

years after the discovery—after almost 200 years of our independence as a nation.

We are now a nation of some 200 million people—and each of us has in his own family—someone who came here with all the courage of Columbus—they came with the character and culture of many races—to make us good sons and daughters in the home—good citizens in the community.

I like to believe that Columbus gave us the example of the dauntless spirit that led us to conquer space and walk the moon.

And I like to believe that we have the spirit to conquer the trials and tribulations of the very earth that Columbus dedicated to a happier and holier destiny.

I believe the answer is in the composite American character—blended of the gifts of many races. Surely we have the means and the minds. We have the learning—and we must have the loyalty. We must have the hearts to control our heads—to guide us with something of the divinity and dedication that inflames every explorer as it did Columbus.

I believe that we have that moral resource—that American something that will lead us—as individuals and as a Nation—on the course to unity, prosperity, and security.

The sanity of America will steer our course beyond the troubled seas of our times—beyond the indecisions and disappointments of today—to the brighter destiny of tomorrow.

This is the inspiration of Columbus Day.

It makes us grateful for his gift of discovery.

It makes us determined to protect, preserve, and promote the riches of America.

Beyond the material riches are the spiritual riches—our American freedoms balanced by our American responsibilities.

We shall keep them in balance by our promise and our performance. We pledge that sanity—humanity—and America shall be inseparable for eternity and another day.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

MILITARY PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION, 1972—APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments on H.R. 8687 and request a conference with the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer (Mr. ALLEN) appointed Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. CANNON, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TOWER, and Mr. DOMINICK conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, this means that the bill would automatically go to the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The bill will automatically go back to the House.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H.J. Res. 915) making a supplemental appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1972, and for other purposes.

The enrolled joint resolution was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore.

PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate and so that it will be in the RECORD, the Senate, when it completes its business shortly, will stand in adjournment until the hour of 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

At the conclusion of the morning business on Tuesday next, which I understand will take 30 minutes or less, the unfinished business will be temporarily laid aside and the Senate will proceed to consider Calendar No. 378, S. 1437, a bill to amend the Airport and Airway Development and Revenue Acts of 1970 to further clarify the intent of Congress as to

priorities for airway modernization and airport development, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, that will be the pending question until disposed of.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Chair. Following that the Senate will turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 389, S. 2652, a bill to provide an elected mayor and city council for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes. The yeas and nays have been granted on that bill.

On Wednesday next it is anticipated that the Senate will turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 332, S. 215, a bill to provide procedures for calling constitutional conventions for proposing amendments to the Constitution of the United States, on application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the States, pursuant to article V of the Constitution.

That, may I say to the distinguished acting minority leader, is about as good as we can do at this time. There will be a rollcall vote on Tuesday on the District of Columbia home rule bill.

AUTHORITY FOR ALL COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS AND FOR THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON MONDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next all committees be authorized to file reports and that the Secretary of the Senate be prepared to receive messages from the House and the President.

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

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1971

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until the hour of 12 o'clock Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, October 12, 1971, at 12 noon.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate October 8, 1971:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Rush Moody, Jr., of Texas, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the term of 5 years expiring June 22, 1976.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

WE MUST EDUCATE

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 8, 1971

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, recently a speech by the president of Boise State

College in Boise, Idaho, came to my attention.

The address, by Dr. John Barnes, gives a concise summary of six gaps in higher education on American campuses.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the speech

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

SIX GAPS IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION (By Dr. Barnes)

Over 100 years ago a theologian named Lyman Beecher gave a strident warning to this nation. He warned: "We must educate! We must educate! Or we must perish by our own prosperity. If we do not, short will be our race from the cradle to the grave. If in

our haste to be rich and mighty we outrun our literary and religious institutions, they will never overtake us. . . . And what is done must be done quickly; for population will not wait, and commerce will not cast anchor, and manufacture will not shut off the steam, nor shut down the gate, and agriculture pushed by millions of free men on their fertile soil, will not withhold her corrupting abundance." There is something that smacks of wisdom, vision, and currency in this remark.

Beecher spoke in a day and time when higher education in America was largely private, sedentary, rural, and remote from the mainstream of public life. In his day, public and private education was parochial in behavior if not in governance. The professor, of which there were few, was a recluse whose contract often stipulated that he would be provided a room for his residence in the library or the science hall. There he ate, slept, and meditated. The closer his room was to his laboratory the higher his pecking order on campus. The president also lived on campus, as close to the administration building as physically possible!

What a contrast! Today, state colleges and regional universities are the thing. Private colleges seem caught between the ease of being "independent" and the difficulty of being unique; between the need for state and federal funds and the desire to be competitive for faculty talent and modern instructional technology. Rural colleges and universities are struggling in a "has been" era, daily remembering that things are not as "good" as they used to be. Some of them have relocated, others have established branches near urban centers. Others are challenged to re-evaluate their central mission in terms of instructional programs, research, and public service. Those that pursue none of these paths see an erosion of key faculty, a stabilized enrollment or a loss, an inner spirit of defensiveness which misplaces energies which are needed to meet modern issues.

Professors have changed since Beecher's day. A good many college teachers wear skirts or pantsuits, high heeled shoes, and, incidentally, most of these are women! The professor is often closely related to his academic friends who do not teach. Business professors involve themselves in the fraternity of free competitive enterprise, art teachers work with art practitioners, English professors enjoy being with those who write for a living. In fact, professors often merge the teaching of a discipline with the practice of their science or art, just as medical school professors perform surgery.

In other words, professors are involved, not isolated. They energize and I think enlighten public issues instead of verbalizing them only within the walls of a classroom.

Oh, yes, students have changed a little too, although there has been no generation to my knowledge which did not challenge, chasten, and in their own way inspire constructive change.

THIS THING CALLED CHANGE

In a very real way our bodies can tolerate change and make adaptations to changing far more readily, and with less tremors than can our minds. In fact, anthropologists say that our bodies are the product of centuries of physiological evolution. Mind adaptation is a difficult business. I suspect even though their speech patterns are modern, the world still contains some blundering Neanderthal men who wear double-knit sportcoats but who demonstrate as much intellectual sophistication as a pregnant sow. While I've not researched this at all, I presume that some such persons hold high office, others possess college degrees, and some are students in colleges and universities. The humorist has said this in another way: "There are still a lot of wide-open spaces in this country; the trouble is that they're mostly surrounded by teeth." We welcome fast ground and air trans-

portation but we lean back on our mental heels when we are challenged to adjust to some new philosophy, some intellectual change of direction, or some new social modes. This may be a way of saying that the physical phenomenon are superficial and that we, therefore, don't argue over a revolution in deodorants, automotive gear-shifts, style of clothing. But when it comes to mental, philosophical, and emotional changes which are deeper and fundamental to our very living, we become conservative. (I use this term to mean "tending to maintain existing views and conditions.")

