the American Optometric Association is a federation of 51 optometric associations representing

all the States and the District of Columbia. The association speaks for nearly 18,000 eye-care practitioners, and is the third largest independent health care profession in the country. It is significant to note that optometry provides over 70 percent of the routine eye care in the United States today.

The American Optometric Association has shown great foresight by electing Dr. Hopping as its president. He has repeatedly exhibited his exceptional dedication in both civic and professional matters. He has been elected "Outstanding Young Man of the Year" by the Dayton Junior Chamber of Commerce; one of the Ten Outstanding Young Men of Ohio; and honored by his own State professional Association as "Outstanding Optometrist of the Year." He has been an active member on the board of directors of the Council for Retarded Children, Big Brother Association, the Montgomery County Mental Health Hygiene Association, and the YWCA Building Fund.

At the age of 36, Dr. Hopping served as president of the Ohio Optometric Association, from 1964-65. During his term, Dr. Hopping demonstrated unusual insight, loyalty, and maturity for someone so young. He provided his association with positive direction and initiative. It is with this same motivation that Dr. Hopping has become president of the American Optometric Association, I can foresee nothing less than the same drive and vigor that has so much characterized his earlier career accompanying him to his new position.

I am delighted to have this opportunity to congratulate Dr. Hopping, honor his association, and extend my best wishes for the continued success of his efforts to provide an outstanding primary health care service. He is a credit to my district, to our State, and to his profession.

QUESTIONNAIRE TO ALL RESIDENTS OF INDIANA'S FIFTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

HON. ELWOOD HILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1971

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, it is very important that Members of Congress know the thinking of people whom they represent, therefore, I have sent out a questionnaire to all the residents of the Indiana Fifth Congressional District. It is as follows:

DEAR FELLOW HOOSIERS: I would like for you to give me your opinions on the major issues that will come before the 92nd Congress. As your elected representative, it is my privilege to cast my vote on legislation that will affect our Nation, and each of its individuals.

I hope that you will take a few minutes of your time by filling out the questionnaire and mailing it today. I know that a "yes" or "no" response is difficult, but we in Congress must use this method when we vote for measures on the floor of the House.

When the questionnaire has been tabulated, the results will be made available to you. If you would like a copy of the results please sign your name on the opposite page.

You will note a special section for new voters. It is important that I know the thinking of the 18 to 21 year olds who will be voting for the first time.

Do you support:

1. Federal Revenue Sharing with the States?
2. The President's troop withdrawal program in Vietnam?
3. The United States expanding diplomatic and trade relations with Communist China?
4. The establishment of a National Health Insurance Program?
5. A Constitutional Amendment which would allow prayer in the public schools?
6. Pollution control legislation if it would mean paying higher income taxes?
7. The new Postal Corporation?
8. The concept of an all volunteer army?

JOEL CARLSON DESCRIBES REPRESSION IN SOUTH AFRICA

HON. JOHN BRADEMÁS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1971

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year Joel Carlson left South Africa after serving for more than a decade as one of the leading civil rights lawyers for black South Africans.

A South African citizen, Mr. Carlson humbly described his work there as reacting "as any civilized person would respond." But his activities in defense of victims of discriminatory laws are testimony to his great commitment to human rights in that troubled nation.

Mr. Speaker, in cooperation with the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, Mr. Carlson represented 37 South West Africans in the first case under the notorious "Terrorism Act." He sued the minister of police on behalf of the widow and children of a man who died in police detention following the administration of electric shocks. And last year, he secured the acquittal of 19 nonwhite political defendants who had been in detention for over a year—mostly in solitary confinement.

Mr. Carlson, who is now a senior fellow at the Center for International Studies, discussed his work and the array of repressive laws he fought in South Africa in an address before a joint meeting of a section of the American Bar Association and the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law in Washington on April 30, 1971.