The changes I've briefly referred to since Beecher's day have in many instances been physical, may I say superficial. Campuses are larger, buildings are finer, faculties are more diverse, money has increased, students enter as a tide, not a trickle. The gaps in American higher education to which I shall now turn are often caused by the fact that we have not made fundamental, philosophical, changes in the nature of higher education although the physical changes are evident to almost everyone.

I. THE GAP BETWEEN PRECEPTS

At the onset, one must admit that the gap between precept and practice is not solely found in higher education. Each man and woman in this audience knows that he or she fails to put into action many of the precepts that easily are verbalized.

In higher education we have gained some preeminence as provocators of theories and principles. But, in too many cases, we have frowned on applications, techniques, the "how to" implications which many students cannot hurdle, although they can recite theories and principles in language remarkably like that of their professor. Funny though, the applications of theory are an art; it is the application of certain principles. Even communicating is an art that must be practiced and perfected. Human relations is an art. Too often in colleges and universities we have evaluated one's knowledge of theory, not his performance of the art. Beyond formal education, each person falls under another form of evaluation in which performance counts most, and knowledge is expected to increase one's ability to perform—whether as attorney, athlete, teacher, electrician, fireman, or nurse.

More and more, but not as rapidly as some would prefer, colleges and universities are involving students in experiences which complement facts and which bridge precepts and practices. The gap is certainly not closed.

II. THE GAP BETWEEN BIGNESS AND PERSONALIZING THE HIGHER EDUCATION EXPERIENCE

Just as participatory democracy is made more difficult as nations, states, and cities get larger in population, so has the size of colleges and universities brought a gap which can detract from a personal experience. Between 1959 and 1969 higher education enrollments rose 115% to 7,696,000 students in 1969, but instructional staff rose only 88%. It could be that we are crying in a vacuum when we hope to preserve the personal touch in higher education when some colleges and universities enroll 30,000 students. But I know this: Everyone seems to need a more personal relationship to those around him. It is a human craving which may be sought in cells, clubs, colonies, precincts, neighborhoods, etc. Man shows few signs of adapting to aloneness; anonymity is not his way. Of course, size is not the only factor that reduces individual personality in a group—openness, various patterns of communication, although not person to person, can nonetheless have positive effects on an individual feeling of belonging to a large group. Some of the dullest college classes are small; large classes under certain conditions can be warm and exciting.

III. THE FINANCIAL GAP IN HIGHER EDUCATION

While many rant for a wider financial involvement of the federal government in pub-

lic higher education, others rave that there is already too much federal money and influence. Whichever side you may take, it should be noted that in fiscal 1970-71 the states appropriated in excess of seven (7) billion dollars for higher education not including vocational-technical support and community colleges. The state legislature is the dominant source of higher education money. State schools tax no district; they set no levy, aside from that dollar amount in an appropriations bill. Actually, legislatures have done a remarkable job; in 10 years their support rose from 1.5 billion to more than 7 billion. Blind damnation is the worst kind. States are to be complimented, not blamed.

But there must be ways to close the gap in funding higher education. Raising the tuition and fees is not a final answer. Neither is raising the appropriation. Giving higher education to the federal government isn't either. What else?

Well, the theorists haven't been silent here. Collins, writing in the "Educational Record," Fall, 1970, says: "Wanted is a perpetual-motion machine that feeds harmlessly on its own product, expands as rapidly as demanded, operates independently of the politicians who turn it on, produces as well and as equitably in Mississippi as in New York, and gives motion to higher education but leaves direction to the educators and the trustees in whose care the people have placed this marvel." Time doesn't permit full disclosure of his solution but the article contains the answer.

Tobin has recommended a National Youth Endowment that would give every citizen \$5,000 in government credit at high school graduation or at age 19 to be used for higher education or vocational-education, with repayment beginning at age 28.

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education recommends a program of grants and loans to both students and institutions. Some congressmen are talking about a compensatory tax write-off, others want extensions of such programs as are already operative. Some States are discussing state-administered programs of student loans or grants. Some speak of federal loans which would be repaid through withholding taxes which would begin one year after completion of college and last throughout life.

The solution is not an easy one but the funding gap seriously affects the quantity and quality of higher education.

IV. THE GAP BETWEEN THE OPEN DOOR AND ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE

The open door admits not only a great number of students to college but students with wide ranges in intelligence and motivation. Americans still think of themselves as a society where a "second change" is possible. The student who barely made it to his high school graduation ceremony or who dropped out and has now reached the age of 19 is admitted to most public institutions of higher education and under the guise of democracy and free choice he can pursue virtually any academic goal except those that relate to physical health, such as nursing and medical education. Others are admitted to college without goals and with meager motivation. The combination gives higher education in this nation a drop-out rate that some authorities say approximates 70% of those who enter. Proponents of the open door pride themselves in the fact that 70% received the opportunity; others ask, "Did they really?" Others remind us that failing to obtain a degree does not mean that all is lost; a few years of college helps everyone. Others say, "At least it kept them out of the labor market." Someone defined college as: "The several year breather between a man's mother and his wife!" However you view it, education is spending a great deal of money, time, and facilities on a high percentage of students with low abilities and/or low motivation. This affects the

pursuit of excellence IF funds are limited and IF such students set impossible goals for themselves. Few seriously question the rather universal need for education beyond the American high school since most high schools do not equip graduates for the world of work in a day in which employability necessitates skill beyond common labor.

There is more talk of a "meritocracy" in higher education. Logan Wilson defines this approach: "Nobody becomes educated by inheritance, gift, or decree. Even when provided with unrestricted opportunity, every person is limited by his own will, desires, and capabilities."

V. THE GAP BETWEEN IMMEDIATE RELEVANCE AND CONFORMITY

The distance between these extremes is likewise wide. If relevance is defined as topics or ideas of immediate interest to freshmen, or if relevance is a daily newspaper type of education, or if it is a popular vote on what shall be taught today—then it is indeed the north pole of higher education. Not much will grow and flourish there. Relevance in that sense refuses to look at what is not yet discovered, yet discovery is one of the roles of higher education. Relevance in that sense also resents most studies of the past, yet educated man stands on the shoulders of the knowledge of preceding generations.