Mr. Speaker, I believe Mr. Carlson's remarks are worth sharing with my colleagues, and at this point I include them in the RECORD:

SOUTH AFRICA 1971: "THE SECURITY OF THE STATE" VERSUS "THE LIBERTY OF THE INDIVIDUAL"—"A PRECEDENT"

(By Joel Carlson)

Mr. Chairman, Brothers in Law, ladies and gentlemen: You have both honored and challenged me by your invitation to me to address your two august law bodies. It is an honor which is more than I deserve, for what I did in South Africa was to react as any civilized person would respond, but may I accept the honor gratefully and humbly. It is a challenge for you to have asked me to speak to you on the eve of "Law Day" and South Africa has a lesson to teach. It is a

challenge I accept. Let me tell you then of South Africa today.

The Republican Constitution Act No. 32 of 1961 created South Africa a Republic. A Parliament of 166 white members elected from 4 provinces and from S.W. Africa—now called "Namibia"—constitute a Sovereign Legislature.

Out of a population of just under 22,000,000 people, 2,028,000 whites are permitted to vote to elect members of Parliament. At the last election in 1970, 1,493,000 white voters cast their votes for the white candidates of the legally exclusively white parties; 96.5 percent of this electorate voted for the continuance of the present white supremacist society while 3.5 percent of this electorate voted for the most moderate change to be made within the existing framework. Those moderate conservatives have one member of Parliament, Helen Suzman, who is elected more for her personality than her party policies.

RETAINING POLICIES

It is true to say, given the alteration of a detail here or there, that the whole white electorate wish the status quo to be maintained.

The question is: Can it be?

There are 22 million people in South Africa and Namibia but only 2 million have a voice in it supreme legislative authority.

I as a lawyer, brought onto the frontiers of change, was able to witness the struggle between those forces maintaining the status quo and the forces urging some real and more equitable system of government. As a result I can tell you something about how the status quo is maintained.

In examining how this is done we are able to see what is done. It is necessary therefore to appreciate that it serves little to maintain law and order by such force of law that in the process individual liberty and fundamental freedoms are destroyed.

In South Africa there is little left of fundamental liberty, liberty of the individual that can be enjoyed. This applies, as indeed it must do, to all the population. Black and White are deprived of their liberties.

In order to uphold, by force of law, the rule of the Whites and their supremacy, these rulers have needed to substitute for the "concept of the fundamental liberty of the subject," the "concept of the security of the State." The Whites, happy to enjoy their privileges and the highest standard of living anywhere in the world, have accepted the replacement of "liberty" by "State security."

To the Courts, to the White public, to all authority the use of the magic phrase "this constitutes a threat to State security" silences all questions and justifies all police actions.

ALMOST TOTAL ACQUIESCENCE

I have seen Bishops accept it when their Deans are arrested and detained: I have seen lawyers accept it when their brothers are detained, and editors accept it, as well as the White public and authority, accept it, and most unforgivable I have seen judges not only accept it but lean over to uphold the patently unjust and irregular actions of the executive and police.

It is most unforgivable for judges and lawyers to accept blindly this concept of "State security" when harsh executive action is taken. For lawyers are above all the Guardians and watchdogs of our liberty. In looking back at South Africa, my country of birth which I dearly love, I can tell you how the status quo, the security of the state, has been maintained at the cost of human dignity and liberty.

A prerequisite of any examination of South Africa is the appreciation that "the State" rest squarely on a concept which featured largely in Europe in the thirties and forties—that is Race Classification.

After 20 years of legislation the "Population Registration Act No. 29 of 1970," is the streamlined basis of rigid race discrimination. In terms of it, every single person alive or dead is classified according to race. It is necessary on birth, during life, and on death for every person to be classified, for on a person's classification flows all his rights and privileges or lack of them. The Act provides that every person shall be issued with a race classification document immediately after registration of birth; this replaces the old birth certificate.

REGISTRATION PROCESS

On reaching 16 years of age every person is photographed and shall apply for a more comprehensive document setting out identity numbers. This number is part of a code which will indicate sex, date of birth, race classification and citizenship.

For Africans only such documents shall register:

- (a) his district of ordinary residence
- (b) his ethnic group or tribe to which he is attached
- (c) further details concerning his birth
- (d) his fingerprints

In addition provision is made for a "record of voting" for all those who are entitled to vote but this has not yet been promulgated by the State President. Why is there a delay? Not because of any hesitation on the part of the State to implement the law, but only because the state has not yet "computerized" all this information it wishes to keep. Who, I wonder, will be the lucky supplier of this computer—an English firm, an American one, a French one? I do not know.