Conformity, too, holds little promise for higher education. How can man or his institutions stand still on a revolving planet? The annual meeting of the Western College Association, March 1971, was devoted to "The Is and the Ought of Higher Education in the United States." Not only students but trustees, professors, and presidents freely debate where higher education ought to be. It ought to be somewhere between the titillating sound of relevance and the comfortable sound of conformity. Neither will meet the needs of students, challenge the public, inspire alumni, or motivate legislators to fund higher education.

VI. THE GAP IN STUDENT INVOLVEMENT

One of the most significant events in higher education has been the participation of students in the diverse affairs of their institution of higher education.

Many presidents, professors, and trustees have welcomed lengthening the conference table. Some have not. Others have done the mechanical thing without heart and soul. Some students have sought a voice, others a veto power, a few have sought disruption and violence. It is too early to know where such varied involvement will lead. Keep in mind that students are the late arrivals in this game of governance and administration in American higher education. At the decision table have sat trustees, state legislators, presidents, faculties, alumni, various external pressure groups and federal agencies. I need not reiterate the plight of the chief administrator of a college or university in this setting. Whether his concern is where to play a key football game, whether to drop or add a department of study, how a budget is to be proposed or spent—he receives subtle, direct raging, or renouncing advice both before and after he makes a decision.

One of the growing inconsistencies is noted in the fact that while some students desire a voice in university affairs they want no voice but their own in student affairs. Shared leadership means fully shared. If all constituencies listed above want impregnation outside their group but not within, the goals of democratic involvement will not be possible.

These are some gaps, there are others time forbids discussing. Such talk of self-criticalness reminds me of the story Orville Freeman told of a stranger in town looking for a church to attend. The stranger stood at the door of a church and heard the minister and congregation reading: "We have left undone the things we ought to have done and we have done things we ought not to have done."

He hesitated no longer, promptly found a seat and quietly sighed: "Thank goodness I've found my kind of people at last!"

The perfect society, the perfected college or university depends on the individuals that comprise it. So long as there is pollution in the air you and I will breathe it. So long as there is ignorance, laziness, bigotry we will be affected by it.

Thoreau in "The Maine Woods" wrote: "If I wished to see a mountain or other scenery under the most favorable auspices, I would go to it in foul weather, so as to be there when it cleared up; we are then in the most suitable mood, and nature is most fresh and inspiring." His statement might well apply to human institutions; it applies to higher education and the gaps in it.

And while the gaps in higher education are being repaired, let us remember that our system is the envy of the world. Personal opportunities for students are wider. Academic freedom is more pervasive. While we self-critically view the gaps and valleys, others at home and abroad who view things from a greater distance see the mountains of achievement. Both views give a balanced perspective of what higher education is in this country.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION OBSERVES 125TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, this year, the Smithsonian Institution celebrates its 125th anniversary. In 1846, the Congress enacted legislation accepting the bequest of the English scientist James Smithson, who left a sum of money to the United States for the purpose of establishing in Washington an institution for "the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men." In fulfillment of that mission, the Smithsonian has grown over the years to become a complex of exciting museums and the sponsor of basic research in the United States and throughout the world. On September 26, a brief and impressive ceremony was held at the Smithsonian to celebrate the occasion of its 125th anniversary. The Secretary, S. Dillon Ripley, reviewed the past accomplishments of the Smithsonian and spoke of its task in the years ahead, describing the Smithsonian's plans for the American Revolution bicentennial celebration. I believe he summarized well the task of this great Institution to help us understand our past so as better to gage our future when he said:

In Washington, at least, we can concentrate on delineating the American Experience for millions of visitors who will be thronging our Nation's capital in this year. We have a duty and an obligation to do so, not only to remind Americans and others of our past, the impact of our science, our technology, and yes also, our culture on our surroundings and on ourselves, but also through these legacies to discern the possibilities for our future. The projection of our past upon a screen, mirrored with the faces and the colors of the present, can surely be used, as in a camera lucida, to outline the traces of the future.

I believe the remarks of Secretary Ripley will be of interest to my colleagues and I include them in the RECORD:

THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

In September, a hundred and twenty-five years ago, the first meeting of the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution was held in Washington. It is perhaps worthwhile celebrating that event every so often. It is now a generation since President Truman proclaimed the hundredth anniversary, and my predecessor Dr. Alexander Wetmore accepted from the Postmaster General a first class stamp with an image of the Institution building to it—a 3-cent stamp. If so much can happen to so many in twenty-five years it seems doubly worthwhile celebrating the anniversary.

That there is an Institution at all seems to be due to the persistence of John Quincy Adams, sometime President, who resumed his public career in the House of Representatives, and who, upon hearing of the legacy of Mr. Smithson to the Nation when his remaining heir died in 1835, resolved to dedicate himself to bringing the project to fruition. Adams was appointed Chairman of a select committee to determine the matter. He quickly found that his task was not easy. John Quincy Adams was an eighteenth century aristocrat who has been described by a recent historian as "the last nineteenth-century occupant of the White House who had a knowledgeable sympathy with the aims and aspirations of science or who believed that fostering the arts might properly be a function of the federal government".

His colleagues in the Congress thought he was out of step. They respected him but they did not have his vision. Besides they thought there was a catch in the terms of the bequest. As Adams noted in his diary, "Vail intimates . . . the man (Smithson) was supposed to be insane." "Bankhead thinks he must have had republican propensities" (which of course could have been probable). One of the Congressmen kept hoping that the courts would discover another illegitimate relative so as to give the whole mess back to England. Another Congressman said that the money simply should be returned to England forthwith. A Senator wanted it to be donated for a university and have himself named the first President for his own greater glory.

But Adams had a conviction—"the increase of knowledge" was not the same as education. Education in the United States was a solemn duty for the children and youth, so as to endow them as individuals with useful truths and knowledge already acquired, and suited to their respective condition. An education qualifies an individual for the enjoyment of his or her rights as a citizen, and for the performance of their duties throughout life. In effect, every man and every woman in this country has the right to be taught how to plow a straight furrow in life.

By accepting the Smithson Trust with its declared objects for the increase of knowledge, and having pledged its faith for the application of the funds to these purposes, the Congress would be derelict in its obligation not to sponsor and support research, in science and the arts. Only in this way could knowledge be increased.

With Adams as the visionary with the power to have his way eventually in the Congress, the extraordinary coincidence for this Institution was that Joseph Henry, an equally visionary scientist one hundred years ahead of his time, was writing from Princeton suggesting how the funds could be adapted for the advancement of science and culture. Henry was a twentieth-Century scientist caught in the Nineteenth. He was as equally dedicated to basic research as Adams was convinced of the necessity of protecting the mission of the Smithsonian. The two together were indispensable for the success of the Institution, for their power and perseverance enabled it to follow a course in direct opposition to the prevailing pragmatism and practicality of the times. Joseph

Henry became the first Secretary and never failed to point out in his early reports to the Congress, as if the life of everyone depended on it: "The Institution . . . is the establishment of an individual . . . to bear and perpetuate his name. The bequest is for the benefit of mankind. The Government of the United States is merely a trustee to carry out the design of the testator. The objects of the Institution are 1st, to increase, and 2nd, to diffuse knowledge among men".

In Henry's interpretation, faithfully followed ever since, these two objectives are distinct. The first implies our sponsorship of basic research, the second our sponsorship of publications, and the widest possible communication and exchange of documents and information. Although Henry stated that all branches of knowledge are entitled to their share of attention, he continually specified that work should not be undertaken which could be more effectively produced elsewhere. Additionally he recognized the original mandate of the Congress to establish a library, a museum and a gallery of art. It was in these latter objectives that he eventually succeeded in obtaining an annual appropriation from the Congress for funds for maintenance and care of the public collections.

The increase of knowledge can and has been pursued in two ways. On the one hand original research has been sponsored for many years. In some cases the Secretary's own predictions have been followed. Henry, for example, felt that an understanding of the weather cycles in our vast domains was not only a worthy object of original research but when understood and correlated could be of signal benefit to the Nation. Once a basic understanding of weather cycles was achieved, then the second aspect of "increase" came into play. Meteorological tables could be constructed, methods of data recording as well as acquisition could be perfected, and finally the whole apparatus transferred to an applied bureau, a government bureau, where the work could be appropriately administered and funded for the benefit of all.

Similarly Secretary Langley sponsored the Institution's research in astrophysics, which continued to this day, has resulted in a vast body of basic research, particularly in the last fifteen years of our joint association with Harvard University. From basic research, the astrophysical observatory has branched into an active role in teaching, in applied research for NASA and other Government agencies, and finally in one of the ultimate rationales of all this, the "diffusion", the publication of standard tables, encyclopedic works, in our case works on geodesy and the measurements of the Earth, star catalogues and a compendium of information on stellar atmospheres. Thus one outgrowth of research follows complementarily: the publication of tables, of standards, of encyclopedic works. Nor must this aspect of research ever be downgraded or neglected, for without this cataloguing responsibility, much succeeding research would be impossible. Thus it has proceeded ever since; first research *per se* by individuals, second the publication of the catalogues. In this tradition, the Institution's Century-old concern with documentation and record keeping as well as original ethnological and linguistic research on the American Indians has culminated in the assumption of the task of preparing the definitive twenty-volume Handbook of North American Indians which will be completed in 1976.

A hundred years ago, the Institution was preparing for the Philadelphia Centennial of 1876. The effects of that exposition were dramatic for the Smithsonian. We inherited a vast deal of objects, and the momentum of the acquisition was sufficient to bring us our second building, the Arts and Industries Museum, completed in 1878. Now, a hundred

years later, this Institution is busily planning for the Bicentennial in 1976. In Washington, at least, we can concentrate on delineating the American Experience for millions of visitors who will be thronging our Nation's capital in that year. We have a duty and an obligation to do so, not only to remind Americans and others of our past, the impact of our science, our technology, and yes also, our culture on our surroundings and on ourselves, but also through these legacies to discern the possibilities for our future. The projection of our past upon a screen, mirrored with the faces and the colors of the present, can surely be used, as in a camera lucida, to outline to traces of the future.

Who can be so foolish as to put away our past? No man of business in his right mind would overlook a past annual report. It is a travesty of our educational processes in these days of increasing complexity, of vast accumulations of facts and data, that the teaching of history is going out of fashion. The reason for it is not far to seek, and would cause any rational believer in the precepts of education such as John Quincy Adams to assume that we had taken leave of our senses. The teaching of history has been transformed by the teaching of sociology, so that today history is thought by young people to be a collection of myths interpreted through oracles. The oracles are influenced by priests who are thought merely to be 'selling' something. Therefore, none of it is necessarily true. All over the world whole segments of people have become used to systems in which lies are used as the basis for propaganda and policy. In such an atmosphere, enhanced by the instant communications which now subject us to so little opportunity for reflection or objective thought we realize that Adams' "useful truths and knowledge already acquired" are thought of as a very limited part of contemporary higher education. Theories have become more fashionable than facts. The existence of truth is doubted by skeptics, and the young feel that life is a "put on."

At the same time the truth exists in objects. It can be interpreted and understood through objects. They cannot lie. Perhaps objects have been classically revered for this reason. They can be handled, touched, thought about and reflected over, and in so doing convey a sense of the truth beyond peradventure. We know that the teaching of history is vital, we who care about objects. We know that the examples of history contain a reaffirmation of everything we believe in and hope for the future, whether it is in our own interest, that of our country, or that of our environment which is the world's. We know that the truth is contained in these things.

Why then does conventional, organized education pay so little attention to our kinds of research, to museum research, and above all to museum exhibits and education. If education as an industry is in difficulty, if there is a credibility gap brought on by an excess of skepticism, muddled thinking, outmoded ritual and a failure of belief, then I should think an effort to go back to first principles would be of the highest priority. A well-known Communist intellectual was recently quoted as saying, "After mature consideration I have come to the conclusion that the only revolutionary thing in the world is the truth". In the world today the truth is denied to many people. On our side of the fence it seems to us that perhaps one half of the world's population is so deprived. But the proportion can be said of course to be much greater. If the truth is really revolutionary it can be said not to lie in most established institutions, whether political or otherwise, including vast institutions of commerce which in themselves are like minor nations. We in America had prided ourselves for nearly two centuries on truth

as an aspect of the pursuit of freedom and happiness, in a free press, liberty of worship and a national attitude of mind which was endlessly enquiring. From this we produced miracles of technology, shrewd insights into manners of organization and trade and a sense of purpose—our belief in ourselves, our honesty and our idealism. Today's education has degenerated into a temporary transfer of training and information. Much of the best of it is disguised trade-learning, but trades themselves are thought to be demeaning. Professionalism in education is largely a fanciful conceit for officialism. Much teaching today is time serving and produces anomie rather than endowing the student with any sense of purpose or "the enjoyment of his rights as a citizen" as Adams phrased it.