There are just over 15 million Africans in South Africa and Namibia—all classified according to ethnic origin and tribe. Over a ten year period 8,000,000 of them have been arrested and jailed for pass offenses. These "Pass" offenses are crimes nowhere else in the world. They are crimes relating only to color of skin—the Blackness of Africans. This is part of the race classification pattern—part of the discrimination based on race.

Every single day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year, and on Sundays too for this super Calvinist regime, a daily average of 2,500 Africans are arrested under the Pass Laws in South Africa: The average time for a case is 2 minutes.

MANY ARRESTS

In Parliament in 1969, a Parliamentarian was shocked and disclosed that 1,777,662 Africans had been arrested. But the average yearly figure is 750,000. Our prison population on a daily average basis is presently on last known figures 90,555, that is 2½ times that of the United Kingdom which is 38,000. Britain population is 55,000,000 which is more than double that of South Africa's. 47% of the world's hangings take place in South Africa.

The degradation of police and of their victims is an inevitable result. Pass Laws and their execution act like acid corroding human relationships of society and destroying respect for law. The feelings and concern for one another which I believe all men and women have and exhibit in all civilized society is eaten away.

Increasingly there are Africans and others no longer willing to accept the state of affairs in South Africa who seek changes. The State security forces armed by the many laws already passed strive to prevent any such change. I say any quite deliberately. Parliament has designed laws to prohibit the bringing about of any political, social or economic change to the present structure.

A body of laws exists to deal with such matters and is called "Security Legislation." It may also be called "Regulation Designed to Prevent and Outlaw Change." It is a crime punishable by death, or by long imprisonment, one year being compulsory, to advo-

cate political, social or economic change where this involves any unlawful act or omission, whatever the nature of the unlawful act or omission (Suppression of Communism Act which creates "Statutory Communism.")

"It is a crime punishable by death or a minimum of 5 years imprisonment, to commit any unlawful act whereby the maintenance of law and order is endangered, any property damaged, the movement of traffic obstructed or the administration of the affairs of state embarrassed unless the defense can prove various listed circumstances.

"It is a crime punishable by death or a minimum of 5 years imprisonment, to commit any act—and here no qualification of unlawfulness is present—if done with intent to endanger the maintenance of law and order, such intent be presumed where the act is likely to have had any one of a number of listed results, such as the achievement of any political, social or economic aim—the cause of financial loss to any person.

"In order to escape conviction a defendant must prove beyond reasonable doubt he did not intend any of the listed results. These are crimes of "Terrorism."

DEMEANING LABELS

Having classified a person by calling him a nasty name "Terrorist" "Communist" "Subversive" it is easy to deal with him and deprive him of all his rights and his liberty.

The law assists too by providing definitions of crimes which are vague, wide and all embracing.

To assist further the law legislates backwards. An act committed in 1962 may have been legal then but is now made illegal in 1967, e.g. [Sec. 9(1) of the Terrorism Act 83 of 1967. Sec. 23 of the General Law Amendment Act No. 62 of 1966 and others].

The law permits special courts and special procedures providing for instance for the prosecution to join in the same indictment a number of charges not necessarily relating to the same offense or arising out of the same transaction against a number of persons. Even although the offense is committed by different persons at different times and places and different offenses are committed persons may be charged in the same charge and all tried together. [Sec. 327(1) and 328 of the Criminal Procedure Act No. 56 of 1955. Sec. 5(c) of the Terrorism Act, Sec. 12(6) (a) of the Suppression of Communism Act No. 37 of 1963.

The right to bail is removed merely by the Attorney General handing in a certificate and the Court may then make no inquiries into the matter.

The burden of proof is made easy for the State and since 1953 (General Law Amendment Act) an accused is more and more frequently required to prove his innocence and the Court may presume his guilt.

Furthermore whether the crime is committed in Los Angeles or Miami the trial can be held in Syracuse.