In the last three or four years this Institution, like other major institutional systems in our land, has come under scrutiny. Our purposes like those of the universities are questioned. Doubt and suspicion pervade our institutions, as people at all levels suspect the truth of what they hear and see and read. If we are a sacred cow as indeed we are, we should be capable of reaffirming our own goal to show the truth, to weigh all factors in the balance, not to be swayed by prejudice or bigotry whether it comes from the left or the right, but to diffuse knowledge objectively, to "tell it like it is".

It has been said by those perhaps too eager to claim such a distinction, people like university presidents for example, that a university is the sole instrument devised by man to illuminate and perfect the truth. A moment's reflection and the recollection of academic faculty debates should be enough to corrode one's confidence in such an illusion. No single institutional system or pattern could possibly claim the hegemony of a rational exposure of the truth. The truth is always too revolutionary if you will. One can only strive for perfection but hardly ever assume that it is attainable.

If the Smithsonian is to increase knowledge in the next twenty-five years, let us join with others in using the Bicentennial observance as a means of reviving interest in the truth as expressed in objects. Let us continue our pursuit of the unfashionable by the unconventional. Let us relive the American experience to remind us of our hard won birthright and to point the way to the enjoyment of our rights as citizens of the world, in that world's only environment, our temporary home, our sole stopping place short of the stars. Let us also join with others in pioneering studies on the creation and capturing of interest, on studies in cognition on the ability to learn effectively so that all of us, men and women of a country in which we believe truth still resides, can eventually achieve that age-old dream of our land, to be qualified through education for the enjoyment of our rights and for the performance of our duties throughout life.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN— HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 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?

IDENTITY UNKNOWN

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the response of the people has been overwhelming toward my truth in food labeling bill—H.R. 8670—which would require that all ingredients contained in a food product be listed on the label for all to see.

This bill was developed with the assistance of a group of five George Washington University law students under Prof. John Banzhaf, known as Law Students Association for Buyers Education in Labeling—LABEL, Inc.

These students—Arthur Koch, Gary Laden, Ellis Saull, Louis Kaufman, and Joan Levy—earlier this year petitioned the Food and Drug Administration to issue new regulations requiring that:

For the purposes of promoting honesty and fair dealing in the interest of the consumer, all food manufacturers and distributors must list on the label, in the order of their pre-dominance, all ingredients which are contained in their product.

The National Health Federation has vigorously supported this measure, generating a national letter-writing effort in support of the LABEL proposal. More than 1,300 signed letters have been forwarded by my office to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare hearing clerk. I am sure hundreds, if not thousands, more letters have been sent directly to the FDA.

The grounds given in these letters for support of this proposal are:

First. Adequate information as to the contents of standardized food should be on the label to enable the consumer to make an informative choice of the food she buys.

Second. The absence of the names of ingredients from the label of standardized food does not promote honesty and fair dealing in the interest of the consumer.

Third. Health and religious dietary reasons require full label disclosure of the names of all ingredients in standardized foods.

Fourth. The absence of the names of all mandatory ingredients and nondesignated optional ingredients from the labels of standardized food is an inadequate substitute for informative labeling and is misleading to the consumer.

I have also received letters from several nutritional societies which, to quote one, "are well aware that many products covered by the FDA standard of identity contain additives of which the consumer has a right to know. Unfortunately, this is not widely known."

The issue here, Mr. Speaker, is essentially one of honesty. Honesty is a commodity sorely lacking in the marketplace today, and consumers are getting fed up.

We have a right to know what we are eating. This is especially critical for those who suffer from allergies or other ailments such as high blood cholesterol, and for those who control their diet for religious purposes.

It is apparent that if the FDA is to honestly and fairly serve the consumer, it will issue the new regulations proposed by LABEL, Inc.

GEORGE H. BLACK**HON. RICHARDSON PREYER**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD from the June 17 edition of Front Lines, the USAID newspaper, an article about a most remarkable North Carolinian:

GEORGE H. BLACK

George H. Black, the 92-year-old brick-maker who went to Guyana last March to teach Guyanese villagers how to make clay bricks, is back home in Winston-Salem, N.C.

Mr. Black, who has been producing handmade bricks for the past 80 years, helped residents of Victoria in the South American country set up an oxen-driven clay-mixing mill and a kiln under an AID-sponsored program.

Mr. Black spent seven weeks in Guyana, and on his return said he was deeply impressed by "the hard work and enthusiasm" of the Guyanese villagers who are involved in the national clay bricks project. Under the pilot project in Victoria, brick production was increased from 300 to 4,000 blocks daily.

Mr. Black arrived in Guyana March 14, accompanied by his granddaughter and assistant, Evelyn Jane Abrams; his helper, Thomas Brabham, and AID's Chief of Guyana Development Affairs Harvey J. Withersell. Mr. Black met with President Nixon and Administrator Hannah February 19 for a brief ceremony initiating the project.

Mr. Black helped train teams of Guyanese to make 4,000 handmade bricks per day per team—a total of between 12,000 and 24,000 bricks per day.

Mr. Black tested and demonstrated to the villagers various combinations of clay and sand for the right consistency, the filling of molds, shaping the bricks and the drying process. The bricks are dried in the sun for about three days, then baked in their own mud packed kiln for five days.

Guyanese houses and buildings formerly have been built of wood, although in recent years some have been erected of cement. Since clay is an abundant and cheap natural resource, the brick-making project was initiated to enable all villagers to afford houses.

The first bricks made by the people of Victoria will be used for a community building and 12 small brick homes in the town, which has changed from a small historic ex-slave village to an agricultural community.

The inauguration of the project on March 16 was attended by Viola Burnham, wife of the Prime Minister; U.S. Ambassador Spencer M. King; Mission Director Robert C. Hamer; Cecil Mercurius, community development officer, and other officials of the Guyana Government.

When the project was completed, Prime Minister Forbes Burnham praised the practicability of Mr. Black's brickmaking technique. He explained that the only non-human power involved is that of a mule or two bullocks harnessed to a clay mill and that clay bricks can be produced at a much lower cost than cement.

Mr. Mercurius, who is the Guyanese coordinating officer for the brick project, said that the methods learned in the Victoria project will increase average national pro-

duction to 100,000 bricks daily. He added that additional sites for establishing clay mills have been selected in the counties of Berbice and Essequibo.

In addition, four Guyanese trainees have been selected to visit Winston-Salem, N.C., this summer to train under Mr. Black's auspices at his backyard mud-mill.

The entire Guyana brick project was filmed by a CBS television news crew and will be shown as an episode of Charles Kuralt's "On the Road" report on a Walter Cronkite evening news hour.

I might add that Charles Kuralt did indeed broadcast the story of Mr. Black's trip to Guyana on the CBS evening news of June 25.

Mr. Black has set an example of which we should all be proud. His unselfish service to the Guyanese is also a service to America, and it is my privilege to recognize him as a great credit to our country.

MISSILE MYTHS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in consecutive issues, October 2 and October 9, 1971, the editors of the New Republic have made a useful contribution to the strategic weapons debate by printing articles by Herbert Scoville, Jr. Dr. Scoville, formerly a high ranking CIA and Arms Control and Disarmament Agency official, is Chairman of the Federation of American Scientists' Strategic Weapons Panel. "Pete" Scoville has appeared on several occasions before congressional committees charged with defense responsibilities and his contributions have been important to our understanding of these issues.

Scoville's New Republic articles appeared under the general title "Missile Myths." Part I is entitled "A Soviet First Strike?" and Part II, "Upgrading Soviet SAM" and both are reprinted following my remarks:

[From the New Republic, Oct. 2, 1971]

MISSILE MYTHS—I: A SOVIET FIRST STRIKE?

(By Herbert Scoville, Jr.)

Now that the US and the USSR have agreed at the highest level to "concentrate this year on working out an agreement to limit the deployment of ABMs" and "to agree on certain measures with respect to the limitations of offensive strategic weapons," it is timely to clear away some of the myths which have been hampering success at SALT and providing fuel for the arms race. One such myth has been the widely trumpeted charges that the Russians were preparing a first strike against the US—a strategic attack on this country which would destroy a sufficient proportion of our strategic retaliatory forces that we would be either unable or unwilling to respond. If the Soviets or we came to believe that they had this capability, then our deterrent, the heart of our strategic security, would have lost its credibility. Nuclear war would have become more likely and our vulnerability to nuclear blackmail a reality. This fear of a first strike against our Minuteman ICBMs was a major factor in President Nixon's previous reluctance, (which now appears to have been partially overcome) to

negotiate an ABM agreement without a simultaneous limitation on offensive weapons. [Laird said September 18 that the Russians in the last 10 months have undertaken, with "tremendous momentum," a buildup of both land- and sea-based missiles. When Laird gets specific in his report to Congress next January on the military budget, there will be, he predicts, no further talk of budget cutting, for the American people don't want to be "militarily inferior." Government officials, it is reported, say that 80 ICBM silos are being built in the Soviet Union, that the Soviet ICBMs already outnumber ours—1500 to 1054—and that they have or soon will have 25 operational missile-firing submarines (the US has 41). Numbers, of course, say nothing definitive about a first strike capability or intent.—The Editors]

Secretary Laird first raised the first-strike alarm in justifying the Safeguard ABM when he said on March 21, 1969 that the Soviet Union is "going for a first strike capability, and there is no question about it." However, later, after testimony by Secretary Rogers and CIA Director Helms, he retreated to the position that the Russians were acquiring the forces that would provide them with such a capability.

Although we have no way of divining Soviet intentions, we must attempt to visualize a first-strike policy from the Soviet point of view. We must remember that a first strike that is only 50 percent or even 95 percent effective is a disaster for the Soviet Union, since few—or even one—thermonuclear explosions on its cities in retaliation would be a catastrophe. Knocking out all our Minuteman missiles but leaving us with a strong retaliatory force of submarine missiles and bombers is only an invitation to national suicide. Even if all our intercontinental bombers were also destroyed by Soviet submarine missiles, we would still be left with a retaliatory capability which could devastate the USSR. Thus, if the Soviets are serious in attempting to develop a first-strike capability, they must find some way to neutralize our Polaris submarines, to say nothing of our bombers based on carriers or overseas.

While the Soviets have a modest anti-submarine warfare program, they could not have a force which could destroy the Polaris fleet in this decade or probably the next and have apparently not even made a major effort to have one. Their only protection from Polaris missiles in the foreseeable future would be through an extensive nationwide ABM system that could shoot down essentially all retaliatory missiles; yet strangely, some time before Secretary Laird announced the Soviet intention to achieve a first-strike capability, the Russians stopped the deployment of their only ABM system, that around Moscow. They have only recently, more than three years later, resumed that deployment, but they could not have in this decade, and probably never, an operational system which they could count on for protection from completely unacceptable damage from the Polaris fleet alone.

The continued Soviet construction of about 50 to 60 very large SS-9 missile launchers a year was the primary evidence used to support the conclusion that the Soviets were seeking a first-strike capability. It was feared that about 500 of these missiles, each equipped with three MIRVs (multiple independently targetable reentry vehicles), could destroy 95 percent of the US Minuteman force in a first strike. The Russians had tested the SS-9 with three reentry vehicles beginning in August 1968, and US defense authorities suggested in 1969 that these were designed to knock out our Minuteman silos. They further argued that the only logical explanation for the continuing SS-9 buildup was a Soviet desire to achieve a first-strike

capability. As time passed, this assumption evolved from theory to unquestioned gospel.

But is the desire to obtain a first-strike capability the only or even the most logical explanation for the Soviet SS-9 program? As background, note that the Russians have over the years been prejudiced in the direction of very large weapons systems. Their first ICBM, the SS-6, had several times the payload of the original US Atlas. The Soviets also carried out several nuclear weapons tests with yields above 20 megatons, one bomb even having a potential of 100 megatons. US defense planners have long since discarded the notion that such high-yield bombs serve any useful military purpose, even for a first strike; a multiplicity of smaller weapons is much more efficient. But, with this history of the desire of the Russian military to have the biggest weapons, it should not surprise us that they would deploy a very large missile.