HEAVY PENALTIES

The above 1953 law outlaws organized protest and processions and imposes heavy fines, imprisonment or whipping or both for any offense "committed by way of protest or in support of any campaign for the repeal or modification of any law." [Criminal Procedure Act No. 8 of 1953]

Thus 354 students, lecturers, churchmen, and others were arrested and charged under this wide ranging law when they marched in orderly fashion to the main police station in Johannesburg to protest redetention of "The 22" last year. The 22 Africans had been detained originally over a year earlier as "Terrorist detainees." They were then brought to Court and charged, not as "Terrorists" but as "Communists." Then in February 1970 they were acquitted by the Supreme Court

when the Attorney General withdrew his prosecution. Immediately the Judge left the bench, the Security Police moved in, and in Court, redetained "The 22."

Twelve weeks after their redetention, again under the Terrorism Act, the students after a meeting at their university spontaneously walked in procession to John Vorster Square. They were arrested and charged. Of the 354, 30 were charged and 29 of them pleaded guilty to a municipal by-law contravention and paid a R50 fine. But as with all those who show opposition in S.A. the punishment did not end with the Court conviction and sentence. The Security police pursued and still pursue everyone of those marchers. When they apply for passports they are called in for questioning. If they need Government approval for any action—a bursary, a grant, a visa, the Security Police interferes. The arm of the law is long and so is its vengeance.

Concerning "The 22," after all the protest, 19 of them were brought to trial after a further 5 month redetention. 3 had mysteriously disappeared, one of these being found in a mental home. Eventually in August 1970, some 15 months after their detention and remaining in custody they were retired. But with all the powers of the law the inept Attorney General and his inefficient prosecutors brought 540 allegations against the same accused who had been acquitted in February. Of these allegations about 538 were identical and not even the Judges could help the Attorney General and the Security Police in finding the differences in allegations which originally said "Accused 1, 2 and 3 consented to do this and that." The Judge found he had no alternative but to throw the new charge out and did so.

NEW ARREST ORDERS

This upset the Security Police and on their suggestion the Justice Minister immediately issued Banning and House Arrest orders on all those twice acquitted. They were all placed under restrictions for 5 years. In addition the State lodged an appeal to the highest Court in the land and arranged for an expeditious hearing. The 3 Appeal Judges deliberated long and cautiously but found that they could only come to one conclusion. In reality, try as they might they could find no difference in the 2 indictments, so in December 1970 they dismissed the Appeal.

But the 19 were still subjected to constant harassment, intimidation and persecution and their families too suffered.

It must be emphasized that acquittal does not mean a defendant is free. Despite long periods of detention and interrogation the accused is still considered guilty—guilty in the eyes of the Justice Minister. So there is whole practice of "Punishment without charge or trial"—Banning, house arrest, banishment or indefinite detention.

Moreover, a man who has been punished after his conviction and sentence—and having served his sentence, is punished twice. Before such a man, a political prisoner who serves his full sentence without any remission and in the harshest maximum security conditions, leaves jail he is served with house arrest or banning orders. Or he may disappear from society into banishment. The Security Police never forgets or forgives and is ever vengeful of the threats passed to it by anyone.

ENDLESS CIRCLE

Yet with all these powers the Security Police were not satisfied. As a lawyer in South Africa I saw the Security Police ask for a relaxation of the rule of law to permit aberration (a). Then having been given (a)

they said in fact it wasn't sufficient and they needed (b) and (c). Then they said with the knowledge they now had managed to obtain, and their own judgment which was of course sound and necessary and in the interest of State security they needed (d) (e) and (f). They, of course, had to get that too.

Now the position is that the Security Police are a law unto themselves. Their actions are the law.

It is the head of the Security Police as it happens who tells the public and all authority—that in future all political trials will be held in such a place. The Minister of Justice and the Attorney General listen.

If you are to be punished without trial, the Minister acts on the advice of his Security Police.

If you are to receive a passport or not, or you have your passport withdrawn, it is a matter of security and the Security Police believe this is necessary so the Minister acts.