It is also important to evaluate the strictly military reasons for acquiring large missile payloads. First, it should be remembered that the greater the payload of an offensive missile, the greater the capability for insuring penetration or saturation of an ABM system with decoys, electronic countermeasures or even multiple warheads. In September 1967, the US announced the decision to go ahead with a nationwide Sentinel ABM, and this was just about the time the Soviets must have been making the decision to expand their SS-9 program. One justification which the Russian military may have used to obtain the funds from the Kremlin leaders may well have been the strategic requirement to neutralize our Sentinel. A similar argument was used in the US to justify the replacement of Polaris missiles by Poseidon with three times the payload.

An alternate explanation could have been a Soviet desire to obtain a second strike counterforce capability, i.e., an ability to retaliate and destroy any enemy weapons not expended in an initial attack. On September 22, 1970, General Ryan, Chief of Staff of the US Air Force, extolled the US Minuteman III with MIRVs because of its ability to destroy the long-range weapons of the enemy (Soviet ICBMs). When Secretary Laird was quizzed on this subject by Senator Brooke, he replied that "we were not seeking to develop a weapons system having, or which could reasonably be construed as having, a first-strike potential," namely, weapons which might be used to attack Soviet strategic forces in an initial attack. Presumably, our MIRV was thus designed to provide a second-strike counterforce capability. Senior Defense officials have over the years supported our MIRV programs on the basis of enhanced effectiveness against hard targets. President Nixon in both his State of the World messages referred to the desire to have some other option in response to challenges or Soviet attacks than the resort to the indiscriminate mass destruction of enemy civilians. Why couldn't the Russians be seeking to achieve a similar option with their large SS-9s? A Soviet second-strike counterforce capability would not look different to us than a first-strike one, much the same as our MIRV deployment must look like a first-strike force to them. We ought not to automatically attribute sinister motives to Soviet attempts to emulate US programs to which we ascribe purely defensive purposes.

Furthermore the evidence from Russian missile programs does not support a first-strike capability as a priority objective. If the Soviets were seeking an early knockout blow against Minuteman with their SS-9s, they would have had to press the development of a true MIRV, preferably with more than three warheads per missile. US fears in 1969 that the Soviets had tested MIRVs proved illusory. Instead the tests proved, as many experts predicted not to involve a multiple target capability, and not to be a

threat to Minuteman. They may have been multiple warheads, which could be used to exhaust the US Sprint ABM interceptors. The Russians have never tested a missile with more than three reentry vehicles. Evidence is mounting that they have never even tested any MIRV which could be used to threaten Minuteman. General Ryan testified last March that the SS-9 would have to have a new guidance system and a more efficient reentry vehicle in order to do so. Previous alarms were based on premature release of unevaluated intelligence. This failure to test a true MIRV is strong evidence that the Soviets are not racing to achieve an early first-strike capability.

The new large holes in the ground or missile launchers, to which Secretary Laird and Senator Jackson pointed with such alarm in the early spring, are also evidence against this objective. The Defense Department has admitted that a large fraction of these are not even for large missiles. It is quite likely that they are a form of increased hardening (protection against a US attack) for both the SS-9s and the SS-11s, a characteristic that would make no sense if a first strike rather than a retaliatory capability were being sought. This explanation would be consistent with the apparent absence of tests of any new missile for these launchers. The Laird-Jackson alarm is just another example of publishing partially analyzed intelligence before all the facts are available and their implications realistically considered.

In sum, it would appear that the thesis that the Soviets are seeking to acquire a first-strike capability is unsupported by any evidence and is a pretext composed to justify Safeguard and other weapons programs. They have not carried out the programs needed to provide such a threat and their existing deployments can be readily explained by alternative strategies. It is time that we stop creating, and giving credibility to, myths which only serve to divert our attention from the real security risks of the continued arms race. Unless we do, President Nixon's hopes for a meaningful SALT agreement this year will prove a mirage.

[From the New Republic, Oct. 9, 1971]

MISSILE MYTHS—II: UPGRADING SOVIET SAM (By Herbert Scoville, Jr.)

If President Nixon is to negotiate an ABM limitation this year, some of the current misconceptions about the nature of ABM systems have to be cleared up. We can't afford to base our security and arms control policies on false alarms. One such little publicized fear has been the idea that somehow the Soviets would secretly convert their extensive anti-aircraft defense missile systems (SAMs) into anti-ballistic missile systems (ABMs) and thus threaten the U.S. deterrent and contribute to a Russian first-strike capability. This theory, which became known in the jargon of strategic planning as "SAM Upgrade," was originally applied to the Tallinn SAM system (so-called because it was first observed near the city of Tallinn), which, in the earlier stages of construction, could not be incontrovertibly assigned an aircraft defense role. However, it has now been demonstrated that the Tallinn radars are completely unsuitable for an ABM system. The interceptor missiles have aerodynamic surfaces, unnecessary for maneuver outside the atmosphere, and many of the site locations are valueless for missile defense. Nevertheless, as this tactic of attributing to the Russians fantastic technological powers proved successful in promoting arms programs and throwing roadblocks in the path of the SALT negotiators, the Upgrade concept has been extended to older SAMs as well.

Dr. John S. Foster, head of the Pentagon

research and engineering, gave public recognition to this fear when, testifying in favor of U.S. MIRV¹ programs and against a MIRV test ban before a House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on August 5, 1969, he stated that "some way to control SAM upgrading must be found." This has been used since as an argument for rushing ahead with the U.S. Minuteman III land-based ICBM and submarine-launched Poseidon MIRV programs, even though the Soviets had halted and cut back on their ABM deployment and could not achieve a true ABM system requiring US MIRVs for more than five years. Furthermore, it was a major cause of half-hearted and patently unrealistic past U.S. efforts to seek limitations on MIRVs at SALT, even though such limitations would have been a much more effective way of protecting our Minuteman deterrent force than would be a ceiling on numbers of the large Soviet SS-9 missiles, which the administration proposed instead. This failure in the long run will, by undermining the viability of our entire Minuteman deterrent, increase the risk to U.S. security far more than could any conceivable conversion of Soviet SAMs to ABMs. Unfortunately, there is no evidence from the joint U.S.-USSR statement in May that MIRVs will be in the next stage of SALT a serious topic for discussion under the measures for limiting offensive weapons.

President Nixon in his State of the World Message last February 25 stated that "we have not yet found a way to overcome certain differences [on verification]. They are particularly difficult in connection with our attempts to limit or ban MIRVs or ABMs." The SAM Upgrade fears are the only conceivable difficulty that could arise in verifying an ABM limitation, since ABMs *per se* are easily detectable by national or unilateral means. If some special verification procedures, such as inspection by foreigners of SAM complexes or special operational procedures for anti-aircraft radars are sought, then we will find it extremely difficult to settle on any ABM controls. As long as a nationwide net of large ABM radars is banned, onsite inspection will not be needed. A severe limitation on ABMs, even without any restrictions on offensive weapons, would be in the US security interest, for it would guarantee our ability to retaliate with devastating effect against the USSR after any conceivable first strike.

Is SAM Upgrade a real security problem or only a myth concocted to make more difficult the halting of the strategic arms race? Its proponents propose that a Russian ABM would be made out of an existing bomber defense. Yet, President Nixon in announcing our Safeguard decision stated that "an ABM system designed to protect cities from a Soviet type threat could not prevent a catastrophic level of US fatalities." Secretary Laird reaffirmed this when he stated that "an effective defense of our population against a major Soviet attack is not now feasible." Thus, even without any restrictions and using all the technology available from US science, we do not believe that an ABM which could protect our people can be built! Why then is it so easy for the Russians to convert an aircraft defense system into an ABM; why are our military planners requesting more than \$13 billion for the Safeguard ABM, which its proponents admit is not capable of protecting populations and its opponents claim is incapable of even doing the easier job of protecting Minuteman sites? Why not simply convert the US Nike-Hercules aircraft defense missile system, which is being dis-

mantled even though it compares favorably with the Soviet SAMs?

An ABM system must have high-powered, highly complex radars to track many incoming objects over long distances and discriminate potential nuclear warheads from a wide variety of decoys. These radars are extremely visible to photographic observation and require many, many years for construction. Before they become operable, they will have to go on the air radiating large amounts of energy which will be readily detectable and identifiable to electronic pickup devices far beyond the borders of the Soviet Union. Since neither the Tallinn nor other Soviet SAMs have radars which in any way resemble such items, the SAM Up-grade fearmongers suggested that, instead, the Soviet early-warning Henhouse radars (similar to US BMEWS radars) might be linked to the air defense system to replace the missing ABM ones. Even if this were done, the system would have marginal effectiveness; even more important, these Henhouse radars are, in most cases, situated on the periphery of the USSR and are indefensible. They could be destroyed by the first incoming missile, and the system would be a blinded Cyclops. Furthermore, the air defense interceptor missiles themselves are also completely inadequate. In fact, it has been said that in order to turn a Soviet aircraft defense system into an ABM with any real capability to affect the US deterrent, the existing radars would have to be replaced or a large number of new ones built, thousands of new interceptors deployed, and a completely new nationwide Command and Control system installed. Better to start from scratch.

Yet it is the fear that something like this will happen which has, in the past, been a critically important factor in undercutting success at SALT. This cannot be allowed to remain so in the next round if President Nixon's satisfaction at breaking the SALT deadlock is not to be illusory. Likewise, this myth must no longer be used to promote new and expensive US strategic weapons programs such as MIRVs, long before any real security requirement exists. It is time that we drop the double standard that attributes to the Russians technological feats of which we are incapable. If we allow such remote possibilities to eat away at our strategic policies, we shall never be released from the burden and risks of an escalating arms race.

THE HERITAGE OF PULASKI

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the 192d anniversary of the death of Gen. Casimir Pulaski evokes thoughts of gratitude and esteem in the hearts of Americans. General Pulaski's life—his participation in our Revolutionary War, his love of freedom, his heroic death at the Battle of Savannah—have been recounted time and again. His feats of bravery have been praised; his dedication to the cause of freedom has been imitated; his image has been memorialized in works of bronze, marble, and stone.

However, General Pulaski did not fit the stereotyped image of a hero. We often tend to envision our heroes as men of advanced age, having a record of achieve-

ment over a long span of life, or successive military triumphs. General Pulaski was none of these.

He became a fighter for freedom—a revolutionary of his age—when he was barely 20 years old, having participated in causes of the oppressed in Poland, Lithuania, and France. Inspired by the exchange of views with Benjamin Franklin in Paris on the rights and freedom of individuals, and armed with a letter of introduction to George Washington, he arrived in Boston when he was only 29 years old. In the 2 years that followed, he was commissioned a brigadier general, organized and commanded the first American cavalry, participated in the Battles of Trenton, Germantown, and Brandywine, and was mortally wounded during the siege of Savannah. At 31 his life was ended.

Although his efforts at defending his native Poland against imperialist Russia, Prussia, and Austria won him wide renown throughout Europe, his activism also brought him severe criticism in his homeland which remained in bondage to its powerful neighbors. The Polish rebellion of 1768 was a failure, both for the nation and for Pulaski. It resulted in the arrest and death of his father, in the confiscation of the family estates, and in Pulaski's eventual exile.

Defeat was familiar to him in "the New World" as in the old. As he rode to his death in Savannah, the general could look back on his 11 years of fighting and see mostly defeats. After 11 years, his goal seemed no closer to realization than when he started—in America as well as in Poland the forces of oppression seemed firmly entrenched. The cause of freedom did not appear to be winning. At his death, life must have seemed to him a bitter disillusioning failure: For he gave up a comfortable aristocratic life, suffered privation, continually risked his life—yet his cause was seemingly unobtainable.

We know, Mr. Speaker, that General Pulaski's cause did win. And it won only because men like the general had the perseverance to continue the fight against great odds, with little hope of success simply because they believed and knew that the cause was just and worth the sacrifice. And it is this same spirit that must again be the inspiration in our efforts toward domestic reforms as well as in our international relations.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate to note, as we commemorate General Pulaski's deeds, the situation in the country of his birth. We know Poland was not free when General Pulaski fell in October of 1779 and it is not entirely free today. The people of Poland are still restrained and cannot raise their voices for Polish interests, nor act as Polish patriots, nor openly cherish the noble Polish traditions. But there is a profound confidence in the fact that the Poles have survived the partitions, the conquests, the suppressions. The Polish character, personality, culture—the Polish spirit as exemplified by General Pulaski—has survived. And that, Mr. Speaker, is itself an inspiration.

¹ MIRV—Multiple Independently Targetable Reentry Vehicle, used to provide a single missile with several nuclear warheads which can be fired at different targets.