If you are to hold a procession or a meeting it is not the Mayor or the Chief Magistrate who must be consulted and finally determine the matter—it is referred to the Security Police and the Mayor or Chief Magistrate acts on the recommendations of the Security Police.

The Security Police are everywhere and with large secret funds of undisclosed amounts, in the Universities, as informers in political parties, as spies, informers in churches, and everything you say may be heard. There is telephone tapping and bugging and surveillance of people. There are agent provocateurs, there is intimidation, warnings, questionings, late night visits, harassments of all kinds. But State Security is maintained and police power had gone mad.

WIDE POWER

What is the limit of the power of the Security Police? Do they themselves know and accept any limit?

Section (6) of the Terrorism Act permits indefinite detention of a person without trial.

If the Security Police will it, such a person is held in solitary confinement. If the Security Police require it, he is held incommunicado or allowed visitors, as Security Police decide.

If Security Police consider it necessary a detainee may not be allowed to wash or shave or change his clothing or have eating utensils—it all depends on them.

A detainee may be interrogated endlessly or not for months after his detention.

No Court may inquire into or pronounce upon the validity of any such action taken by the Security Police (Sec. 6(1) of the Terrorism Act).

Professor Arthur Larson of Duke University attended one trial in Pretoria as observer for the World Lutheran Federation—the trial of 37 Namibians and said,

"If you pass a statute which gives the police . . . free reign to do almost anything they please in the way of human rights, and then excuse this by saying that you will of course rely on the discretion of the authorities not to abuse this power, you have for all practical purposes, thrown away law and substituted unlimited personal tyranny."

It is not surprising and not unexpected that time and again serious allegations have been made of unlawful assaults and torture during interrogation.

It is not surprising too that the Minister when called on to investigate declines to do so and no judicial enquiry is held.

TESTIMONY ABOUT TORTURE

Detainees have said on oath that they have been stripped naked, suspended above the

ground, electrically shocked after being blindfolded, and made to stand endlessly.

It is known that at least 14 detainees have died in detention but the figure of 18 has substance too. It is hard to ascertain how many have died as a result of detention. Inquest Magistrates have held that at least 7 detainees died by "suicidal hangings."

One detainee jumped from the 7th floor window of his interrogation room. The Security Police have said others have died as a result of "falling in a shower" or "slipping on a piece of soap" or "falling downstairs."

The most poignant record of the death of a detainee which speaks for all is the statement in Parliament which simply records:

"An unknown man died on an unknown date of a cause unknown."

How can the unbridled, power mad Security Police now be controlled. The answer for South Africa and South Africans is not an easy one and it may be that peaceful ways of change are outdated.

But the lesson to be learned is not to start on this road to ruin, this self-destructing plague of arbitrary powers being granted to Security Police or executive authority. Make everyone subject to the law and equal before it. The words of an American Judge were:

"The history of liberty has largely been the history of observances of procedural safeguards."

It is not new but it must be said again and again so that it is remembered and applied.

Lawyers must invoke the protection of the laws guarding the subjects' liberty. Lawyers must ensure that the Rule of Law is supreme. Lawyers must be awake to any threat to liberty. Lawyers must reject all laws which do not observe and provide for procedural safeguards.

Lawyers must ensure that the liberty of the individual is upheld under the Rule of Law.

MISS LINDA JEAN MOYER CHOSEN
MISS VIRGINIA

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1971

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, it has long been well known that the State of Virginia is graced by many lovely young ladies. Last Saturday evening, it was established that Tidewater Virginia can boast the loveliest of them all.

On Saturday evening, July 10, the finals of the Miss Virginia Pageant were held in Roanoke. At that time, Miss Norfolk, Miss Linda Jean Moyer, was chosen Miss Virginia, and Miss Portsmouth, Miss Katherine Bruce Liebler, was named first runner-up.

Miss Moyer was a first-round winner in the swimsuit competition, and Miss Liebler won in that same round for her talent in ballet. They are both young ladies of warmth, charm, and poise, and most deserving of the recognition they have received. Miss Moyer will be a junior at Chowan College, and Miss Liebler will be a sophomore at Old Dominion University. They are a credit to their schools, their cities, and our State, and I salute them both.